

CIMAM 2007 ANNUAL CONFERENCE
CONTEMPORARY INSTITUTIONS AS
PRODUCERS IN LATE CAPITALISM
20 - 22 AUGUST, 2007 – GENERALI FOUNDATION, VIENNA

While acquisition and collecting, conservation and preserving, scientific work and research, exhibiting and publishing as well as education are still on the official agenda, contemporary art museums and institutions now have to cope with issues of a very different kind in order to legitimate their existence

20 - 22 AUGUST, 2007 – Generali Foundation, Vienna

CIMAM 2007 Annual Conference. 'Contemporary Institutions as Producers in Late Capitalism' 20 – 22 August, 2007 – Generali Foundation, Vienna. A two-day conference examining the current issues that museums have to cope with to legitimate their existence [published on the occasion of the 2007 CIMAM Annual Meeting, 20 - 22 August, 2007 – Generali Foundation, Vienna]; edited by Cathy Douglas with the collaboration of Pilar Cortada; sessions transcribed by Mireia Bartels.

INDEX

Welcoming remarks and introduction

Alfred Pacquement – president of CIMAM, director Centre Pompidou, Paris 5

Conference overview

Sabine Breitwieser – director, Generali Foundation, Vienna 9

Keynote general speech

Peter Weibel – artist, curator, art- and media theoretician, Director ZKM Karlsruhe 16

SESSION 1

THE MUSEUM AS A PUBLIC SPHERE AND ITS AUDIENCES

Introduction

Ann Goldstein – senior curator, The Museum of Contemporary Art, Los Angeles 33

Panellists

Chantal Mouffe – political theorist, University of Westminster, London 36

Georg Schöllhammer – author, curator and editor-in-chief of Documenta 12
magazines, Vienna 42

Charles Esche – director Van Abbemuseum, Eindhoven 49

SESSION 2

BEYOND THE MUSEUM:

Introduction

Christian Höller – art and culture theorist, editorial board of Springerin, Vienna; Visiting
Professor for Cultural Studies, École Supérieure des Beaux-Arts, 59

Panellists

Alte Arte/Pavel Braila – artist, Chisinau/Moldavia and Berlin/Germany 61

Natasa Ilic – curator of What, How and for Whom, Zagreb 64

Florian Pumhösl – artist and editor of montage, Vienna 72

Response

Christian Höller – art and culture theorist, editorial board of Springerin, Vienna; Visiting Professor for Cultural Studies, École Supérieure des Beaux-Arts, Geneva	77
--	----

Questions

Open to the public	87
--------------------	----

SESSION 3

RESEARCH, EDUCATION, PRODUCTION AND DISSEMINATION OF KNOWLEDGE:

Introduction

Beatrice von Bismarck – professor of Art History and Visual Culture, Academy of Visual Arts Leipzig, Leipzig/ Berlin	92
--	----

Panellists

Lisette Lagnado – chief curator 27 ^a Bienal de São Paulo	94
East Art Map/IRWIN – artist group, Ljubljana/Slovenia, presented by Miran Mohar and Borut Vogelnik	101
Gerald Raunig – philosopher, eipcp.net, Vienna	110

Response and questions

Beatrice von Bismarck – professor of Art History and Visual Culture, Academy of Visual Arts Leipzig, Leipzig/ Berlin	117
--	-----

WELCOMING REMARKS AND INTRODUCTION

Alfred Pacquement

The topic of this session has been entitled 'Contemporary Institutions as Producers in Late Capitalism'. At the same time, ICOM will deal with the general theme 'Museums and Universal Heritage'. And ICOM states in these introductory remarks, I quote, 'Being increasingly exposed to numerical and economic criteria, museums are threatened with losing their main focus and collections. But collections still remain the core basis for the knowledge, competence and value of museums'. End of quotation.

Those economic criteria are a fundamental part of our museum situation and, as institutions dealing with modern and contemporary art, we probably face them even more starkly, given the extensive market interest surrounding our activities. It is important to know that ICOM, in this statement, fears the consequent risk of a limitation in collecting, as we in modern art museums have the feeling that where there's stronger competition than ever, activities such as popular exhibitions or media events might take a dominant position in the museum life.

Magazines publish rankings of museums, as they do with tourist venues or with the stock exchange, based, naturally, on the number of visitors or other figures which will not deal with the content. Public or private sponsors attach value to those classifications. The concept of 'result' is rather new for museums – and suddenly disturbing. The rules of the game seem to have changed.

I know that among us CIMAM members, many are in charge of an institution without a collection. Some, working as independent curators, are not even related to an institution and have been co-opted by CIMAM. In that case, of course, the problem of the collection is quite different. However, this is the particular situation of spaces involved with contemporary art, divided between museums, *Kunsthallen*, art centres, research centres, foundations and so on.

But museums, even if they are challenged by other kinds of institutions – which is a good thing – represent a continuity and are the basis of our value systems. That's what I believe, anyway. In this respect, collecting might often appear secondary or inadequate, if not unnecessary, because of its negative aspects when seen by administrations or by trustees. In many situations, anyway, the market is so hot that museums cannot compete with private collectors.

Museums have to face not only the expenses of new acquisitions, but also the costs of storage, of conservation, of installation, for less attractive results than other events – not to mention public opinion questioning the necessity of adding other works to a collection when so many are in storage.

As a museum director with a strong and abundant collection to run, and hopefully with an ongoing policy of acquisition, I'm always surprised to see the limited impact in the media of a new installation in the so-called 'permanent' collection, which, in many cases, is not often permanently displayed. I notice the strong effect of a new work in the display, a new artist in the hanging, but any exhibition, even on a small scale, will probably have more impact. For the artist, for the visitor, this presence in such a context is really important. It will determine another vision of the museum, new relations, new revelations.

At the other end, this is not to forget that the notion of entertainment, a place for tourists to visit, eat and buy souvenirs, is a collateral effect of a new trend in the museum image. As curators and directors we must move away from this concept, even if our system pushes in that direction. Moreover, the art exhibition as a market forum is nowadays predominant in many ways. The confusion between art fairs, biennales and museum exhibitions is at its peak. We have all experienced the reactions of visitors mixing all these categories. The *raison d'être* of exhibiting art must be thought about.

'Contemporary Institutions as Producers' is the theme for this conference. Are we in the capital city to support production for artists who need this kind of intervention to make their works exist? Or do we leave this responsibility to others (meaning, of course, the market, with its specific interests)? Can we also produce research, serious education programmes, and comprehensive publications in this situation? These are the kind of questions we would like to raise.

More generally, we will discuss the situation of our institutions in the liberal economy, where the museum role is in evolution. We will ask curators, artists, theorists, editors, art historians, to react to these notions, and I thank them in advance for their participation.

The three sessions are divided into three themes:

- a. 'The Museum as Part of the Public Sphere and its Audiences', meaning how the museum relates to its public, how research and efforts intended perhaps for a limited audience of specialists can be compatible with a more general approach for any kind of visitor. For whom does the museum work? Do we need, after all, a public, or do we give the artist a kind of capacity to find a context?
- b. 'Beyond the Museum.' By that we want to raise questions about the museum space. Is it adapted to the current expectation, especially when artists are looking for other grounds closer to real life? In some cases, artistic projects disrupt the museum space. In some situations, the museum does not seem adapted as a place, but still can be the institution producing a project. This is the kind of transformation we must consider and discuss.
- c. 'Research, Education, Production and Dissemination of Knowledge', questioning how those fundamental missions of the museum are threatened by this market- and marketing-orientation of the cultural context, not neglecting the impact of the World Wide Web and new access to information.

As institutions giving place to the real works of art, we have the responsibility to maintain these objectives and be prepared to accept an evolution conducted by artists themselves. CIMAM is a platform where such questions should be raised among art professionals without any naivety. We work in this system. We are agents of this evolution. We certainly do not act as we would have 25 years ago, when CIMAM was created. We should face these new realities and react consciously to maintain the main objective of museums: to give view and comprehension to new works of art, gathered in a certain order, to paraphrase a certain famous quotation.

I would like to end this introduction by thanking everyone who has been involved in the preparation of this conference. As I said before, I want to acknowledge the involvement of the Board, the Executive Board of CIMAM, and I think during the past three years this board has done a great job of preparing these conferences. For those of you who had the chance to

attend the conference in Brazil, in London, and now in Vienna, I think you can testify to the quality of the conferences.

I also thank the speakers and the moderators for accepting our invitation to take part in the conference, and we are looking forward to their contributions.

We have had a number of sponsors, including sponsors to support grants to invite some of you to this conference. These were the Getty Foundation and the Arts and Culture Network Programme of the Open Society Institute, and they have been extremely helpful in making possible this presence of so many of you from different parts of the world. Our principal sponsors, of course, are Generali and the Generali Foundation, which I thank again, as well as the others: ICOM, Erste Bank – and I thank Mr Boris Marte – Dorotheum – and I thank Mr Martin Böhm – and the NOUS Guide.

And after we have had our discussions in this room, we will have the chance to visit a number of institutions in Vienna, and I thank very warmly the people in charge of those institutions who are welcoming us: Edelbert Köb, the director of MUMOK; Gerald Matt, the director of the Kunsthalle Wien; Peter Noever, CEO and artistic director MAK; Barbara Holub, President of the Secession; and Agnes and Karl-Heinz Essl of the Sammlung Essl.

And for those of you joining the post-conference tour to Graz, we will have the chance to visit and be welcomed by Peter Pakesch, for the Joanneum and Kunsthau Graz; Christine Frisinghelli and Manfred Willmann, for Camera Austria; Christa Steinle for the Neue Galerie; Elisabeth Fiedler for the Sculpture Park in Graz; and Christine and Berrand Conrad-Eybesfeld.

All of them have been involved in this conference, and I thank them on your behalf.

Thank you.

CONFERENCE OVERVIEW

Sabine Breitwieser

I am very happy to welcome you to this 2007 CIMAM Conference, hosted by the Generali Foundation and dedicated to the exploration of *Contemporary Institutions as Producers in Late Capitalism*.

The conference takes place in a former industrial site, the Habig-court, where the Habig hat factory was a frontrunner in global production and marketing at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries. At the 1900 Paris World Expo Peter Habig, the founder of the factory, received the Grand Prix for his enterprise – one of the medals which are actually displayed in this very space, the former Habig hat shop. Habig had branches in Vienna, Budapest, Prague, Frankfurt, Karlsbad, Berlin and Paris. The secret of his success was co-operation with other companies in cheap-labour countries such as Moravia, which delivered the half-fabricated products that were completed by Habig workers in Vienna. But after WWII, Adolf Loos' prognosis that 'the future belongs to men without hats' came true. The hatless American athlete stood for mobility and progress.

The transformation of the former Habig hat factory into the Generali Foundation's museum of contemporary art is just another example of the use of large industrial spaces for cultural organisations. It highlights a fundamental shift in Western society, in the course of which cultural activities are becoming more and more important relative to the traditional production of goods. While the Habig-court is framed by five streets and the former factory constructed in the courtyard is not visible from 'outside', the (new) architecture of the Generali Foundation is embedded in the structural past. In fact our museum has been built on the foundations of the former factory. The frontage and yard section of this complex constitute a meeting of a hundred years of time. It might also be worth mentioning that the Generali Foundation is probably the only museum building which had to plan for and respect a potential future function of the space – for instance if the museum had to be closed for some reason.

It was at the 1990 CIMAM conference in Los Angeles that Rosalind Krauss gave her lecture on '*The Cultural Logic of the Late Capitalist Museum*', in reference to Fredric Jameson's renowned essay '*Postmodernism, or The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*' (first published in 1984). In

relation to the presentation of the Panza collection in Paris and the Guggenheim's expansion plans the same year, Krauss confronted CIMAM with an analysis of the dilemma and – from her perspective – ongoing revision of Minimalism happening 'in tandem with powerful changes in how the museum itself is now being reprogrammed or reconceptualised.' Given the very particular production modes of the Minimalist art movement – the choice of materials, the simple forms, the serialisation of objects – it was always likely to be 'caught up in the logic of commodity production' which would outweigh its specificity. At the same time Minimalism's aim of creating a 'lived bodily experience' could, if pushed a little further, break up entirely into utterly fragmented, postmodern contemporary mass culture.' The 'industrialised' museum, as Krauss calls it, will 'deal with mass-markets, rather than art markets, and simulacral experiences rather than aesthetic immediacy. It needs technological subjects, seeking [not of affect but of intensities] the subject which experiences its fragmentation as euphoria, whose field is no longer history, but space itself.'

Lately, we all have experienced the transition of the museum from guardian of public patrimony and repository of knowledge to a corporate entity with 'assets' of highly marketable value, individualistic programmes, and the desire for growth. 'A museum is not a business. [But] it is run in a businesslike fashion,' once stated Philippe de Montebello, then director of the New York Metropolitan Museum. The artist Andrea Fraser, who used this quote as the title of an essay, questioned whether the ongoing professionalisation and corporatisation of museums could continue to develop at such an extraordinarily rapid pace, or 'if it would not be consistent, on some level, with the interests and orientation of museum professionals and the artists who staff and supply them; because we have accepted these trends as inevitable, necessary, or even desirable.'

Do we just need to accept that the 'classic bourgeois institutional model ... has long since been replaced by a corporative institutional logic' (Nina Möntmann), and adapt ourselves in terms of flexibility and progress? Or could we successfully develop new criteria, new forms and modes of collecting, exhibiting and mediating modern and contemporary art?

The need to examine the current situation, especially in light of the contemporary art museum and its relation to the public sphere, its missions – but also its boundaries – is thus evident.

We are experiencing a paradigm shift in museum policies. While acquisition and collecting, conservation and preserving, scientific work and research, exhibiting and publishing as well as education, are still on the official agenda, contemporary art museums and institutions now have to cope with issues of a very different kind in order to legitimise their existence.

A few years ago, federal and provincial museums and universities in Austria, as one example, were transformed into 'scientific institutions', with a legally and economically 'autonomous' status. While generated income could now be used by those institutions, this new status forced them to make do with a set budget and facilities. Now some institutions are nearly incapable of expanding their collections or even covering their overheads. One result is that institutions turn into 'profit centres' when marketing strategies become core issues, the activities of museums are assessed and resources are allocated exclusively in terms of attendance, efficiency, and, ultimately, cost reduction. That means that, simultaneously, private collections and corporate art institutions are ever more important.

It has been just seventeen years since Austria, and especially Vienna, was faced with the so-called 'Iron Curtain' separating the west from the socialist countries. Vienna has the privilege – in former times it was considered more of a burden – of being located in the (new) heart of Europe. It is about an hour by car from Vienna to Bratislava, two hours to Budapest, four to Ljubljana or Prague, and five hours to Zagreb. The specific geopolitical location of the 2007 CIMAM conference allows us to discuss the situation of the contemporary art institution in a social and economic system that functions in more countries than ever before.

In 'The Author as Producer', Walter Benjamin recalls Plato's model of the state, in which no poets were allowed to live. Even if Plato had a high regard for the power of poetry, he considered it to be – in a perfect community – destructive and superfluous. In his 1934 speech at the Institute for Fascist Studies in Paris, Benjamin raises the example of the Russian writer Sergei Tretyakov, who sees himself not as an 'informing' but an 'operating' writer; a socially and politically active author who does not focus on the theme of production but is working to change the conditions and means of production; who is on a mission not to report but to struggle.

If this dialectic of social and productive relations is translated into the field of the art institution, we need to look at how to engage the current situation with the contemporary art museum.

Introduction of the sessions and speakers

This conference brings together distinguished speakers and participants from many countries. Peter Weibel – artist, curator, art- and media-theoretician, and Director Z.K.M. Karlsruhe – will be our keynote speaker. Following him, the meeting will comprise three sessions:

1. The Museum as Part of the Public Spheres, and Its Audiences
2. Beyond Museums
3. Research, Education, Production, and Dissemination of Knowledge.

Each session will feature three or four individual panellists, each presenting a twenty-minute paper. Every session will then be followed by a forty-five minute period during which a respondent with specialised knowledge of the panel's topic will summarise the ideas and issues arising from the presentations; then the audience will be invited to respond.

Regarding Session 1 'The Museum as Part of the Public Spheres and Its Audiences', the museum has traditionally been a site of the bourgeois public sphere, in two ways: as a forum for a specific audience, and at the same time as a discursive formation involved in producing the fiction of a largely homogeneous public. The idea of a single public sphere has given way to the image of a multiplicity of coexisting publics that are interrelated in a great variety of ways. The sphere of art is one of these particular (though not autonomous) social systems engendered by discursive self-reference, yet it is in itself very heterogeneous. How do art museums relate to publics and counter-publics? What does it mean for the notion of museum audiences if the original conception of the museum as a bourgeois institution of education and enlightenment is increasingly being supplanted by ideas of entertainment and consumption? Are there alternative forms of spectatorship, and can institutions create, or at least support, participatory models of the encounter with art? And here I would like to agree with Chantal Mouffe in accepting the public as a realm in which aesthetic strategies are understood as political interventions.

The panellists for this session will be: Chantal Mouffe – political theorist, University of Westminster, London; Georg Schöllhammer – author, curator and editor-in-chief of the *Documenta 12* magazine, Vienna; and Charles Esche – Director, Van Abbemuseum, Eindhoven. Ann Goldstein – senior curator, The Museum of Contemporary Art, Los Angeles – will respond and summarise the ideas arising from the presentations.

Regarding Session 2 ‘Beyond the Museum’, museum space defines art and creates a very specific context. It is as a result inevitably restrictive, removed from other contexts of life, and often seems depoliticising. Artistic projects ‘beyond the museum’ have tried again and again to disrupt the museums’ self-reference – whether to attain greater control of the presentation and mediation of the artist’s own work, or to test alternative forms of addressing the viewer, or as part of an activist effort to alter the relations of production. How do such projects relate to the museum’s mission? Can they leave the limitations of those behind, or do they, as they establish themselves as institutions in their turn, submit to comparable limitations? Is the distinction between presenting institutions/organisations and producing artists even still relevant today? To what degree can the recourse to models of the 1920s and 1930s be helpful in contemporary attempts to establish a position within the cultural field and its economic, social, and political conditions?

The panellists for this session will include Pavel Braila – artist, Chisinau/Moldavia and Berlin/Germany, presenting *Alte Arte*; Natasa Ilic – curator of *What, How and for Whom*, Zagreb; and Florian Pumhösl – artist and editor of *montage*, Vienna. Christian Höller – art and culture theorist, on the editorial board of *Springerin*, Vienna and visiting Professor for Cultural Studies, École Supérieure des Beaux-Arts, Geneva – will be the respondent.

In relation to Session 3, that will deal with education, the museum as a site of bourgeois self-representation and enlightenment is increasingly being supplanted by ideas configured around the concept of ‘the market’, and hence around that of the consumer. The rise of the international biennial, with its claim to global significance and its wide range of offerings, accords in this perspective with current neo-liberal conceptions of the global exchange of commodities. How can museums in this context perform such central parts of their mission as research, education, and the dissemination of knowledge? Are museums, with their focus on material witnesses, still fit for these tasks? Or does the availability of all information through

the internet in fact necessitate a correction: that experiences be bound back to actual artefacts? Are there counter-models to the traditional hierarchical organisation of the production and mediation of knowledge in museums that follow guiding notions such as networking and self-empowerment? To what degree can, and should, artists be integrated into the classical functions of the museum, mediation and research?

The panellists for this session will be Lisette Lagnado – chief curator 27^a Bienal de São Paulo; Gerald Raunig – philosopher, eipcp.net, Vienna; and Miran Mohar and Borut Vogelник from IRWIN – an artist group from Ljubljana/Slovenia, presenting their project East Art Map. The response is in the hands of Beatrice von Bismarck, Professor of Art History, Leipzig and Berlin.

We do have a very intense programme, and I would really like to motivate you all to participate actively in the conference, involve yourself strongly in the discussion and bring in your position, your experience and your ideas.

Finally, I would like to thank all those who have made this meeting possible; especially the following people and organizations: CIMAM's Executive Board; CIMAM co-ordinator Pilar Cortada; all speakers and moderators; our travel grant sponsors the Getty Foundation and the Arts and the Open Society Institute; Generali Vienna – namely Dietrich Karner – and Generali Allgemeine Immobilienverwaltung – namely Klaus Edelhauser and Gerald Ruess who have also persuaded Akustik Blasch, Axima Gebäudetechnik, Hazet Baugesellschaft, LHD Küchen, Ortner Haustechnik, Otis Aufzüge, Porr Baugesellschaft and Rauhofer Elektro and Schindler Aufzüge to support this conference through the Generali Foundation; ICOM; Erste Bank/Boris Marte, Dorotheum/Martin Böhm, and Nous Guide.

I would also like to thank all the institutions that are opening their collections and exhibitions to us: MUMOK/Edelbert Köb; Kunsthalle Wien/Gerald Matt; MAK/Peter Noever; Secession/Barbara Holub; Agnes and Karl-Heinz Essl; Joanneum and Kunsthau Graz/Peter Pakesch; Camera Austria/Christine Frisinghelli and Manfred Willmann; Neue Galerie/Christa Steinle, Sculpture Park in Graz/Elisabeth Fiedler; and Christine and Bertrand Conrad-Eybesfeld. Also the Esterhazy family and Mr Ottrubay, who support the conference with their delicious wines. The Hotel Triest/Manfred Stallmayer, supports the conference in many ways. And the

Hirzberger agency: most of you have been in touch with Alexander Zerza or Geraldine Nusser when booking the conference.

Last but not least, I would also like to thank the wonderful team of the Generali Foundation. A lot of them have been involved in some way or the other in the preparations and organisation of this conference, and I am extremely thankful to all of them for their support.

KEYNOTE GENERAL SPEECH

Peter Weibel

As Sabine Breitwieser has already mentioned, precisely 17 years ago, on 10 September 1990, Rosalind Krauss gave a lecture with the title 'The Cultural Logic of the Late Capitalist Museum'. She was, and still is, editor of *October*. The title was actually a paraphrase of the famous paper by Fredric Jameson, published in the *New Left Review* in 1984, called 'Postmodernism, or the Culture Logic of Late Capitalism'. So, even 16 years earlier, it was clear that postmodernism was an expression, a visual recording, of what he called 'late capitalism'.

The debt of this year's CIMAM conference to the work of Jameson and Krauss is obvious. The question is only, have we moved forward in the last 20 years? That is to say, have we found new solutions, new perspectives, to the problems discussed in these papers or, as I mentioned, by Breitwieser?

I will give you three models of the problem's description analyses: first, the famous cultural critique of education articulated by Adorno, Bourdieu and Habermas and Marcuse; second, the economic critique of the art system of Jameson, Krauss, Jean-Joseph Goux and others; and finally my own model, a critique of consumer society through the emancipation of the consumer. So my idea is not to make the author the producer. I will show you models of how we can make the consumer the producer.

The cultural critique is, actually, as you all know, a pure condemnation of what is going on today. There is a famous book by Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno, published in 1946, *Dialectics of Enlightenment*, which has a big chapter about the culture industry. This is precisely what we are doing. And the sub-title of this chapter is 'The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception'. This has been the verdict of the culture critique of the Left for about 60 years.

And it says in the first paragraph that TV, cinema and radio mass media don't pretend to be part of culture any more. It is not necessary. The truth is that they are just businesses that use culture as an ideology to legitimate the trash they sell. They are specialists in using culture as entertainment, which is today part of the daily business of those of us who work in museums.

So, to look a little bit closer at this condemnation of the culture industry by these famous authors, we have to look at an article by Theodor Adorno, published in 1959, called 'The Theory of *Halbbildung*'. *Bildung* is a German word which is difficult to translate, but it means something like 'cultural competence', 'education'; and 'half-education' is just the opposite, the culture of people who are only half-educated. *Halbbildung* means you have a little bit of knowledge. *Halbbildung* is precisely what people who read magazines, who watch TV and go to the cinema are accused of by Marcuse and Adorno and Horkheimer: that they have only been half-educated.

And culture, according to Adorno and his Frankfurt School, is not just the science of humanities. It's not just the science of education. And if it is only about the science of education, it's already amateur culture, trash culture. Culture is a design of real life. But if it is only a design of real life; then it is an adaptation to the misery of the status quo. We adapt to real life to survive as a museum. So culture should be both. It should be the development of the consciousness, and the management and design of real life.

When in 17th-century England and 18th-century France the bourgeoisie gained power, they were not only economically more developed than the feudal class – this is important to remember – but also conscious. So for the bourgeoisie, it was not enough just to have better economic competence. They could only achieve real power if they also had better cultural competence: knowledge, education, *Bildung*. Culture was not just a sign of the emancipation of the bourgeoisie from the feudal class. It was a privilege of the bourgeoisie, of the power of the workers, and this cultural competence made them competent to fulfil their work in trade and business administration.

Without education, Adorno says, without culture, the bourgeoisie would have failed as citizens, as entrepreneurs, as administrators. Culture was a general competence, not just a specialised competence. And the bourgeoisie had a monopoly on culture. The proletariat had to work, and had no time for education, no time for culture and *Bildung*.

The mass media – radio and television – destroyed in the countryside the prevailing world of religion, and transferred directly this world of religious experience to the world of the media. That meant there was a direct transfer from the church to the soccer game, from the

hegemony of religion to the hegemony of entertainment. So already in the early sixties, Adorno is accusing the mass media of destroying the critical awareness of the consumer.

Nothing has changed, even after the reality of the social revolution. All that has changed is the ideological system of consciousness. Now comes an important point. He says, 'Neutralisation is the strategy of the consciousness industry. You must always remember what that means. Neutralisation of any message is the strategy of the consciousness industry.'

I will explain later. This strategy of neutralisation was invented by what is called today 'Biedermeier' in middle Europe, or the *Ancien Régime* in France, both meaning the feudal system. So my proposal is that it is not enough to look at late capitalism, as we will do later in this lecture, but we have to remember that, mixed with late capitalism, we have also a return to feudalism and Biedermeier, and one of the strategies for this was neutralisation. That means not to mind the gap between bourgeoisie and proletariat, but to forget the gap; not to mind the gap that puts cultural competence and the bourgeoisie on one side, and on the other side no culture at all. This is precisely the function of mass media, according to the cultural critique: that mass media in the culture industry tries to forget this gap.

They replace real culture and real education with this *Halbbildung*, this half-education. They are replacing real consciousness which is a product of culture, by the illusion of consciousness, the *Halbbildung*. So what mass media do, according to this critique, is neutralisation, forgetting the gap between culture and non-culture. So the people who listen to radio, watch TV, think they are participating in culture. But in effect, according to the cultural Left, they don't participate in culture. They are just rewarded with a substitute.

And to make them forget that, they neutralised everything. The sixties succeeded by way of the mass media, which adapted culture to the mechanism which should normally eradicate critical consciousness, the mechanism which is excluded from culture and whose consciousness should have been changed by that culture. So instead of raising the consciousness of the consumer and the worker, to lift them up a level, they dumbed down the existing level of culture.

This is precisely the argument we hear every day in magazines and newspapers: we have to adapt to the consciousness of our listeners or viewers. We have to reduce our programmes to a level the people who are radio-listeners and TV-viewers can understand. And this is also precisely, as they put it in the late fifties, the wrong way to establish culture. There is no highway to culture. We also have to learn the ability to share the cultural experience. So whenever those responsible for the mass media explain that you must understand they have to match their programmes to the consumers, it's just an excuse to legitimise their own trash. Mass media do the opposite: they change high culture to adapt it to low consciousness. They sell as culture what is not culture, but only *Halbbildung*. Therefore, the proletariat misses out on the real foundation for autonomy, as this autonomy is precisely the heart of culture, the medium of freedom.

The entertainment and culture industries create a circle to forget the gap. Unestimated elements of culture enforce the edification, the *Verbildlichung*, of consciousness, which education should prevent. 'Mere half-knowing' – and this is a very famous sentence – 'Mere half-knowledge and half-experience is not even the first step.' People always say, 'Give the audience a little information, even if it's the wrong information,' as if half-education and half-experience of culture is better than nothing. And Adorno says, precisely, no. Half-knowledge, or half-experience, is not the first step to education and culture; it is precisely the enemy of it. So to him, half-education, what you get served every day by the mass media, is the enemy of culture. Adorno, therefore, is violently against popularisation.

I'll give you an anecdotal example. There was a book published in the forties, by Sigmund Spaeth: *Great Symphonies: How to Recognise and Remember Them*. And in this book you find a phrase... it's about the *Symphony Pathétique* by Tchaikovsky, and you have a description: 'The music has a less *pathétique* strain. It sounds more sane and not so painful. Sorrow is ended, grief may be mended. It seems Tchaikovsky will revive.'

This is a typical example of how the mass media popularises so-called culture, and Adorno calls it an 'explosion of barbarism' because he says, precisely, when you talk like this about Tchaikovsky's *Symphony Pathétique*, you miss the point. He says, for another example, that hearing Beethoven doesn't mean anything. 'If you hear Beethoven and don't hear the sound of the clocks of a strange revolution: in that case you didn't hear Beethoven.'

So to enable people to listen to Beethoven, we now have the radio, and great distribution, but people still don't hear Beethoven. They hear, I don't even say understand, hear Beethoven only if they understand what Beethoven wants to express. For this to be possible you need some kind of competence.

So *Halbbildung* today is evident in the mass-media environment. From quiz shows to game shows and betting shows, we see the collective Nazism that Adorno mentions in the context of *Halbbildung* as a substitute for critical consciousness.

Now we come to another example. This is Bourdieu, in his famous book *Sur le television*, published in 1996. Pierre Bourdieu attacks television even more harshly, because he says the problem is not television alone, but the fact that the framework of television has taken hegemony over all the other fields of cultural production. What happens in television slowly expands to cover all other fields of cultural production. For example, journalists – and I quote – ‘monopolise the instruments of distribution of information, and so they monopolise of the access of citizens to culture.’ Even when they are not the creators of revolutionary information, they have the power to make it public. They make things public and therefore themselves become public figures, public personalities. So they monopolise the public sphere.

The journalists and print magazines like Nazistic power. So what Adorno approaches here, regarding this Nazistic collective, is *Halbbildung*, part of the essence of the journalist. They decide what is public and what is not public. Therefore they enjoy publishing listings, rankings. Every week you have ‘Best Book of the Week,’ ‘The Best Museum in Europe,’ ‘The Best Shops in Vienna,’ ‘The Most Important Building,’ ‘The Most Important Artists,’ ‘The Most Important Actors,’ ‘The Most Beautiful People in the World,’ etc, etc. Thus these rankings and lists which you read every week, every month, every year, are an expression of the Nazistic power of journalism.

I quote Bourdieu: ‘These games of power are disgusting, and strange, because the journalist is less informed than the people listed by the journalist and ranked. Their aim is evidently to establish a kind of hegemony, with the constructor of the list being more important than the people who are listed.’

But, as I said, as if this were not bad enough, the situation is worsened by an additional problem. For the structure of the journalistic field, the structure of television, exercises a strong pressure on other fields. We know how strong media pressure can be in, for example, influencing jury-declaration processes. The critical rationality of a professional field, like the law, can be strongly affected by collective irrationality expressed in the mass media. So the logic of demagoguery, the vote, replaces the logic of internal critique. This is precisely the point. When we see the decline of the so-called bourgeois public sphere, then, in the name of God and all the other arguments of the mass media, we see the substitution of the logic of professional and internal critique by a kind of irrational democracy. So the decline of the public sphere in the mass media is the decline of democracy. This is precisely the point Adorno and Bourdieu are making. To defend democracy we have to defend the public sphere, we have to attempt to establish ourselves the public sphere.

TV, as a field of commercial pressure, transfers this commercial pressure to the other fields of cultural production. Museums will make shows that please journalists. Museums will make shows that please the media, the mass media, television and magazines. They will make journalistic shows supported by marketing experts and tourism experts. This is the new character of the museum.

Most museums hire people. They have departments of marketing. They have departments to liaise with the mass media, to liaise with tourism, etc. So what Breitwieser mentioned as the problem of minimalism, raised by Rosalind Krauss, is a problem of museums too; the crux of minimalism is to be at the same time against technology and for technology; to be at the same time against mass media and operating in mass media, which was expressed clearly by the fact that minimal art was the art form most favoured by big corporations. All the big corporations bought as much minimal art as they could, because they realised minimal art visually expresses their only ideology better than they could do it.

This situation, that we can broach regarding minimal art, we can also broach regarding the museum. It has become the norm today, that museums will operate from the beginning – it is even institutionalised by the marketing departments, the tourism departments, etc, etc.– with corporations into co-optation and, as Bourdieu calls it, into ‘collaboration’. He uses the word

‘collaboration’, even if it has the negative connotation of Nazi collaboration. He said yes and no, so this collaboration, or negative collaboration, is the museums’ excuse for collaborating with the mass media. The media partnership, for example, is easily the first step in this direction. The museums, therefore, have famously become no more than another place of *Halbbildung*, to quote Bourdieu.

So that means if museums really become another place, another forum, of *Halbbildung*, then the museum becomes the enemy of culture, if you agree with Adorno and Bourdieu. (I don’t say whether or not you should; I just want to make it clear to you what the arguments are.) So museums risk becoming enemies of culture, like TV and the press, from the first moment they start to co-operate with TV and newspapers.

Newspapers, I think – What can happen when newspapers collaborate with art collectors? Look at England. They have these terrible trashy rags called ‘tabloids’. And we’ve seen how successfully a private collector can co-operate with tabloids in the sensational success of the Young British Artists generation under the label ‘Sensation’. So the success of British artists such as Damien Hirst and Tracey Emin would not have been possible but for the direct, empirically verifiable, collaboration of Saatchi with the British tabloids.

So if a museum, with its products, leans towards the mass audience, the so-called broad audience, it is all the more obliged to co-operate with the mass media. You cannot mount an exhibition for the masses if you do not co-operate with the mass media. This means that, for example, in Austria, when the Albertina mounts a successful show with 800,000 visitors, they have to spend so much money every other day in the popular paper called the *Kronenzeitung*, so that, in the end, they’re making a loss. Thus the more audience you have, the more money you have to pay out. This is the experience at Albertina.

Breitwieser is always surprised by Albertina making a deficit. It’s very easy. You have to co-operate with the mass media to reach the mass audience. If you want 600,000 or 800,000 hundred visitors, you have to do an enormous amount of advertising – all those posters in Vienna in the First district, all the mass media, because obviously every day you must invite people to come to Albertina. This costs a fortune, and the more audience you have, the more you have to spend on advertising.

So, the more you have to co-operate with the mass media, with television, with journalists, the more museums will in fact cede power to the mass media and lose their autonomy. What is at stake is the question of the public sphere. Will journalists, TV, radio news and newspapers always hold the monopoly of public? The question is very important, because the history of the formation of a public sphere, as I said before, is inseparable from the history of democracy. To share the public sphere is a democratic impulse and a necessity.

The opposite of public sphere is censorship. And we have, as you know, this famous joke: what is the difference between Moscow and New York? And the answer: in Moscow everyone uses the same toothpaste, and in New York everyone uses the same toothpaste too, but the people in New York believe to do it out of trust. This is the only difference. Because censorship today is not classical censorship by the State apparatus, by the police, like in the East. Contemporary censorship is done in the name of the quota, of entertainment. The mass media decide what is not interesting for us, not entertaining for us. You can mount endless shows and the mass media don't cover them.

For example, recently I was talking to the director of the Museum of History in Bonn and he said, 'I did shows about the Jewish Diaspora and other classical political exhibitions. I had no reviews. I had no attendance. But when I showed in co-operation the *Bild-Zeitung*, that famous little paper... There was the famous soccer championship in Germany, when at one point the goalkeeper took out of his pocket a slip of paper with the names of the people who shoot goals. He used this list of names to get an idea of how this or that soccer player would shoot a goal. In collaboration with the *Bild-Zeitung*, the director showed it in a small vitrine, and this exhibition of the goalie's slip of paper was the most successful show he ever did. It was even more successful in the media attendance and the number of visitors than the opening of the museum itself.

So you see what you can achieve. You can achieve a marvellous exhibition in terms of reviews, but which contains no information at all, just like a show you have already seen on television. And this may be the future, a possible future, for some museums: large-scale co-operation with the mass media, and mounting exhibitions, even starting to plan exhibitions, together with the mass media.

But, naturally, what you lose is your autonomy. The mass media, in fact, often make authoritative decisions in the name of their clients. They establish an authoritative hegemony, an authoritative regime, over entertainment. None of us here has anything against entertainment, but the problem is entertainment hegemony in the mass media suppressing cultural information. When you look at the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* in Germany, you have a full page at the front about the latest concert by a completely stupid rock group called the 'Rolling Stones'. They devote a whole page, in the name of culture, to this rock'n'roll concert, and then, crammed into the later pages, we have important shows at the *Haus der Kunst* with tiny amounts of information.

So Bourdieu and Alain Darbel published a very important book for us in 1966: *L'Amour de l'art: les musées d'art européens et leur public* – *The Love of Art: the European Museums and their Public* – and they wrote in this book a very important sentence for our discussions: 'There is no authentic aesthetic experience of the art work.' There's no touching, feeling of the arts from an art work. There is no immediate intuitive understanding of art. Yet people tell us, even today, that you don't need education, you don't need competence, you just look at the art work and the art work itself will speak to you.

Adorno had already countered that argument when he said that if you just listen to Beethoven, you don't understand and don't hear Beethoven, and the same argument comes up with Bourdieu. He says, this idea – that you can experience art authentically without education; you just have to open your eyes and your heart – suppresses the social condition that you need to acquire, by learning and by studying, the competence necessary to understand culture, to understand an art work, to have available the key to the code of culture.

So this is precisely what we have to do in the museum, even under late capitalism: to give the audience the chance, to give them the key to cultural awareness – not to attack our exhibitions, like the mass media, but just the opposite. We have the unfortunate task of saying, 'If you want to understand art, you have to learn it. You have to learn to understand art. It's not easy... not a given. You have to learn it for yourself. You must learn that when we give you the key to the code of culture, we give you the key to decipher the cryptic language of

art work... Because art acts more or less like dreams. You cannot understand dreams just by art. You have to learn them, and the same with art.'

So the question of 'the public', already mentioned by Breitwieser, is precisely this: what does the museum do with the public? And we have to remember that we need a politically functioning public sphere; we have to save our democracy. Otherwise, if we leave the public sphere solely to market forces or the mass media, according to Adorno, we destroy all our democracy.

In the 20th century the question of 'the public' was really born in 1922, with Ferdinand Tönnies and his critique *On Public Opinion*, in which he said public opinion has the status of a religion. Then came the next book, in 1922, by Walter Lippman, *The Public Opinion*, and a bit later another by Walter Lippmann, *The Phantom Public*. So it was already clear, and you know, it has been for 80 years. The public is just a phantom. It doesn't exist. We have to find it. Maybe we even have to construct it. We have to find the means to construct our own public.

Therefore John Dewey – the famous John Dewey – published a book in 1927 called *The Public and its Problems*. It was very clear: the public itself is the problem. In the book he shows precisely how the public is the problem.

Then later, much later, after the revolution of the sixties, we got an answer. One answer came from Bruce Robbins, in *The Phantom of the Public Sphere* in 1993. He says about the idea of the omniscient citizen – this is in part an argument against the cultural critique of Adorno and Bourdieu, because they already had this ideal of the citizen who knows everything, and then they realised this citizen had only *Halsbildung* and therefore they said the public sphere was just a 'phantom' – Robbins says, no, no, we have to accept that the ideal citizen, who is omniscient, who knows everything, doesn't exist, but that doesn't mean we have to renounce the possibility of the public sphere.

So finally, according to Michael Warner in 2002, we have 'the public' and we have 'the counter public'. We have many, many public spheres. The ideal is that the public sphere – the bourgeois public sphere – is one great dome. And in this dome, like in the ideal of Habermas, all come together and exchange information. But if the public sphere is a huge dome where all

interests and all exchanges of information are collectively experienced and transferred, they start not to exist any more. The public dome has collapsed. We have, now, little *casitas*, little churches; instead of one big dome we now have hundreds, millions, of little *casitas*, of small public spheres. So we have a multitude of public spheres and counter-publics.

So the crisis of democracy, which is part of the crisis of public sphere, can only be solved when we first accept that democracy means multiple elites, multiple public spheres. It is just possible – it is the price we now have to remember – to have multiple elites, multiple public spheres, if you also give to the multiple audiences the right to competence. So we have to advance the tools of democracy and enlightenment in our exhibitions. We have to give people the keys to understand contemporary art, to expand, celebrate, democracy in our most [...]

Now we come to the next model, model number two. We have to make this short. The next model is actually an economic model, which has already been expressed by Rosalind Krauss, and she quotes more or less everything from Jameson; and Jameson, as we have said, equates post-modern art with late capitalism.

So what is meant by 'late capitalism?' The term was introduced by Werner Sombart at the beginning of the 20th century, and was used, actually, by the wonderful, often Marxist, Rudolf Hilferding to demonstrate the decline of Austrian democracy. All my life, I've failed to persuade any Social Democratic politician to offer a prize in the name of Rudolf Hilferding, although there's only one economist in the world who's known as the writer of the 1910 book *Das Finanzkapital*, *Finance Capital*, and he was the only master critic we've ever had in Austria. He's famous in France. There's no book in France about economy, no book in England about economy, that doesn't list a selection from Rudolf Hilferding in its bibliography.

He was born in Vienna, but from the age of 30 he lived in Berlin, and he died in 1941 in Paris. And he was the first to make a sound mathematical model, the idea behind *Das Finanzkapital*, which is interesting, even though it was later influenced by Hilferding – who also used the term 'Spätkapitalismus'; 'late capitalism'. As, later, did Jürgen Habermas, who published in 1973 the famous book *The Problems of Legitimation in Late Capitalism*.

The first meaning of 'late capitalism' was to describe state intervention to prevent the circulation of capital – because as you know, there is a capitalist ideology that the free market regulates everything, but, naturally, we know from the capitalists that they are always having crises. And to protect capitalism against these crises, which occur every 10 or 15 years, we need state regulation.

So the next book by Rudolf Hilferding was called *The Theory of Organised Capital*. It was very clear that you have to organise capitalism; it's not something that can be run, uncontrolled, by the market. There's no invisible hand over the market; there's the visible hand of the state. For example, we've been reading in the last few days about the fall in the New York stock market, and how it was even supported by the European banks. They had to give them millions of dollars, and the head of the ERM had to invest *billions* of dollars, to avert the collapse of the capitalist system.

Well, so this theory was already surfacing in the early 20th century, but the problem is even more difficult now. The founder of modern financial theory at the heart of late capitalism, said Hilferding in his 1910 book, was the French mathematician Louis Bachelier. He was a disciple of the famous French mathematician Poincaré, and he wrote a book called *La théorie de la spéculation* around 1900 which demonstrated precisely the first sound mathematical model, before Leon Walras and other French economists. And, by the way, Leon Walras was studied closely by Paul Valéry, André Gide and all those people, to understand the cultural logic. So French have a long tradition of studying economics to understand the logic of culture.

And in his book *La théorie de la spéculation – The Theory of Speculation* – it's funny; you write a book about the finance markets, and call it *The Theory of Speculation*. 'The events in the market bear no recognisable relationship to the stock exchange.' This is important. Because, when you create a product, you found a company, and then you ask a stock exchange, 'What is that worth?' you realise that there's no recognisable relationship. So only the way you describe the relationship between the real life of the market and the virtual values of the stock exchange etc, he says, can be estimated as part of the theory of probability. Which is precisely the point up for discussion today.

Finance market theory has nothing to do with classic labour and values theory: the finance market today, and this is the core of late capitalism, is an instrument. So finance capital has become an instrument to adjust the market in favour of those who have capital. So the first step, like with Lenin and Habermas, was to look at how the State intervenes to regulate finance capital.

But this stage is over, even while... the problem of exchange and the state still harks back to the idea of late capitalism. The reality of late capitalism is that private collectors and corporations now have a tool at hand developed by the famous Chicago School, which also gets all the Nobel prizes, from Markovitz to Simons. So the Nobel company is very grateful to these people in Chicago, who therefore always get the prizes, because since the fifties they have developed a mathematical formula to regulate capital.

So finance theory today is not a camera which records what is going on around the market. It's just the opposite: it's a machine, an instrument to measure how to make more profit without labour. This is the point. So when Bachelier realised there was no recognisable relationship between real markets and the stock market, it was precisely because, at the time, he was unable to see that through these mathematical tools you could make an enormous amount of money without working at all.

To give you an example: you believe in the power of the 'Deutsche Bank'. The Deutsche Bank is regarded by the general public as a bank that makes money by giving credit to the bourgeoisie – to people who want to establish a factory, open a shop. But the fact is that 80% of Deutsche Bank's profit is made on the London stock exchange. Just by clever use of finance theory, Deutsche Bank makes a profit. It's not normal banking. With normal banking, you can't make money at all; there's no risk. Banking only makes money when it goes up to the extra level of regulation of finance capital, which is its heart. And at the heart of capitalism we see something very interesting.

So Bachelier says there's no way of recognising the relationship between real life and stock-market life. It's an echo of another famous sentence by the semiotician Saussure, who said, 'The relation between a sign and the object is arbitrary.' There's no recognisable relationship and, precisely because of this equivalence of finance theory and semiotics, it was possible for

the French post-structuralists like Bourdieu to say OK, here we have, on the one hand, the free-floating values of capital and, on the other, the free-floating signifiers. So, in fact, the heart of semiotic theory which tries to describe our reality is an equivalent of late capitalist theory, and how capital functions.

So in fact – and identically – how French post-structuralists and post-modernists define reality is not as a camera but as a machine, an instrument to change reality. We have to say, from Derrida to Baudrillard, that they're right, but seriously – now is not the time to get theoretical – it is comparable on the same axiomatic basis to modern finance theory, and that is a section of Jean Bau's book. Now we can actually approach and reproach them, saying you are not descriptive, you are operative.

It would be interesting to go on for a long time about late capitalism. I will just explain why we talk about casino capitalism. When you go into the mathematics of capitalism, one possibility is to describe it as a certain curve, with two possible shapes: the mild curve and the so-called wild curve – the worst scenario – which we owe to the French mathematician Bonjean, who provided in 1853 a wonderful example: what happens when a blindfold archer shoots at a target? We must remember that the man with the bow, shooting at the target, has no idea where the target is. You just give him a blindfold and a bow, so a blind archer has to shoot at the target. How high is the probability that he will miss the target completely? He doesn't know if it's behind him, in front of him, etc.

And then Bonjean made the calculation: you could say that sometimes he shoots just a metre from the target, but sometimes he shoots a kilometre away from it. Statistically, that means that you have a hundred shots which don't count at all. And therefore, the statistics for this blind man hitting the target are very low.

And the mathematicians of today, the most advanced mathematicians, say this is precisely the description of casino capitalism: people have no idea, so when they go on the stock market, and acquire futures and derivatives and options, they act like the blindfold man. This is the latest lesson of the most advanced mathematicians.

Therefore, capitalism is following Bonjean's wild curve. And one of the Nobel Prize winners, Henry Markovitz, from the Chicago School – when he made his famous market model, which he called, in brief, the idea of the market model – he went back to a book by Uspensky, called *The Introduction of Mathematic Probability*, again quite partially. Several years later, people still use the same mathematical methods of Bachelier or Bojean, but the point is now we have this wild form of capitalism where you are blindfold. This is precisely what you call 'the Newtonian Casino', no? And there's a book by Thomas Bass, published in 1991, called *The Newtonian Casino*, which shows how mathematicians go into the casino, use these techniques and make a lot of money. And so we call casino capitalism the strongest form of late capitalism, when you have no expectation at all of what could be the outcome of your action.

What in fact happens with late capitalism is precisely what is happening today in the market for art works. When we follow the auctions, we see art works by Richter and Warhol command prices nobody could have expected years ago. And for us in museums, we are completely unable to compete with these prices. We can never, we have never, the budget now to buy now a Warhol, a Rothko, etc. So it's all down to corporations and rich individuals, who are able to play the market.

So because of this casino capitalism, because of this situation, museums are not players in the market. We can't buy anything that is offered in the market. Maybe we can buy something for five years, and say we pay in the next five years.

And this means, precisely, a return to feudalism. It is not only that we're living in late capitalism. It is evident that when we have corporations, like Pinaud and others, who have museums, we are back again in the situation as it was before the French Revolution – because the triumph of the 19th century was to make things public, to have public museums. Now everything has become not just late-capitalist, but re-feudalised. It has become private property again.

To conclude, when you look at the *Ancien Régime*, especially in its latest manifestation, and then at the following era of restoration in Biedermeier, we have a semiotically united structure. A structure, as I said at the beginning, which is neutralisation.

For example, the motto of the Venice biennale is something like 'Feeling with the Mind, Thinking with the Senses'. That's very *Ancien Régime*, very Biedermeier. It's very structured. You don't say, 'You think with the mind.' That would be much too clear: you have to satisfy both parties. You have to satisfy the people who think who like feelings, and you have to satisfy those who like the concept of aesthetics. And then you can say, 'OK, we think, but don't worry; we think with feelings, with senses.' Or you can say, 'You feel, but don't worry; you feel with the mind.' This is the non-confrontational model.

So in today's dialogues, there's this technique of neutralisation, a strategy of avoiding conflict. This is Biedermeier. Everything should be covered: no quarrel, no discussion, avoid conflict. You see, even the various *documenta* demonstrate a Biedermeier/*Ancien Régime* strategy. *Documenta* are the most powerful and expensive exhibitions in the world. But you see, the sign of *documenta 12* is written in the language of incompetent people. Written for people who are in prison and don't know how to write a number. So you see, it favours the poor, the people in prison, who sit and makes their numbers and count the days. It's the language of the poor, of people who aren't participating in culture, who are excluded, and it's strange that this is now the sign for just the opposite: for the most powerful exhibition in four regions of the world. So again it is the same strategy, we satisfy both. We say to the poor, 'we are on your side, you see your language'; and to the rich, 'we are the world's most expensive and powerful exhibition'.

And this strategy happens every day. Here's an Austrian magazine revealing a world exclusive: a woman is pregnant; she's the lady of the former Minister of Finance. And we have simultaneously a picture of the Chancellor. It's the same idea – think with the heart, fill with the mind – to satisfy you they have both politics and privacy. And this strategy is precisely what is more dangerous today than the problems of late capitalism.

To end, I would say that to escape we need precisely to give our visitors back the competence they need to understand art. And I think that technology, Net technology, is the way to do it. And I can tell you precisely how we can do this; how we can use the behaviour that people acquire in the Internet, the way people in the Net emancipate themselves and get closer to information and how to access, and how we can incorporate it into our museums. Because one big change has happened, and this is the storage evolution. A museum was like a kind of

Noah's Ark, you remember? It had a very strict selection process; only Noah and his wife, his three sons and their wives, were saved by God. The Bible says Noah was elected by God to save himself and his family because he was a just citizen. And, as we know, the Ark was very small. Today we would say that its storage space was very limited, 'only people and some animals and always in couples'.

But the point is, today, there's so much storage space we can never fill it. The example is television itself. We have hundreds of channels and they don't have any programmes. They have to ask you, in talk shows, 'Please be our programme'. So the user as visitor becomes more and more the centre of communication, because television is not able to do anything any more. So even if I had a memory stick from birth, everything I say, every film I see, every book I read, would not be enough to fill my memory stick.

So today we have a world which does not produce enough events and information to fill our storage space. Noah's Ark has become very big. So it's not necessary to select any more. The Net is already a new kind of Noah's Ark. The World Wide Net posts all the information about everybody who wants to communicate. So the museum, if it does not adapt to this kind of emancipated consumer, and turns the consumer, the visitor, into a kind of producer, is in danger of becoming an obsolete space, compared to the possibilities that people already have via the Net.

The other side of this is that storage time constantly diminishes. We go back to Noah's Ark. You could say, now, that Noah's Ark is immensely big, but sinks rather fast. Its storage space is immense, it's exploding, but storage time is imploding, because every five years we have to change our media. When you go to buy a camera the battery doesn't fit; if it fits, the camera doesn't. So we have to change constantly. The storage medium becomes bigger in space, smaller in time.

So what we have to do now is precisely to give the consumer the chance of emancipation in our museums, and to protect our information from collapsing in time. So again we have the old task of saving culture from perishing, and, at the same time, giving the audience the technical means and competence to understand what culture is.

Thank you for your attention.

SESSION 1

THE MUSEUM AS PART OF THE PUBLIC SPHERE AND ITS AUDIENCES

Sabine Breitwieser: Our first session 'The museum as part of the public sphere and its audiences' will be moderated by Ann Goldstein, Senior Curator at the Museum of Contemporary Art, Los Angeles (MOCA). Since joining the museum in 1983, Ann has organised several large-scale survey exhibitions, including *A Minimal Future: Art as Object 1958-1968; 1965-1975: Reconsidering the Object of Art* (with Anne Rorimer), and *A Forest of Signs: Art in the Crisis of Representation* (with Mary Jane Jacob), as well as solo exhibitions with Barbara Kruger, Christopher Wool, Felix Gonzalez-Torres, Jorge Pardo, Roni Horn, and Jennifer Bornstein.

Upcoming projects in 2007 include the first American museum exhibition of Cologne-based artist Cosima von Bonin, the first retrospective mounted in the US of the work of Lawrence Weiner (co-organised by MOCA and the Whitney Museum of American Art, and co-curated with Donna De Salvo). In addition, she is organising *Martin Kippenberger: The Problem Perspective*, the first American retrospective of the artist's work, which will open at MOCA in September 2008.

So please welcome Ann Goldstein, who will introduce the panellists. Thank you.

INTRODUCTION

Ann Goldstein: Thank you very much for inviting me to participate, and I want to thank the Board of CIMAM, and especially Sabine and Pilar, for all their wonderful help in preparation for this panel. I've been a member of CIMAM for about five years and this is my first opportunity to attend one of the conferences, and I feel very privileged to be here today and to speak on a subject that I think is already quite pressing, as we've been hearing from the introductions by Alfred, Sabine and Peter. This is a very critical moment, as they have described; the terms have changed and paradigms have shifted, both within our own institutional culture and in the broader culture, and we are at a pivotal moment where museums need to consider our position, mission and priorities, as well as how we evaluate ourselves and determine our sense of success and failure.

As you all know, from the general comments and the conference programme, there are questions that all of us need to consider concerning the museum's public role and duty to its audience; the ideas already mentioned about the shift from a homogeneous public to heterogeneity; how art museums relate to these different publics; and how to evolve the institution's traditional function of education into the fields of entertainment and consumption. And we also need to consider alternative forms of spectatorship, and how institutions can create and foster new ethics about conjoining education with art.

To these questions I would also add my own – certainly these are issues that are strongly facing us in the United States, and specifically in my position within MOCA, and it's going to be very interesting for me to hear how they're being confronted elsewhere. MOCA is a privately funded institution, and as Sabine said, I've worked there for 24 years, so I'm quite institutionalised, and really consider my practice as a curator within the institutional framework of the Museum of Contemporary Art in Los Angeles. And because we're privately funded, as is very common in the United States, our funding comes from cultivation of resources, which is mostly what would be called 'contributed income' and 'fundraising'; which is, as we know, the primary domain of the director – and more than any museum director ever imagined or would have wished for. It's also – and I know it's increasingly the case elsewhere as well – a major part of the curator's role. So we all serve many publics, even within our own communities and constituencies inside the museum structure and family, to keep the machine running. And so I think all these questions kind of need to be considered together.

As to the questions posed in the programme, I just wanted to open with a number that I've been considering. The question of 'the public', to me, immediately raises a question of who we are and what is our core mission, not just as we focus on the public but internally, within the institution. I think it is important to consider our internal motivations, when facing such questions as whom do we serve? To whom are we accountable? Where do the artists fit into this? Are we doing what we consider to be necessary? How do we gauge our institutional success? And, obviously, we have already touched upon how these gauges are defined and quantified in terms of attendance, fundraising, successes, media attention and so on.

And concerning our reach out to the public, how far and how close *should* we reach? (The problems of trying to be all things to all people.) What changes are we already observing

within the museum culture? And I think that Peter certainly outlined a lot of those already, and what's been particularly interesting for me is that I'm starting to realise that we're no longer a sub-culture. Contemporary art is much more mainstream than we could have imagined – and certainly than how we set out when each of us began our individual course. We are now feeling the effects of that and don't necessarily quite know how to deal with it. And, of course, in relationship to that, how *do* we negotiate the ubiquity and the incredible power of the marketplace? We are certainly not outside of it and can no longer pretend to be.

And, finally in terms of the public, just a question: is there a space for a work or a curatorial position that does not seek a broad public, where we should not be concerned with the public?

So these are some of the questions that I've been thinking about. And now it is my pleasure to introduce the first of our three panellists. I'll introduce each of them before they speak.

And our first panellist is Chantal Mouffe. She is Professor of Political Theory at the Centre for the Study of Democracy at the University of Westminster in London. She's taught and researched in many universities in Europe, North America and South America, and has held positions at Harvard, Cornell, the University of California and numerous others. She is a corresponding member of the International College of Philosophy, in Paris, where she was Director of Programmes, from 1989 to 1995.

She is the editor of numerous publications, including *Gramsci and Marxist Theory*, in 1979; *Dimensions of Radical Democracy: Pluralism, Citizenship, Community*, 1992; *Deconstruction and Pragmatism*, 1996; and *The Challenge of Carl Schmitt*, in 1999. She's co-author with Ernesto Laclau of *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy Toward a Radical Democratic Politics*, in 1985, and the author of *The Return of the Political*, *The Democratic Paradox* and *On the Political*, three different publications.

Also, for those here in Vienna, Sabine brought to my attention that she recently organised a series of lectures and political discussions on the subject 'The Public in Question', at the Academy of Fine Arts here.

So, please welcome Chantal.

Chantal Mouffe: For all those who are interested in the critical role that the museum could play in the public sphere the first question that needs to be addressed is the following: can artistic practices still play a critical role in societies in which every critical gesture is quickly recuperated and neutralised by the dominant powers? Indeed, many authors do not believe any more in the possibility of such a critique. They affirm that the blurring of the lines between art and advertising is such that the idea of critical public spaces has lost its meaning since we are now living in societies where even the public has become privatised.

Reflecting on the growth of the global culture industry some theorists came to the conclusion that Adorno and Horkheimer's worst nightmares have come true. The production of symbols is now a central goal of capitalism and through the development of the creative industries individuals have become totally subjugated to the control of capital. Not only consumers but cultural producers too are prisoners of the culture industry dominated by the media and entertainments corporations and they have been transformed into passive functions of the capitalist system. The possibility of an effective critique in a range of public spaces has therefore disappeared.

Fortunately this pessimistic diagnostic is not shared by everybody. For instance there are theorists who claim that the analysis of Adorno and Horkheimer, based as it is on the Fordist model, does not provide any more a useful guide to examine the new forms of productions which have become dominant in the current post-Fordist mode of capitalist regulation. They argue that those new forms of production allow for new types of resistance and a revitalisation of the emancipatory project to which artistic practices could make a decisive contribution.

I consider that something really crucial is at stake in this debate, and I believe that in order to be able to envisage the questions which are at the core of our reflection in this symposium on 'Contemporary Institutions and Producers in late Capitalism', it is necessary to elucidate the nature and the consequences of the transition that advanced industrial societies have undergone since the last decades of the 20th century. This transition is being presented, according to different approaches, as either one from industrial to post-industrial society, from Fordism to post-Fordism, or from a disciplinary society to a society of control.

To grasp what is at stake in the transition from Fordism to post-Fordism, I will first examine the differences between the approaches influenced by the critical theory of Adorno and Horkheimer and those which are influenced by the Italian autonomist tradition. Their main disagreement lies in the role that the culture industry has played in the transformations of capitalism. It is well known that Adorno and Horkheimer saw the development of the culture industry as the moment when the Fordist mode of production finally managed to enter into the field of culture. They see this evolution as a further stage in the process of commodification and subjugation of society to the requisites of capitalist production. For Paolo Virno and some other post-operaists, on the contrary, the culture industry played an important role in the process of transition between Fordism and post-Fordism because it is there that new practices of productions emerged which led to the overcoming of Fordism. The space granted to the informal, the unexpected and the unplanned, which for Horkheimer and Adorno were uninfluential remnants of the past, are for Virno anticipatory omens. With the development of immaterial labour they began to play an increasingly important role, and that opened the way for new forms of social relations. In advanced capitalism, says Virno, the labour process has become performative and it mobilises the most universal requisites of the species: perception, language, memory and feelings. Contemporary production is virtuosic and productive labour in its totality appropriates the special characteristics of the performing artist. According to him the culture industry is in fact the matrix of post-Fordism.

Theorists influenced by the autonomist tradition argue that the transition from Fordism to post-Fordism should not be seen as dictated by the logic of the development of capitalist forces of production but as a reaction to the new practices of resistance of the workers. Disagreements exist between them, however, among them concerning the political consequences of this transition. Although many of them use the notion of 'multitude' to refer to the new type of political agent characteristic of the current period, they do not envisage its future in the same way. Some, like Hardt and Negri, celebrate in the multitude the emergence of a new revolutionary subject which will necessarily bring down the new forms of domination embodied in empire. Incorporating, although not always in a faithful way, some of the analyses of Foucault and Deleuze, they assert that the end of the disciplinary regime that was exercised over bodies in enclosed spaces like schools, factories and asylums, and its replacement by the procedures of control linked to the growth of networks, is leading to a new type of governance which opens the way to more autonomous and independent forms of subjectivity. With the

expansion of new forms of co-operative communication and the invention of new communicative forms of life, those subjectivities can express themselves freely and they will contribute to the formation of a new set of social relations that will finally replace the capitalist system.

Others, like Paolo Virno, while agreeing on the potential open for new forms of life, are not so sanguine about the future. Virno sees the growth of the multitude as an ambivalent phenomenon and he also acknowledges the new forms of subjection and precarisation which are typical of the post-Fordist stage. It is true that people are not as passive as before, but it is because they have now become active actors of their own precarisation. So instead of seeing in the generalisation of immaterial labour a type of spontaneous communism like Hardt and Negri, Virno tends to see post-Fordism as 'a manifestation of the communism of capital.' This does not mean that he abandons every hope for emancipation, but it is in the refusal to work and the different forms of exodus and disobedience that he locates such hope.

There is something that all those thinkers have in common; it is their conviction that what has to be relinquished is the conception of radical politics aimed at 'taking power' in order to control the institutions of the state. For them, the main task is the production of new subjectivities and the elaboration of new worlds. They claim that one should ignore the existing power structure, to dedicate oneself to constructing alternative social forms outside the existing institutions. They reject any majoritarian model of society, organised around a state, in favour of another model of organisation of the multitude which they present as more universal. It has the form of a unity provided by common places of the mind, cognitive-linguistic habits and the general intellect.

We should note that it is in fact the very idea of the public itself that is increasingly put into question by those theorists because they see it as too indebted to the idea of the state, which they take as its necessary corollary. Instead of the public we should, they say, think in terms of the 'common'. Virno, for instance, asserts that the multitude dissolves the distinction between public and private and, in a recent book, Negri argues that in the transition from modern to postmodern politics, it is necessary to abandon the categories of public/private and to envisage the mode of existence of the multitude in terms of the 'exercise of the common'.

II. While agreeing on the necessity to acknowledge the fundamental transformations in the mode of regulation of capitalism represented by the transition to post-Fordism and the society of control, I have been arguing, for my part, that we should envisage this transition from the point of view of the theory of hegemony. I recognise of course the importance of not seeing the transformations undergone by our societies as the mere consequence of technological progress and on bringing to the fore their political dimension. My problem with operaist and some post-operaist views is that by putting the emphasis on the workers' struggles they tend to see this transition as if it were exclusively moved by one single logic, the workers' resistance to the process of exploitation forcing the capitalists to reorganise the process of production, and to move to the post-Fordist era of immaterial labour. According to them capitalism can only be reactive and, unlike Deleuze and Guattari, they refuse to accept the creative role played by both capital and the working class. What they do not acknowledge is the role played in this transition by the hegemonic struggle.

In order to introduce this hegemonic dimension we can find interesting insights in the interpretation of the transition between Fordism and post-Fordism put forward by Luc Boltanski and Eve Chiapello. In their book 'The New Spirit of Capitalism' they bring to light the role played by what they call 'artistic critique' in the transformation undergone by capitalism in the last decades of the 20th century. They show how the demands for autonomy of the new movements of the 1960's have been harnessed in the development of the post-Fordist networked economy and transformed into new forms of control. The aesthetic strategies of the counter-culture – the search for authenticity, the ideal of self-management, the anti-hierarchical exigency – are now used to promote the conditions required by the current mode of capitalist regulation, replacing the disciplinary framework characteristic of the Fordist period. Nowadays artistic and cultural production play a central role in the process of capital valorisation and through neo-management, artistic critique has become an important element of capitalist productivity.

From my point of view what is interesting in this approach is that it can reveal that one important dimension of the transition was a process of discursive rearticulation of elements, and permits us to apprehend it in terms of hegemonic struggle. To be sure, Boltanski and Chiapello do not use this vocabulary, but theirs is a clear example of what Gramsci calls hegemony through neutralisation or passive revolution to refer to the situation where

demands which challenge an established hegemonic order are recuperated by the existing system, by satisfying them in a way that neutralises their subversive potential. To envisage the transition from Fordism to post-Fordism in such a way helps us to understand it as an hegemonic move by capital to re-establish its leading role and to re-assert its legitimacy. By adding to the analysis offered by *The New Spirit of Capitalism* the undeniable role played in this transition by workers' resistance, we can arrive at a more complex understanding of the forces at play in the emergence of the current neo-liberal hegemony. This hegemony is the result of a set of political interventions in a complex field of economic, legal and ideological forces. It is a discursive construction that articulates in a very specific manner manifold practices, discourses and languages-games of very different natures. Through a process of sedimentation the political origin of those contingent practices has been erased and they have become naturalised. Neo-liberal practices and institutions appear as the outcome of natural processes and the forms of identification that they produce have crystallised in identities which are taken for granted. This is how the 'common sense' which constitutes the framework for what is deemed possible and desirable has been established.

To challenge neo-liberalism it is therefore vital to transform this framework and this requires the production of new subjectivities. There is no doubt that in the present stage of capitalism this is a terrain that is more important than ever. Today's capitalism relies increasingly on semiotic techniques in order to create the modes of subjectivation which are necessary for its reproduction. In modern production, the control of the souls (Foucault) plays a strategic role in governing affects and passions. The forms of exploitation characteristic of the times when manual labour was dominant have been replaced by new ones which require constantly creating new needs and an incessant desire for the acquisition of goods. This is why in our consumer societies advertising plays such an important role. This role is not limited to promoting specific products, but also to producing fantasy worlds with which the consumers of goods will identify. Indeed, nowadays to buy something is to enter into a specific world, to become part of an imagined community. It is therefore the construction of the very identity of the consumer which is at stake in the techniques of advertising. To maintain its hegemony the neo-liberal system needs constantly to mobilise people's desires and shape their identity. A counter-hegemonic politics needs therefore to engage with this terrain so as to foster other forms of identification. This is why the cultural terrain occupies today such a strategic place in

politics. To be sure, the realm of culture has always played an important role in hegemonic politics, but in the times of post-Fordist production this role has become absolutely crucial.

According to the hegemonic approach that I am advocating, the question we should ask is: how can cultural and artistic practices contribute to the development of agonistic public spaces where the dominant hegemony is being questioned? This can be done in many different ways, but given the post-political Zeitgeist that exists nowadays, one of the most urgent ones is to undermine the dominant consensus by bringing to the fore what it tends to obscure and obliterate. I want to stress that this should not be understood in the mode of a kind of lifting a supposedly false consciousness in order to reveal the true reality. Such an approach is completely at odds with the anti-essentialist premises of the theory of hegemony, which rejects the very idea of a 'true consciousness' and asserts that identities are always the result of a process of identification and that it is through insertion in manifold practices, discourses and language games that specific forms of individualities are constructed. What is at stake in the transformation of political identities is not a rationalist appeal to the true interest of the subject but the insertion of the social agent in practices that will mobilise its affects in a way that allows for the disarticulation of the framework in which the process of identification is taking place, so as to allow for other forms of identification. This means that to construct oppositional identities it is not enough simply to foster a process of 'de-identification' or 'de-individualisation'. The second move, the moment of 're-identification', of 're-individualisation' is crucial. To insist only on the first move is in fact to remain trapped in a problematic that believes that the negative moment is sufficient on its own to bring about something positive, as if new subjectivities were already there, ready to emerge when the weight of the dominant ideology was lifted. Such a view, which informs many forms of critical art, fails to come to terms with the nature of the hegemonic struggle and the complex process of construction of identities.

As for the more specific question of what could be the role of the museum in the development of those agonistic spaces, this is one that I would have to leave to those of you who are working with those institutions because, as a political theorist, I have no expertise in this field. But I am convinced that to pose this question in a fruitful way it is necessary to have an adequate grasp of the present conditions of production of artistic practices and of their role in the process of capitalist reproduction. I hope that by delineating the different theoretical

frameworks available to envisage this problem, I have contributed to clarifying some of the issues that are at the centre of our conference.

Ann Goldstein: Thank you Chantal.

Our next speaker is Georg Schöllhammer. He lives here in Vienna and is an author, curator and editor-in-chief of the *documenta 12* magazines. Since 1995 he has also been editor-in-chief and co-founder of *Springerin*, a quarterly magazine based here in Vienna, dedicated to the theory and critique of contemporary art and culture. He was editor of fine arts for the Austrian newspaper *Der Standard* from 1988-94, and since 1992 he has been a visiting professor in theory of contemporary art at the University of Art and Industrial Design in Linz. He has published widely on contemporary topics and on issues of urban and cultural transformation, focusing on central and south-eastern Europe. Thank you.

Georg Schöllhammer: Well thanks, Ann, for introducing me. Actually, while Peter Weibel was talking about the concepts of criticism in the cultural industry, I got the message that one of my best artist friends has just died, in Bratislava, only a few kilometres away. And his career, actually, has to do with what I'm going to talk about a bit.

It was Julius Koller, and maybe I could cite as a start one project about his idea of the public. It is the concept for the UFO gallery that he wrote in 1971, when, after May '68 in Prague and the mobilisation of the Warsaw Pact troops, the situation totally closed down, and the party committee re-established something like a real social arts policy.

The concept of the UFO Gallery was presented for the first time in the magazine *Galérie Vysoké Tatry*, the High Tatra Gallery. That was a spoof version of the original *Vysoké Tatry*, which was a totally touristic magazine. The Gallery was situated on the rocky terrace of the legendary Gallery Ganek in the High Tatra, so the Gallery means 'something up in the mountains that's pretty hard to reach'. The terrace was given its name by mountaineers. It presents the most extreme mountaineering challenge on the route to the peak Ganek.

The UFO Gallery was meant to be a challenging and hard-to-reach fictitious space for spiritual communication between earthly beings and the unknown cosmic world, which may stand here

for the general public, for an artistic practice like that of Julius Koller in the leaden years of '71. This high-altitude location symbolises the encounter between the earthly and the spiritual, the earth and the cosmos. This natural open environment thus became a psycho-physical cultural space, almost a medium between Heaven and Earth: 'an ideal space for new creative thinking,' as Julius Koller put it.

In 1980, the official fictitious UFO Gallery for communication with extra-terrestrial civilisations was re-established; in 1981 the five members of the UFO Gallery organisational committee were appointed and started to work on its manifesto and programme. In '82, they completed it, and in 1983-5 proposed some new members to the committee. Together with the committee, Julius Koller worked on expanding the manifesto and programme. At the same time, he produced a few drawings, graphics and paintings on the subject of the UFO Gallery; in 1987 and 1988 he worked on new changes to the manifesto, programme and membership of the gallery; in 1989, he stopped the fictitious activity related to the UFO Gallery.

Actually, I feel burdened somehow to move from the total 'raisonnement' that Peter Weibel gave and the precise analysis of the current situation by cultural practitioners, at least in the Western world, to the practical project that I have been invited to present, which is the *documenta* magazines – a project that is somehow deeply enmired in all the contradictions Chantal Mouffe has just pointed out. I mean, it starts, Peter, from your definition of *documenta* as the most powerful and, you said, influential art show in the world – I think you also said the richest. Well, the budget of *documenta* is half the cost of the security chain that had to be constructed for the last G8-summit at Heiligendamm. So there is always a relation between budgets and power... even in institutions such as *documenta*.

Secondly, one could say that *documenta*, since *documenta 72*, has a very strange relationship with what one usually calls the 'art market', you know? Since the reception of the Harald Szeemann show, which was credited with bringing in new trends that were, so to speak, neo-avant-garde, but not for bringing in what he in fact also did in two-thirds of the show: the market values of the time; pop, nouveau realism and so on.

There is an odd imbalance in what *documenta* actually delivers market-wise... if you look into the artists' careers, it's very, very rare that commercial success immediately follows a showing at *documenta*. So in terms of the art market, *documenta* is not a powerful institution at all.

It is, and has been – under Harald Szeemann and mainly under Catherine David and Okwui Enwezor – still quite a powerful institution when it comes to canon-making. And maybe that's what Peter was referring to – even though it's a mass event that totally follows the projections of the economy of late-culture, late-capitalist societies, as Chantal Mouffe has said.

So there is a kind of strange dialectic in the project, which actually somehow drove the makers of *documenta 10* and *documenta 11* to try to, not fulfil, but let's say, somehow imbue the art world – which in Catherine David's case was still very much a Western art world – with some idea of the art of what was then called the Third World, twenty years too late. Actually, these expectations have not been fulfilled, neither by Catherine nor Okwui. Catherine was supposed to deal with the arena of the multicultural: her credentials were that her work had crossed the bounds of the canons of the Euro-American history of avant-garde, and she had worked in, or at least... talked with, more hybrid spheres, as they were then called in cultural theory, like Latin America.

What she did was re-emphasise, at a fundamental moment for late modernism, its paradigm; the universal paradigm of late modernism that was written in the history of the show itself and of the big event; a paradigm questioned, and also challenged, to call it that, both by artistic practices that came along with conceptual practices, and by politicised practices. And that at a moment when the theory, so to speak, demanded to be seen generally as a theory, not just an aesthetic, but a genuine theory – which had actually been coming since the early eighties in the realm of art, and was then, in the mid-nineties, very central to a lot of debates on the word 'theory'.

She said, 'Well, where does that come from?' and tried to reiterate that kind of narrative, and now hers is actually thought to be the most influential *documenta* since Harald Szeemann's. The same thing happened, slightly differently, with Okwui Enwezor's, which took on the challenge of showing, so to speak, multicultural diversity, but did it in a strange way, mirroring the logics of the major cities that then played a big role in the art world.

So what we faced when *documenta* asked us to do this show was the strange notion of it being an institution itself, plus its rather dialectical position in the economy of art world events. Secondly, it was a very short-lived institution, a bit like the American presidency, which has to change all its personnel every time, you know? Every five years, all the personnel change and totally different people are doing it, which is very much what today's project economists do. And we were thinking about this strange dialectical role, and how to deal with the problem of making the wrong choice that you always have if you do a *documenta* – obviously, given the context you navigate in – and it was especially the case for this *documenta* since, let's say, the people doing it hadn't been, for a long time, part of that what one could call the institutionalised circuit of global canon-making activity, like the forum where I'm speaking now.

The challenge was how to stay within the logic of the institution, on the one hand, and on the other hand to take into account that there might be no way to avoid the contradictions of the reduction of spheres we live in. Regarding the problem of the wrong choice, in fact when you walk into a local environment it isn't at all obvious; nothing is obvious, even for those who work in a local environment that is sometimes fetishised it isn't obvious, and the same goes for you. You go somewhere for the first time to curate something, and the first hand you shake is always the wrong hand, and the artist you choose as typical of the local style is always the wrong artist.

So we thought about finding a way of making the wrong choice in a more decent way, and what we found was that we had to do it from our own experience – as Ann told you, I've worked as an editor for a long time. What we actually did was look for modes of production that somehow mirrored that kind of epistemological and structural shift in society that has been so intelligently analysed here already.

Somehow in our first, so to speak, total study, we found a strange similarity to the paradigm shifts of the sixties – when a lot of small and mid-scale publications created that counter-public that was so formative for a lot of the sixties' protest movements that, at a point, actually had real political power. They often centred around small and mid-scale publications, and not just in the aesthetic realm. The most famous example may be the *Archigram* publication, which

brought Situationist modes of production to architecture. When Japanese architects went to London to see the *Archigram* collective, in fact they entered an editorial office.

So there have been a lot of small and mid-scale publications. Strangely enough, we've found that from the mid- to late-nineties there's been a new wave of start-ups in this field... founding them on a really global basis, you know? Even in contexts where it is difficult to publish, because of authoritarian regimes or censorship, these publications offer new opportunities to reach a local audience via a remote server on a peer-to-peer connection, and really get things publicised through the net.

'So why not use this?' I asked these small- and mid-scale publications – not the majors, which are much more stuck into the pre-ordained logics, but the mid- and small-scale ones that serve the needs of a local public; that digest or display not just practices, but debates, and make them feasible for local audiences – small-scale audiences, mainly. I mean, the average print-run of these publications is between 500 and 1000, maybe 2,000. And invite them, actually, into the contradictory space that this exhibition is, you know, and think about some of the motives that we had in mind when we set up, so to speak, the curatorial framework for *documenta*. And that's what we did. It was... I'll just sketch out the practical structure of that. We did an enormous amount of research, and identified something like 400, one might say, engaged publications; rather a heterogeneous and diverse group.

We weren't looking to form anything like an international political set-up. We weren't looking for academic publications that served a need for theory-making in universities. We were just looking for independent editorial groups that, on different levels, do political work in their own contexts. And then we invited them to engage with the simple question: could you, from your own curatorial perspective, from your own editorial experience, with the means and the people that you usually publish with, and serving your audience help us to consider some of the main topics of *documenta* that have been formulated as its three leitmotifs? Three rather general issues, already identifiable and enshrined in debate.

One was about the relation between distinct contexts and localities, the power of the universalist concept of modernity and its leftovers and fragments, and whether those could contain an empowerment one might be able to reuse today. The second was about

subjectification, reiterated in a quite controversial book by Giorgio Agamben that harked back to Walter Benjamin's famous essay on the conditions of the Weimar Republic and the possibilities of empowerment of the powerless. So subjectification in the dialectical way Chantal Mouffe was talking about. The third one was largely about the transformation of local institutions, and imagining a possible mode of productive restructuring that is not just economically driven, somehow posing Lenin's question of 'what is to be done?' I refer to Lenin's famous text, where he tried to identify the ways to proliferate the theories of Communism and the needs of the working class. And the answer in the text was found a magazine, or found a paper or an international newspaper.

So we invited editors from local or thematic environments. The invitation came along with requests to artists and theorists to help us, so to speak, translate these questions into a specific context. And we found, in the end, that some 90 to 100 publications – online publications, magazines, journals and even radio stations – had been voluntarily pushing themselves into a contradictory situation, like autonomous small academies trying to break down those three leitmotifs in their editorial workshops.

So that's what happened, and something like 600 texts, replies and really contradictory debates about what we'd asked about the three leitmotifs, have so far been published locally in these 90-plus publications worldwide. We didn't even ask, and don't know, what has actually been published. I'm well aware that Lenin would immediately call this 'disability of the production sphere', but we are at least aware of the contradiction.

Then we created something like an Internet editorial office, where these theses were displayed and there was a debate about them. It wasn't about creating a sort of universal discourse that served the needs of *documenta*. But what we had already seen in this Internet platform, which worked in many languages, was emergent openings between quite distant contexts – and that's actually the most productive residue of the project.

But we said from the start that this project would, for *documenta*, end with curatorial closure: namely that it would help us to create simultaneously three textbooks which would open a kind of eco-space that explained the exhibition. And we said, well, so this will be a kind of selective process. So we also opened an Internet site, where all the contributions are

translated into English and posted in the original language too, and where the general public itself can edit its *documenta* magazine. That may even give rise to a counter-publication to ours.

The most successful element ... we invited editors to join us for a week at *documenta* itself; editors who shared a certain theme, or who we felt needed to broaden or deepen their message. This is ongoing, so we have backstage activities in *documenta*, small seminary-like meetings of editors, and have created a lot of spin-offs of the project.

Just to note a few: in South-East Asia, at the University of Chiang Mai in Thailand, when, at our invitation, a group of editors met, they immediately decided that was a good idea, and created a forum that is living and breathing and playing a very important role in the debate about the coup d'état and Thailand's new constitution. In Singapore, for instance – a very complicated context, as you all know, I don't need to tell you – after our initiative, one institution made the effort to attract invited editors to work on a new history of art production in the region, and there are now ten editors doing that, re-writing art history and the canons of what is called contemporary creativity. In the Arab world, at a meeting in Beirut, there were complaints by a lot of editors that the high-Arabic style did not provide the proper terminology to discuss, for instance, the subject of contemporary production. [...] So we have a forum that is like a sub-forum of the *documenta* magazine, working on a glossary of a terminology of current art production and so on.

So, these are the sustainable effects of the project. The publication we made is itself viewable, and has been displayed at *documenta*. And again, we decided to go with the contradiction and distribute it by the only viable means for such a short-term project, namely through the very capitalist editor of *Taschen*.

Thanks for listening to me.

Ann Goldstein: Thank you, Georg.

Our next speaker is Charles Esche. A curator and writer, Charles is currently the director of the Van Abbemuseum, Eindhoven and co-editor of *AFTERALL*, an art publication based at Central

St Martins College of Art and Design, London and CalArts, Los Angeles. In the last years he curated and co-curated numerous exhibitions, amongst which are: the 9th Istanbul Biennial (2005) and Gwangju Biennale (2002), as well as project Cork Caucus, Cork (2005), and exhibitions Intelligence: New British Art, Tate Gallery, London (2000) and Amateur: Variable Research Initiatives, Konstmuseum and Konsthall, Göteborg (2000). From 2000–2004 he was the director of Rooseum Centre for Contemporary Art, Malmö, Sweden. Esche has written for numerous catalogues and magazines and published an edited volume of his writings in 2005. He lives in Eindhoven.

Charles Esche: Thank you for inviting me to speak. I will try to keep it short and speculative, while pinning my ideas down in relation to the Van Abbemuseum that I direct in Eindhoven. Thanks also to Chantal for a great paper and description of the possibilities in the public sphere.

I want to start with a self-evident truth, but one that deserves repeating as a prelude to what I will suggest. The museum is the product of its society and its history. As an institution created by and crucial to forming the bourgeois public sphere of old, it remains held in check by that history. Under the social democratic settlement in twentieth-century Europe – to which I will mostly refer from now on – it is usually funded by public money and is therefore accountable to the existing democratic structures that we have built up together in this region since 1945. It therefore carries the burdens, limitations and possibilities of its time and place. It is in no sense free to do as it will, no matter how desirous the employees of a museum are to initiate radical change.

Yet, while the museum is the product of its environment, it also contributes to the direction of movement that is already under way in its surrounding environment. It is not a passive spectator but a more or less active player, an agent if you like, with tasks that pivot around the definition of art and its purposes in society, its relationships to what we traditionally call visitors and its adaptation to competitive or complementary institutions in the cultural, commercial, academic and leisure fields. To stress the publicness of the museum's funding and activities offers a view of the museum as an institution that has responsibilities to the wellbeing of its social and political environment, and understands education in its broadest sense as a core aim, transcending wealth-generation and popularity. The public museum I am

describing here is interested in conjuring meaning from its collection in the geographic and cultural here and now, while ensuring the archives are preserved for future explorations of *here and nows* to come. It is significantly less concerned with typology, classification and historical reconstruction than the nineteenth-century museum was, and less enraptured by the lines of development drawn by art history. In that sense, it is perhaps an irresponsible museum in the inherited sense of the term, but it is the 'freedom' to be irresponsible about its own history that I would claim here as one of the significant potentialities of the 21st-century museum – a freedom different from the idea of artistic autonomy that, at least in the Netherlands, is still connected to the museum's right to be free of the exigencies of government policy (though not of the demands of the free market). Our publicly funded, protected enclosure is a privilege we should use. After all, the commitment of public money in a state such as the Netherlands is often made more out of habit than real enthusiasm, and is therefore always potentially under threat. But as long as it survives, it is precisely the area where we have an opportunity to change the popular understanding of art and its role as a generator of imaginative possibility and new knowledge.

None of which denies that many existing museums already go a long way towards doing this. Even those most conservatively adherent to nineteenth-century goals may encompass what is going on around them, and allow for activities under the titles 'free expression' and 'artistic licence' that are extremely valuable. This approach can and does achieve much. It presents good (sometimes great) art and, if well-marketed, generates an enthusiastic, if largely passive, audience. Museums also use their commissioning and exhibiting arms to bring new ideas or objects into being – things that would otherwise not exist, but which might generate new possibilities through their existence. And these potential instruments are not insignificant.

Yet, I suggest there is more that could be done, together, than satisfy existing political and cultural expectations. Indeed the history of the museum in some sense demands it, having not just reflected but also generated the original public sphere of the Enlightenment. In order to make full use of the potential of a museum, I believe we need museums to take an active and self-aware position – both political and poetic – in relation to the issues of the day. They need to make those positions visible in their activities, and argue for them with other museums that take different positions. These imagined positions should constantly reconsider what art museums have done in the past, but the dialogue with our legacy should be more liberating

than limiting. It may mean that we need to reject certain aspects of our history, such as our pretensions to universalism or coherence, or at least highlight that we understand such claims in the light of today's social and artistic concerns. It may mean that we no longer 'facilitate' artistic actions, but struggle with and against them, in an agonistic form of exchange in which the balance of power is revealed. It almost certainly means that we have to search for new criteria by which to make judgements about ourselves – or have judgements passed on us – which are not imposed by free-market measures of wealth or popularity, but rather relate to the (now rather clichéd but still valid) idea of knowledge production.

In this short paper and in a spirit of speculation, please allow me to suggest a few adjectives that might help contribute to a new critical lexicon that would help us to judge museum projects. They are in no particular order.

Reflexive, Experimental, Engaged, Hospitable, Critical, Radical...

These are the terms by which I would like the Van Abbemuseum, at least, to be judged. I suggest them as criteria to replace, or at least co-exist with, visitor numbers, financial success and press exposure when politicians, media and public consider what we are for. I would like to suggest that they might help us collectively to determine new kinds of expectations for art museums in the media sphere, and distinguish ourselves from shopping malls, theme parks, community centres and places of worship, with whom we share many interests.

Such selective criteria to identify the qualities of a museum cannot be above criticism, which would indicate that the museum doesn't value certain measures of judgement. It requires the museum to see itself not a vessel to be filled by objects from outside, but as a creative force in its own right, in which terms each museum is different. It understands itself as a contextual force with a particular sensibility – and I would like to say ideology – that is openly professed. It cannot be 'all things to all people' but is necessarily partial, passionate and political – just as Baudelaire wanted critics to be. Indeed, one of the reasons for doing this at an institution like Van Abbemuseum is to challenge other museums our public might visit, and uncover, through comparison, their otherwise veiled agendas.

To explore these terms a little further, I will focus on the Van Abbemuseum today as inheritor of its own historic conditions and precedents. This is not to advertise ourselves, but to ground my point. I am quite sure that I can't dispassionately analyse the Van Abbemuseum, nor would I try to. I do this in a spirit of taking a position, putting my policy on the line and attempting to understand what the team at Van Abbemuseum are doing in response to the immediate geopolitical and artistic situations we face. So we hope to find appropriate uses for these public spaces called museums, following in the footsteps of many experimental and radical predecessors, according to the circumstances in which we find ourselves – artistically, politically and financially. I seek to do this without losing our museological anchors, nor our sense that each museum director passes through an ongoing institution that will be far more significant than his/her individual shaping of a brief moment in its story.

And so to the Van Abbemuseum in Eindhoven, the southern Netherlands, Western Europe in 2007. Eindhoven is a peculiar place. Mostly it is exceptionally average and undistinguished. It has the façade of careless affluence that the Netherlands assumed after the 1960s, while being unremarkable to a degree that might even make it noteworthy. However, in a few areas it stands head and shoulders above similar middle-sized western European towns. It has more multinational high-tech research facilities than any comparably sized city on the continent; it has, for its size, the best football team in Europe; and it has the Van Abbemuseum. Modern Eindhoven was brought into being by the Phillips factories that have dominated the city since the 1890s, and it still has largely the character of a dormitory town. But the workers needed cultural fodder, just as the growing bourgeoisie of the city needed a place to call their own at a time when travel was not so easy. The Van Abbemuseum, founded in 1936, was the product of an Amsterdam-born tobacco merchant's desire to see more sophistication in the city. A deal was made with the city council, and the museum was built with the profits of tobacco-smoking, while the council purchased part of his collection. The building carried the donor's name, which is now better known internationally through the museum than through the long-closed factory that gave it birth.

Today the bourgeois legacy that is the origin not only of the Van Abbemuseum but of many modern art museums remains in a part of the collection, but also in a more abstract legacy of the bourgeois public sphere that was both served and created by the foundation of the museum. In Eindhoven this bourgeois sphere was always small but, like the football team and

the industry, had ambitions beyond what might have been expected. The ambitiousness of the museum as an institution was more precisely defined by the first post-war director, Edy de Wilde (1946-1964). He and his team negotiated with the city council that the museum would be a modern art museum only, and not attempt to collect Dutch Golden Age paintings, which had been the councillors' original plan. The history of the museum has often been written in terms of the periods of each subsequent directorship, starting with de Wilde and going through Jean Leering (1964-1973), who is of great significance for our current policy, to the glory days of Rudi Fuchs (1973-1988) and finally to Jan Debbaut (1989-2003), who dedicated his stewardship to the construction of a new museum architecture. I took over the directorship in August 2004, very conscious of this story but also increasingly aware that other complexities and individual contributions lay behind the so-called 'four chapters' of the directors, and that the city and representatives of Eindhoven had much to do with the successful extension of the Van Abbemuseum's reputation over the past seventy years.

As we know, the concept that constructed the museum – that of the bourgeois public sphere – no longer exists now, or exists only as a memory. The Van Abbemuseum, in common with most other provincial museums, is therefore paradoxically homeless in its own city, without a clearly invested community who believe in its historic values and mission, while searching to embed itself in new interest groups – most obviously in those major inheritors of bourgeois society, the new rich. If we observe the art market and the rather incestuous current relationships between private art collecting and public-sphere institutions, we can say that many museums have chosen the new rich as their core constituency with notable success. But what I would like to propose here is precisely to reject the obvious connection between old bourgeois and new rich – instead premising museum activities on a potential, imaginable public constituency formed out of incoherent individual desires.

I began my directorship by invoking, foremost, the twin terms 'radicalism' and 'hospitality'. These two terms are meant to create a classic paradox in order to reveal a necessary tension inherent in museum policy and, by so doing, suggest an underlying coherence that distinguishes our objectives from those of either commercial or educational institutions. The 'radical' museum relates specifically to how museum histories can be re-engaged in a potentially revolutionary way. I can't explore them too much here, but there is a German-language book due out in September under the auspices of the *Bund der Deutsche Industrie*,

co-edited by Barbara Steiner and myself, which covers ten museums we feel are worth quoting or reconsidering. They range from the Stedelijk Museum under Sandberg, through Louisiana, Van Abbemuseum under Leering, the Museum of Fine Art in Sao Paulo to MACBA and Moderna Galerija in Ljubljana, amongst others. The roots of museum experimentation are therefore broad and diverse, but they indicate a lineage of which we can all make use.

The second term I used at the beginning of my museum period is 'Hospitality', understood in the way Derrida implied as a gesture of saying 'yes to whoever or whatever turns up' – a turn of phrase that undermines the gate-keeping function of the museum and permits its outside ambience to penetrate the museum with minimal resistance. This hospitality could potentially be either experimental or critical, in that it allows the museum to sanction activities outwith its control that can criticise the existing assumptions of the museum from within. Or, put another way, simply saying 'yes' can have huge consequences.

As a publicly accountable art institution, a museum such as Van Abbemuseum can no longer premise its survival on the institutional protection accorded to art by academic disciplines or social classes. Our task is to create another kind of – probably temporary and dynamically constructed – public sphere that replaces the empty bourgeois one, and may seem urgent enough to connect diverse interests with art on an international level. These groups are likely to contain combinations of antagonistic interests, from international art-world insiders to members of the city's various social and ethnic communities; from immigrant intellectuals to born-and-bred Eindhoven cleaners; from members of Turkish or Indonesian communities to the new rich. The question is how to turn any attention they might bestow on the museum into forms of critical reflection – a term that must define a fundamental task of a museum today, especially when the pressure of time and the urgency to consume denies opportunities for such activity on other occasions. For it is relatively simple to generate attention from such groups – good media management of spectacular architecture or celebrity programming can almost guarantee it. The issue is not the number of museum visitors or the fulfilment of their wants, but the actions they are encouraged to perform and the reflective possibilities offered to them. To invert the title of one of Jean Leering's most significant exhibitions, it is 'van vermaak tot lering' that we need to traverse – loosely translated as moving from 'from pleasure to reflection'.

Irit Rogoff's neologism *criticality* is a useful, if wordy, term to help understand what is at stake here. I understand her to mean by it living and operating with full knowledge of the contradictions of contemporary capitalist culture and recognising that we are totally dependent on its structures, while trying to achieve a critical dialogue with it, until such time as it may be superseded by a more equitable system. This kind of *criticality* should be encouraged in everyone within the museum, from artists and curators to educators and visitors. Hopefully, we might then see a chance of raising this delicate discourse reflectively (rather than combatively) in the cultural field – and specifically with regard to the publicly supported museum, especially in the absence of any real, properly argued debate in the political or economic fields. If the desire to generate *criticality* is not inscribed as a public objective, museums are in danger either of simply affirming the organisational principles of capitalism through their global expansion and the externally driven demand to service more customers, or, even worse, retreating into a nostalgia for old models of critique for an increasingly self-regarding, diminishing leftist elite.

To avoid such outcomes, we need to think through the invention of forms that deal with the familiar issues of liberty, equality and co-operation from within the place, possibilities or traditions we are in. If the invention of techniques to express these ideals anew can be begun within existing cultural institutions, they have to be able to destroy the very institutions that give them space. This is the compelling paradox that renewing the possibility of the museum throws up. The museum must remain as open as possible to its reinvention, and prepared to countenance its abolition when better models are discovered, while defending its right to *criticality* from the threats of privatisation, speculation and the entertainment industry. How to tell which attacks are desirable and which are not is perhaps the trickiest task we museum directors have, and one we are still mastering. Criticality demands self-critique, pluralist responses and experimentation, since the ethical certainties of a clear ideology are absent. What it might indicate, though I am not yet sure, is that the institution of art itself, just as much as the art institutions corralled in its defence, might need to be abandoned or redefined. At the least, the identification of the art institution with the institution of art can be tested, and prised apart more firmly than it was in the 1970s.

Until then, however, we are trying use the museum in Eindhoven as fully as possible to try what an internationally focused museum can mean to and in a small city. Through a series of

exhibition projects and longer-term initiatives connected to the collection, we are using the Van Abbemuseum's tradition of regular reinvention to challenge its present systemologies, reflexes and instincts. Regarding the collection, we have expanded the terms under which it is understood internally, and given voice to different artistic and curatorial modes of address in a single exhibition proposal. The project *Living Archive* deals with the former. By asking the librarian to take on a curatorial role, it shifts information that was in the cellar to the main museum rooms. Every six months, a new *Living Archive* delves into the history of the museum and creates a narrative around particular events or recurring issues in diachronic slices though the last seventy-one years. The project began with an account of the major exhibitions under Jean Leering, went through a year-by-year narrative of the organisational development of the museum, and has looked at the sometimes fraught relationship between the museum, its city council and its artists over the whole period. Remarkable and revealing material – such as the initial critical response to the now legendary exhibition 'The Street', or Rudi Fuchs' plea for price reductions from Michael Werner, Hans Haacke's letter fuming at Fuchs' support for Anselm Kiefer, or the outrage stirred by a French religious art exhibition in the 1950s – have all been presented in ways that, hopefully, always show a museum visitor that the museum is more than its current exhibitions: it also includes historical narratives, political conflicts and social changes as an integral part of its identity today.

The *Plug In – Re-Imagining the Collection* project is designed to refocus the museum as a whole on its activities with and around the collection. The first step was to resist the idea that each successive room should relate to its neighbours, but instead to understand the architecture of the new museum as a twisted *enfilade* that allowed us to use them as a series of independent units. This formal step permitted us to adapt the principles of self-reflection and criticality already mentioned to the methods of curating and displaying the collection. These principles indicated a recognition of the pseudo-totalising prism of the museum, and its false attempt to present a comprehensive collection story (even in Van Abbemuseum, given the subjectivities of the four post-1945 directors). Dilution or diversion have been the means to do this, through a variable approach to reading singular examples of art, recombining and recontextualising on a constant basis. Thus *Plug In* was able systematically to multiply its curatorial voices: inviting guest- and research-curators to take on their own room; offering artists whose work was newly acquired the chance to show it alongside existing museum works; commissioning works to be shown in relation to the collection; inviting the public to

play a role in curatorial decision-making in the *Kijkdepot* and *Your Space*; and, in one case, asking the artist Lily van der Stokker to take over the responsibility of collecting itself, designing a room in which her work (wallpaper) would serve as the background to the works of her choosing. These works, so far all by women artists in a bid to address the huge gender imbalance in the collection, are then bought by the museum as independent works that will always have a particular narrative associated with their acquisition.

In addition to the main tasks of considering and manipulating the various elements that go to make up a museum collection, we have been busy with certain longer-term exhibition projects that seek to loosen the fixity of traditional art-historical lines and consider anew the relation of the museum to geography and history. The first of these, *EindhovenIstanbul* (October 2005-January 2006), brought two differently defined collections together, juxtaposing the Van Abbemuseum's art holdings with the non-existent but imaginable 'collection' of all the repetitions of the Istanbul Biennial. The resulting tension between an object archive going back to 1909 and a biennial archive that was sometimes incomplete, and regularly produced works that did not survive the closure of the biennial, was fascinating. As an exhibition, it indicated the caesuras in both institutional frameworks, and offered the museum a way of understanding how 'collection' could be expanded to include relations to site, people and time, which have informed our subsequent policy. Forthcoming projects in this line include *Forms of Resistance, Artists and the Desire for Social Change* (October 2007-January 2008), which will track an alternative art history from the engagement of Gustave Courbet in the Paris Commune of 1871 to Oliver Ressler today. This will include much 'artwork' that slips out of the categories familiar to museums – from pamphlets and street posters to wall-paintings, and from images celebrating revolutionary victory to straightforward demands for action. The thesis of the exhibition is that, to become politically active, artists often had to abandon their status as such and engage in subterfuge to put their imagination and skills to the service of an ideological project. How this thin line through another order of visual art will affect the museum and its collection in the future remains to be seen, but the intention that it should do so is clear. Finally, I come to the two-year investigation into contemporary national, cultural identity called *Be(com)ing Dutch (2007-2009)*. Stimulated by the increasingly xenophobic immigration and asylum policies of the Dutch and other Western European governments (while paradoxically being heavily financed by the Dutch authorities), *Be(com)ing Dutch* began in January 2007 with a call to the people local to Eindhoven and its environs to discover their

different understandings of the significance of national cultural identity here and now, and contribute their own ideas. The first publication as a result of this 'gathering' was a *Be(com)ing Dutch Dictionary* that will be ongoing and seek to define terms such as nationalism, modernism, identity and culture, which are so often misunderstood by diverse groups using the same words in different ways. Further on, *Be(com)ing Dutch* will organise a four-week caucus where the ideas will be developed by a combination of a group of thirty-five invited participants and regular public discussions with artists and intellectuals. Finally, artists coming out of these programmes will be invited to produce specially commissioned projects in and around Eindhoven for exhibition in May 2008. The final product will be a handbook, to be published at the end of 2008, in which the logistics of the whole project can be re-examined.

The underlying aim of all these projects is the simple, emancipatory quest for a more democratic, more socially diverse, more critically and politically engaged, museum interest group. To conclude, I take one example of a recent purchase. In 2007, the Van Abbemuseum bought *Aktiengesellschaft* from Maria Eichhorn. The piece had been commissioned by documenta 11 and, as documenta 12 opened, it was necessary to purchase the work so that the company of which it consists would not be closed. Eichhorn established this company in 2002 with two precise limitations. One was that the capital of €50.000 would never be changed; the other was that the company must own all its own shares. These requirements produced reams of paperwork as the authorities tried to give legal form to such an anti-capitalist enterprise. It results in an annual accounts statement that reads in effect:

Income	0.00
Expenditure	0.00
Profit	0.00

At the opening, watching one of our richer patrons read this statement, I saw him smile and then start to laugh out loud. When I asked why, he said it put things into a totally different perspective for him. *Aktiengesellschaft* is as near to a depiction of the absurd quest of capitalism that art has so far produced. It makes capitalists laugh – but it also proposes another way that would result, absurdly of course, in a very different kind of world. That possibility, that moment of self-reflection or even criticality, captured in a museum, is what museums are all about, and what they should remain committed to providing.

SESSION 2

BEYOND THE MUSEUM:

Introduction

Sabine Breitwieser: I would like to introduce Pavel Braila, Natasa Ilic, and Florian Pumhösl, the three speakers of our second panel 'Beyond the Museum', which will be moderated by Christian Höller. And I have to say, I'm very glad he agreed to moderate this panel: Christian Höller is the best moderator in town, actually in the country.

Christian Höller is a collaborator of mine. We did several things together, he often gave talks at the Foundation and so on. Also he's editor of Springerin, *Hefte für Gegenwartskunst*, an important art magazine in Austria, and he has written extensively on art and cultural theory. He also curated a special programme for Oberhausen, the film festival, in 2000, 'Pop Unlimited?' and he published his texts in the anthology with the same name, *Pop Unlimited?* Plus a number of books, including his 'Techno-Visionen', together with Sandro Droschl and Harald Wiltsche, and a volume of his interviews, with the title *Action Time Vision: Conversations in Cultural Studies, Theory and Activism*, will be published this year. We are very much looking forward to this book by Christian. He's also one of the editors of the documenta 12 magazine Georg Schöllhammer spoke so interestingly about.

Of course, he also holds an important teaching position in Geneva, where he's Visiting Professor at the École Supérieure des Beaux Arts. So please welcome Christian, who will moderate the second panel. Thank you all very much.

Christian Höller: Thank you, Sabine, and the whole organisation of CIMAM also, for inviting me to have the pleasure and privilege of introducing and also maybe responding to the contributions of this panel. One thing I guess I can't do is bring back the stolen alarm clock. I have none on me, but I'll try to keep the presentations... I'll see that the presentations stick with... stay within a 20- or 25-minute timeframe.

Also, of course, it's a pity that a lot of the very important, very interesting issues that were brought up in the first sessions cannot be pursued any further now. But maybe we will have a chance at the very end. If people in the audience have particular questions, directed towards the individual speakers, then there should also be, of course, time for that later on, or

following or maybe even in our concluding discussion we may manage to connect some of the points raised now with what's been said earlier – for instance the idea of agonising public spaces, which I'm sure also, at least implicitly, lies at the core of, or is touched upon, by our main topic for the current session.

And this topic, as you heard in the morning from the various introductions, and also know from the programme, is how artistic projects that, in some way, situate themselves beyond the museum space, beyond the institutional framework of a museum, might be assessed or, well... what their impetus and their implications might be all about. A couple of questions and remarks have already been laid down in the programme; for instance, the aspect of gaining greater control of the presentation and mediation of the artist's own work might be a reason for trying to move beyond conventional museum spaces. But then maybe also, in order to test alternative forms of addressing the spectator; that might be another interesting question; or as a third aspect to mention here, to move beyond the museum space in order to pursue an activist effort that might also alter relations between productions more generally.

So there's quite a lot of ground to be covered, I guess, and I won't stay too long with introductory remarks, but introduce our three speakers. And each of our three speakers will present their very individual, very particular, approach to what such a move beyond the museum framework might be all about.

So, to my far left is Pavel Braila. He's an artist who graduated from the Technical University of Moldova, the State University of Moldova, the Jan van Eyck Academie in Maastricht, Netherlands, and Le Fresnoy. He has participated in numerous international exhibitions, film and video festivals and has done installations, photos and performances. And the project he will talk about in a second was launched two-and-a-half years ago, in January 2005, namely a TV project called *Alte Arte*, a TV on Art/Art on TV magazine which came into existence as a project for the Centre of Contemporary Art in Chisinau, Moldova – which I'm sure I've mispronounced – the capital city.

Yes, Pavel, it's your turn now to present this project.

Pavel Braila: In fact what I want to say is just a short introduction, because I have a clip of this programme that will describe what it's all about, but it will not be 30 minutes, as it was usually broadcast. I have like 15 minutes, so I will speak five minutes about this project and then you'll have a chance to look at this, how it was broadcast.

To understand the meaning of *ALTE ARTE* you have to translate *ALTE* to 'old'. Alte Arte means 'old' arts, because we were thinking how to approach the general public, to show contemporary art, which is not a new thing, but a strange thing for the general public. To start working on this project was a very interesting experience. I was really challenged by the task of showing a programme on contemporary art, broadcast twice a month for 30 minutes of prime time, Saturday at 10 o'clock in the evening. So immediately after the news we had the project, this 30-minute programme where we would show contemporary art in the country, which is run by Communists. Yeah, unfortunately, we have a Communist government who was already re-elected, and probably it's the only country in Eastern Europe and the ex-Soviet Union who had this 'luck'.

And, for me, it was really strange that they accepted this... In 2003 when I started, when we started to work on this project, there was a law by which all the national TV channels... had to produce their own stuff. So 70% of their broadcast time had to be their own stuff. The state-owned station, TV Moldova, didn't have money, so although run by the government, financed by the government and controlled by the government, it still didn't have enough money, and the broadcast time of TV Moldova during the week, is six hours; during the weekend, it's 12 hours.

So when we approached the director of TV Moldova, we immediately knew that they'd accept it. We only wanted to hear their conditions, and their conditions were very simple: they would not give any money for production; we would not take any time from the advertisements; we would not speak badly about Communists; and no pornography is allowed.

We agreed on this and then we started to discuss it. It was really a very funny situation, because during two years of preparation –the idea was launched in 2003; we went on the air in 2005 – between these two dates, 2003 and 2005, we had to produce a so-called pilot project, and a pilot project we produced... First of all, the programme was produced by artists.

We didn't have any professionals in the team; just artists from the Centre for Contemporary Art for Moldova. So we dragged in everyone we knew in all the countries in our, like... neighbourhood, from Ukraine, Romania, Russia, all of our friends in different cities. We asked them both to participate and to contribute to it, so it was kind of... I don't know... a co-operative project with no contracts, so to everybody who wanted to do something we just told them the topic, or we just said, 'If you want to be shown on TV Moldova, please send us some material.'

And we spent those two years producing the pilot. First of all, we had to produce a pilot for our financiers, so when we produced the one, we did it like an artist would. It was very, I would say, alternative. Then, once approved, we had to produce a pilot for TV Moldova. When we brought them the 'alternative' 30-minute programme, of course TV Moldova... the TV direction team... were a bit shocked, and they asked, 'What is all this, what is all this about?' So we had to find a formula to balance these two things: to present contemporary art for a general public to whom it was not familiar and, at the same time, to show the art produced by the artists, which had to be, like... alternative, contemporary, and had to match what artists wanted to see. So for two years, we juggled with all these topics, and in the end..., we had this project launched on TV.

I think that's enough? If it's possible, as the programme consists of four blocks...

Christian Höller: Could you briefly explain what they are? And then we will view it.

Pavel Braila: Yeah, the first block is reportage; in fact, the first block was done professionally, by TV 'rules'. It had to be very clear, very understandable for the general public. The second block [...] we called it *Agenda ALTE ARTE*, and it covers different news regarding contemporary art. We did kind of, I don't know, the Moscow biennale, then we covered Venezuela, then we twice covered the biennale from Berlin, different institutions... Then we covered the opening of the Museum of Modern and Contemporary Art in Bucharest, and in that case –it was just before the elections– the Communist government said no, so we substituted the opening of the Ukrainian Museum of Contemporary Art in Kiev. Then we had to show the reportage of the opening of the Museum of Contemporary Art in Bucharest like three months later. Every time

we produced something we wanted to show immediately, they would reject it and we would show it later. So it was always kind of also juggling with these things.

But the four blocks are *ALTE ARTE Reportage*, *ALTE ARTE News*, *ALTE ARTE Studio* – in this block we would invite an artist to produce a piece specially for the programme – and then to balance the whole programme we always used *Gallery ALTE ARTE*. So we'd choose a piece that corresponded to the overall structure of the programme that was broadcast, so in fact every time we would show two art pieces. *S'il vous plaît*.

Video

Pavel Braila: Thank you. OK. What I wanted to say was that ... in Moldova we have like two speaking languages. Every fourth programme was in Russian, but three programmes were in Romanian, just to make up... for the balance of the audience. And every time it was subtitled in the respective language. If it was in Russian, we'd have subtitles in Romanian, and if it was in Romanian then we had Russian subtitles, so the general public would be... it would be easy for them to understand. And also, one reason we chose Moldova One was simply because at that time it was the State channel, which covered the whole country, so even in the remote regions, people could see it. That was strategically very important for us.

Thank you.

Christian Höller: Thank you, Pavel. Our second speaker is Nataša Ilić, a free-lance curator and critic, and member of the independent curator collective What, How & for Whom/WHW, a non-profit organisation for visual culture, formed in 1999 and based in Zagreb, Croatia. Since May 2003 WHW has been directing the program of Gallery Nova, a non-profit, city-owned gallery in Zagreb. Among WHW's international shows are *What, How & for Whom*, on the occasion of the 152nd anniversary of *The Communist Manifesto*, Kunsthalle Exnergasse, Vienna (2001), *Looking Awry*, Apexart, New York (2003), and *Collective Creativity*, Kunsthalle Fridericianum, Kassel (2005). Nataša Ilić co-curated Cetinje Biennial V *Love it or Leave it* (2004). She lives in Zagreb.

Natasa Ilic: I am a member of independent curatorial collective WHW (which we actually pronounce in Croatian pronunciation as WeHaWe), based in Zagreb and working in Zagreb. WHW organises different production, exhibition and publishing projects and also directs Galerija Nova in Zagreb, Croatia. Its members are curators Ivet Curlin, Ana Devic, Natasa Ilic, Sabina Sabolovic and designer and publicist Dejan Krsic. We have worked together since 1999. WHW stands for What, How and for Whom, the three basic questions of every economic organisation, that also concern the planning, concept and realisation of the exhibition, as well as the production and distribution of artworks or artists' position at the labour market. These questions, which were the title of our first project dedicated to the 150th anniversary of *The Communist Manifesto* (2000), became the motto of our work and we took it as the title of our collective, while instrumentality of social capital in constituting the social post-socialist reality became a matrix for the development of our projects and their internal and external operations.

In relation to the subject of this panel – relations to museum institutions – I will talk about one exhibition and one artist, Vojin Bakić, because that exhibition is in many ways symptomatic of the relations of institutional and non-institutional culture in Zagreb. Recent intensification and proliferation of independent cultural production in Zagreb, which is positioning itself in opposition to dominant models of representation and as a reaction to the inadequate work of institutions, is directly related to the possibility of its institutionalisation and influence on that process. I certainly have no straightforward answers to questions posed by this panel; they are to be answered tactically and with the awareness that there are no easily replicable models or solutions. But I hope that the exhibition of Vojin Bakić I will talk about will shed some light on the dynamics of these relations in Zagreb at the moment.

Before I start talking about the exhibition, a brief intro into background of WHW collective: We started in the late '90s, when the grip of '90s politics – characterised by the mobilisation of extreme right ideologies that engaged the 'intellectual establishment' with a struggle for a unique national culture, against what was considered left cultural hegemony, interpreted as the foreign, external element that threatens the purity of national culture/national identity – slowly loosened up. By the end of the '90s a smaller number of cultural initiatives emerged that saw their future in creating new forms of non-institutional cultural engagement based on the independent and non-profit form of civil association. The position of these basically

unstable initiatives was greatly dependent on the conditions imposed on them by an extremely (end of '90s) and later substantially (beginning '00s) unfavourable context of institutional culture (i.e. state or state-subsidised culture) and a greater public (whose opinion was mostly created by state-run broadcasting media or privatised print media).

Since 1999 the broader social context changed significantly and now we can characterise it as a period of normalisation, or better to say, ideology of normalisation, that today seems to serve to legitimise liberal capitalism and a political system of parliamentary democracy as the only natural and acceptable solution, the optimal norm of political consciousness.

Antagonisms that deeply stratified society have been temporarily suspended under a consensus that is, obviously, exclusionary, and nationalistic rhetoric is certainly watered down, but the basic understanding of culture has not changed at all. Although in the last years we have witnessed significant changes in the vocabulary used by decision-makers and representatives of institutional 'state' culture, the cultural domain in Croatia is still characterised by the logic of identity, particularly national identity.

The work of WHW is being formed in opposition to this dominant representative understanding of culture, and simply put, all our projects are streaming towards opening space for public discussion on issues that are ignored, made unfashionable by their lack of 'new Europe glamour' and unmarketability, swept under the carpet or even openly suppressed. Although the context and framework of WHW activities has changed – from a certain urgency to normalisation, from an informal self-organised team based on friendship to complex partnerships and permanent gallery space, the key question remains: how to create critical projects that will not become prisoners of their own 'will to influence' but will stay open to the play of contradictions and enable constant re-investigations of representational strategies.

Gallery Nova, which we have programmed since 2003, is a city-owned gallery located in the city centre, with a yearly programme of international and local exhibitions changed in a monthly rhythm, with loose thematic threads and focuses. It is financed through programme applications submitted yearly to the Ministry of Culture and City office for Culture, which means that there is no real financial stability and any longer-term planning is almost impossible to achieve.

The exhibition of Vojin Bakić, which closed in late July, was the first time that we so directly intervened in the highly restricted and institutionally guarded area of high modernism.

Vojin Bakić (1915-1992) is an artist on one hand perceived as an 'authentic' modernist sculptor, main figure of the break-up with soc-realism and proponent of abstraction who forged the paths for freedom of artistic expression in the 1950s, and on the other as a 'state artist' whose art has been servicing ideology.

Local and international reception of his work notes periods of intense interpretation and critical valorisation, but also significant silences and breaks of continuities. After exhibiting in Venice Biennial in 1956, World expo in Brussels in 1958, gallery Denise Paris in 1959 (with Ivan Picelj and Alexander Srnec), Documenta in 1959 etc., he was included in histories of modern sculpture by historians like Michel Seuphor, Herbert Read, Udo Kulterman. Also, locally the '60s are the peak of his valorisation in art history, but in the last decades his work oscillates between material devastation and intellectual marginalisation. He is highly acclaimed in official art histories, yet his monuments erected to honour and commemorate the victims of the anti-fascist struggle have been devastated in the heat of nationalism and anti-communism in the early '90s, and after that he seemed to be almost forgotten.

Problematic relations towards the legacy of socialist decades of society that imposed collective mystification and oblivion on the archive of politics, economy and style of the failed project of socialist society are certainly crucial for understanding the context of the reception of Vojin Bakić's works in the last decades, but many misunderstandings related to his position are the result of the dominant understanding of modernism. The function of art institutions, relations between national culture and its international options, problematic collective relations towards the past, are some of the unresolved contradictions that define the context of understanding modernism today.

As I said, Bakić is seen as a visionary who played a 'historic' role in the break with soc-realism in sculpture.

The political situation in Yugoslavia up to 1948 was characterised by membership of the communist bloc. Due to his organisational and military capacities during the people's liberation struggle, the leader of the Yugoslav Party Josip Broz Tito managed to gain the respect of Western

allies, and a high level of agreement in the Party regarding its decision to keep the country completely independent in domestic and foreign policy, with close collaboration with USSR in all the other areas. As Stalin could not agree to these terms without posing a threat to the monolith of the Eastern Bloc, in 1948 the Yugoslav Party proclaimed the Informbiro resolution, which resulted in the total break-up of all diplomatic, economic and military ties between Yugoslavia and USSR. After that Tito, who in 1947 declined participation in Marshall Plan, turned towards the West and accepted US financial aid.

The changes in culture were gradual, but nonetheless dramatic. In 1949, the main party ideologist Edvard Kardelj proclaimed the withdrawal of the Party from cultural affairs. To prove its attempt to open communication channels in both ways, in 1950 Yugoslavia was taking part in the Venice Biennial in 1950 (and Vojin Bakić, along with three other sculptors, took part with his impressionist portrait of partisan poet Ivan Goran Kovačić and the model for the Monument to Partisans Executed by Firing Squad in city of Bjelovar).

From 1950 to 1954 fervent debates about the proper expression of socialist ideas took place. With the demise of soc-realism, its place in the mainstream had been taken by 'socialist realism in humanistic way', meaning non-conflicting academic modernism which could link just nicely to national traditions between the two wars, but acceptance of abstraction was not that easy, and monumental sculpture would slowly get out of the firm embrace of academism.

Perhaps the most important episode in that process was the public call proposing a monument to Marx and Engels, for the square of the same name in Belgrade, the country's capital, in 1953, and the ensuing scandal, which settled the case against social realism once and for all. Vojin Bakić's proposal, although rejected by the jury composed of writers Milan Bogdanović from Serbia, Miroslav Krleža from Croatia, and Josip Vidmar from Slovenia, still played the crucial role in the process of freeing monumental sculpture from academic realism. The rejection of that rather benign sculpture, with its moderate leaning on formal solutions of cubism, resulted in a scandal in which young critics stood in its defence. The importance of the episode certainly does not lie within the inherent artistic qualities of Bakić's sculpture, but in the fact that to commemorate the fathers of Marxism, the formal repertoire of the artistic movement that just recently ceased to be stigmatised for its bourgeois decadence has been chosen.

In that narrative Bakić is understood as a propagator of abstraction who struggled for freedom of artistic expression, and his use of clean abstract forms is interpreted as a victory of art not only over socialist dogma, but over ideology in general. The only way in which his works, especially his monuments, are being valorised today in local art history is exclusively in their formal qualities, emptied of any political resonances and the ideological burden of socialist heritage. Those are taken into account only very simplistically, in order to dismiss Bakić as a 'state artist' servicing ideology.

What such an understanding fails to comprehend is the fact that modernism is not monolithic construction nor is it ideologically empty; notions of artistic freedom and the autonomy of art are only seemingly disconnected from ideology and politics. Neutralisation of art as the means of social critique, performed through the demise of the avant-garde, and the possibility to input precise ideological messages into a self-referential form of high modernism, without direct 'programme intervention' on the part of the centres of political power and without open violation of the institution of autonomous art, was politically functional both in the West and in ex-Yugoslavia.

Today we understand abstraction after WW2 as a phenomenon related to politics within the specific context of the Cold War, in which many different cultural initiatives played their roles. The complex relations between 'marginal' modernisms of a socialist background and the ideologically free and neutral modernism of the West – supposedly led strictly by ideas of individualism and freedom of artistic experimentation, offering a new, supra-national and international framework for art in the period of Cold War, and as such in contrast to socialist realism, collectivism and politically prescribed art in the East – are only recently becoming a subject of more extensive researches.

In that context especially interesting is the case of Yugoslavia, not only as the only socialist country that cut off relations with the Eastern bloc, relaxed ideological barriers and culturally opened towards the West, but also as a cultural space in which parts of the communist political and cultural elite recognised correspondences between the universalism of modernist art and the universalism of socialist emancipation.

The abandoning of social realism in Yugoslavia was not an act of artist-heroes, brave individuals, but the result of Party politics after the resolution of Informbiro and break-up with Stalin. There are many indications that Yugoslavia had a clear cultural politics in which ideological separation from the USSR and Eastern bloc supplemented strong modernising impulses with modernism in culture.

It is certainly necessary to get rid of cultural-racist prejudices about communism as something produced by an ethnical Other, and to abandon banal clichés, still held by local art historians, about strong social realism and the struggle for modern art as certain form of resistance to endangered bourgeois society. One has to take into account that after WW2 the leading people of the Yugoslav Communist Party and Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia within the general modernisation movement not only tolerated modern – meaning abstract – art, but overtly supported it. The schematic presentation of a clash between dogmatic soc-realism and progressive modernistic tendencies is not true, but that does not mean that modernism was accepted without much resistance. The current revisionist view inscribes into post WW2 Yugoslavian abstraction a tendency of 'restoration of belonging to the Western European cultural circle' and understands modernism as a certain continuity of 'bourgeois' culture, failing to comprehend that exactly this bourgeois, traditionalist culture, prone to academism, strongly resisted modernistic tendencies, and that modernism stands on the side of social change; that ideologically it is closer to the socialist project than to bourgeois culture. That does not mean that modernist artists were necessarily Party men. It is not about mere manipulation and instrumentalisation of modernistic tendencies, for political needs led to Yugoslavia's separation from Soviet bloc. In modernist abstraction enlightened communist consciousness saw a closeness to the universalism of modern emancipatory politics. Those artists were not modernist because they were communists following the Party line, but as modernists they were necessarily leftist, anti-fascist, socialists, and communists.

The fact that Vojin Bakić used the same formal repertoire simultaneously to create a global cosmopolitan cultural identity and a collective memory of socialist Yugoslavia is thus not a paradox, but the true face of modernism. The point is not to neutralise or reconcile contrasted views on modernism, but to understand them within the dynamics of their relations, to see contradictions as inherent to modernism itself, and to explore their specificities in any given cultural space.

This ideological battle over modernism in socialist Yugoslavia and its legacy and importance today is exactly what cannot be left to institutions, what needs to be taken over and invested with new meanings, which is one of the main reasons we decided to organise an exhibition of Vojin Bakić.

The form and conditions of presentation of his works – since his death owned and kept by his family in a private apartment in completely inappropriate conditions – was determined by the conditions of the works in need of urgent restoration, but also by a state of half-visibility of Bakić and his works – partially visible, limited and insufficiently contextualised, present but only in fragments. Selection from the family estate in the end included some 50 sculptures of small formats, a number of models for monuments, studies and drawings. Among the works that thematically and morphologically include all the phases of Bakić's works are many anthological pieces, like 'Head of a woman' exhibited in Venice Biennial in 1956, or his 'Bull' in many variations, but many works (especially his drawings) were shown for the first time.

The exhibition was not really open to visitors. Sculptures could be seen only through gallery windows, and twice a week the gallery opened for guided tours done by art historians, curators, critics or artists. In a separate space an archive had been set up, which in the form of a timeline contextualised his work in a broader social and artistic context, composed of press and TV documentation, with quotes from the most important critical texts on Bakić and photos from his family archive. This part of the exhibition was open in regular opening hours. We also published a special issue of gallery newspapers, composed of interviews with critics, curators and artists who were in some way influenced by him, and also included reprints of some of the key texts written on him at different moments of his career.

Showing his sculpture in a locked gallery, behind glass, is not conceptual pun, provocation or self-absorbed curatorial joke, but the result of very real limitations – on one hand the condition of sculptures in urgent need of restoration, and on the other a small non-profit gallery with insufficient infrastructure and an extremely tight budget.

We devised the exhibition as a 'realised metaphor' that refers to the etymology of the word problem – something thrown in front of somebody, an obstacle – and also to Bakić's own

thoughts on the exhibition format, which he understood as something that just blurs the picture, creates misunderstandings and is not appropriate for sculptures, which he always imagined in specific and defined environments and contexts.

The matrix of the exhibition thus became the very problematisation of the processes and conditions of exhibiting, pointing to existent problems related to the reception, interpretation and material existence of his works. The exhibition alluded to the objective state and frustration over significant parts of modernist heritage – we cannot approach it directly, and if we attempt to do so, we are not completely sure what to do with it.

This was the first solo show of Vojin Bakić for 41 years (he did his last solo exhibition in 1966 in his birth town Bjelovar). As I mentioned, the reasons for that are partly related to Bakić's reluctance to exhibit, and partly to his occupation with monumental sculpture, of which some of the most important examples had been realised in the '70s and early '80s. The fact that it took place in a small non-profit gallery, and not in some properly equipped institution, is significant for the reconfiguration of interests and relations between institutional and non-institutional cultural practices in Croatia. What are the perspectives of these concepts of culture, who and what today define so-called mainstream in Croatia, what characterises the relations between institutional and non-institutional culture? Is it about conflict, parallelism, mutual ignorance and exclusion? The need to radically confront the role of art institutions, in a situation in which not only art as material product, but also its promotion, become marketing tools and ideologically lucrative products, in a local context does not necessarily mean understanding institutions as mere mechanisms of the reproduction of global capitalism and its ideological hegemony. The dynamics of these relations include activities leading towards transforming institutions into platforms for the articulation of collective interests that are not completely overtaken by the interests of global capitalism. That includes building new institutions, attempting institutional work in a different language, with different economic parameters and aspirations in relation to existent institutions, but also in relation to the very institution of art.

In that sense we tried to diagnose critically a situation, but also to initiate changes. So the exhibition is in no way a full point, but a necessary comma, a proposal to actualise the legacy of Bakić, to restore his studio and works in the family estate and to restore his destroyed

monuments: a call for transformation of the situation. And as such it is a result of confrontation with institutions, but also a tactical tool and proposal for solutions and debates which are not possible without them.

Christian Höller: Our third and last speaker for this afternoon session is Florian Pumhösl, whom I don't need to introduce to a local Austrian or Viennese audience. In fact, you could just go next door and see one of his most recent pieces, a film installation he produced for the last São Paulo biennial, titled *Programm*. So for all of you who haven't seen either the whole exhibition or this particular piece, feel free, and I think there'll also be time later on to walk through the exhibition here.

Florian works both as an artist and an editor of a serial publication called *Montage*. He studied Art at the University of Applied Arts in Vienna and, as he writes, he develops his works from theoretical considerations relating to architecture, design and the human being as a social entity. He's concerned with the influence exerted by industry, modern architecture on urban systems, and the connection between architecture and power.

As I've already touched upon, a close link exists between his artistic practice, on the one hand, and the book, or serial publication, he has been pursuing for the last 10 years. The title of it is *Montage*, and it's conceived as a kind of co-operative platform for artists and authors, and so far it has included artists' books by, for instance, Dorit Margreiter, Martin Beck and Kaucyila Brooke. But also, I should mention, reissues of important books that have gone out of print, like, for instance, *Ideologie und Utopie des Designs* – Ideology and Utopia of Design – by the German theoretician Gert Selle.

So please welcome Florian.

Florian Pumhösl: Good afternoon. Thank you. When I got invited to speak and I got Sabine's paper, I immediately wrote about a page of pure pessimism, and I think in this page I had the word 'neutralisation', like two or three times, but I will not read this to you.

Before I start I would like to continue from the point Ann introduced, that we are not a sub-culture any more, the art world. I have read a few times in the papers that institutions are

becoming an extinct species. But I think we are facing a lot of prosperity at the moment, and I think many of the previous speeches were very much focused on the question of mass culture.

So my speech is more or less some thoughts from my kitchen table. And I was thinking of just putting into this debate a single work, quite well known, which is the 'Co-op Interior' by Hannes Meyer. I would like to say in advance that I don't see this as an art-historian contribution, so please be fair.

A structural transformation can usually be felt looming in the displays for a long time before it actually takes place. In my work I have recently been occupied in various ways with moments and documents of artistic manifestation in the first half of the 20th century. Their proponents laid the foundations for those spaces that can be enlisted, today, as reference or legitimation for artistic strategies, within and beyond their institutional origin.

In my statement I would like to try to describe one example of such a space, combined with reflections on what relationship it might have to contemporary routines for producing and exhibiting. Behind this investigation is perhaps the question of whether alternative spaces, or spaces beyond the museum, can be achieved by all forms of organisation, or whether they are, instead, of a more complex nature.

Due to our time constraints, I will limit myself to talking about a single, quite well-known central work, namely the 'Co-op interieur' by Hannes Meyer, from 1926. I would like to bring this space into the discussion with respect to its character as exhibition or perhaps even institution – naturally, in a very wide sense.

Certainly it is easy enough to answer all questions historically, especially using an example that is more likely today to be assigned to architecture than to art history. I'm well aware of that. But I still believe that it is productive to, once again, take a closer look at this space in particular, with regard to certain current conventions and habits, both in terms of its clear artistic intention to encourage a feeling of community, and of the way in which the design and non-material features of the space take shape.

Hannes Meyer was the director of the Bauhaus between 1928 and 1930, until his politically motivated dismissal. In the years immediately before that, Meyer was active as architect, author and designer, with close connections to the artists and architects of the De Stijl group, to Baumeister, Oud, Vantongerloo. He worked on freelance projects, stage designs, and photographs. This is the period that gave birth to the 'Co-op interieur' or the *Co-op Zimmer*, the mobile sleeping cell for the modern nomad, a small room that Meyer installed in the Basel studio nicknamed 'The Laboratory' which he shared with Hans Wittwer.

One can describe Meyer's activity at the time as bound up with a claim to totalitarian design oriented along the lines of social reform. His interior, in its basic features, was still beholden to the idea of the collective and the impetus to educate the people that had been espoused by earlier Co-op projects: the Co-op Theatre of 1924, and the Co-op Vitrine of 1925. It seems, nevertheless, to point clearly beyond this functional mission and pursue a more general proposition.

It bears witness to a series of influences and transitions in Meyer's work, and, perhaps, it is precisely the character of this Spartan ensemble as transitional space, a 'diagram of the present age', that makes it seem so significant from today's point of view, and therefore maybe suitable as a focus of our discussion.

What we notice first is the relative artificiality of the space, which can perhaps be understood as a radicalisation of the Co-op Theatre stages. In the book *Modernism and the Post-Humanist Subject*, about Meyer and Ludwig Hilberseimer, 1992, Michael Hayes speculates that the 'Co-op interieur' has always been just a photograph.

The interior – I'm showing this maybe in the context of the manifesto of 1926 – shown in the photographs that have survived is, obviously, not a stage. However, nor is it a display or a fair booth, and, yet, it is, unequivocally, a space that mainly serves to display the furniture within it. The second possible title is *Zimmer* – 'room' – which allows us to conclude that one can also imagine it as a part of a sequence of rooms.

The enclosing walls are made of white paper. One cannot see how big the room actually is. The cropping of the photos available to us limits our view to one corner of the room. The floor is

also made of paper. No base port, no windows, no door. Low room height. The bed has been divested of bedding. The folding chair that leans against the wall is no longer needed, but the other stands ready for use. The gramophone is lacking any black shellac albums; these too seem to have been stowed away a long time ago.

In the glass and metal bookshelves, the upper glass shelf has been cleared so that the lower shelves reveal what's inside: nails, chalk, white powder, dark liquid. There's no other storage furniture present. The bed stands on black, conical feet, supporting a steel box-spring base on which rests a rough linen mattress, filled with horsehair.

It seems to be a place of consumption, possibly of regeneration as well, but by no means a place for production or preparation. Made for one individual, the modern nomad, and a guest.

Meyer commented on the interior, the year of its creation, 1926, in his famous text, 'The New World', published in the magazine *Das Werk*. His essay is probably one of the most radical avowals of standardisation of its day. It's amazing how close this article and the layout and the interior correspond, almost as if the space had been written or generated by the text.

Meyer writes, 'The community rules the individual. Every age demands its own form. (...) Typical standard goods... the folding chair... the light bulb... the travelling gramophone (...) Apparatus for the mechanisation of our daily lives. Their standardised form is non-personal. Their production is serial. A series article, a series furnishing, a series component, a series house.'

He goes on to say, 'Our homes are becoming more mobile than ever. Communal apartment houses, motor homes, yachts and cruisers are undermining the local concept of a hometown.'

But the 'New World' is not just about standardisation. Meyer pinpoints therein the cultural and aesthetic phenomena for an emerging collectivist, democratic and internationalist society, and develops out of them a universal design conception. The concept of society posited remains abstract in its socio-economic parameters. However, nor is it exemplified by Meyer. Nevertheless, a kind of cultural programme emerges for a society that is, in fact, developing,

whose new qualities are reflected by the leaps and bounds being made in science and technology.

At the end of his essay, Meyer pleads for the renewal of art production: 'Art's right to exist is undisputed, as long as the speculative spirit of man still has a need for a graphically colourful, sculpturally constructive, musically kinetic reflection of his world view. Art is permeated through and through by the rationalisation of the present time, raising it to a new level. Art is becoming invention and controlled reality.'

Meyer showed photographs of the 'Co-op interieur' in 1927, at the Bauhaus exhibition in the Soviet Union. This show may have prompted El Lissitzky to make his comment on residential culture: 'One can take the clarity of forms,' he says, 'and object to certain limits. Perhaps it is sufficient for a modern person to have an empty room with only a mattress, folding chair and gramophone, all of them standard elements. But the error is that the Meyer arithmetical accumulation of standard objects does not, in sum, equal a new standard.' End of quote.

This criticism is certainly justified, anticipating much of what has proved unsustainable in Meyer's reform strategy. Meyer indeed later distanced himself from that manifesto, sliding from right to left that very same year, and thus regarding it as 'once again, too tame and not anarchic enough'.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Interior, and the intention attached to its context – its content, if you will – were already being called into question during their own time, I would still like to recognise here its quality as a guidance system; its beauty as, to put it speculatively, an institution. With its streamlined economy, its stage-like improvised character, and its refusal to aspire to be anything but a concrete illustration of an everyday situation, the Co-op Interior is perhaps ultimately better suited as a documentation of the emancipatory global thinking of its day than many of the works and exhibitions that rhetorically assert this, even now. It allows us to recognise in retrospect the enthusiasm, the poetry, and also the lack of focus, of such a project. What might be the relevance of this design, though, for our discussion of alternative forms of production beyond the museum? I think that this lies, first of all, in its very clear intention and integration. It is a space that provides a concrete model of the change

in our environment, in which, however, the artwork – I quote, ‘as a privilege of the individual,’ as Meyer puts it in ‘The New World’ – has no place.

We have to acknowledge that these two aspirations do not exactly form guiding principles for contemporary art production. But what seems almost more important, to me, is that Meyer creates a level that is complex enough to anchor its intentions in a contextual relationship alone. A context is thus formed that is defined, not exclusively through an institutional superstructure or its evident functionalism, but, in fact, via the offer to negotiate form as it is read.

An additional aspect seems to me the relative indeterminacy of the category of the representation involved in this offer to launch a discourse which, paradoxically, emerges precisely from the bare-bones functional nature of the ensemble. Hannes Meyer is, to my mind, present here neither as a creative architect in our present-day concept of it, nor as a visual artist or writer; and by no means as a cultural producer in today’s sense – I’m not concerned here with interdisciplinary pursuits. He is, instead, the creator of a multi-faceted moment. He makes possible a very concise space, a form in which relations can display themselves.

Thank you.

Christian Höller: We’ve now heard three proposals of how artistic or curatorial practice might point towards an outside, or ‘beyond’, the conventional museum framework, and before commenting on the three proposals individually, I briefly wanted to recap on the need for such a beyond.

The need for such a beyond, especially with respect to how the borders of institutional spaces have become permeable in all sorts of ways – and here I only have to remind you of everything that Charles Esche was pointing out this morning about the kind of permeability that has become more or less essential for high quality or the working of the museum today.

It was actually quite a long time ago that museum spaces were exclusively dedicated or restricted to an expert selection of so-called masterpieces and the autonomous aura they were

supposed to carry. And it is an equally long time since considerations of contextuality, be it in social-historical trans-disciplinary respects or various considerations of a re-canonisation, entered these spaces and re-drew their boundaries.

In fact, today, there is hardly any art form, or articulation of a conceivable artistic aspiration, that could successfully avoid integration, at least temporarily, into a museum framework. And actually, all the three projects and endeavours just presented would make perfect museum pieces, or contributions to a museum show, in the right circumstances.

But I guess the question of a possible beyond is not so much about successes and failures in staying out of museum circulation, or *Musealisierung* as the German language has it, approximately the same as with *Halbbildung*, which Peter Weibel mentioned. (There is no proper English translation for the term *Musealisierung*). Rather the crucial question of a beyond is much more directed towards a transformation of existing institutional frameworks, whether their primary focus is producing, collecting, exhibiting or generating other forms of public awareness.

So the main point in my mind, really, seems to be how to engender such transformative processes, given that the currently existing structures are perceived to be somewhat restrictive, exclusionary, or even oppressive. And here, of course, there exists quite a big variety of limitations; no matter if a museum sees itself as, in principle, liberal or open-minded, or whether it is dedicated to a very particular or narrowly defined agenda, which *per se* would make for a lot of restrictions.

Therefore, the question, our guiding question, of a possible beyond, or transformative steps towards such a beyond, is very much focused on the combination of certain power structures – structures that are equally at work in institutions preoccupied with so-called critical art as they are in museums; institutions whose mission lies in the delineation of more formalist art histories.

Now a second general point, before I come to the individual proposals, concerns the ways in which the limits of exhibiting institutions are currently being renegotiated. For quite some time now, the name of the game, if you wish, has been, at least from an artist's point of view, how

to gain access. Getting a major show in one of the top-ranking museums has been the main agenda of many artists and potentially still is today – probably still is today.

The effort to get inside the museum has not been confined to individual artists, though, but has been the main thrust behind redrawing the borders of the art world more generally, a process that we have witnessed over the past two or three decades. Bringing ever more artists or art scenes, global art scenes, or former Third World or Eastern European art scenes, or artists that have been neglected for a long time, into the focus of big representative institutions has, for the most part, generated public awareness that would otherwise have not have happened. At the same time, it needs to be seen how this process of generous inclusion has in fact altered the ways in which these institutions have functioned so far. Or, to put it more polemically, perhaps this constant expansion of focus has primarily served to saturate an increasing appetite for cultural or artistic difference without – and this is my main point here – altering the existing power structures in any profound way.

So maybe the need to look for a 'beyond the museum' is quite legitimate from the very point of view I've just pointed out – and by such a 'beyond' one should probably not just think of a kind of 'outside', but rather of models and experimental devices through which the existing frameworks can be turned into more profoundly liberating and possibly democratic arrangements.

Now quite a lot of such devices have been created and tried out historically, from the invention of highly personal and idiosyncratic, sometimes fictitious, institutions – and Georg Schöllhammer mentioned Julius Koller's UFO Gallery this morning as an example of such a highly idiosyncratic, fictitious institution – but also processes like the use of institutional space for all kinds of *détournement*, be it by the insertion of highly politicised agendas or the pursuit of non-artistic endeavours. But, of course, today there is hardly anything that could be considered as non-artistic subject matter, and thus unworthy of exposure in a museum context.

Now, a crucial question in my mind, in all this, is whether any existing structures can be used for personalised, or maybe also collectively designed projects, with an emancipatory agenda, or whether such structures need to be invented or built from scratch in order to pursue a more

democratic or emancipatory ideal. In other words, do the extant exhibiting institutions allow the pursuit of such ideals, and if not, how can the respective frameworks be generated, given local circumstances? Or, as yet another option, how can such potentially more liberating contexts be negotiated within an environment that does not seem open to such endeavours?

Now, all three proposals presented earlier offer interesting answers to these three questions, and, in the case of the TV programme *ALTE ARTE*, the main goal seems to be (or to have been, as the programme doesn't, unfortunately, exist any more) to bring into existence a structure for the diffusion and publicisation of contemporary art in the specific context of the national space of Moldova. So it was very much about filling a void, one could also say a lack that has been registered, with respect to the public awareness of contemporary art in a certain context, Moldova in this case. But also with respect to finding new analytical approaches to contemporary art – and I think that, actually, the first part in the sample you showed exemplified a quite compelling new analytical approach. All those missing things, all those missing structures, were compensated for through the creation of a television format that just had not existed before. Now, leaving aside all the particular beneficial factors like, for instance, the support of the German *Bundeskulturstiftung*, without which the project probably would never have happened, or the surprising open-mindedness of Moldovan TV executives, a couple of aspects seem to me to be worth pointing out.

The first striking point, for me, was that there seemed to be quite a universal – or universalist, I don't know which you call it – for lack of another word, aspiration, towards the subject matter and what it was supposed to mean to the audience of the TV programme... You mentioned, I think, that the whole programme was addressed to the general public at large... I think your intention was also to include all kinds of contemporary art, as much variety as you could find and so on.

Now, I'm almost tempted to say that there has to be some kind of limit; there probably was some kind of limitation somewhere, not only in respect of the selection process of art that made it into the programme, but also in respect of the scope of the public interested in such a programme – and not forgetting the mediating role the TV format itself played. That might also have affected the success, in particular cases, in presenting particular pieces.

The second point to raise here – but I think you concede this yourself – is the actual target group, and thus the real audience, which could probably be much more narrowly defined, and in fact was probably a certain milieu in which the programme circulated from the beginning. Targeting the public at large – or maybe that was just rhetoric by or for the TV officials – might have been a great ideal to make this [programme] happen, but what has become the sort of standard of special-interest programmes is not so much the modern or fifties' sense of television, but a narrow casting that confines itself to audiences who already have a certain pre-knowledge, certain tastes in art and so on. So what I would suggest we have here is a kind of peer-group universalism, instead of a universal address to a public *per se*.

Now the last point I want to raise with respect to Pavel – and I think you mentioned or touched on this as well – is the selection mechanisms necessarily at work. I don't know if you pointed it out, but the video pieces, or the small pieces, I think we saw one of them at the very end... of course have to confine themselves to a certain format. The programme was never designed, I think, as a kind of open channel that would just be this indifferent...well, provider of broadcasting time or facility for all sorts of visual, filmmaker, video, works that were brought along. The wide category of art pieces that can be shown, in real time, seems to slow down the selection process, actually quite dramatically, as they have to fit the standards of the television format and so on.

My concluding remark would be that art on TV – and this was one of the crucial guiding concepts, of course – remains a very challenging enterprise, although there are, of course, many very interesting historical precedents for art projects especially produced and designed for TV. But I would leave it open, as I'm ultimately not sure if such a project can pretend to serve all the art forms, all the contemporary art forms, that are out there, or serve quite a broad general public at large.

So those are just a couple of points. I don't know if you want to address them...

Pavel Braila: The main idea of *ALTE ARTE* was just to bring the information, in fact, and to talk about it, and at least to raise the discussion in public, because in Moldova the situation in the, let's say, art industry or art world or art education, we don't even have... In the local institutions, the schools, the universities, there is no such subject as History of Modern Art: art

stops at the end of the twentieth century, probably even the nineteenth [...] For me, it was really interesting to see how the people would react, and, of course, the public, the main public, were people who were somehow related to art. It was students, professors and, of course, like, so-called fans of art, and especially the young generation – that was the biggest part of our audience, the young generation, although in the end, when we found out our ratings, there was seven per cent from the national public, so... Also, many people watched the programme because of the exoticism, and it was even accepted by the TV guys and also the institutions. For instance, when we aired it for the first time, the first pilot, which was a lot of work, included many humorous elements, and they thought it would be kind of an entertainment thing.

But we played with quite serious subjects as well. In fact, it was also a matter of production, and when you say... regarding what bits to show and what not to, we wanted to show as much as possible, and we almost negotiated a one-hour broadcast time... because we were going twice a week, once every two weeks, and I wanted to introduce another segment, to have one part with just art pieces, which are longer, because usually... But they asked us not to have more than seven or ten minutes, so that's why I was fighting for more and more time for this.

But, of course, it's not comparable to put TV and museum on one side of the scale, because in a museum you have an absolutely different approach to an art piece. You see it live. On TV you see a reproduction... but on TV you also have the idea...

Christian Höller: I wouldn't be so absolutely sure about a whole different approach, because in museum and exhibition practice I think the viewing practice is moving more and more towards having two- or three-minute pieces at most, also because the attention span of the viewer...

Pavel Braila: No, of course, there is...

Christian Höller: At least, some institutions cannot be burdened with three-hour videos or whatever.

Pavel Braila: Yeah, of course, and TV – when you show it on TV, it's somebody else's opinion on this piece and, of course, it's different.

Christian Höller: OK.

Pavel Braila: Questions?

Christian Höller: No, maybe I'll make my comments on the Vojin Bakić project, and then, of course, everybody's free to join in or raise questions, make comments themselves.

So, the Vojin Bakić project we presented is, I think, also filling a void in a way, but in a quite different way from the *ALTE ARTE* project. Here – at least that's how I understood it – the institutions, or at least one or two of them, that might be the right kind of framework for the presentation of such a project, do actually exist. But, given their circumstances, they wouldn't do it because it would run contrary to their pursuit of their particular idea of national identity, while the project is very much about complicating, actually, this entrenched idea of a national identity, by pointing out the controversial and ambivalent position between Bakić's break with social realism and him being considered a state artist in the old sense, nevertheless.

So, in my reading, or the way I understood it, the project is not primarily about rescuing or rediscovering a discredited artist, but much more about revealing the contradictions that characterise the particular relationship of the public creation to its modernist past. And this modernism, of course, as you presented it, has all sorts of ideological and political implications. And all those ideological and political implications – that's the conclusion I draw from your presentation – are exactly the subject matter that the remembrance of histories of modern art should be all about.

So what you were trying to counter is those kind of quite reductionist accounts, and here I think you're actually on quite a similar path to Florian Pumhösl with his presentation of Hannes Meyer's interior Co-op, who also highlighted at least the context of the Co-op or ideas of, like, socialists, social democratic collectivity, or *Genossenschaftlichkeit*, as a determining context for Hannes Meyer's work.

Now the Bakić project was very much about unveiling a complex positioning of an artist like Bakić, and this, I think, is exactly the mode in which a beyond-existing institution is called upon

here, or a 'problematisation', I think that's what you called it, a problematisation not just of an individual artist's career and the relation of the public creation to its past, but also of the extant institution set-up overall – please correct me if I'm wrong.

Otherwise, very briefly, my comments to Florian – the Co-op Interior seems to be a very particular and well-chosen example of how to open up spaces beyond the museum, since right from the beginning it was designed for everyday use as well as an exhibition piece, or in fact a photographic exhibition, which never again materialised in its first real form. And thus, I think, it's been occupying an ambivalent role, testifying to the old avant-garde ethos of extending art into life and life into art.

Now, as a mobile living or sleeping unit to be used by modern nomads, it has transgressed the limits of any exhibiting – or for that matter, reproducing – institution, ever since its inception. Its purpose just seems to be ordinary usage, even a kind of personalised usage, with maybe some rearrangements of its constituent parts. But still the design, or the photographic reproduction, comes to us as a kind of museum piece, no matter how frequently its reproduction has actually been exhibited or reproduced in any particular publication.

Now this, for me, raises the question how such a museum piece, or artefact of cultural history, more widely, can be made to work in our current setting – and this you of course addressed towards the very end, at least with two hints that you gave in quite compelling, but also quite condensed, ways. First, I think you mentioned the aspect of changing one's environment or of 'controlling reality', as Meyer himself called it as well. I don't know if you can put that on the same level, but this kind of direct incentive for the viewer is rarely emphasised in discussions of current museum spectatorship, so it seems even more important to point out such possible everyday usages of design structures that have acquired all sorts of historical or museum value, but hardly any practical merits, at least not in the mind of the maybe 'ordinary' bourgeoisie museum-goer. And the second hint you gave, I think, was about trying to overcome the idea of art as the privilege of certain individuals, or a 'chosen few' belonging to a certain class, which is quite important, and you also pointed out.

Now by designing a flexible and actually quite fragile structure, with very minimal furnishing, in which rearrangements are easily carried out, Meyer probably contributed to a kind of

democratic movement which also attempts, in a broader or general sense, to open up the closed-off spaces of art or design appreciation quite widely.

My last remark now, and then everybody's welcome to join in. I'm not sure if this model alone points to an alternative to the particular spatial framework in which museum-like structures are embedded today, and this is because our flexibility and permeability have long entered the traditional white-cube settings, or what is still considered as the white-cube framework. But what Co-op Interior surely does, and I think that's why the example was so telling, is to highlight the kind of border or, better, transition zone, between a museum setting, or a *museal* setting, as the German would have it, and an everyday environment. And as the borders, or the transit zone, are revealed as fluid, or at least in the process of historical renegotiation, we get at least a glimpse of what the talk of a 'beyond' the museum might be about, without jumping out, trying to jump out and totally transgressing all existing institutional frameworks altogether.

Florian Pumhösl: Yes, I can only agree. But, I think the least interesting thing to me about this example is its sheer functionalism...What counted more, or what was surprising for me, was the way...which might be productive in this discussion... the way discourse is embedded, or the layout of the whole thing as a kind of public or model, or how it's textually defined, how it's defined by manifestation, etc. I mean, to pick up on some of the things we started this morning, if we look at this 90-year-or-so distance, maybe there's something like a very critical tradition inherent in your curating; or something that's turned into a complex discursive practice about modernity, modernism and what might kind of be in the room, more or less, looking at Hannes Meyer's work on the one hand. And on the other hand, I feel this kind of debate as I experienced it is very fragmented. So maybe it's not so much a question of whether the museum can participate or play a role, but maybe more about how the terms that were defined in the morning fit the marketplace to the museum, to curating – from pre-eminence, to the temporary component, how to find concepts to make them fruitful, under the prospect of growth, simply...

Christian Höller: Ok. So, finally, to the public, and you're very welcome to join in; at least, for the last ten minutes. So, please, there, there's a question there.

Janne Gallen-Kallela-Sirén: I'm Janne Sirén, Director of the Helsinki City Art Museum, and I suppose this is... one could call it an intervention to members of Session One as well as Session Two, in the sense that... I think one of the things I've been thinking about today during the various speeches has been that there seems to be a kind of reductive notion of what the museum is. And I think we have such a diversity in the museum field today, and such different organisational structures, that it's really unfair, you know, in a sense, to talk of 'the museum' or 'the contemporary institution'.

And there are also many societies today, I think, that would regard themselves as not part of 'late capitalism', but of 'new capitalism' – China, for instance, and other places where the waves of what is late capitalism in a Western European and North American sense is, actually, something entirely new. I know this, for example, from Estonia, which has, you know, celebrated its sort of independence from the Soviet era fairly recently; and certainly most Estonians would regard themselves, I think, as parties in a kind of a new capitalism.

Not to say that new capitalism doesn't have its problems, which are analogous in some ways with late capitalism. But they are different kinds of paradigms, and I think that things are happening in the world today that are not heliocentric any more, and we need to understand the trajectories of these different planets. 'Planets', I'm using that as a metaphor for museums, other institutions, as well as nations, and I think that one of the dangers...

I come from an academic background myself and started working as a museum administrator only three years ago (full time). And it was easy to sort of talk on a theoretical level, as a museologist and as a lecturer on post-modern theories; but as a museum administrator responsible for a staff of 70 people and six million euros and 25 exhibitions a year, you realise that you're not a producer, you're a facilitator – because you've got so many different people making decisions for you and, you know, you're dealing with the public and curators and so on. I think it's a much more complex galaxy, from the pragmatic, practical point of view than, perhaps, some of the theories I know.

Sorry, that was a long question and I...

Christian Höller: I think this very important point should be re-directed or passed on, maybe to the organisers of next year's conference – that we shouldn't use the 'museum' in the singular, but parallel to multiple public spheres, and talk of multiple ideas in the plural of the museum. But the way, I think, I at least picked it up now, was just... yeah, referring to the conference outline and the way it was presented there. But thank you for this very important point.

If no hand is raised in the next five seconds, I think we'll call it... not quite a day. Oh, there is, there was one more hand, one more hand there.

Sabine Breitwieser: Yes, I want to make a comment on that, of course. That's the reason the conference is not called 'Museums as Producers in Late Capitalism', but actually as 'Contemporary Institutions, as Producers in Late Capitalism.' But thank you very much for the comments on the historical notions when dealing with capitalism.

I would like to make a comment on the use of TV as an artistic medium or whatever, as a mediator of the arts. I mean, we have historic examples in Austria, which I don't know if you are all familiar with. Peter Weibel was talking and also had projects in the late sixties and early seventies. We actually had a very innovative TV personality, who was later fired. But at the time that happened, artworks were really produced for TV, on TV, with TV. And one example offers also, I think, a good symbol of what that means for an artist dealing with the mass media. It was a piece by Richard Kriesche. In 'Blackout' (1974), an action happening staged during a television discussion, he attempted to demonstrate the power of the medium by keeping the camera black by focusing on his black eye-patch.

However, the cameraman shot him from all directions. He shot profiles of Kriesche, everything, like he would shoot a celebrity. But never came to the point where the artwork was supposed to be. And this couple of live TV broadcasts of artworks ended with the person who conceived and produced them with the artist was fired, losing his job, and the result was the more standardised art or culture TV that went on for some years, but now even that has stopped. So that's just a comment, maybe, on the history of the use of TV in the arts.

Christian Höller: The shame about art on TV, or similar formats, is also, I guess, that they always end very abruptly, very quickly; there's hardly ever a continuous flow. Maybe now,

looking back at a couple of decades of art projects on TV, one can start to construe a kind of tradition of that kind. But all individual attempts, even on very liberal-minded... like state TV, or private channels; I mean, there are some exceptions, like in ... I would say German private television actually has some exceptions. But usually they end again very quickly. And, I think you didn't touch on that. Maybe you can tell us why it ended after this two-year period, or what the economic conditions for it were.

Pavel Braila: It was, of course, financial conditions. The project relationship stopped, so they stopped our finances. We couldn't find any support from the local businessmen or any organisations, so now, because we've started to look for new possibilities, we'll probably move to Bucharest. And we've already talked to the main TV channel in Romania, which is broadcast also in Moldova, and Erste Bank is opening the Foundation there, so we're going to play with this ...

And we also cover... The new point in this is that we want to open so-called *ALTE ARTE residency* where we would invite an artist from the East, another artist from some Eastern state, like either Ukraine or Russia, and artists from Romania and Moldova and one artist from the West. So then we'd create something for a programme, so...

Christian Höller: But it was by no means about any media-specific limitations, like running out of scenes or running against certain technical borders or...?

Pavel Braila: No, for a few months we were repeating all the programmes. The media is still open because, as I explained you, the big joker in our hands was that we found the money to produce, and they did not have money to cover their broadcasting time, so, of course, this always offers a possibility to show what you want. So we'll see. If we find the finance... somebody who'll finance it, of course, we'll launch it again, because the TV channel is still open for this.

Christian Höller: Well... oh, there is still one last question there.

Penelope Curtis: This is a question for Peter Weibel, but I don't know whether he's still here – or perhaps it might also apply to what Charles was talking about this morning, in relation to

the 'half-educated person'. I mean, I wasn't sure whether the position was that we should work with the half-education or whether we should provide the other half of the education, and, I guess, in the English phrase, 'a little education is a dangerous thing'. So, whose position is it, or whose responsibility is it, to provide the other half? Or is the point that to create a competent, functioning public we work with the half, the existing half? We work with what education people *do* have, rather than with what they *don't* have?

Christian Höller: Do you want to take it? Charles, do you want to take it? I...

Charles Esche: I think he was talking about Adorno, maybe [...]

Christian Höller: Yeah, yeah...

Charles Esche: I think Christian can answer it much better than me, but as far as I understand, he was talking about Adorno's position, not his own. And I am not going to be in the [best] position to defend Adorno either for or against.

Christian Höller: Yes, I'm also afraid... I mean, thank you for the point you raised, and this, of course, remains a challenging question for everybody involved in museum work – 'in the plural', of course – but I think we... none of us can speak in the name of Peter Weibel now. If he has already left, nobody would manage to do it and... running against the limits of our capacities here as well. But thank you very much for your long attendance, your patience, and I think... I don't know if Sabine wants to make an announcement about how the programme is continuing now? Otherwise, I think the sessions will start again tomorrow morning. Thank you.

Sabine Breitwieser: Yes...If there are some other questions to the final group, or the previous group: final orders, or... What's it called? "Last orders". Thanks.

Well, it's raining cats and dogs, by the way, I don't know if you've noticed that, so we'll have the reception in the Generali Foundation. You get some drinks, and we'll spend some time. Then we will take you to the vineyard, which is quite a challenge. We won't sit outside; we were smart and thought it might rain. So we'll sit inside; but we have to take a little walk. It's not long, and we've brought some jackets and umbrellas, and we'll hope the rain stops.

Then, at 5:45 or whenever, the bus departs... So, thanks to everyone for today. It was a great pleasure, and I also want to say, the speakers from the previous panel offered, all of them, individually and communally, to do the vineyard dinner, and that might be a chance to follow up!

So please welcome to the Generali Foundation, where you can view the exhibition...

SESSION 3

RESEARCH, EDUCATION, PRODUCTION AND DISSEMINATION OF KNOWLEDGE:

Sabine Breitwieser: I would like to welcome you to our second day of the conference, starting with the third panel and 'Knowledge, Production, Education', with Lisette Lagnado, Gerald Raunig, the two guys from IRWIN, Miran Mohar and Borut Vogelnik – actually, Miran Mohar will do the verbal part and his colleague will support him, symbolically, from the front row – and Beatrice Bismarck will moderate this panel today. So, please welcome our four speakers and the moderator.

I would like to introduce to you briefly Beatrice von Bismarck, who will in turn introduce the speakers. Beatrice is a professor of Art History and Visual Studies at the Academy of Visual Arts in Leipzig, which I think is a real challenge, considering the arts context in Leipzig, and Beatrice's background. She was also at the *Städelsche Kunstinstitut* from 1989 to 1993, in Frankfurt the main curator for the department of twentieth-century art. And before that she spent a long time in Lüneburg, at the university; she's one of the founders and co-directors of the *Kunstraum der Universität Lüneburg*, which is very well known to most of you for its really innovative programme and projects with artists, something I've followed very closely for a long time, of course.

And since 2000, she's been Programme Director at the Leipzig Academy's gallery and co-founder of the project section there. Since 2003, she's also Vice-Director of the Leipzig Academy, and she's researching in, especially, areas like the modes of cultural production connecting theory and practice; different definitions of artistic work; curatorial practice; the effects of neo-liberalism and globalisation on the cultural field; and the post-modern concepts of the 'artist'.

Her most recent publications are *Beyond Education; Kunst, Ausbildung, Arbeit und Ökonomie – so, Art, Education, Labour and the Economy* – which she co-edited with Alexander Koch in 2005, and then also in 2005 *Grenzbespielungen: Visuelle Politik in der Übergangszone*.

She lives in Leipzig and Berlin, and I'm very happy she's moderating this panel. And I would like to announce now that, at the end, we will try to tie in... to have a discussion, not only among this panel. Afterwards, we'd like to tie in – and maybe Ann Goldstein would like to join us too,

to open up the discussion, and also, of course, the panels from yesterday. We should have some time before the coffee break, I think, so please think about the urgent questions that maybe you have kind of held back for today.

So please welcome this panel and, especially, Beatrice.

Beatrice von Bismarck: Yeah, thank you very much, Sabine, and Manuel, for the invitation. I'm very glad to be here; in fact, particularly to be here when the topic of the whole two days – but particularly today – sums up so many activities that are relevant to the context I work in, which, as Sabine's told you, is educational contacts, in which not only the... is an exhibition space, so education and exhibiting are intertwined in a very special way, but also, as Sabine has also mentioned, the *Kunstraum* in Lüneburg, as well as this D/O/C/K Project Space I'm responsible for in Leipzig, are project formats in which questions are raised in a wider context about cultural, and not just artistic, productions within the context of the institutional framework we work in, but also in relation to the different activities within the cultural field, the interdependencies, the hierarchical differences and so on.

So, today is a panel which I think already raises, in its title, many different questions, such as research, education, production and dissemination, all four of them having been pretty central to all the other contributions we heard yesterday. I think it's very good to have educational questions coming within the context of art. What I think we perhaps could do today, and Sabine already mentioned this, is to take up some of the central issues that were raised yesterday and that I think are intertwined, connected, very closely to the three contributions that we're going to have this morning.

And, just to mention, perhaps, three perspectives. I think we dealt, yesterday, with what I would call the symbolic effects and function of exhibitionary attitudes... For example, we heard yesterday afternoon from different perspectives. I think what was raised yesterday from a variety of viewpoints, as a second point, is the relation to the public in general – and not only addressing the public, but also how the public are part of the production of an institution. And what do we do with terms such as 'facilitating', which I think was a very important point yesterday in relation to the public, and how can we discuss these kinds of topics?

And the third point, I think, that was raised yesterday and has a direct connection to what we'll discuss today, is the institutional formats that not only already exist, but are being created and are possible to create. So, to insert a kind of procedural aspect into the format of institutions.

For that reason I think it would be desirable to connect the two issues, the two discussions of today and yesterday. But before I hand over the word – I think that's a Germanism – before I introduce the first speaker, I would like to sketch out three brief topics that have particular reference in view of my background, and which I would like to be part of what we discuss later on.

The first is a topic that was raised in a variety of ways yesterday briefly, but only touched on, which is the role of the artist for the institution. And by that I mean I could envisage the discussion of this role much more in context of the particular activities, the particular projections, the particular statuses, that are associated with the artists in relation to other people working in the institution, such as – and this is, I think, the most frequent relationship discussed – the curator. But also, in relation to the title of our session 'Research and Education', how are these activities that for much of the twentieth century have been taken over by artists anyway, relatable, intertwinable and productively useable by the different positions within the institution? Here, I think we relate very much again to the discussion of economic conditions within post-Fordism, inasmuch as this kind of work, where the overlaps happen between artistic and other cultural productions, relate to modes of work as it is typical, as it is significant, as immaterial work for the conditions in which we currently work.

The second point I would like to address is the modes in which work is done in institutions – and by 'modes', I mean something that Charles perhaps raised yesterday when listing the different characteristics of what an institution can be. But by 'modes' I also mean a process of activity, not just a characteristic: how do we actually characterise the activity of being, of working, of producing and of using an institution? And by that I mean, for example, 'collective', 'procedural', 'temporary', but also a word that I think might be raised later on: 'instituting', or 'instituent'. You know, modes of work where the process of working is put into the foreground in relation to the potential results that might have.

And the third aspect is an enormous one, but I think we shouldn't leave it out, and that's the one of education. And that has been discussed over the last five years for different reasons and with different motives, to an enormous extent. In this context, I think, particularly looking from art institutions, I would like to raise the question: how far can we replace the phrase 'learning from' with the phrase 'learning with'? That's one point in relation to education, and the other is: how can we actually use the word 'empowerment' in a way that is not too idealistic in relation to education, but rather something that has to do with learning, with the kind of procedure of institutional work?

Yeah, those are the three questions that came up most in my own experience. And now, I'm very happy to present to you Lisette Lagnado, and Lisette Lagnado...now I have taken the wrong paper. Lisette Lagnado – and I think that is very a specific characteristic – has a philosophical background with which she then approached the artistic field, and wrote her PhD on Hélio Oiticica before – and this is her most recent activity, which she's going to talk about today – she became the Chief Curator of the 27th biennial of São Paulo. Additionally, she is the co-editor of the online magazine *Trópico*, which has been selected as one of the *documenta 12* magazines.

Lisette Lagnado started in 1981 as the editor of another magazine, *Arte em São Paulo* – I hope I've pronounced that at least something like what it's supposed to be! And her first curatorship, which was in 1993, won the prize of the São Paulo Art Critics' Association as the Best Exhibition of the Year; I'm not going to give you the title because my Portuguese is non-existent. In 1996, she sat on the Curatorial Committee of *Antarctica Artes com a Folha*, participating in the curatorial committee in which new Brazilian talents were chosen. And from 1999 to 2002, she co-ordinated the implementation of the website *Programa Hélio Oiticica*. In 2004, she was invited to curate the Brazilian galleries at ARCO, at the Up & Coming section, and in 2007 she was one of the 10 curators chosen for *Ice Cream*, the Phaidon publication.

Yeah, I'm very happy to welcome you here.

Lisette Lagnado: All my thanks to the organisers of this Conference, Sabine Breitwieser and Manolo Borja-Villel, who invited me to be among you and to share my experience. Special thanks to Pilar Cortada for her patience towards my various doubts.

The repetition of the word 'bourgeois' in the description of our sessions caught my attention. Not to deny the real origins of the museum, but how can a deep-rooted-bourgeois body of knowledge stand for something outside its very social position? Is anyone able to have a historical consciousness created from an external identity? And if we go a step further: how to care about less privileged groups without adopting a paternalistic discourse? For Dieter Lesage, in 'Populism and democracy',^[1] the fact of making art exhibitions 'public-friendly', keeping things 'simple and clear', is a symptom of populism; if education is in the politicians' programme, it is a symptom of populism; and, moreover, there is a populist meaning in the motto 'think globally, act locally'. I wonder what can be done if this is the perspective left for the intellectuals. Is researching, educating and disseminating knowledge something possible to be done regardless of basic averages?

I shall focus my talk on the 'rise of the international biennial'. It seems that it is a neuralgic point, a threat to the existence of museums. Somewhere in our mind lies an antagonism. Nevertheless, I really don't believe we should understand museums and biennials as an opposition. Only after having been chief curator of the 27^a Bienal de São Paulo (supposed to have gained *savoir-faire* during 50 years of activities, but unfortunately no residue of tradition is left after each edition), occupying more than 30,000,00 square meters, receiving 535,000,00 visitors in 64 days, costing almost 10 million dollars (as far as we can trust the official numbers), was I able to go back to my conceptual project so that I can state that, more than ever, active and creative museums are absolutely fundamental – just to provide the conditions to make a biennial comprehensible. Contrary to the general idea that biennials carry the opportunity to give the audience a great arc of contemporary practices, I would defend another position, which is that no big exhibition is able to give any robust ground if the city has no museum, cultural centre or foundation, working in the same direction. I understand the Biennial as an event not restricted to the exhibition. It must mobilise the city. Working in the context of a city of 20 million people is a far different responsibility from doing it for the audience of the documenta or Venice. Istanbul would be a similar interesting working case, for both biennial and museum.

^[1] Cf. *The Populism Reader*. pp 11-16.

It must have been odd for people in Brazil to realise that the Bienal de São Paulo was officially opening in January (when everybody is still recovering from summer holidays) and it lasted until December. I wanted an engagement with the city and to do this we used several different approaches: from the audience, through participation in the seminars; from the artists' position, and through new works based on the experience of living for a while in a foreign city and working with local knowledge. We opened with one of the six international seminars, inviting artists and scholars to discuss 'what is an artist?', 'what is (an art) collection?' and 'what is the logic behind an exhibition?' in the context of Marcel Broodthaers. During the exhibition, the content of this seminar vanished from all the São Paulo articles. Nobody connected those questions to the kinds of objects we had selected.

The 27^a Bienal de São Paulo – whose title 'How to live together' was inspired by Roland Barthes' classes and seminars for the Collège de France in 1976-1977 – not only provided the audience with a gradual propagation of the ideas guiding the show's development, but also enlarged its territorial extension through a programme of Art Residencies. Combining the outgrowth of both a temporal exhibition and a geographical State, the idea was to reverberate throughout the year among Brazilian cultural diversity, activating regions whose citizens never go to São Paulo for any reason – let alone for an 'art' exhibition. The word 'idiorythmie' was the most important concept in Barthes's lessons. 'Of whom am I contemporary?', 'With whom am I living?'. In the entrance of the show, after some struggle because that idea only came up after the floor plan, I put two series facing each other: one was the 2002 election ceremony in Brasília, and the other was part of the series Leopold and Mobutu. With opposite formal languages, two photographers, Mauro Restiff and Guy Tillim, reflected upon the failure of modernist urban planning. The first one focuses on Lula's winning of the election in Brazil. When people really understood this fact as a historical turning point, they spread over Oscar Niemeyer's fictional cityscape, which had never before been represented with human beings, manifesting their joy by taking water from the building's pools. Guy Tillim's pictures were completely different, but they were in that precise location to question the ambiguity of a colonial state and a dictatorship: Mobutu repeating against his people the same abject tortures as inflicted by Belgian forces during King Leopold's rule.

The opening of the 27^a Bienal happened between the first and the second round of 2007's presidential elections and, as that excitement did not exist any more after the first Lula

government, the black-and-white images gained another connotation, as if they were a kind of distant but familiar document of a bubbling moment. For a long time, Brasília had been the emblematic sign of Modernity. With its political institutions falling apart despite the democratic regime that followed a long period of military dictatorship, Brasília is nowadays a synonym of no project at all. The 27a Bienal focused the Acre Estate for many reasons: 1) because it had been Bolivian territory (with a small part coming from Peru) since the beginning of the twentieth century, and, having been annexed to Brazil, it could give us clues on how border lines change; 2) mostly, because of its colonial past based upon the wealth of rubber extraction; Brazilian rubber workers gave the start for the annexation of that territory to Brazil. Nowadays, the rainforest represents a possibility of sustained development, although there is no assurance that it will not be exploited by multinational capital. But here 'future' does not carry the impossible horizon of the world 'utopian' as it does in a planned city such as Brasília.

Leaving aside the fact that schools should also be added to the chain of educational programmes, what is clear, from the perspective of a curatorial practice based in Brazil, is that the artistic community lost its synchronicity with the major art event of its own country. I am taking, as a reference, the importance given by concrete artists to Max Bill when his work was presented in São Paulo in the first Bienal, in 1951; until Anselm Kiefer's participation in 1987, it is still possible to encounter resonances here and there. Local artists and art critics found themselves threatened and challenged by a new reality (the new reality of today's art), and nowadays a greater part of them would rather accuse the Bienal of being a replica of the art fair model than something more closely reflecting the real world. I shall not talk about this because it would take us too far from our subject, but my position is that the influence works from the opposite direction – in fact, it is the art fairs that take advantage of the research done by curators. During the '90s, a conservative wing inside the Fundação Bienal created an air-conditioned room to receive museum pieces, using the false argument that historical artists would give a more comprehensive feature to the show. Actually, aside from Paulo Herkenhoff's real concern with rewriting an art narrative from the anthropophagic manifesto (24a Bienal in 1998), the other historical editions were a pure marketing masquerade for fund-raising purposes. Of course it is much easier to get funds when you have a couple of big names in the show. All of a sudden, a good decision based on the wrong reasons, it was decided that the Bienal de São Paulo would not have historical rooms any more because the local museums had improved their performance. It is true that the Museu de Arte Moderna and the

Pinacoteca de São Paulo, along with other isolated cultural foundations, were having a better time, but still...

Pinacoteca de São Paulo, along with other isolated cultural foundations, were having a better time, but still...

In the Biennial I organised, Gordon Matta-Clark was presented for the first time in Brazil since he boycotted the Bienal de São Paulo in 1971 because of the dictatorship. Nobody published a serious interview with Jane Crawford, who was generous in giving her time during the seminar, the hanging of the pieces and through the end of the Bienal. Matta-Clark was described as the artist showing 'ruins' in the show! Ana Mendieta was also presented for the first time. No deeper resonance was found in any of the art journals. My point is: Matta-Clark and Mendieta would certainly have had a wider and more profound consideration if a museum had done this work before. The Biennial is not the place to make historical considerations. For the team of curators, Matta-Clark and Mendieta were present because, according to the 'idiorythmie' concept, they were contemporary as much as the young generation of the artists who are producing works following their directions. They live in the 'togetherness' concept.

Yes, the Bienal de São Paulo became a stranger in the city in spite of being an organism able to expand world views. The huge effort to discuss with each country the end of 'national representations' turned into a difficult way to understand the exhibition, revealing how much the audience needs the local dimension as a point of reference.

We now have an ambitious example to be analysed as an exhibition that was especially conceived to be its own medium, which means: the artworks dialoguing with themselves, no text in between to mediate, and the correspondences being drawn by a strong architectural display. I am talking about documenta 12, whose artistic director, Roger Buergel, dismissed direct access to the information about the artist's backgrounds. Whereas the catalogue (which I should prefer to call a 'guide') followed chronological time, the exhibition presented the curator's own juxtapositions. What is behind this learning process, considering that one of his three topics is dedicated to 'Education'? There are many points for discussion here, aside from museums' skills and the logic of a big exhibition offering a signature each five years. The statement of Buergel is that 'the big exhibition has no form' and that a concept can suffocate

an art piece. But what about the hanging? It carries its own syntax and it does not mean that arrangements in space are deprived of interrelationship.^[3] We have to admit that documenta 12 is all dedicated to form and that the curator closed his door to most of the familiar museological possibilities of research, such as: a theme, an era, a style or particular artists – and what does this mean to the educational programme?

Buergel went back to the first documenta, in a wish to reactivate a 'sensory collaboration' with the viewers. Now that someone has done this propaedeutic task, at a moment when Europe is somehow looking for its 'soul' – I believe it was also a process necessary to the whole art system, becoming tired of the ideas of process, lack of goals and so on – we can take the following step for granted: before documenta 12, the fight for the autonomy of art was still under suspicion; after documenta 12: a) any attempt to isolate objects from their own context is bound to be ineffective; b) I think the crisis of big shows has never been deeper than the crisis of museums.

Is it the same to present just one small painting by Gerhard Richter and one small sculpture by Luis Sacilotto in the context of documenta 12, in a German country? Buergel's fine irony using Richter would not work in Brazil, where a 75-year-old artist like him never had a one-man show organised by a museum, despite his importance. So, what is it like for an artist to be represented by a single piece when the museums have not already presented a monographic exhibition? Here comes the responsibility of the museum in late capitalism and in cities that already heads up a biennial: it is supposed to enable communication between a foreign and a local art knowledge. No contemporary institution can be seen as a successful one if it does not react to the international phenomenon. And why is this matter left to curators of biennials and not to curators-as-researchers working for museums?

To me, an artist is meaningless if he is deprived of his own context. For the 27th Bienal de São Paulo, one of my proposals was to work with a smaller number of artists so as to be able to combine both new works and previous pieces. It was meant to give the viewer the chance to understand how the past moves in time and how the present is a discovery which is coherent along its continuous unfolding. Therefore, in a sense, the mini-survey was a museological dispositive, combined with commissioned works, which fit into the logic of biennials. What

^[3] Sentences excerpted from the Catalogue (ed. Taschen), cf. Roger M. Buergel, Ruth Noack, 'Preface', pp11-13.

Shimabuku did as an artist-in-residence in São Paulo was an amazing attempt to deliver a new work linked to his former works. Shimabuku solved the problem of the new piece with a video of seven stones travelling in his hand, as a metaphor for the strong Japanese immigration in Brazil almost a century ago. Regarding the 'mini survey', Shimabuku invited a couple of musicians, called 'repentistas', he had found during his residency time in downtown São Paulo. He told them what his work was and the musicians, after watching his film based on a guided visit for an octopus in different places, agreed to compose a spontaneous narrative based upon his destiny.

When one deals with paintings or photographs, it is easy to manage. But what is the best way to do it with artists handling environmental situations? A good example is how the Musée d'art moderne de la Ville de Paris answered to the idea of the format of the retrospective. Jennifer Allen wrote a good article in *Frieze* magazine (May 2007), presenting how the 'mid-career' retrospective of Dominique Gonzalez-Foerster, among a few other examples, offered 'their own historical re-evaluation' as opposed to the collection of older works and their organisation in a chronological view. We should pay attention to this affirmation coming from Laurence Bossé (curator at MAM/ARC): 'The classic retrospective became "impossible" for all of these artists because their works had no finality.' This is a turning point we should pay attention to, mostly because the so-called 'finality' can be defined as the 'object' that art fairs are looking for and the commodity here is an abstract value. There is something here growing in the margins of nothing but consumerism.

Just to conclude: Hélio Oiticica once wrote – in the sixties – that the artist should be an educator. I want to finish with some words about the meaning of 'playground' for Oiticica. His concept of Creleisure – a mixture of creativity, belief and leisure – cannot be mistaken for the idea of something between a shopping centre and a thematic park, like the current pessimistic description of the museum of the 21st century. It is my opinion that Brazil still does not even know its own artists. There is a gap between international career and local knowledge. I always give the example of Cildo Meireles, who had to be presented twice in a documenta before gaining respect in his own country. The same is happening with the present generation of mid-career artists: Rivane Neuenschwander is expected to fit in any international group show as a biennial, but in any rural Brazilian town far from the centre, people still ask me where she is

from. The local infrastructure is insufficient to invite and support artists over-busy with an international agenda.

Dieter Lesage is right to point out that intentions have big potential to be a source of populism because they will not change the world; but I hope virtue does change us and, therefore, our relation to the world. If you are not a little bit 'naïf', actually you do not do anything worthy. Only a naive person would draw two sketches under the name of 'Constructive Projects' and 'Programs for Life'. This was the project of a biennial built in spite of educational departments of museums still teaching neo-Kantian notions of beauty as an objective quality. I am not in the position of the artist, nor of a common viewer, but I have the dream of a creative viewer. And this is neither for today, nor for tomorrow.

Thank you very much for your attention.

Beatrice von Bismarck: As our next speaker I'll introduce the one – or two – members of the group IRWIN, a group of five artists, who are here today: Miran Mohar, up at the podium, and also Borut Vogeltnik, in the audience, who will also take part in the later discussion.

These five members make up the Visual Arts component of the Slovenian art collective NSK, an art collective that IRWIN [...] founded in 1983. Since its foundation, they have participated in numerous exhibitions in Europe and the USA. And one of their most recent and, in a way, still continuing projects is the East Art Map, Contemporary Art and Eastern Europe, which is the project that they are going to introduce to us today, a reconstruction of the missing history of contemporary art. But I think you should take it from there.

Thank you.

Miran Mohar: Hello, everybody. I would like to thank Sabine and the Board very much for inviting us over; and, of course, I'm glad that she and the Board found the East Art Map Project worthy of being presented here. And that we were asked to present the project which we have been working on for the last, let's say, seven years.

Basically – maybe you could switch to the, yes, to the picture? – what you see on this picture is a map of Eastern Europe. Let's say Eastern Europe, Middle Europe and Russia. And you can see some...it's a little bit distorted, but you can see some proportion of the space where so many people were living, and still live, after the fall of the Berlin Wall. Well, in fact we were born in the country of Slovenia, which is a long way west of this, what you might call dinosaur shape.

We started, as a group, in 1983, at a time when Yugoslavia was still very socialist, and we were working in the specific context of the art system which was, let's say, prevalent, at that time, in Yugoslavia and the whole of Eastern Europe. And in this context the system was not developed as yours was in the West. We didn't have galleries, for example. We didn't have certain modes of education. We had institutions, and most of these institutions, then, were underdeveloped or even developed in the wrong direction. So, basically, [...] there was a big dichotomy between the artistic production and the system itself.

I will do a short introduction before I go on to the East Art Map, because I would like you to have a context, the background to why we did this project. So to explain, we decided, after the fall of the Berlin Wall, to stay in the place we had been working. Of course, we had been travelling and working in various exhibitions around it, but we decided to stay because if we wouldn't stay, who else would? I mean this was important, because if everybody left, it would be like a cultural desert.

So we decided to stay, and in fact what we did is a kind of a switch with the question of including exclusion, to the point that we decided we wanted to create our own reality. We wanted to create our own living and working conditions, and try to contribute, let's say, to the construction of an art system, because you can't really live and work with the kind of system that existed.

So basically, when the Berlin Wall fell down, as I mentioned, most of the people in the West and in the East said, 'Now we are finally together. Now we are of a kind... We could get together, meet each other, and admit that all this time we have been producing a very similar art', because there was, like, a conceptual practice in the East as well.

Well, basically, we had a different point of view. We took the view that it is not productive to talk about the similarities. Our position was that, because we had lived for so long in such a different place, different art was produced simply because of the different conditions: different politically, socially, economically and culturally. And therefore, we thought, different art was produced.

So in the nineties we started a project called *Kapital*. We asked various intellectuals in Europe and America, and some artists, what they thought of this point. We wrote, together with Eda Cufer, *The Ear Behind the Painting*, and we asked people about this notion of the difference of Eastern modernism, of the art which had been produced in Eastern Europe after the Second World War. And this is how, let's say, our journey started.

Up till then, we had been working on projects which reflected the sort of conditions and different art systems in Eastern Europe. I mentioned *Kapital*: this was the first book, in which we invited different writers like Groys, the director of the Kunsthalle Düsseldorf at that time, and some others, and this was kind of a base. And then, in 1991, we got an invitation from art critics and artists in Moscow to participate in a project called *After Art International*. The idea of this project was to produce a work that would reflect how, after a certain amount of time, this experience in Russia – where the exhibition was displayed in a private apartment – the whole movement was still valuable and possible.

So we came to Moscow and we opened Irwin-NSK Embassy for a month, the NSK project, and we organised discussions with the Russian audience, the intellectual artists, and visitors from Yugoslavia, about how they in Eastern Europe saw the East, Eastern Europe, after all these political changes. What was our future? How should we treat our past? And we found out that we had a lot in common, that we had something to discuss. We published a book on this, *How the East is the East*, and then later we also did a tour in the United States.

In 1996 we were invited by Mary Jane Jacob, the American curator, to do a project for the Olympics, and we didn't want to do like a show or something like that, so we proposed a journey; a trip from the east to the west coast, with a question which we put to many Americans: how the West sees the East. We didn't go there to teach, to tell them stories and

so on, or to debate; we came with a question, to find out what... how we are perceived. And we also published a book on that, a kind of a road essay, a road book.

Then we were also involved in the curation of three collections. One just before the start of the war, initiated by Jadran Adamović, in which artists were involved, and we, IRWIN, were too; it was a collection of contemporary art from the seventies and eighties, on the territory of Yugoslavia, like post-conceptual art of that time. And then we were involved in a collection for Sarajevo, which we did together with Zdenka Badovinac. We started it during the war, but then in the mid-nineties it was exhibited first in Ljubljana and then transferred to Sarajevo. And we participated in the project by Moderna Galerija, with Zdenka Badovinac, the artists' collection in which we supported... tried to help with the financial side – not personally, because we're artists, we don't have the money, but fund-raising from some collectors.

It was important for us to start to construct this elementary art system. Of course, we have had many limitations, but at least we wanted to stress that we have to organise it ourselves, we have to put something in place, we shouldn't just complain it isn't there. To complain about something is, we find, completely unproductive.

So now we are already moving slowly towards the East Art Map. Because we were travelling quite a lot for the period from the beginning of the nineties until the beginning of 2000, around the whole of Eastern Europe, and in Moscow we established many very strong contacts on the Moscow art scene, so we started to think about new projects on the topics that had been raised and so on. After so long, and having got involved with so many people, it seemed that the project of the East Art Map was possible.

So East Art Map, in fact, has its foundation, as I said, in all these projects which took place in the previous ten years. Basically, it could be said that in Eastern Europe there are problems because art history does not really exist; I mean, not as a whole, but not in the individual countries either. What exists is a kind of local mythology, like a history in quotation marks... a sort of dialogue peculiar to the particular country. So you have this kind of local mythology, and this history or this pseudo-history is not recognisable outside that country. If you went out of these countries then, if you went out of Croatia, Poland etc, people outside would not know

these names. They would be totally different people or, at that time, artists from the East were just not as visible as they probably are now.

So because of this complete lack of transparent structures, it was ... very difficult for specialists, and artists too, to communicate with each other. For example, then we knew very little of what was going on in Romania, Bulgaria, and so on. People from Croatia weren't connected with the Czech Republic. I mean, there were some private contacts, and so on, but across the board there was no solid art history, as art historians simply didn't do their job. Of course, that is understandable because of... the lack of systems and so on.

As artists, we found this situation very unproductive for ourselves... It was something that even we were missing, and we saw that nobody was doing it, so we started this project – well aware that we are not specialists, not art historians, not trained in writing history, theory and so on. We just felt this lack as artists, and reflected on it.

So, we then started to think about this project. It was really difficult because we didn't have any money. We asked Victor Misiano what he thought, and he said, 'Better find some sponsors, otherwise you will never do it.' Well we'd had the idea for some time already when along came this person with a name like Dragan Sakan who ran an agency, and he said, 'Well, you know, I'm doing a festival, I might like you to prepare some projects,' and we suggested this project. And he said, 'Well, I'll back you. I make no special conditions for it.'

So that's how we started – just with the money, almost private money, by definition, and then we contacted the people we knew. At first there were twenty of them, then more, twenty-three, mostly from Eastern European countries. Two of them are here, Iara Boubnova and Sirje Helme, in the audience (I can't see very well from here). And we asked them to select, from their perspective, the most important works created in the period between the end of the Second World War and now. Well, not just the war. To be precise, we asked for artefacts, personalities, events – and the response was really strong.

Most of them responded; I think there was only one who didn't. And we also asked them what they should be doing and how they should do it; in fact, what information and criteria they thought they would need – I've already mentioned artefacts and art events and personalities.

Then we asked them to write down why they believed these artefacts were so relevant, and the precise data and documentation of the project, plus a description, and also that they should provide us with the connections with other comparable artistic practices outside their own country; say with the West.

We also asked them to relate to artists within Eastern Europe, artists who were connected and influenced and so on. After a year, I think this was in 2001, and then in spring 2002, we got an enormous amount of material: documents, tapes, catalogues and so on, so it was obvious that these people also felt that something like this needed to be done. Maybe people reacted so well because we weren't from a big country – we were from Slovenia. I don't know, but if we were from Russia or somewhere else it could have been much more difficult, in a way.

So we got these reactions and started to build the map, and, of course, here you see the detail. I'll go back a bit. This isn't a good image because it's too light, but you will see that we got about 220 different artefacts, events and so on, and classified them through space and time. Maybe it's also important to say that we asked people to present artworks from their respective backgrounds and countries, to avoid the proposal of 30 Kavakovs, because we wanted to cover all the territory.

The idea was not to present a national art history show, but to cover this big territory, and we didn't present them nationalistically in the end. So, here you see this 'X', and each X represents one item or article, art work or phenomenon or whatever. And, later on, you see that they are connected by the red lines we drew after the intervention, the proposition of all the selectors. They would say, for instance: I don't know how Group Zero and Igor Toševski of Macedonia are connected, and we would draw the red lines, based purely on the selectors' impressions.

Then there's the blue line. The blue line is different. We found out from Ana Peraica from Croatia that as well as this connection, she also drew a line of what she called the 'anonymous artist'. She found out that in the territory of Yugoslavia the concept of anonymity existed for a long time, and she drew this line of anonymity, then we, IRWIN, mapped three other lines we were interested in. One is about Moscow conceptualism; another one, if you look on the line, is about Sots-Art, and the third we worked on is retro-avant-garde.

So, when we had this map and this basic data, we first made, let's say, a kind of a... road book, you know, like a road map. It's a book with this map and very short descriptions of the work, really... in three sentences or something like that, and there you have the results of what was collected in this period of time.

And then we put all material on the Internet. We opened a site, www.eastartmap.org for people; so that everybody who thought there was something missing could suggest it, or could replace something. I think in the beginning we thought that people would replace things, because our idea was not to make a database of East European art; our idea was to make a map with which you can navigate it, not to have, like 3000 examples of work.

But people didn't want to replace things, in fact. You always learn as the project goes on. People started to suggest other works that were missing. For a year we had this site open and sent some information around, and after a year we'd got about 25, something like that, new propositions. But these propositions were not unprepared, like you just tick a box, a name or whatever. We didn't consider such propositions. It was important to write a short text, like half a page or so, about why this work was worth being included.

And then we set up an international jury, composed of people from Eastern and Western Europe – one of them was Georg Schöllhammer, who might be here, he was yesterday – and the jury met in Ljubljana, and from these 25 or so suggestions they selected nine works to be included in the East Art Map.

So this was, you might say, a very formal procedure. Like with a magazine or a book, you have a board to decide what goes into the book. And, well, the next phase was... we now had this selection that was nine names or works bigger than the previous selection, and we had already been thinking for some time about how to formalise it, and we had been thinking of doing a book. Well, you know, it was like this in Eastern Europe: you would have, of course, a lot of exhibitions, and people would be exhibited and so on, but in reality there was very little in the way of comparative studies of artists, or coverage of this artist, that artistic movement, what was going on in East and West.

So it's all a little bit isolated, and reflection was very important. If we did a book, we wanted not just to say who is who, or publish just this map, but we wanted also at least to start some sort of process. So we asked 17 different writers to write comparative essays on various topics. Of course, we didn't do this – we couldn't, because it was the first time, as a project which would take years and require us researching the subject completely. But we did have the opportunity to ask people to write certain case studies on different topics. For instance, we asked... Igor Zabel, who unfortunately died two years ago, to write a text on the Slovenian conceptual groups and compare conceptual groups in Slovenia with what was going on in the West. And, would you believe it, it was never done!

So simple things like that were never done, never put into context. He did a brilliant text, and Inke Arns from Berlin wrote a text together with Saskia Sassen about how a certain concept of art, conceptual art, coming from Eastern Europe, influenced the new media art in the West. So sometimes there was kind of a flow in another direction. And there were some other texts, and this book just came out; I think it was published last spring, with the publisher Afterall; Charles Esche is here as well, in collaboration with MIT Press – which is, in fact, very important, because if we had published such a book in Slovenia or South East Europe, its *visibility* would have been very low for various reasons: distribution problems, and others as well.

So basically this book is a kind of source of information, and as of now is still a work in progress, the site is still open for new propositions, and if maybe the book is reprinted, hopefully, we will add new information, the additional selections.

I also want to say that in this book the texts on the artists are relatively substantial; there is one page for each artist or work, whereas in the previous publication there were only a few lines. So you could read it by names, or by countries, you could search for certain topics in that book. Maybe I'll just go quickly through [the slides], because I think the artists deserve just a few images, a short selection, so that you get a glimpse of what kind of works are in this book.

This is a work by Ivan Kožarić, from the early sixties. It is a kind of, let's say, proto-length work, called 'Cutting Sljeme'. This is like a gouache he painted over a photo, and the idea was to cut the hill.

This is one by Mikhail Chernyshev, who stretched bought geometric plastic tablecloths and wallpapers over wood subframes in 1962 and exhibited them as paintings. So in fact he bought ready-made paintings in a Russian shop.

This is a work by the Slovenian Group OHO, very important for us, and we also believe very important in a wider context. This is their action and sculpture; it's called 'Wheat and the rope'. You see they just intervene with the rope in the wheat field.

This is a marvellous work. In fact, it is a video, I think it's an 8mm, Tomislav Gotovac, when he just walked all over... he drew a line, and walked along that line all over Belgrade.

This is by Maria Bartuszo, I think, it's also in the current *documenta*.

Most of you probably know this work. It's by Mladen Stilinović from Zagreb.

This is the work which we wanted to put on the cover of the first book, but the distributors said that they wanted to reserve it for another edition.

This is a beautiful work by Róza el Hassan – it's like, I think, a bug in a pear. Sculpture.

This is a performance by Tanja Ostojić. And a work by Zbigniew Libera, whom most of you probably know for what he did for the Venice Biennale, and then took away.

This is a beautiful work by Vladimir Nikolić, from Serbia, a video in which five young people cross themselves against a background of techno music. It could be like an MTV-video, but very minimalistic.

This is an art work by Rassim Krastev, from Bulgaria; he was getting the money and the food to change his body, from a kind of a poetic-looking guy to a bodybuilder.

This is the work of Slovenian director Dragan Živadinov, who took part in Gravitation 0, the Russian space-simulation flight, about, I don't know, six years ago.

Here, I would like to show you also a few slides from an exhibition, which we didn't originally plan to do, but Michael Fehr, the ex-director of the Karl Ernst Osthaus Museum, which we think is one of the most interesting museums, suggested to us. So we made our selections, IRWIN and Michael Fehr. We chose what we believed were the crucial works in the East Art Map project. But we limited ourselves to the end of seventies. Only a few works from the eighties were included, because those artists had started working in the seventies. So we did this show, and called it the 'East Art Museum'.

Here's a work by Kazimir Malevich from Belgrade.

This is a work by Knifer – not Kiefer, Julije Knifer. On the left is the work of the same artist who did the tablecloth, Chernyshev, but here it's like wallpaper.

Braco Dimitrijević, on the left.

What was important at this exhibition was that Michael Fehr also proposed that there should be small exhibitions done in a way to show the public how the same work could be displayed very, very differently. So a group of his Art History students from Bonn were working on this show, displaying all this work in a kind of mini-exhibition... Here, you see, there were like seven different stages here. I have to finish...

So this was the show we did in Hagen, and in the end we also did a symposium in Leipzig, which Beatrice participated in, with her students. And this symposium was a collaboration between different universities from Eastern and Western Europe, including younger theoreticians to work on the East Art Map. And the book was published.

Thank you very much.

Gerald Raunig:

Changing the Apparatus of Knowledge Production

This provisional text is the slightly edited version of a talk, held on the occasion of the CIMAM-conference 'Contemporary Institutions as Producers in Late Capitalism', 21 August 2007. For further reading on Benjamin and Tretyakov see Gerald Raunig, Art and Revolution. Transversal

Activism in the Long Twentieth Century, *Los Angeles: Semiotext(e) 2007; on Culture Industries* see Gerald Raunig, *Creative Industries as Mass Deception*, <http://eipcp.net/transversal/0207/raunig/en>; on machinstiic enslavement, see the forthcoming book by Gerald Raunig, *Mayday Maschine. Eine kleine Philosophie der Maschine als sozialer Bewegung*, Wien: Turia+Kant 2007.

As the last speaker of this conference I want to return to the start, to the concept paper of the conference and its reference to Walter Benjamin's essay 'The Author as Producer'. But before trying to adapt the main thesis of the essay to the question of knowledge production today, let me take a detour to Adorno and Horkheimer again. In my opinion, Benjamin was much ahead of his colleagues in critical theory. [I believe] Peter Weibel wrongly translated Adorno's and Horkheimer's 'Kulturindustrie. Aufklärung als Massenbetrug' as 'Culture Industry. Enlightenment as Mass *Betrayal*'. I think that's wrong: it's 'Mass *Deception*', and I want to reserve the term betrayal for a different signification. I'll return to that later, and stick for a moment to the problems of the essay by Adorno and Horkheimer. Peter Weibel summed it up with the sentence: 'Mass media destroys the consciousness of the consumers.'

Culture industry, according to Horkheimer and Adorno, totalises its audience, exposing this audience to a permanently repeated, yet ever unfulfilled promise. And here's a typical quote from Horkheimer and Adorno in their eloquent style, which is very hard to translate: 'Immerwährend betrügt die Kulturindustrie ihre Konsumenten um das, was sie immerwährend verspricht' – 'The culture industry perpetually cheats its consumers of what it perpetually promises.' What becomes evident in the image of consumers who have succumbed to the anonymous culture-industry apparatus of seduction is both the culmination and simultaneously the limitation of Horkheimer and Adorno's approach: the figure of the 'deceived masses' victimises them as passive, externally determined, and enslaved.

But it's not only the victimised position of the consumer; we also find a specific image of production: like the consumers, the producers also appear as subjugated, passive functionaries of the system. Whereas in Benjamin's theories of authorship and new media, and Brecht's *Lehrstück* theory and practice of the early 1930s, there are inherently only authors and producers, instead of a consuming audience, Horkheimer/Adorno's rigid image shows only

strangely passive producers trapped in the totality of the culture industry. Social subordination remains the only imaginable mode of subjectivation, even on the side of production.

I have to limit myself here to these two components of the simple and crude concepts of producers and consumers, but of course we have heard some more contemporary ideas on the relationship of culture industries, producers and consumers in the talk of Chantal Mouffe, especially when she referred to Paolo Virno's *Grammar of the Multitude*. I can only add, from the perspective of Félix Guattari and Maurizio Lazzarato, that a second line develops beyond social subjection, which emphasises active involvement and modes of subjectivation in addition to the structural factors that are described by Adorno and Horkheimer. In contradistinction to social subjection, Guattari calls this second line 'machinistic enslavement' [*asservissement machinique*]. This is very much connected with what Michel Foucault called 'governmentality'. Enslavement and subjugation are simultaneously existing poles that are actualised in the same things and in the same events. In the regime of social subjugation, a higher entity constitutes the human being as subject, which refers to an object that has become external. In the mode of machinistic enslavement, human beings are not subjects, but parts of a machine that outweigh the whole.

Now it is important that this double form of social subjection and machinistic enslavement reaches far back into early modern times, and just becomes actualised in a specific way by the living and working conditions that emerged in the context of the new social movements in the 1970s and the principles of the post-1968-generations: deciding for yourself, what and with whom and when you want to work; freedom, autonomy, self-determination, collectivity and in this context consciously choosing precarious living and working conditions. When Chantal Mouffe was talking about Boltanski/Chiappello, she referred to a similar figure, but I would be careful to use their dichotomic opposition of artistic and social critique. And I would not want to bash the 68-generation; on the contrary, it was very necessary to leave the cage of the Fordist modes of subjectivation, but – as many post-structuralist and autonomist theories argue – these modes of living and of working, these desires for autonomy, have been outweighed by post-Fordist capitalism and turned into a new regime of social subjection *and* machinistic enslavement.

Isabell Lorey developed the term 'self-chosen precarisation', or '*self-precarisation*': she insists that people still had to learn to develop a creative and productive relationship to the self

under liberal government as well. This practice of creativity and the ability to shape oneself has been a part of governmental self-techniques since the 18th century. But what is changing here, according to Lorey's argument, is the *function* of precarisation: from an immanent contradiction and marginalisation in liberal government to a function of normalisation in neo-liberal government, from an inclusive exclusion at the margins of society to a mainstream process.

These developments also explain the transformation of the culture industry described by Horkheimer and Adorno into the current forms of the creative industries, which is in a very bad sense also the future of museums. The experiments of the 1970s to develop self-determined forms of living and working as alternatives to the normalised and regulated regime of work were especially influential. With the emancipation from spatially and temporally rigidly ordered everyday life, there was also a reinforcement of the line that allows subjectivation beyond social subjugation to be imagined no longer only in an emancipatory way. Quote Lorey: 'It is precisely these alternative living and working conditions that have become increasingly more economically utilisable in recent years, because they favour the flexibility that the labour market demands. Thus practices and discourses of social movements in the past thirty to forty years were not only dissident and directed *against* normalisation, but also at the same time, a part of the transformation towards a neo-liberal form of government.'

OK, so here we are in the present: at a time when the old ideas and ideologies of the autonomy and freedom of the individual (especially the individual as genius artist), plus specific aspects of post-1968 politics, have turned into hegemonic neo-liberal modes of subjectivation. Self-precarisation means saying yes to exploiting every aspect of creativity and of life.

And once again: there is a double situation of social subjection and machinistic enslavement. There is not only – to repeat Florian Pumhösl's quote in the context of Hannes Meyer – 'the community ruling the individual' in the mode of social subjection and repression, but there is also the mode of machinistic enslavement, of self-control, self-government and self-precarisation. Why do I insist on that dual system of subjection and enslavement? Because only against the background of this analysis can we think about contemporary resistance,

changing our modes of subjectivation and changing the production apparatus, not least of art institutions.

The term 'production apparatus' leads me back to Walter Benjamin and 'The Author as Producer', written in 1934, and I have bad news for Sabine: the lecture which was supposed to be held at the Institute for Fascist Studies was never delivered. Anyway, it is a wonderful and rich text which has often been discussed in art theory, but still offers new interpretations. The author is a bourgeois intellectual, thinking about the betrayal of his own class. As he finds the position alongside the proletariat is an impossible one, Benjamin wants to test another impossibility: the flight from projecting the proletariat as 'the other'.

He draws a clear distinction between the question of how a work relates *to* the production conditions of its era, and the question of how a work is positioned *in* the production conditions of its era. The first one is a question of the political content of a work; the second one problematises the position in a certain production apparatus and the question of how to change it.

Besides his friend Brecht, the main example in Benjamin's essay is Sergej Tretyakov: in the early 1920s known for his revolutionary theatre work together with Meyerhold, Eisenstein, Majakovsky: in their search for a homogenic proletarian public they had a lot of experiences and in the end found a certain, quite homogenous public, but not in their sense: it was the public – and that could remind us about what Charles said about the museum public as also a specific public of the new rich – Moscow theatre public in 1923 was mainly a NEP audience, a very specific new rich audience. This was one of the reasons for Eisenstein's and Tretyakov's flight from the theatre to the factory, and later Eisenstein's retreat into film work and Tretyakov's journey into a much broader field.

When in 1928, in the era of total agricultural collectivisation, the watchword was 'Writers into the kolkhoz', Tretyakov joined the 'Communist Lighthouse' commune and began to work on the following themes during two long stays: the convention of mass meetings; the collection of money for down-payments on tractors; convincing individual farmers to join the kolkhoz; the inspection of reading rooms; the creation of travelling newspapers, and the management of

the kolkhoz newspaper; writing reports for the Moscow newspapers; the introduction of radio and travelling cinemas, etc.

This broad assembly of collective ‘knowledge production’ is quite far off the idea of the universal intellectual. The universal figure, which implies a speaker articulating the mute truth of others, must necessarily come under fire in emancipatory, egalitarian contexts. According to Benjamin, contents and political tendency retain a counter-revolutionary function, as long as the instruments, forms and apparatuses of production, i.e., the relationship between the universal intellectual and the proletariat, remains unchanged. Benjamin refers not only to the example of ‘Activism’, but also to that of *Neue Sachlichkeit* to describe how the bourgeois apparatus of production itself and its publications are able to assimilate and even propagate revolutionary themes using the figure of the artist/intellectual *beside/above* the proletariat. The work of writing *for* the proletariat from the position of a law-giver and a fighter *for* justice is a presumption; the status of the universal intellectual is an untenable one. If the intellectual’s solidarity with the proletariat can always only be a mediated solidarity, then the intellectual, who has become a *bourgeois* intellectual due to social and educational privilege, must become, according to Benjamin, a ‘betrayal of his [bourgeois] class of origin’. This necessary betrayal consists in the transformation of his position from someone who *supplies* the production apparatus with contents, revolutionary as they may be, to an engineer who *changes* the production apparatus; as Benjamin formulates it, someone who ‘sees as his task to adapt this apparatus to the purposes of the proletarian revolution’.

For a renewal of the demand that Benjamin poses, of adapting the production apparatus rather than supplying it, it seems to me that both aspects are equally important. The first part of the demand, *not to supply* the production apparatus, could be updated with the help of Gilles Deleuze’s criticism of representation, namely the criticism of the framework of media representation and the function that intellectuals and artists carry out within this framework. The second part of the demand, that of *adapting* the production apparatus, is also found in an expanded form in Foucault’s exhortation to specific intellectuals to constitute a new politics of truth. There are echoes of Benjamin’s figures and terminology in both Deleuze and Foucault: with Deleuze it is the topos of betrayal, with which the intelligentsia leave their class; with Foucault it is the specific intellectual as ‘specialist’, which Benjamin in turn took over from the terminological toolbox of the Russian productivists.

‘The intellectuals to come will not be individuals, not a caste, but rather a collective concatenation, in which people are involved, who do manual work, intellectual work, artistic work,’ said Guattari as early as the late 1970s. In the post-Fordist setting of cognitive capitalism there is evidence that knowledge-production as the privilege of intellectuals is dissolving, while there is an increasing diffusion of ‘the power of truth’ in society at the same time. What Marx once alluded to in the term ‘the general intellect’ was taken up again in the Italian tradition of the Operaism of the 1960s and ’70s as ‘mass intellectuality’ generalised by social struggles.

In his famous ‘Fragment on Machines’ Marx wrote that machines ‘are *organs of the human brain, created by the human hand*; the power of knowledge, objectified. The development of fixed capital indicates to what degree general social knowledge has become a *direct force of production*, and to what degree, therefore, the conditions of the process of social life itself have come under the control of the general intellect and been transformed in accordance with it. To what degree the powers of social production have been produced, not only in the form of knowledge, but also as immediate organs of social practice, of the real-life process.’

In his texts on this theme, especially in the *Grammar of the Multitude*, Paolo Virno picks up directly from the ‘Fragment on Machines’ and the concept, casually introduced there by Marx, of the general intellect. Even if social knowledge was really ever fully absorbed in the technical machines in the era of industrialisation, this would be completely unthinkable in the post-Fordist context: ‘Obviously, this aspect of the “general intellect” matters, but it is not everything. We should consider the dimension where the general intellect, instead of being incarnated (or rather, *cast in iron*) into the system of machines, exists as an attribute of living labour.’ As post-Operaist theory formulates, following Guattari, due to the logic of economic development itself, it is necessary that the machine is not understood merely as a structure that striates the workers and encloses social knowledge in itself. Going beyond Marx’s idea of knowledge absorbed in fixed capital, Virno thus posits his thesis of the simultaneously pre-individual and trans-individual social quality of the intellect: ‘Living labour in post-Fordism has the raw material and means of production: thinking that is expressed through language, the ability to learn and communicate, the imagination, in other words the capacity that distinguishes human consciousness. Living labour accordingly incarnates the general intellect (the “social brain”), which Marx called the “pillar of production and wealth”. Today the general

intellect is no longer absorbed in fixed capital; it no longer represents only the knowledge contained in the system of the machines, but rather the verbal co-operation of a multitude of living subjects.'

By taking up Marx's term, Virno indicates that 'intellect' is not to be understood here as the exclusive competence of an individual, but rather as a common tie and a constantly developing foundation of individualisation, as a social quality of the intellect. Here pre-individual human 'nature', which lies in speech, thought and communication, is augmented by the trans-individual aspect of the general intellect: it is not only the entirety of all knowledge accumulated by the human species, not only what all prior shared capability has in common: it is also the in-between of cognitive workers, the communicative interaction, abstraction and self-reflexion of living subjects, the co-operation, the co-ordinated actions of living labour. If we [want to] think about changing the production apparatus of knowledge-production in this context, which is also the production apparatus of art institutions, if we want to change it in an emancipatory way, we have to consider [not only] our own involvement in this setting and in the processes of (self-)precarisation, but also the function of universal knowledge-production and invention, both problems within ever-new forms of machinistic enslavement, AND how to resist modes of subjectivation.

Response and questions

Beatrice von Bismarck: Perhaps the best idea is to start with a discussion by the panel on some of the topics that were raised, and then open it up to the audience in general, and take up some of the issues that have been discussed through all three sessions.

I would like to start with a question that relates to all three – four – of you, and maybe you could answer it from your respective positions. It has to do with what, perhaps, Gerald, at the end, raised in terms of what Foucault called 'governmentality'; – which sound terrible in any language – the idea that you're always filtering into an existing machine: you're part of it, but equally, it rules you. And I think I would like you, perhaps, to elaborate on that model again, and how it might have to do with the cultural production or the modes of institutional practices we have discussed over the last two days, and the differences between those contexts.

And perhaps you would address this idea in terms of your comment: 'Education may be in part populist, but it's something we need'. And can we actually understand this role of education as maybe something that finds a way to accept and support whatever difference the context allows?

Thirdly, perhaps, you could address how East Art Map, as a project, made a strategic difference when you first started it, and the way it has now developed as something feeding, again, into an existing model of cultural production. By which I mean, for example, the difference between the distribution mode that you're using at the moment, and the transparency you discussed as something at the start of the project.

So those were the three questions. Maybe the two of you would start.

Miran Mohar: Would you like to go first?

Beatrice von Bismarck: Is there a mike down there?

Borut Vogelink: Sure, I'll try to answer your questions.

So, maybe just to start, we already began to speak about this a little outside, over the coffee. What pleased me when I listened to Gerald's text ... I realised that he extended... I must admit that I'm not familiar with Virno's theory, so when he extended a Marxist notion of modes of production influencing the product itself, I, of course, enjoyed it very much, because that was, in fact, what we used as our basis. Of course, from our point of view it was to some extent ambivalent. But still, we could openly claim art production in the East was different, so we based that claim on the Marxist theory (as Miran already mentioned). So, you can imagine that I love it when I hear that it can be extended to current reasoning as well.

So, the reason we did it was the following: we were amazed by quite a few things. The first was that, leaving aside all other practices, social practices and different social fields, which were in transition for quite some period – and this was on both the West and East sides respectively – everybody agreed that there should be a time when certain types of functioning should be adapted to other standards. In the field of arts, that was not so at all. Funnily enough, that

seemed to succeed in a kind of surprise overnight transformation. We expected, at least from Leftist positions in the West – and it seems from what I heard yesterday, everybody here is Leftist, aren't they? – that they would see this as a good chance, a possibility, to use this possible differentiation. But no, nothing happened.

Everybody agreed that changed overnight. You can imagine, our insistence on a Marxist basis trying to be heard by Leftists from the West was pointing to an insistence on diversity. Why? For a very simple reason. First, because – again I'm going to turn to something that happened yesterday. A member of the audience, from Finland, mentioned that the difference between institutions should be taken into consideration, and I think that everybody agreed... So, that difference should be taken into consideration. And, funnily enough, in fact, everything that was said took the view that there is no big difference between these institutions and the political institutions. But if we agree about differences between institutions, then I hope we can agree about differences of cultural production in different countries, especially when the organisation of the production has been so different for so long.

Another thing: why not, and I would not like to sound cheeky here, why not accept fifty years of different production as an enormous opportunity? Why not use it? At least as something to think about, to research, to document? Why not...why be so... why hurry so much to cover it all overnight? I didn't get it. It was so out of the scope of my understanding. Why throw it away? Such an enormous and incredible experiment. I couldn't understand it. Something that is at the core of differentialisation, which is important for art production itself, for art which is on the programme exactly because of the... this enormous unification that is going on.

So this was the thing we didn't accept. So, East Art Map, yes, one of the important policies came from this direction. There is another thing I would like to mention: Miran said it already, but I think it should be stressed. I think it's really important. I think it's related to the understanding, or at least my understanding, of how Weibel put it yesterday about 'half-education' being worse than 'non-education'. It was then picked up by somebody else as well, this half... kind of...

So, our programme, and I noticed something similar in your text, was the following: we found out that the art system in our country claimed to belong to the international art system, but in

fact it didn't... communicate with this international art system. What it did was claim its rights as part of the general, but took power to regulate the particular, local. That's a big disruption of the system's function, when it's organised like that. So to those inside it says that it is part of the international system, that it has the right to participate internationally, but that's what it is: international, but on a smaller scale, because as a smaller country it has less power.

So the difference is just difference of quantity. But we found out – or at least we decided, basically – that there is no art history in these countries, that there are in fact mythologies, and the differences are absolutely untranslatable because of that. Untranslatable not because they would be completely wrong; they're untranslatable because they are somehow mixed with problematic decisions, and, of course, because of that system it's very hard to communicate to a so-called 'international' format. And this is serious political programme... how to manage it? Because the whole society is deeply, somehow, penetrated by agents who, of course, have an interest in the fact that that this type of system continues. So translating the system would simply show that it's problematic.

So, it's not a problem of not knowing it; it's a problem of the double position of the system internally and its relation to the outside world, and that was our chance; because we could do something that usually specialists would, but couldn't... not because specialists wouldn't know what to do, but they'd just have terrible problems doing it.

OK, that's a few remarks, I don't know if I answered your question?

Beatrice von Bismarck: Would you like to continue with it, or Gerald?

Gerald Raunig: *Du...* OK. I just want to repeat something Chantal referred to, or explained, in her lecture, about your question. I understood it as, what is the cultural field's role, if you put in Bourdieu terms, in this whole 'gouvernementality' discussion, in this discussion about machinistic enslavement.

Yeah, I repeat Virno again, and I would be interested – because I didn't get it, really, Chantal, in your presentation – to know what your view is concerning this position of Virno, and I repeat it now: Whereas Adorno thought that the cultural field, especially high culture, of course, is kind

of the last resort in the transformation into capitalism, so it's almost an island, where you have a non-capitalistic atmosphere or sphere, Virno put it the other way round. He said that that the cultural field is the avant-garde of post-Fordist production. And he has these different examples of the implosion of public and private, the performative aspects of production, but also this kind of ... I don't know... the term 'virtuoso' especially, and this is also connected to the question of how self- [...] developed, especially after 1968.

So these are two different paradigms. Is the cultural field something which should be defended in the face of new capitalism? Or is it, as in Virno's view, something like an avant-garde of post-Fordist development? Always taking in account that it's ambivalent; that you have a kind of negative function of culture in this process, but also maybe certain modes of resistance in the field.

Chantal Mouffe: I wanted to react to something that Gerald said, that one should be careful not to bash the '68 generation. I think there you definitely misunderstand the project of Boltanski and Chiapello, because it's not at all a bashing of the '68 generation, and I know that particularly Maurizio Lazaratto is the worst in misinterpretations of their book. I think I want to make a more general point about that.

But let's first clarify this issue, because when they say...when they refer to the 'artistic critique' – and it's true that you did not make that mistake, because you refer to '68, but many people understood that artistic critique is what the artist did, and they clarified that it's not that at all, and sometimes they said 'maybe we did not choose exactly the right term to refer to that'. It's more about the demands of '68, the demands of the new movement for autonomy, anti-hierarchy, all this kind of, you know, new type of struggle, which, they say, is now recuperated by capitalism, in that they abuse that in order to neutralise those demands and, in fact, harness them to the process of capitalist production.

But they are not at all accusing '68 of being responsible. They are not bashing '68 at all. What they are saying – and I think this is what's really important – is that one should understand the way in which what I call the 'hegemonic struggle' worked: that you make a demand, and it can be very radical, but there is absolutely nothing that guarantees that this demand, whatever it is, could not be recovered.

I think there is nothing so radical it can never be recovered. For me this is something absolutely central, precisely because it seems to me that the passivism to the negative is to say that critique is not possible because, you know, everything we do can be recovered, so... Well, of course everything we do can be recovered, but we can also re-intervene in order to... this is what I call the 'battle for position', the hegemonic struggle. So capitalism re-converts some things, but then we intervene...

For instance, I think a very interesting example of the battle for position is, for instance, in the eighties in the USA, the Gran Fury Collection. Remember, for instance, the Benetton campaign? Kissing doesn't kill? They were showing three different couples: hetero, homo and mixed race, because of course, advertising is using the techniques of art, but they were re-intervening and using the techniques of advertising, and putting Benetton on American buses. So this is, for me... you know, you intervene; they answer; you intervene back, but...to try to find a point that is so radical is absurd, and I think it's exactly the wrong kind of politics ... What I found really interesting in Chiapello and Boltanski was precisely that they made us understand the ambivalence of the process, you know?

So it's not all bashing '68, it's not a critique of that at all. And a last point: you say that one should not distinguish, as they do, artistic critique from social critique. Well, first, as I said, artistic critique is not something done by the artist, but I think it *is* important to distinguish them – though not to separate them, of course. But you know, there are many different demands for the emancipatory project, some for equality and some for liberty. And of course the task is to articulate those demands, link them, and link the new movement with the demands of the working class.

You know, one of the reasons I'm so critical of the concept of the 'multitude' is precisely because they don't realise the need for articulation. They believe that all those struggles go in exactly the same direction. They don't. There are a lot of antagonisms among those different groups. So the political task is to find a way to articulate those demands, but to do that, we need to be able to distinguish and then articulate, though not separate.

Then, finally, concerning Virno... Yeah, I find his analysis really interesting, I mean on that point. I will again insist on the ambivalence. Horkheimer and Adorno, of course, insist on something completely one-sided, but I don't think one should go totally to the other side. In many cases Virno, it must be said – and this is precisely what I find interesting in him – recognises the ambivalence of the process, no? And what I also find interesting in Virno, contrary to many of his followers, is the awareness of possibilities. For instance, when he speaks of flight, the line of flight, he also realise that those lines of flight can result in destruction. So, you know, again there are always these ambivalences, and I think we need to see that nothing is really purely emancipatory, yeah. Emancipation can transform itself into its perfect opposite.

Lisette Lagnado: Maybe I should have agreed to go second, but that's OK. Just to give a link to what I'm going to say – which is much closer to what Mohar presented – just to react to what Chantal said about articulation, something I found very peculiar in Brazil now, is that after the plane crash we had an articulation – which is not a working-class articulation – a kind of very strange mobilisation, difficult to circumscribe to the Right wing of society, but it is a movement that in Portuguese is called 'cansei', and it was translated in French as '*J'en ai marre!*' ('I'm tired.'). But it's not 'I'm tired *of it*'; it's 'I'm tired'.

So 'I'm tired' is different because when you say '*J'en ai marre!*' it really means you're fed up, as a reaction. However, when you say 'I'm tired', you are kind of a victim. What currently happens is an articulation in society that has nothing to do with the working classes. The current social phenomenon is, somehow, that the idea of social classes is completely vanishing.

To take what IRWIN was saying here, I think the whole question is about rewriting history, and I think this concept is very clear, like in the Okwui *documenta* and also *documenta 12*: it's always about how to rewrite history. Before I came, I asked for the book of the Eastern Map, because I wanted to be aware of this research. It was amazing for me as a Brazilian to read it, because we, for example, have fought for years to say that Brazil is not Latin America. Brazil is specific: it's not like Argentina, it's not like Chile; you can see different specificities. It was a bit strange for me to see another great cause in rewriting history from an Eastern context – and when I talked about context I was careful to say that it is a historical and geographical one – of

course it is – but I was trying to say that each artist has his own context. So the concept of ‘context’ I’m using is that of the artists. So how could museums react in this sense?

Well, of course, I’m saying this after the biennales, so this is another experience now. But I think that museums could work in parallel with biennales, because we have to connect local research and international research, and not just to invite and drop new names in the art scene. So, for instance, I’m always defending the point that an international artist must be presented with a local artist or group working more or less in the same direction. So this could be an educational possibility. Another could be the one we tried to do... we tried to combine the mini-survey with commissioned new pieces. And I would just end my intervention now with... what happened in the press, during the biennale. The biennale was labelled by the critics as a ‘populist biennale’, and the artist selected to be the ‘populist’ one was Thomas Hirschorn. And, of course, I understand that Thomas Hirschorn is a big name, of course, to provoke strong reactions. He’s not young... So he was the only one I told ‘I’m not going to make a mini-survey. You just present a new work,’ because a mini-survey, in his case, does not make much sense, because each new work is in its own a mini-survey, or I understand it in this way.

But Thomas Hirschorn was understood as populist, while at the same time I did an interview with him for *documenta 12* magazine, in which, from beginning to end, he was arguing for form – and, of course, it was a provocative form. Yes, he was arguing for form, but not just a form... he was talking about his own form, not form as a Malevich one or a modernist one. So I think ... we lacked, or we missed a debate. Thomas Hirschorn was presented in a moment. Well, I don’t know where to go from there.

But just to say that... how you work in a temporary exhibition, and how you prepare the guides of the exhibition who are seeing the artists for the first time... Because every biennale has to re-conquer its own staff, it has to start from scratch; you don’t have a long-term process of education. And in each biennale you have to contract a new team of monitors, and this is something, you know, for a general curator... I just didn’t know what to do with the audience, with the monitors; they were reading the newspapers and they used to come to me and say, ‘Well, aren’t you going to answer this critic?’ and I said ‘No’. Well, I don’t if it’s part of the

democratic process; it's OK if that's what they think, so I'm not going to respond to each review and defend each position.

But I think the problem is deeper. The problem is not reacting to each individual critic, but to give a background to help people – when I say people, it's not *le peuple* but *les gens* (the general public) – to understand what it is about... I don't know if that was clear.

Beatrice von Bismarck: Yeah, no, I think it was very clear, and, perhaps, to explain again the background of my question, and again that relates to the two of you, and maybe Charles – I'd like you to answer what I'm asking now – because I think that, in both cases, a problem is coming up that, for once, counterposes a temporary exhibition and a museum as working methods, and with all the other conditions that you've mentioned, such as regional and globalised systems, and the, anyway, existing much more privatised organisation. But just to pick up on the kind of time mode in which you're working, I think that's a very specific difference, and has a lot to do with education and the possibilities you have. And the other part is, perhaps, not the temporal, but the independent mode in which you can work, because what you do seems, at least to me, like a very viable model that can or cannot – and we can discuss that – be institutionalised. But anyway, what it does is give a lot of impulses to the work that institutions might or might not do, in terms of cultural exchange and knowledge production.

So, perhaps we could do it like that. Either of you relate to that or disagree?

Miran Mohar: Sorry?

Beatrice von Bismarck: If you disagree, maybe you could explain that. Otherwise, I would like Charles, perhaps, to address it, because I think it relates to some of the questions you addressed in your talk.

Miran Mohar: Maybe I can say a few things about this. Well, first of all, we founded IRWIN and our broad artistic campaign NSK as an institution because our idea was, at the time, that the art institutions of – let's say, to name just one, Slovenia – were completely dysfunctional. So, basically, we used this kind of over-identification model when we started in the eighties, and

there was a time, with the punk movement and so on, when everybody said 'We are against institutions, against the State, against oppressive forces and so on.'

And we said, well, we're not interested just in being against something that doesn't even have any actual power, so basically our idea in IRWIN was to...especially in the nineties, we reacted against something and we started to construct, construct our own context. So the idea of construction played a crucial role in our creation.

I've also heard today about 'radical education', and a lot of expressions like this, but basically I believe that we were already doing that from the beginning, from the nineties, with the Moscow Embassy. I'm sorry, I did a presentation and maybe put too much inside it. If somebody's interested, maybe I can explain later on about certain super-projects we did.

But, basically, our idea was that you have to have it all. You have to have collaboration, a certain collaboration with institutions, but you have to have your own autonomy too. I would agree with you that is always a kind of negotiation; because, first of all, I mentioned at the beginning that the biggest problem, living in Yugoslavia and the East, was that there were no institutions that would serve.

I would also agree with Charles Esche that the said institutions, under certain conditions and so on, are very valuable. And the same goes for us also, so we don't have this kind of un-vision, and we tried to... I don't know how to say it. We believe that all elements – because you also have different conditions in the four...let's say, in Eastern Europe – all elements of the system have to be built; also institutions. Borut, maybe you want to explain further...

Borut Vogeltnik: Just to continue where Miran started. We were lucky enough that institutions were not built, that we could negate their relevance completely from the beginning, that we could put ourselves in their position, at least in our consideration of our function during the eighties and later during the nineties. But the fact is that it was lucky, too, as we didn't have problems in establishing and developing a kind of reflection of our relationship towards institutions. This was simply a privilege we had, as we stressed on many occasions.

That is the case of East Art Map as well. We are privileged in relation to the Western artists in ways you cannot imagine. We in the East could do things which are unimaginable in the West. We participated in building up concretely, without money, three really important collections. To do East Art Map, these are bizarre things, if you consider them from the point of view of art work, to organise them as West-East... So ... come on, imagine if a [Western] artist claimed his own view on art history, at the least the institutions would jump on him. We don't have this problem.

So, as I said, that was a big privilege for us as well. And the fact is that, somehow, the negative side of it was that we didn't need to establish relationships with institutions; that is, serious relationships, which, I think, lie ahead of us. Thank you.

Charles Esche: I've lost track a bit, I must admit, but I think it was the relationship between museums and biennales that, obviously, Lisette was talking about, and...

Beatrice von Bismarck: And also about the relationship of something like this – shall we call it autonomous artistic model? – which could, perhaps, serve as a basis for institutions.

Charles Esche: Yeah. I mean, I think so. Yes, it's...maybe I can go back to where I was and then try and bring the autonomous model in. Maybe 'autonomy' is a problematic term, but the artistic organised model if you like, the artistic organised model.

One point I think is self-evident is the relationship between time and the institutions, and a biennale is completely different; and we know that. Their modes of address are different as well, because one can address a small group of people over a long time and can reach many people, as a biennale can over 60 days, 100 days or whatever its duration is. So, clearly, time relates to the number of people that may pass through an institution. I think that's always important to remember: that if we have 70,000 to 100,000 people a year, you know, after six years we get up to the level of a *documenta* – which actually is every 5 years anyway – so it's quite similar in some ways.

But I think that that question of time also gives an advantage, or at least creates a possibility, and it's our responsibility to make use of that possibility. And I can refer to one project I

organised, which was called Eindhoven-Istanbul, and it was a project where I was doing Istanbul biennale in 2005 and, at the same time, doing a show in the museum. And what that exhibition was about was trying to put the collection, which was predominantly a provincial collection of North-west European and North American art, at risk, in a way, through combining it with a series of projects which were not in a collection, but had been shown in a previous Istanbul biennale.

So, in a sense, we're in a sort of virtual or imagined Istanbul collection of all the Istanbul installations of the biennale since 1997, and what was important for us as a museum in that, and I think its impact is unfolding in the long term, is that we put the two in juxtaposition. So we actually, in a very formal device, put in very temporary walls of unpainted plaster board, and put the collection on the temporary walls and the Istanbul works on the real architecture of the building. It was just a very simple formal device, not only to make the distinction, but also to destabilise the authority of the collection itself, and I think that effect is still unwinding. I mean, it's unwinding directly, in terms of the collection, because our collection has reoriented itself geographically. But also it's unwinding in various other ways in which we think about the collection itself. And I think one of the most significant ways of that... I should begin by saying the collection is what we're about. The exhibitions, whether we're talking about exhibitions or solo shows or whatever, are important, but they're an addition, I think. The museum needs to think about what it is as a collection. That is, its specificity, what distinguishes it from the *Kunsthalle* and the biennale. So therefore I as a director think the collection is the thing we find most interesting, for sure, because it's the unique thing that we have.

And I think what is important about the realisation that came out of Eindhoven-Istanbul was that we needed to think about how we might collect not just objects, not just things, but relationships, because it was clear that the biennale and many of its projects were about relationships: relations to the city, relations to context, relations to each other, relations to the curators, relations on many different terms...

Beatrice von Bismarck: Yes.

Charles Esche: ... Relations to different geographies and different histories that are the consequence of those geographies. And I think the challenge for the museum, and it's not something that we've worked out yet, but it certainly relates to the questions of the archive, for instance, or the living archive, is how we might move from a collection of objects to a collection of relationships, which include objects within them, but in which the object is a starting point for a description of a set of possible relationships – of actual historical ones, imaginary ones, possible new meetings that might happen there.

Well, I think all that can only be done over the kind of time span that – in the Eindhoven museum I am talking about, ten years probably. I mean, you need certainly a significant period of time; if they don't sack me before, I guess. But over that period you can start to unfold something, and also, as you add to the collection, add to the possibilities the next person who comes along can reinvent that all, can reject everything we were busy doing, but still have those same relationships – not just objects, but relationships – to play with. And that's also quite exciting, actually, to see how they could be reinvented and turned around and negotiated in the context of 10-year trends, like I'm trying to negotiate what Eindhoven inherited in the context of today.

I don't think I got on to autonomy, but I'll stop there.

Beatrice von Bismarck: Yeah, don't worry. No, I'm very glad you raised the term 'relationships' because as, you know, I think that curating has a lot to do with articulating relations in general. But perhaps that brings us back, as far as relations are concerned, to the notion of 'the institution', because you said yesterday we're not talking about art museums, but about institutions, say cultural institutions, within the current economy. And I think all of you raised, in different ways, the question of what is an institution, and how can we actually deal with the advantages and disadvantages of institutions.

You talked about not having had institutions, but relating to the fact that some exist, and you referred to the different modes in which institutions exist in different countries, and I think you referred to it as a really active factor within what I call 'the art field', as something we have to express as a mode of production. And maybe that would be a nice point, actually, to bring into the discussion, in relation to, for example, Ann Goldstein, who discussed yesterday the

advantages and disadvantages of institutional frameworks, which I think we don't have to accept as a set item, but are in a mode of constant change and re-articulation and – I use the word you used for the programme, 'institutent', which is very important if you want to look at institutions as things which not only actively participate in the production, but perhaps find alternative, or variable or flexible or whatever you want to call them, modes of doing so. Maybe, Ann, you could react to that?

Ann Goldstein: Sure. Well, I'm also interested in what Charles just said about 'collecting relationships', but kind of maybe moving back into that from the ideas of the advantages and disadvantages of the museum. And I would really also hope to hear from more of my colleagues who work in museums, because we've talked individually over the last couple of days and I think a lot of the ideas that have been brought up in all these panels have given us, you know, an opportunity not only to reflect, but, also to think about really, when we go back to the nuts and bolts of our jobs and the daily life of what we do within our institutions, you know, how do we take a lot of these ideas and really interesting thoughts back home to our own institutions?

And just a couple of reactions to Lisette's presentation today, and to Nataša's yesterday, again from the perspective of a person working in a museum myself. And I was very moved by both these presentations and how they reflect back on museums, that Nataša was here taking it upon herself, with her colleagues, to construct a position for a history of a really incredible artist who had not been well known; and to create a set of circumstances where there can be consequences for that; the consequences being not just a knowledge of that artist's work, but the preservation of it. And obviously, the next consequence of that is the repository for that artist's work, so that it's not only known, but it's also saved and can be there for future consideration; and the future consequences of that also are that there are more artists for this, you know, kind of very traditional museum form to happen. Unfortunately, she didn't have the opportunity... a museum was not an option there, but what she was really doing was museum work and, to my mind, research, scholarship, preservation, conservation and articulation.

And Lisette also, talking about the Biennial in Sao Paolo and how museums there had maybe not been doing their job of laying a kind of foundation to enable people to understand what was going in these exhibitions. And, so I think that it still kind of comes back to, you know,

what is the function of a museum? And we have to justify ourselves constantly. We must justify ourselves, but I think we also have a convention we work in, a convention that is, actually, very necessary in many ways; within the convention, we can then screw around with it, but I think that the conventions of collecting, of research, of providing an edifice for people to come to a particular kind of experience, a particular kind of interaction, a particular kind of relationship to how an artist produces work and how an artist may see their work, I think is also something for each of us to think about always, and not have to... not feel that we should always apologise for it. I think we have to justify it.

Then just another comment about this idea of collecting relationships, which I think is also embedded in a museum. I mean, it's embedded in institutions of all types, but in a museum, I think the collection of relations is embedded in every object in that museum, whether... I remember, years ago, I was asked to... we had a big kind of gap that suddenly opened up in our exhibition schedule; like the whole museum, so I was asked to do, within a couple of months, a permanent collection exhibition, in about 25,000 square metres of exhibition space, and tell the history of contemporary art with it. So I decided to look at our collection, and all I could see were the gaps. And, you know, we didn't have a Warhol or a De Kooning or any of these very classic things one's supposed to have. But then I actually started to look just at the collection, and at an institution which at that time was only about fifteen years old, and at all the various histories which were already embedded within that collection.

Museum curators are always looking at the object labels, which tell us not only whether the work was purchased or if it was given to the museum, but also who gave it to us, and, often, the accession date, when it came into the collection. And those are all about relationships, as are the people we work with day to day to continue the work of the museum, as well as our colleagues within the staff. So anyway, I could go on for ever...

Lisette Lagnado: Excuse me, I just... I wanted to correct something, because I don't think it's fair to... museum directors from Sao Paulo who are present here. I would like to say that I have great relationships with both gallery and museum directors, and when we opened the biennale we worked together wonderfully with the Pinacoteca over the artist Leon Ferrari. We manage to run simultaneously a retrospective of Leon Ferrari in the Pinacoteca, and the new works or

the survey related to his new works in the biennale. I was really pleased with what that did to the audience.

And I also would like to put on record that when I was preparing Marcel Broodthaers in the biennale, suddenly a lot of people – several galleries and also one museum – had projects by Marcel Broodthaers to exhibit, so it was really very strange that nobody even... this was a name completely out of the blue. When my project was written up in the papers, suddenly I had a gallery calling me to tell me, ‘Well, I’m going to... have a show of Marcel Broodthaers at the same time.’ I was completely naïve at the time, saying, well, what’s going on, you know?

So we have to take care when we are talking about relationships. I’m really all for that, but also, just to give another example, the galleries used to mount a galleries’ exhibition, and this time they did it in the Park of Ibirapuera, so it was walking distance away, and I said, ‘Well, I’m done with national representations, but now I have the market inside the biennale.’ So I just wanted to say, well, if you want to have an exhibition, fine, but why in my house? So this kind of relationship is very delicate, you know?

Gerard Raunig: Well, to come back to the question of relationships, starting from your earlier question about institutions, I think not only in our project *Transform*, but also as a broader idea, it is interesting to view it from two sides. One is the side you mentioned, the view you mentioned, the term ‘instituent practices’, which we developed from a term much used by Antonio Negri: ‘constituent power’, an idea which is, in a way, an absolute term that means it’s not – at least the term ‘instituent practice’ – it’s not always in relation to the institution, but something which has been invented anew. And, of course, a collective, self-organised artists’ practice like IRWIN is an example for such an instituent practice.

Here I would say, on this track, it’s interesting to see how these new instituent practices fight the problems of structuralisation and institutionalisation – because of course all these artists’ collectives, also political collectives, tend to become institutionalised. That is one point, and the other point is that if we’re talking about the existing institutions, art institutions, then my question is again more concerned with the production apparatus: what measures, what structures, what methods could lead us to reflect on our own involvement in processes of, again, self-procreation? To be more concrete, all museums are involved in the problems of

outsourcing museum guides, and also, in a way, of affirming post-Fordist capitalism by so doing.

So my question is not to raise a debate on morals, but maybe a question on what kind of structures could help us to reflect these processes, and what could we do to counter them? And so, in the end, change the production apparatus of the museum or art institution in a deliberate way, not just kind of unconsciously, as a part of the post-Fordist machine.

Miran Mohar: Maybe just a short remark. Because we are talking about relationships, it is interesting, just thinking structurally, that two projects presented here, at this conference, came out of relationships in Berlin, *Alte Arte* and East Art Map, and the connection... the production team from Berlin was initiated by the *Kulturstiftung des Bundes*. I mean, it's really... the institutions themselves are adopting the word 'relationship', for the name of the institution.

Gerard Raunig: I forgot to say that, of course. In this term 'relationship', maybe some of you have also this *anklang*...

Beatrice von Bismarck: Subnotation or connotation.

Gerard Răunig: Subnotation or connotation of Bourdieu's relationality, and that's connected in a way. Of course he's the propagandist of post-Fordist exploitation within community arts – well, not community arts, but you know the kind of art forms. And so we should... I agree with you that we should be careful about relationships because, of course, there is another side to them, they're not always positive. Sometimes, Deleuze said, we should not think of oiling the flow of communication, but of disrupting it... disrupting that flow.

Beatrice von Bismarck: Ja, wonderful. Let's open it up finally, yeah.

Zdenka Badovinac: I would just like to comment on the question of the kind of practice like the IRWIN project, whether they're becoming institutionalised or not. I think, maybe, this is not the right question, and what's interesting is that the project raises the question whether there is a new way. Maybe we should think about art projects not in terms of presentation, but in

terms of collaboration between art and museum. And maybe it was not emphasised enough in Miran's presentation that, actually, what you did was an art project.

You were talking about, and emphasising a lot, the lack of institutions that work. Maybe this was not fair enough to the Eastern European institutions under socialism. There was some work done. There are archives, there are works in the collections, but I agree it was done without... outside the modern cultural system we know in the West.

So, this is my question, maybe for you, or for other people here, especially for museum curators: what does this kind of project mean for the museums? Are we just going to present and institutionalise them, or are we going to collaborate? Because we are talking, actually, about the archives, about the data. We can learn something from this kind of project. So maybe this is the moment to take this debate in the direction of how a professional museum works to deal with this kind of project.

Beatrice von Bismarck: Yeah, can I just hand the mike over there.

Janne Gallen-Kallela-Sirén: Yeah, hi! It's the representative from Finland again at the microphone! I guess I would like to toss another case study example into the mixture of discussions we've had today. And that has to do with the museum I'm presently running in Finland. I've only been there for a month, so I really have just started, and I am putting all the things on my shoulders right now, on you.

The museum has the largest acquisition budget in Finland. The collections policy is 'purchase only young, Finnish art'. That is approximately 150 Finnish works a year, average price of about €3.500. I can assure you I will *not* be getting many loan requests from my esteemed colleagues in the audience; perhaps a few, but not many.

Our collections policy is based on – and it dates from the 1980s – a certain type of support structure for practising Finnish artists. Now this is very peculiar... I've been out of Finland for twenty-one years with various international museums, and have never seen a collections policy of this nature. The collections policy is, essentially, a kind of funding policy, meaning we

are building a collection by buying young Finnish artists' works, and the level of entry is very low.

Many of these will not pursue their careers as artists. Some may, and some of them may become important, but we are buying them in at a point when – well, my predecessors have been buying them at a point when we just don't know what's going to happen to the representatives of the local art scene.

Now, at the same time, our exhibitions policy, which also has the largest budget in Finland, is very international, meaning we do various types of international exhibitions that could be hosted in any of the large museums in Europe, I suppose. Now, there's a big discrepancy between the collections policy and the exhibitions policy, and this just goes, I guess, to kind of influence... In a sense, you could say that the collections policy is an emancipatory gesture against the kind of, you know... we don't have very high-priced works in the collection, except those that have come in through donations or various collections. But this is a different kind of a gesture, in terms of the international art market, and goes very much against the grain of what the big, institutionalised operators and systems have been doing in the last ten or fifteen years. You know, here there's no overheated market in that sense, insofar as this institution's policies are concerned.

Now, as a final footnote, in terms of '68, I think '68 also needs to be understood... in its correct cultural context. You may have heard of the term '*Finlandisierung*' in '68, and its ramifications in Finland were a bit different from its ramifications in, say, New York and Paris. I'll give you a little concrete example so you know what I mean by that.

In the early 1980s Estonian artists, who were starting to manifest some forms of anti-Soviet expressions in their works, sent a letter to their Finnish colleagues, asking, in a sense, for help. Members who are recognised as – and I won't name them – who were really important intellectuals of the '68 generation and who still hold important positions today. What did they do? They took the letter to the Soviet embassy: and the Estonian artists were sent to Siberia and their families were torn into pieces.

So, you know, I cling to the right to exercise some '68-generation bashing, in a certain context, but it needs to be understood that there were many things happening in the world vis-à-vis '68, and it's not a simple question of good or bad. One needs to look at the concrete elements of it as well, I think.

Beatrice von Bismarck: Are there, perhaps, more comments or questions, related not only to this latest discussion or current contributions, but perhaps to the discussions we've had in the last three sessions? Thank you.

Sabine Breitwieser: No-one else? I can't believe that! Someone? Yes?

Mwape J. Mumbi: This, perhaps, is more so for Sabine than the debaters on the panel. And my curiosity, of course, is to do specifically with... There's an aspect of restitution, I think, that's been discussed in some publications, about the relationship, which I think you touched on a while ago, between museums in Europe and those in Africa – whose history, of course, is a legacy from events such as colonialism, which [for the purpose of] exhibition, displayed the most negative aspects of its society.

Now, of course, the present generation and its leadership is looking at ways of using museums as places for the generation of knowledge. So for instance, [we have] the rationale about having to loan back, as the term goes, the Rosetta Stone to Egypt, or even the Broken Hill skull in the London Museum to a museum in its Zambian home.

As CIMAM, what policy or position would you take in terms of this relationship, which has to create a new way forward? Would you, for instance, go so far as to endorse restitution as opposed to loaning?

Sabine Breitwieser: I'm not... sorry, I'm not sure if I... Can you repeat the last question? Sorry, couldn't really get that... I understood 'What's the policy of CIMAM towards restitution...'

Mwape J. Mumbi: Right, as opposed to loaning back artefacts that may be in European museums back home to African museums.

Sabine Breitwieser: Well, Alfred, do you want to answer that? We have a president in charge of crucial questions.

Alfred Pacquement: This is, of course, a very important issue, but it's mostly discussed in institutions who have been collecting these kind of artefacts for longer than contemporary art museums or modern art museums. It is definitely an issue we hear a lot about in some other gatherings of museums – and I would say exclusively museums, which is not the case here [at CIMAM] – from, you know, the very large Western museums, who reach out to many parts of the world, like, let's say, the British Museum, or the museums in France as well, especially in countries who had a colonisation programme, if I may call it that.

But actually this is, I think, a question which... Maybe I'm wrong, but I don't feel it affects our policies in our own museums, because we have a different kind of relationship with artists and works of art coming from many parts of the world. And when we bring a work of art into our collection, I think, it's certainly, I hope, with the agreement of the artists and everyone concerned with the work. That's what I can say.

Lars Nittve: I actually both agree and disagree. I mean, I think that this is your ... Of course, the specific issue may not be a CIMAM one, but the question of restitution, looting... the very, very vague principles and the very different ways it's handled in different countries is something we could definitely discuss in CIMAM, and should, I think; maybe next conference.

Sabine Breitwieser: Well, it's also an issue of time, of the date of an art work, of course. I mean, we have very current issues in Austria at the moment with the Leopold Collection, as most of you may know and I've been discussing. Some people were asking yesterday. I think some of you might have mentioned it to me yesterday.

So, I think we're closing then, actually. Aha, OK, very good.

Penelope Curtis: I thought the question that the lady at the front asked about the relationship between Miran's project and the museum was really interesting, whether this is an artist's project or a museum project, and how artists can affect the museum, so I wondered if Miran could answer how the Eastern Art Map affected the policy of museums in the region.

Miran Mohar: First of all, I would refer to what Zdenka Badovinac said, she's right. There were, like, small institutions in Eastern Europe who were, in fact, very important, and when I was talking about institutions I meant the state museums and the big institutions. I think on that point...I hope I'm right, or maybe somebody has another opinion, but it was at least our experience or, I would say, mine.

So, the East Art Map project, as we said, didn't want to replace any specialists. It didn't want to replace the work of the museums or art historians or specialists in that field. Our idea was kind of...throwing the glove, in a way – how to say it? – to initiate the response, to initiate the dynamics of this. We are absolutely aware that what we were doing was like a kind of medieval map, in a way, which is totally wrong, potato-looking in a way, but we were aiming in a certain direction. I mean, it pointed you towards a certain direction.

So, basically, we would be more than happy, really delighted, if people who were specialists tried to work in this field. This is... this was somehow a dialogue not only with the institutions, but also with the specialists. That was the intention, and I hope that you recognise, by the very fact that we're here, that this will have another effect on this. But I must admit that in the whole process, we collaborated with many, many different people – sponsors, individuals, with money or without money, institutions and so on. So it... I mean, if you see the list, it's very complex. But yes?

Zdenka Badovinac: This was not the question for me. As I mentioned before, for me it's very interesting and crucial that this is really a project that has a root in art itself, and it's important to emphasise this legacy of conceptual art, which deals with the same questions as the institution. And that's the challenge for the institution. It was already conceptual art, and now we have the next step, how to deal with it... so that was my question, basically.

Coming back to the institutions, of course, there could be a debate about what they did under socialism. Also in the big institutions I don't agree absolutely, but the problem was that it wasn't systematised. It was done without discourse, it was done outside the discursive system, and it was fragmentised and so on, and probably the situation was very similar in Brazil, I suppose.

Lisette Lagnado: Yes.

Zdenka Badovinac: There are probably many similarities. How...the question from... I don't know who put the question of how the project influenced the institutions. For example, you and I both come from Ljubljana: I'm from the museum and you're an artist, and we have been collaborating a lot, so it's not just by chance that there are many projects relating to the redefinition of Eastern art history coming from Ljubljana.

In Moderna Galerija in 1998 we mounted the exhibition 'The Body and the East' and in 2000 we created the collection 'Artist 2000+', which covers, really, art from the sixties to the present day, so it's a big exhibition and we are going on with this. So, that's why I emphasise collaboration. I think maybe there's a new moment which has to be... we have to focus more on this.

Borut Vogelnik: Just a few words on this. What was maybe not stressed enough before is that Zdenka Badovinac and the Museum of Modern Art is an institution we've collaborated with on several projects over the last decade, that's very true, very important projects. Some collections were built between these projects.

But the problem which, somehow, raised this question, these two sides of the question, is as follows: to be very concrete, our concrete practice or experience of the former Yugoslav territories, even though it was one country, as you know, until [June] 1990, the different republics, basically, were organised as totally separate entities regarding the right to judge art production from the respective republics. So if a critic from one republic was supposed to judge art production from another republic, he would do so only if he were invited. Let's put that in brackets because, of course, trespasses happened. But, basically, that was the situation.

So, the problem is the following: even now, the communication between these different countries is scarce. So the question of the Eastern Art Map as we understood it was that if there wasn't cross-border communication between these countries that would be bad for all of us. So we as amateurs did it, probably not well enough. We do hope that specialists from these countries are going to correct us. But as it is a map of the whole East, probably no one

country alone can do it. Probably they will meet to discuss it between themselves and find out how to do it. If not, then it will be ours. That's not going to happen. That is the situation, isn't it?

Sabine Breitwieser: So, I do think institutions have to take on the challenge or project of collaborating with artists, and there are a number of possibilities. For example, we have a corporate background, and we did a project with Andrea Fraser, researching the function of the arts for corporations, taking us as a case study, which was very [heavily] criticised in Austria actually; and, internationally, it's become a very important study on art sponsorship, by the way. So we already had this 'phenomenon', that getting acknowledged meant more outside than inside, which happens everywhere in the country, both to artists, curators, museum directors probably, so all the people and institutions we're related to.

I would like to conclude, because we do have to close now. I would like to refer again to Tretiakov (sounds very historical!). But I think it's really great that we're on a mission to inform, but not just a mission to inform, but to struggle, and that's something we face on all sides of the production apparatus, I would say.

And I also very much like Chantal's suggestion, that we need to analyse, to distinguish, to intervene, and when there's a response, of course, we re-intervene. So it's an ongoing process of rewriting history, but, at the same time, recognising that there has been a gap in communications, and different production modes.

So I think all this has to be considered when we're presenting artworks from so-called Eastern Europe, and we also had a number of projects about that. So how do we present them? Can we just present as if nothing had happened? After World War II and the fall of the Iron Curtain? Probably not. There also needs to be information about the context.

We need to reconsider our structural system modes, conditions, relations to the mass-media and the artists, and we have... Well, there's a lot we have to consider and reconsider, I guess. But I think it's also very important – and this is something I liked in Charles' presentation – that we reconsider constantly the criteria of our evaluations. Do we just behave as victims of criteria imposed on us by politicians, by owners, by trustees, or can we develop our own

criteria? Can we establish, really successfully, criteria that make for an interesting museum or contemporary art institution, that make an important contribution?

And I think this is what we have to fight for, and each of us has to find his or her own position with the museum... And, well then, of course, we're confronted with the question of how much the concept of the museum should be related to... You could even see the biography of the person running it at one moment. Well, I would even question, if a museum director holds another position at the same time, whether this could be the criterion, or an important factor, for bringing into a museum a collection which has a complete different history, somehow.

And I think, of course this is not something we've solved today; it's just something we've started today, and I hope and believe we will continue in future CIMAM conferences yet to be decided on. We'll do that this afternoon in our General Meeting, I guess, start the discussion about where will it be...

And I'd like to thank all the speakers and moderators very much. I think you all did a great job, and it was very interesting. And thanks to the audience, of course, for listening and participating.

Well, we have a lunch break now, at the Hotel Triest again, and we're lucky; you can see the sun's come back!