

Corruption, Corruptibility and Complicity

Preliminary Note

This text was first published in book *The Captured Museum*, which accompanied the exhibition series *Carte Blanche* at the Museum of Contemporary Art in Leipzig. The project placed emphasis on the variety of different interests performed by private persons in art and the museum. It aimed to rethink the relationship between the museum and its traditional supporters (collectors, commercial galleries and enterprises) under current conditions and to discuss possible future partnerships and their impact on art, its institutions and the public sphere. A key objective was to encourage the public to join in debates over economic processes and notions of the public.

From Critique to Complicity

Held at the Pat Hearn gallery in New York in 1986, the panel discussion *From Criticism to Complicity* between Sherrie Levine, Ashley Bickerton, Jeff Koons, Heim Steinbach, Philip Taaffe and Peter Halley, dealt with how art and the artist interrelate with consumerism and the desires that this generates.¹ The debate was based on the premise that the artist is necessarily involved in capitalist structures, and works were cited that address this issue. It was also in 1986 that Brian O'Doherty, author of *Inside the White Cube: The Ideology of the Gallery Space*, noted that the 1980s elicited 'the ironic turn of history', as 'everything that had been subject to critical analysis earlier on, was now subject to intense affirmation. Commodities and consumerism had become fashionable again [...].' The book ends with the conclusion that 'the elusive and precarious art from the period between 1964-1976, as well as its messages, have disappeared.'² Considering the scope of exhibitions and projects available to the public at the time, such as *documenta VII* in Kassel and the *Zeitgeist* exhibition in Berlin, both in 1982, and the exhibition titled *An International Survey of Recent Painting and Sculpture* on the occasion the MoMA's reopening in 1984, it seems that a revision of critical artistic positions was taking place, fostering a more corroborative view of art.³ With respect to these developments, American art theoretician and critic Douglas Crimp noted that '(...) there has been a concerted effort to suppress this fact [of an intensification of the critique of art's institutionalization, a deepening of the rupture with modernism, and to re-establish the traditional fine art categories by all conservative forces of society, from cultural bureaucracies to museum institutions, from corporate boardrooms to the marketplace for art.]⁴ Above all, he focuses on the willingness of artists and art institutions to collude, stating that 'this has been accomplished with the complicity of a new breed of entrepreneurial artists, utterly cynical in their disregard of both recent art history and present political reality.'⁵ Crimp views the inaugural exhibition on the occasion of the MoMA's reopening and the financial support offered by the AT&T Corporation as prime examples of this paradigmatic shift. In his text, he quotes the inaugural speech by the director of MoMA: 'AT&T clearly recognizes that experiment and innovation, so highly prized in business and industry, must be equally valued and supported in the arts.'⁶ Not only does the museum, in this case one of the world's most prominent museums, open itself up toward the economy, but rather, corporations and the museum seek to cooperate so as to create a mutual space of 'experimentation' and 'innovation'. This at least suggests that both parties engage in comparable activities. In *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (1991), Fredric Jameson described this as a significant phenomenon of late capitalism: '[...] the *cultural* and the *economic*, thereby collapse back into one another and say the same thing [...] it seems to obligate you in advance to talk about cultural phenomena at least in business terms if not in those of political economy.'⁷ When Thomas Krens became the director of the Solomon R. Guggenheim

Foundation in 1988, he basically adapted the economic model of franchising, applying it to the museum. Subsequently, 'The Guggenheim' expanded from New York to Venice, Bilbao, Berlin and Las Vegas.⁸ Commissioning internationally celebrated architects guaranteed enormous instant publicity, and also helped coin the term 'Bilbao effect' to describe the enhancement of a particular location by means of spectacular buildings designed by star architects.⁹ Furthermore, redefining the Guggenheim and developing it as a global 'brand' enabled Krens, amongst other things, to settle longer term contracts with Deutsche Telekom, the clothing corporation Boss and the Deutsche Bank, as well as consolidate its connections to influential, affluent collectors.¹⁰ In so doing, Krens intentionally capitalised on art's aura and uniqueness, an approach about which Charles Esche, director of the Van Abbe Museum in Eindhoven, remarked some twenty years later, '[...] the Guggenheim [stands] for the attempt to transfer art's status of autonomy onto other matter, by accumulating the pious aloofness and perfection emanating from such rare and unique commodities.'¹¹ Here, Esche is referring to exhibitions at the Guggenheim of Harley Davidson motorcycles and Armani dresses. Incidentally, Crimp also identified that the inaugural exhibition marking the MoMA's reopening sought to capitalise on the autonomous aesthetic object. He, clairvoyantly, perceived a simple correspondence between attempts at decontextualising art and prioritising aesthetic experience in terms of a specific set of interests, which are not only obscured by the demand for an autonomous aesthetic, but which also seek to selectively exploit the myth of artistic creativity as occurring independently of preconditions, history or context.¹²

2. Unintentional Complicity

Above all during the 1960s and 1970s, the structural authorities of the art world were key areas of artistic investigation. Daniel Buren, an artist whose work explicitly deals with the structural frameworks of art and the formats via which art is shown and seen, accused painting of 'shrouding not only its own inherent process' but also 'the field of reference (i.e. the locality) in which paintings are displayed (i.e. the museum/gallery).'¹³ By concealing their field of social reference consequently led to the museum and the gallery taking their isolation for granted, thus becoming 'a mythical and distorting frame for everything displayed within their bounds.'¹⁴ To avoid this from happening, one would have to 'examine both the formal as well as the cultural framework (and not merely the one or the other)'. Buren's theoretical and practical designs sought to attack naturalised concepts of art and space. These denied any bias toward special interests and suppressed social and historical contexts in order to strengthen the 'predominant ideology' whereby 'the artist is responsible for leisure and distraction.'¹⁵

In 1970, Buren stated that 'freedom in art' is 'the luxury and prerogative of a repressive society'.¹⁶ Applied both inside and outside the museum, Buren's serial coloured stripes cite their origin within everyday contexts, whilst precisely delineating the institutional, historical and social frameworks pertaining to art, which Buren refers to in his writings.¹⁷ At that time, numerous other artists were also critically examining the 'mythical and deforming frame' within which art is produced, presented, distributed and contemplated. The analysis of the exhibition space's physical components extended to issues of political, economic and social space. Conversely, the white exhibition space was transformed into a stage and space in which to articulate issues concerning language, education or politics. In many of their projects and exhibitions, these artists referred to the interconnection of art with other areas of society, as well as to the politics of power – thus raising issues of inclusion and exclusion. In this way, the critical analysis of art institutions progressively extended to also include the institution of art. First and foremost, this continued to involve critiquing museums and galleries, but also other contexts, ranging from art periodicals to public spaces, as well as questions of production,

reception and discourse.¹⁸ Almost three decades later, Andrea Fraser describes precisely this process of expansion as a key shift in the work of artists practicing institutional critique: 'Moving from a substantive understanding of "the institution" as specific places, organizations and individuals to a conception of it as a social field, the question of what is inside and what is outside becomes more complex.'¹⁹ As an institution in its own right, art represented a social and historical product, a discursive convention and a powerful construction promoting the cultural dominance of specific advocacy groups. Furthermore, art could be understood as a disposition (*dispositif*) in the Foucauldian sense, namely as 'a decidedly heterogeneous ensemble incorporating a range of discourses, institutions, architectural fittings, regulatory decisions, laws, administrative measures, scientific declarations, philosophical, moral or philanthropic theorems, in a word, both the said and the unsaid.'²⁰ In 1974 Hans Haacke examined the issue of unintentional complicity between artists and their 'supporters': "'Artists" as much as their supporters and their enemies, no matter of what ideological coloration, are unwitting partners in the art syndrome and relate to each other dialectically. They participate jointly in the maintenance and/or development of the ideological make-up of their society. They work within that frame, set the frame and are being framed.'²¹ Haacke's artworks publicly relay this frame and its intrinsic power mechanisms, revealing conspiracies involving art, corporations and state organisations as a means to advocate the integrity of the museum and protect it from being absorbed by political and economic interests.

On many occasions Haacke publicly opposed the system he was critiquing, and often had to endure censorship and disapproval as a result.²² Thirteen years later, in 1987, the artist Barbara Kruger addressed that she too, was, as an artist, necessarily involved in the market structures of capitalism: 'The fact that we survive by exchange means that our lives are encompassed by a market that is erratic, virulent, horrendously pervasive. To ignore this, to argue that there's a way around it, is the privilege of a person with an inheritance or a tenured job. [...] I'm just trying to be in the world. Because if my work is not tested by this reality – by the labor and exchange conditions of the market – then it might be politically correct, but I'd be deluded.'²³ Here, Kruger was defending herself against those who accused her of switching sides and of ignoring her own critical practice of many years. The reason was that she and Sherrie Levine had joined a commercial gallery in New York that was rated as uncritical. The works of both Barbara Kruger and Sherrie Levine deal with mass media imageries, advertising and branding, as well as how these categories apply to art, and therefore mark the narrow divide between the temptations expressed by mass media imagery and their critical analysis. Thus, from the outset, their works are deliberately developed in close proximity to capitalist culture, a fact that, already in 1982, caused Benjamin Buchloh in his essay *Allegorical Procedures: Appropriation and Montage in Contemporary Art* to perceive that these artists were inadvertently involved with an all-absorbing capitalistic market and its gluttonous logic of innovation.²⁴ Similarly, Hal Foster criticised certain methods of artistic appropriation. He writes: '[...] appropriation becomes problematic not only because it implies a truth beyond ideology and a subject (e.g. a critic or an artist) free of it, but because it is predicated on the logic of the sign, not a critique of it. [...] As they shake the sign, contest the code, they may only manipulate signifiers within it and so replicate rather than dismantle this logic.'²⁵

In view of these pivotal debates in the 1980s, James Meyer, in the final chapter of his essay entitled *What Happened to the Institutional Critique?* (1993), posits questions concerning the possibility of critical practice in the 1990s: 'What does the artist base his/her practice on in the age of late capitalism? [...] Which alternative situations are available to cultural practitioners as a result?' He proceeds to describe the dilemmas artists are faced with today.²⁶ Though viewed by Meyer as plausible alternatives to market-oriented art, activist practices too, are ultimately

forced to operate within the coordinates of capitalism.²⁷ Meyer does, however, justify the role of activism within the 'commodity system' as a strategic necessity in order to achieve specific (political) goals. With reference to ACT UP (AIDS Coalition To Unleash Power) he stresses the fact that 'ACT UP's videos, T-shirts, which were produced by the group, primarily had an effect outside the gallery. If they played a part within the commodity system then they did so only in terms of the fight against AIDS.'²⁸ Thus, Meyer draws a distinction between the art market and the activities of cultural politics. However, with reference to Bordowitz, he also describes the fundamental difficulties of the relationship between the artist/activist and the economic regulatory framework with which he/she is forced to comply. Although Bordowitz had, in a narrower sense, left the art world to work at GMHC (Gay Men's Health Crisis) and ACT UP, there, he also had to confront questions of financing as well as the occasionally rather contaminated interests upon which these questions are based.²⁹ Meyer asks: 'Yet what is the power of economic resistance today? Is poverty a guarantee of a given practice's integrity or seriousness? On the other hand, the fact that certain kinds of practice are readily commodified – take, for instance a work from a nineteenth-century *salon* – could indicate a lack of commitment. It is not easy to answer these questions. As ≡ Barbara ≡ Kruger suggests, even something, which 'doesn't sell', is potentially marketable. This is demonstrated by Duchamp's *readymades*, which ultimately became commodities as well, or by artistic 'de-materialising practices' in the 1960s.'³⁰ The author basically describes how hard it is to critique an infinitely flexible capitalist system, and how readily one becomes the accomplice of such a system, although originally, one intended to achieve precisely the opposite. Moreover, Meyer's insights can be applied retrospectively, to better understand critical practice of the 1960s and 1970s. For the urge to instil new and different functions into the exhibition space ultimately opened it up in terms of potential commercial interests. Essentially, the expansion of the field of art also served to hone an awareness of how to utilise all that, which is related to art – be it the act of selling art, or the marketing of characteristic qualities associated with art.

Perhaps one of the severest blows suffered by critical practice was the realisation that capitalism is remarkably resilient and capable of absorbing into a logic of economic utilisation (branding) seemingly oppositional stances, especially by employing these stances as a means of demonstrating an ability to perform institutional critique.³¹ In a commentary on Buren's exhibition at the Guggenheim, published in the *New York Times* in 2005, Michael Kimmelman points out how the artist's former 'counter-establishment ideas', which intended to challenge the commodity status of art and critique the institution of the museum, later gave way to a diluted artistic stance: 'By now, he's also a virtual official artist of France, a role that does not seem to trouble some of his once-radical fans. Nor, apparently, does the fact that his brand of institutional analysis, preaching white-box clichés to a converted audience of insiders, invariably depends on the largesse of institutions like the Guggenheim.'³² Buren's critical analysis of the institution gradually forfeited much of its credibility, and was subsequently perceived as a standard recipe by which museums could demonstrate their ability to be (self-) critical.

3. Strategic Complicity I

However, while negative forms of complicity, such as those described by Crimp in *The Art of Exhibition*, were evolving in the 1980s between artists, corporations and conservative politics, and while controversies and debates concerning the artist's involvement in the art market and other capitalist structures were being carried out, there also evolved a positive form of *strategic* complicity. In this connection, the panel discussion at the Pat Hearn Gallery cited at the beginning of this essay appears pivotal. Artists such as Haim Steinbach, Jeff Koons and Ashley Bickerton sought to position themselves and their works within a – at least potentially –

corruptible system, thus putting their own potential corruptibility up for discussion. However, their deliberate propensity for the commercial sphere, implied by Steinbach's notion of 'being complicit with'³³, was often read as their abandoning themselves to the world of consumerism and its products. For example, Stephan Schmidt-Wulffen notes, that 'Koons, Steinbach and like-minded people seek to eradicate all possible distinctions between the fetishisation of the art object and the fetishisation of the consumer commodity.' He continues, 'A work of art fulfils its function if it is marvelled at like a Mercedes-Benz.'³⁴ Although we should not lump all these artists' works together, one aspect common to all is that none eradicate 'all possible distinctions' between the fetish of the art object and the fetish of the consumer good. Indeed, as we perceive them, these two types of fetishised product seem constantly interchangeable, and it ultimately becomes impossible to clearly classify them as separate entities. When Steinbach speaks of complicity as 'being complicit with', this implies a state of strategic complicity with, and in terms of, the desire attached to a specific object. The object's appearance, material constitution and style, as well as how it is presented and contextualised, aim to trigger discourse.³⁵ So essentially, the subject is addressed twice – firstly in terms of his/her desire, indeed, as Schmidt-Wulffen suspects, *consumerist* desires³⁶, and secondly, in terms of his/her willingness to partake in discourse. The objects provide and interconnect these two alternatives in order to manifestly complicate both a purely consumerist as well as an analytical or discursive understanding of them. For the works do not only look seductive, there is also something hideous and aggressive about them. They engender proximity and distance at the same time. They represent both tributes to, as well as the monstrous, hypertrophic products of – Capitalism. The objects' alluring appearance may induce joy, but may also arouse apprehension and a sense of guilty defiance. This is because one feels seduced by them or considers them aesthetically pleasing, although – or precisely due to the fact that – the occurrence of such emotional reactions seems inappropriate for the contemplation of art. Bickerton takes this idea a step further by pointing out that art can conceivably be taken over by the economy.³⁷ Precisely because artworks are in themselves contradictory entities, and given that the boundaries between the consumer object, the fetish and the artwork are not clearly definable, the viewer is challenged both emotionally and intellectually. Steinbach's question 'Is there such a thing as a consumer object, a fetish object, an art object, or is it our relation to it that concerns us?'³⁸ clarifies that, now, the subject plays an important role in determining the status of a given object.³⁹ In other words, the recipient is responsible for activating or deactivating a given artwork's critical content.⁴⁰ And that the viewer might just as well not want to react at all is approvingly accepted, as Jeff Koons corroborates in the following statement: 'I don't set up any kind of requirement. Almost like television, I tell a story that is easy for anyone to enter into and on some level enjoy. [...] The objects and the other images that are interconnected to the body of work have other contexts and, depending on how much the viewer wants to enter it, they can try to get more out of it and start dealing in art vocabulary, and start to deal with abstractions of ideas and of context.'⁴¹ Like Koons, both Bickerton and Steinbach apply the concept of strategic complicity so as to produce a common space and relationship through which the artist and the recipient may correspond. It is intended that, upon actively engaging with the object, the viewer can and ought to be in a position to terminate the ensuing state of complicity at any time. Thus, this approach functions on the one hand to open the door toward the viewer. More importantly however, it poses the serious question concerning the extent to which art is prone to complicity and corruption. And ultimately, this question not only concerns the directive authorities in politics, economics or culture, but also artists and, ultimately, the audience as well.

4. Amalgamation Strategies

Similarly, during the 1980s, the long-established antagonisms between art and

economics/politics started to crumble. On this phenomenon, artist Liam Gillick writes, 'It has become difficult to identify a true and final barricade.'⁴² Thus, the question as to exactly where the boundaries between certain groups of people and areas of activity may be drawn does not merely have an impact on whichever kind of – identifiably oppositional – concept of 'otherness', but rather on artistic practice itself. Gillick's oft-repeated interest in forms of social utopia, his art-market success, his projects developed for companies such as Porsche or Lufthansa, and finally his artistic method of combining discourse and the input borne of sensory experience of material objects, often accounted for disapproval for ostensibly lacking a clear stance. This is supported by Gillick's own statements in which he refers to his work as an artist in terms of a 'nebulous' practice.⁴³ The fact that Gillick also works as a curator, graphic designer, art critic and author, collaborating with changing partners on a wide variety of different projects, is often seen as deliberately distracting the observer's attention from his deficiencies as an artist, while Gillick prefers to define his work as the embodiment of an increasingly variegated artistic practice. Interestingly, although he is viewed as the exponent of an entirely different artistic stance and of critical practice, Mark Dion expresses himself in a similar manner: 'To get a call from the World Wildlife Fund, from the Museum of Contemporary Art in Santa Fe, from a gallery in Tokyo, and a letter from a primatologist in South America: that's where the practice is located for me.'⁴⁴ As far as he is concerned, the World Wildlife Fund, the commercial gallery and the exchange of information with a primatologist are equally significant benchmarks in his work as an artist. Thus, critical positions as well as those not perceived as representing a critical practice seem to proceed in a similar fashion. The multiple demands on the artist do not merely form the basis of artistic practice, they are considered as being integral to it, in contrast to the way older-generation artists might distinguish between making art and different, albeit related, activities, such as teaching and publishing. The following generation of artists do not restrict themselves to carrying out that which is generally referred to as cultural practice, but rather seek to immediately interconnect 'a means of securing a livelihood with making art', as demonstrated by the early works of Heger & Dejanov for instance.⁴⁵ Dion, Bordowitz and numerous other artists of their, and of the following generation, departed from a more comprehensive notion of artistic practice that seeks to integrate the various facets, as well as the preconditions, of artistic production. This applied first and foremost to artists pursuing an activist art practice, and was of course closely tied to the hope that the work of the artist might attain greater relevance within society. Gregg Bordowitz succinctly expresses this idea: 'I believe that each and every activity constituting a practice has to transcend the established boundaries of cultural labour dividing the art world from the rest of society. Art is no absolute, autonomous entity, and perhaps it never was one.'⁴⁶

At the same time, the working profiles of those described as 'opposing' artistic practice changed and made it increasingly difficult to discern demarcations. In the obituary of Colin de Land, a New York gallery owner who passed away in 2003 at the age of 47, he is described as a person 'whose ambivalence about commercialism was reflected in an art gallery that sometimes resembled an anti-art gallery if not a work of conceptual art.' It continues: 'Mr. de Land disdained consistency. He allowed one artist to close the gallery for a month to protest art commercialization, but he also taught a course for art collectors and helped found the New York Armory Show, which fills two piers on the Hudson River every year.'⁴⁷ Colin de Land not only expanded our understanding of gallery work, he also embarked on conceptual collaborations with various artists including Richard Prince, among others. It is said that together, they invented a fictitious artist called John Dagg.⁴⁸ In 2009, the commercial gallery KOCH OBERHUBER WOLFF (KOW) opened in Berlin. KOW's guiding concept aims at establishing an institutional model, which amalgamates economic concerns with the mediation of contemporary art, social commitment and critical discourse. Departing from the observation

that the production of art today, is, to an increasing extent, determined by economic forces, the founders of KOW perceive the model of the commercial gallery as an appropriate context offering the necessary freedom to produce and mediate art, while at the same time critically reflecting on the related (contemporary) mechanisms and conditions pertaining to the art field.⁴⁹ The tendencies towards diversification described here are not limited to the activities carried out by the artist or gallery only. The increase in egalitarian forms of collaboration between artists, curators, architects, designers, gallery owners and collectors etc., and increasingly multi-faceted practices reveal that functions and responsibilities within the contemporary art field are becoming more and more hybridised. As already mentioned in the chapter on 'unwilling complicity', art's expansion into other domains (even though it may be argued that this is inexorable, both artistically and socio-politically) necessarily implies opening art up to concerns and intents that sometimes directly oppose particular artistic concepts and ideals. In this connection, I refer again to the exhibition held at the MoMA in 1984 on the occasion of its reopening. By demonstratively emphasising the interest in the 'experimental' and the 'innovative' common to both the museum and the corporation, serves to place the two, at least verbally, on an equal level. In the 1980s, this ostensible common ground was a precondition, allowing the museum and the corporation to be conceptually on a par. Krens had taken this idea a step further by transferring the principles of franchising and branding to the institution of the museum, turning it into a company *as well as* a marketable product. As a result of his combinations of reputed 'highlights' from art and architecture to make the Guggenheim more attractive, Krens was able to embark on so-called joint ventures with other global corporations – using the aura of artistic singularity as *the museum's* most important capital. Opening up the museum towards corporate practices and commercial collaborations not only caused museum tasks to coalesce – as immaterial, material, private and public interests and objectives became inextricably intertwined – but also brought about a multifarious range of fetishes that resembled hybrids between auratically charged artworks and marketable commodities, or marketable artworks and auratically charged commodities.

This strategy of ostensive integration was perfected over time, and is best exemplified by the LVMH Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton luxury group. Designers and artists including Stephen Sprouse⁵⁰, Takashi Murakami and Richard Prince developed designer handbags for this global leader in luxury. The company commissioned artists such as Vanessa Beecroft, Olafur Eliasson and James Turrell to make artworks for the corporation's headquarters on the Champs Élysées in Paris. Situated on the top floor of the building, the company's own exhibition space, the *Espace Culturel Louis Vuitton*, was inaugurated on 12 January 2006, accompanied by a huge social event.⁵¹ Louis Vuitton's president, Yves Carcelle, emphasises that the company is interested in creative processes, irrespective of discipline: '... for us it is exciting and inspiring to partake in the creative processes of people not only working in the world of fashion, but also with those from the world of art and architecture, who collaborate with Louis Vuitton from time to time.'⁵² Similar to the collaboration between MoMA and AT&T, which, hinged on the notions of the 'innovative' and the 'experimental', establishes connections between the museum and the company, in the case of LVMH, 'creativity' occurs on a level common to, and, interconnecting the realms of art, the artist and the corporate public. Paradoxically, this renders precisely those elitist definitions of art socially acceptable, which celebrate exclusiveness and snobbism whilst implementing these qualities to effectively promote the company image and increase sales.⁵³ Meanwhile, the synergism between art and LVMH Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton continues to grow. In 2006, Bernard Arnault, chief executive of LVMH and also an important art collector, set up the 'Fondation Louis Vuitton pour la Création' art foundation.

The museum's current director is Suzanne Pagé, who was formerly the director of the Museum

of Modern Art in Paris and, in that capacity, responsible for the exhibition entitled *Passions privées* (private passions), which aimed to show the significant commitment of private collectors and collections in France. Indeed, at the time, this was a somewhat complicated undertaking, as, according to Werner Spies in a speech he held on the occasion of awarding the Art Cologne Prize to Suzanne Pagé, a 'post-revolution fear of confiscation and meddling by the state' was still prevalent in France. 'For this reason, concealment and understatement are still very much the French collector's favourite sport.'⁵⁴ Repeatedly, Spies and Pagé voiced their conviction that the aloofness or absence of private collectors would in the long term have a negative impact on French contemporary art. Essentially, both address a traditional conflict between private commitment and a state, in which private zeal and enthusiasm for the arts are faced with bureaucracy and mediocrity. About this, Spies stated: 'The *Passions privées* show objected polemically to the monopoly of the state, and to the taste of art adjudicators appointed by the state.'⁵⁵ Apart from the fact that this opposition appears somewhat clichéd today – indeed, why are museum experts bureaucrats, and why does zealousness automatically bring about better results? – in the meantime, the situation has undergone crucial changes. With regard to financial resources and competition for public attention, private museums are most certainly at a competitive advantage.⁵⁶ Alongside Bernard Artault's financially powerful initiative, further examples deserving to be mentioned include François Pinault's collections shown at the Palazzo Grassi in Venice and in a bonded warehouse (Punta della Dogana) converted by Tadeo Ando on the island of Santa Maria della Salute, and the Ukrainian billionaire and major collector Victor Pinchuk and his PinchukArtCentre in Kiev. Due to overly broad media coverage, these projects forcefully affect the public perception of what contemporary art is, and define to a large extent which artistic concepts, artists and curators are in vogue.

In effect, not only do disparate stances and reactions, such as corruption, strategic complicity, sycophantic behaviour, refusal or downright protest seem to move more closely together, they actually merge and interlock. The public and the private spheres intermix, whilst curators and artists also seem to effortlessly switch sides within what used to be seen as an antagonistic polarity. As public art curators, Alison M. Gingeras and Francesco Bonami curated the exhibition *Mapping the Studio* for tycoon and art collector François Pinault.⁵⁷ Upon the initiative of billionaire Viktor Pinchuk, star artists such as Andreas Gursky, Jeff Koons, Damien Hirst and Takashi Murakami figure as active mentors of the 'Future Generation Art Prize' for emerging artists. Members of the jury include Nicolas Serota from Tate and Glenn D Lowry from the Museum of Modern Art. The director of Pinchuk's centre for the arts, the PinchukArtCentre, is Eckhard Schneider, who was formerly the director of the Kunsthauus Bregenz.⁵⁸ The Free State of Bavaria and the collector Uwe Brandhorst joined forces to build and run a private museum located near the Modern Pinakothek in Munich. The director is Armin Zweite, who was formerly the director of the Kunstsammlung Nordrhein-Westfalen (Art Collection of North Rhine-Westphalia).⁵⁹ Clearly, in the cases cited here, the public institution functions as a springboard. If the merits of esteemed museum experts are profitably transferable to the respective new foundation – as the direct result of a functioning image policy – then, conversely, these experts are evidently allowed to treasure the (financial) possibilities offered to them by the collectors.

6. Strategic complicity II

As the most expensive artwork ever to sell by a living artist, *For the Love of God* (2007) by British artist Damien Hirst topped all the sensational reports on contemporary art sales and the hysteria related to 'the most expensive work of art in the world'. At least according to media reports and Hirst himself, the work, a skull cast in platinum and encrusted with 8,601 diamonds, was sold for 50 million pounds sterling to an unnamed investment group in August 2007.⁶⁰ Then, on 15 September 2008, the day the Lehman Brothers filed for bankruptcy, Hirst

auctioned off his artistic output of an entire year, titled *Beautiful Inside My Head Forever* at Sotheby's for approximately 110 million pounds sterling. In view of such prices, Hirst's statement, 'It's a very democratic way to sell art and it feels like a natural evolution for contemporary art'⁶¹, may at first appear cynical. But auctions are stock markets in which both the rise and fall of prices are difficult to calculate and control. At auctions, top prices can be attained, but artworks can also be purchased far below the market price, which is one of the reasons why gallery owners buy back works by their artists at auctions – above all, in order not to leave the pricing policy over to others. Hirst steered the sale of his year's bulk of work by himself, thus bypassing his galleries: if Hirst's gallery owners wanted to sell a given work by the artist from 2008, they had to buy it first, thus having to face precisely those, partly irrational, market mechanisms over which they themselves usually have control. Armed with the respective public attention – well before it actually took place, Hirst's plan was widely debated in the media – the artist was able to attain an unprecedented sales record.⁶² It is not without cause that the main lot of the auction, *Golden Calf* (2008), consisting of a bull preserved in formaldehyde whose head is crowned with a disk of solid gold, is reminiscent of a graven image. Irrefutably, the work can be read as an exegesis of an art market which is dependent on its idols and thus dependent on launching these at regular intervals.⁶³ Hirst posits the question as to the value of art in conceptual, symbolic and economic terms by simultaneously inflating and dismantling the fetish of the original and the cult of the artist. Intrinsically mechanical and serial, the *Spot Paintings* were painted by Hirst's assistants and only attain their value through the artist's authorisation. They are compelling conceptually, because they posit questions concerning the artistic worth and economic status of the artwork, and are also highly sought after commodities. Aesthetically, they are indistinguishable from the unauthorised pictures.⁶⁴ Discussions concerning the price to be paid for an artwork's authenticity culminated in the debate about the disintegration of Hirst's work *The Physical Impossibility of Death in the Mind of Someone Living*. Not only the collector, who had paid a very high price when he bought the work from Charles Saatchi, but also a wider public, was preoccupied with the question of whether we were still dealing with the same icon from 1991, after the original shark had been replaced by a new one.⁶⁵ Evidently, anticipating that the debate would be covered by the mass media was a significant part of the concept. In this connection, the author Robert Preece analysed how many hits were commanded on Google search by <"Damien. Hirst" + "skull"> and other theme words such as <"diamond" + "50 million"> to investigate the hype throughout society unleashed by Hirst's famous skull piece.⁶⁶ In a conversation with Preece, the author, curator and artist, Patricia Ellis, supports Preece's theory that Hirst skilfully manipulates the economy of attention: "The skull piece was most likely anticipated to create a huge interest through a wide variety of media. [...] If you look at how media operates it is very much about temporality, multiplication, and the sublime. Hirst is not so dissimilar from Andy Warhol. He is a global brand. I don't think you can separate it. I think it is definitely part of the concept of his work."⁶⁷ Indeed, Hirst places his art objects in relation to their economic, symbolic and cultural context, or, as is the case here, to the specific framework provided by the media, as well as to the art market and art history. In view of this, the artist's strategy of cunningly appropriating and subverting the mechanisms of the media, whilst also inciting a process whereby the intentions of instrumentalisation are reciprocally played off one against the other, must be seen as vital to Hirst's artistic practice.

Although Olaf Nicolai's approach may at first seem to be no more than the extension of the artistic positions (Steinbach, Koons, Bickerton) presented in 'Strategic complicity I' above, Nicolai, like Hirst, is interested in ways of intervening in the framing conditions of artistic action, and engaging with the artworks' perception, communication and potential instrumentalisation. Nicolai shifts the artwork, the fetish and the consumer

product onto a common level of potential consumability, thus facilitating perceptual shifts from artwork to high-priced commodity or from utilitarian object to product fetish. In *Big Sneaker (The Nineties)* from 1999, a gigantic silver Nike sneaker functions as an oversized floor cushion, as an archetypal cult object from the 1990s and as a work of art. Due to its positive status as a cult object, the viewer is captured, both emotionally and in terms of discourse, in a direct relationship to the sneaker as a commodity, which is essentially sustainable for the masses. On the other hand, due to its monstrously exaggerated size it can also be read as critique of consumerism.⁶⁸ This recalls the practices developed during the 1980s by both Steinbach and Koons. However, in contrast to these positions from the 1980s, Nicolai seeks to establish correlations between the respective objects and current systems of economic utilisation and incorporation. He primarily refers to the art market's suggestive practices, but also to the way in which museums and corporations deploy the aura of art to the ends of making a profit. In the present text, these strategies have been described in detail with reference to the Guggenheim and LVMH Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton. Olaf Nicolai challenges this logic of utilisation and incorporation by selectively violating ownership and utilization rights. For *Big Sneaker [The Nineties]*, Nicolai did not ask Nike first for permission to copy and enlarge the cult sneaker from the 1990s. Prada and Gieves & Hawkes know nothing of Nicolai's *pirate edition* (2000). And of course the rights managers of Donald Judd, one of the most important American artists of the 20th century, were not asked for permission whether Nicolai was allowed to produce the work from 2000 entitled *O.T. (Instruction for Producing a Work After D. Judd)*, which comprised a set of instructions summoning the visitor to make his/her own 'Donald Judd'. On the one hand, Nicolai investigates the mechanisms of instrumentalisation (who is instrumentalising whom?) and appropriation (who claims what?), and on the other hand, he deliberately oversteps the legal boundaries between producer/originator and consumer/user to trigger critical debate about role allocation, legitimate copyright protection and the monopoly on power serving to enforce capitalist interests.⁶⁹ Thus, art and the economy interlock.

Nicolai not only inquires into the interests guiding corporations and the art industry, he also directly calls upon the recipient to be out of step with the passivity of consumerism, to scrutinise the relation between producer and consumer, and to consider the possibilities of piracy, self-organisation and other alternative economic models. Nicolai and numerous other artists/artist collectives such as Superflex, Christine Hill, Maria Eichhorn and Marianne Heier deploy a dual strategy: on the one hand to challenge and provoke the economic system, which includes the art market, and on the other hand to specifically utilise and capitalise on precisely that system.

6. Criticality

In chapter 2, I discussed the problem of how to articulate criticism towards and within an – apparently infinitely – adaptable capitalist system, while not, at the same time, becoming an unintentional accomplice of precisely that system. In their book, *The New Spirit of Capitalism*, Luc Boltanski and Ève Chiapello depart from the assumption that capitalism was able to modify and stabilise itself, *above all* through the criticism it received from art and from the social domain. Capitalism thus assimilated certain aspects of that criticism, specifically so as to maintain precisely the necessary degree of criticism to justify and sustain itself.⁷⁰ Beyond the assertion that artists – precisely by criticising the system which they saw as questionable – contributed substantially to stabilising the latter, it becomes increasingly difficult to separate artistic and economic interests, especially since art's economic potential has itself become a

broader social concern. The exploitation of art and its institutions does not merely extend to art's material products, but also to characteristic traits associated with art, such as creativity, authenticity and open-mindedness, but also criticism. Although significantly inspiring for artists, former opposition to the economic domains and issues of an economy driven by capitalism, has given way to highly complex integration processes from which neither artists nor art institutions are exempt. In short, the notion of employing art to conceptualise the idealistic, polar opposite of other social domains deteriorated at an increasingly rapid rate in the course of the 20th century. However, it seems overhasty to draw the conclusion that the perforation of the established boundaries between art and the economy necessarily leads to art being absorbed *by* the economy, just as a lack of distance does not automatically involve the loss of criticism. Rather, we should assume that the modes of the critical have to change. In my opinion, Irit Rogoff's proposed use of the terms *criticism*, *critique* and *criticality* marks such gradations of change: 'In the project of "criticism" we are mainly preoccupied with the application of values and judgements, operating from a barely acknowledged humanist index of measure sustained in turn by naturalised beliefs and disavowed interests. [...] Critique, in all of its myriad complexities has allowed us to unveil, uncover and critically re-examine the convincing logics and operations of such truth claims. However, for all of its mighty critical apparatus and its immense and continuing value, critique has sustained a certain external knowingness, a certain ability to look in from the outside and unravel and examine and expose that which had seemingly lay hidden within the folds of structured knowledge.'⁷¹ Rogoff's redefinition of the term 'criticality' demonstrates that a need for an external and objectively critical viewpoint has given way to an awareness of one's own involvement in – and of the innate contradictions of – a culture determined by capitalism: 'In "criticality" we have that double occupation in which we are both fully armed with the knowledges of critique, able to analyse and unveil while at the same time sharing and living out the very conditions which we are able to see through.'⁷² For this reason, artists, curators and everyone else working in this field need to develop a critical stance toward precisely the established structures on which they depend, to learn how to work within economic structures whilst questioning them at the same time, and how to be actively involved in the economy as well as the art field whilst equally gauging the dangers of exploitation and the possibilities of opposition.

The resulting rift became a central theme of critical art practice, as demonstrated by Andrea Fraser for instance. Already in *Gallery Talks*, in which she acted as her alter ego Jane Castelton, she ushered the way through various American museums, changing her position as speaker several times during the performance.⁷³ In 1986, on the occasion of the group exhibition *Damaged Goods: Desire and the Economy of the Object* at the New Museum of Contemporary Art in New York, Brian Wallis invited Fraser to present her performance *Damaged Goods Gallery Talk Starts Here*. This consisted of disparate bits of language culled from the exhibition catalogue, the usual visitor guides, Marxist cultural criticism as well as fashion magazines. The speech fragments included descriptions of famous artworks, pieces of pottery and a trip to China, companies' business reports, advertising pointers and statistical extracts on poverty in the Third World.⁷⁴ On the one hand, assuming the role of Jane Castelton, Fraser developed an intense identification with the museum, communicating what the institution expected her to communicate, or rather, communicating what she *presumed* the institution expected her to. She thus turned herself into a strategic accomplice of the museum. On the other hand, she formulated a critique of the institution, its sovereignty of interpretation and defining power. In the first case, Fraser functioned as the extended arm of the museum, in the second as its critic or analyst.⁷⁵ In later performances, she not only constantly switched perspectives, but rather also swayed playfully between the characteristic identities of various different protagonists from the field of art. In the performance *Inaugural Speech* (1997), presented on the occasion of the

opening of SITE97 in San Diego/Tijuana, Fraser first spoke as an artist, then as a curator/organiser, a public funding body representative, a politician and, finally, as a corporate sponsor. Each respective speech consisted of assorted fragments used on a variety of similar occasions and supplemented by Fraser.⁷⁶ Supported by the Friedrich Petzel Gallery in New York, in *Untitled* (2003) she pushed the theme of complicity as far as possible toward the representation of how the artist, the gallery owner and the collector are inextricably entangled. The artist offered her sexual services to a collector, and 50% of the price of the 'work' was due to be paid to Fraser's gallerist, as is common practice in the art business.⁷⁷ In this project, Fraser brought together two fundamentally irreconcilable systems: the art market and prostitution. Here, the role of the artist is equivalent to that of the prostitute, just as the collector and gallery owner correspond to the client and pimp respectively.

The resultant blur of a suchlike practice is also prevalent in the work of Liam Gillick, who I mentioned earlier on. Although it seems paradoxical, it can be said that this artist creates sharply defined uncertainty relations. Significantly, this is not the outcome of specific insufficiencies, but rather a principle. Gillick's artistic vocabulary also combines different elements, images, texts, object-like manifestations and fragments; the materials, surfaces, associative titles and arrangements bring to mind a multitude of references to architecture, design, Capitalism, Socialism, utopian ideas and action. Derived from both the field of art and the corporate domain, the codes inherent to the typefaces, colours, materials and production methods employed by Gillick are mutually interconnected in his works within specific spatio-temporal contexts, and above all are put in relation to the recipient.⁷⁸ Gillick's work posits many questions on the status and social purpose of artistic work and the artist, on the possibilities of expressing criticism and critique, as well as on idealism, pragmatism, complicity and corruptibility: nevertheless, the 'scenarios' referred to remain hypothetical as long as they do not actually take place. Gillick says, 'My work is like the light in the fridge, it only works when there are people there to open the fridge door. Without people, it's not art – it's something else – stuff in a room.'⁷⁹ Not only Fraser and Gillick deliberately define the division between critique and affirmation as a very fine line. A number of other artists do the same, irrespective of whether or not they engage in or represent critical practice.

Now, the status of the work essentially depends on the viewer's willingness to classify it as either critical or affirmative. It is crucial neither whether the artist is able to articulate intelligible and unambiguous criticism, nor whether the curator mediates this in a likewise comprehensible manner. More significantly, critical content is generated in the course of the work's reception, and may subsequently continue to change and metamorphose according to context. The role of the viewer becomes increasingly important, as he/she collaborates with the respective artist and curator to determine the work's status and meaning. The concept of criticality outlined here invalidates the hierarchic, asymmetrical relationship between the artist and the audience, which was still characteristic of the first generation of critical practice artists whose works were often latently didactic. This model does not cater to an expectation that some distant deputised individual is responsible for formulating critique. A given work will stand or fall by the recipient's willingness to engage in critical discourse, assume responsibility and take a clear position. This implies that the possibilities of criticism/critique and potential allegations of complicity and corruption not only affect the artist and curator. They also involve the recipient, who, if she or he does not respond to the offer of engaging in critical analysis or debate, becomes a voluntary or involuntary accomplice of a corrupt – or potentially corruptible – system.

7. From Complicity to Criticality

During recent years, significant shifts have taken place within the field of art. The glamorous art of the international jet set has moved in right next to the academic discourse section. Commercial agendas and alternative economic models converge, overlap or emerge shoulder to shoulder. Cool cynicism and attitudes insisting on art's utopian potential coexist. Collective art projects run parallel to branding strategies intent on celebrating the artist-as-genius. Indeed, shifting positions and areas marked by the transitional and erratic make it increasingly difficult to discern unambiguously clear demarcations.⁸⁰ If conflicts do arise, then not necessarily between the customary sets of opposing areas and factions, along the lines of corporate domain versus art and politics, artist versus curator, or artist versus museum administrator. Today, conflicts are much more likely within each of the abovementioned areas or groups, whereas alliances have become conceivable between once opposing parties, if there is the incentive to pursue a common objective.⁸¹ In other words, the art world has, contrarily to traditional forms of group bonding, adjusted according to certain political, economic, social and cultural interests. With reference to the planned construction of the *Tschlin Library* in the Engadine mountain village of Tschlin, the architect and author Markus Miessen appropriately describes today's often highly complex modes of cooperation and the participating partners' changing functions and tasks as 'delicate'.⁸² The project was initiated by Miessen and Swiss super-curator and author Hans Ulrich Obrist. They are presently collaborating with the collector and entrepreneur Rudolph Schürmann and businesswoman Michelle Nicol to build a cultural centre offering permanent access to Obrist's private archive, 'focusing on its possible configuration as an open field of possibilities and knowledge [...] as an open work able to reactivate and to reenact historic events and layers of knowledge in which the transparency of organization allows for a richer and more surprising usage.' In addition, the project serves to 'rethink the significance of the politics of storage, individual selection and archival authorship [...]'. An interest in creating a physical place in which collective knowledge is both produced and rendered accessible, is directly connected with the task of digitising the archive.⁸³ As a venue offering seminars, exhibitions and artist/research residencies, the planned cultural centre is to be funded through the construction and sale of private real estate in the same village. Thus, it is planned that the non-profit-making part of the project will be financed by private sector revenue. In other words, this is an entrepreneurial venture in which different interlocking interests serve to push its realisation forward, even though this involves unforeseeable risks due to the project's enormous investment volume and its merging of material and immaterial components. This model is no longer based on the notion of the altruistic patron, but rather on financially strong cooperation partners seeking agreement between their respective goals and ideas. It is basically a strategic partnership aimed at mutual benefits on both sides.⁸⁴

Although it is still open how the *Tschlin Library* experiment will evolve, the concepts developed up to now are exceptional insofar as they combine the project's idealism with calculated strategies and tactical considerations. This strategy, which not only banks upon the economic framing conditions, but rather incorporates these as a vital part of the project, is comparable to the initiative of Koch Oberhuber Wolff mentioned in chapter 4 above. KOW apply the model of the commercial gallery in order to attain new freedoms relevant not only in the production, but also the mediation of contemporary art: this entails reinvesting accumulated capital in art/curatorial projects which could not be accomplished otherwise. In an interview with the German business newspaper *Handelsblatt*, Koch countered Harald Szeemann's popular demand to shatter the triad of studio, gallery and museum: 'We don't have to shatter the triad. [...] On the contrary, we need to mobilise it! We have to exploit it for the right cause. If our gallery contributes to making sure that art is relevant within society, then not by bypassing the market. [...] Then precisely these positions need to be promoted in the market.'⁸⁵ The projects discussed in this chapter indicate a shift of paradigm: they are all part of an economic system, which is no

longer criticised but rather actively utilised by its subscribers to the ends of implementing specific institutional, artistic and curatorial concepts. Moreover, these projects neither aim to merely gratify the – sellable – autonomous aesthetic object, nor to accept that there is no alternative to the current economic modes whereby all areas of life are incorporated and utilised in terms of profit. Rather, they seek to intervene in economic processes, actively shaping these to emancipatory ends. This is also a reaction to the argument forwarded by Luc Boltanski and Ève Chiapello that capitalism could always successfully stabilise itself by incorporating its critics and modifiers to the benefit of capitalist principles. As Don-Quixotian as this may seem, today, there are some very real attempts at being active within what used to be understood as the oppositional field, so as to appropriate economic methods of reinvesting consolidated revenue to emancipatory ends. The utopian objective links up with a highly pragmatic approach, while critical perception becomes aware that it too is implicated in capitalistic cycles of utilisation.

Considering that these distinctions and functions have become indeterminate, and that relationships have become contingent and precarious, today it seems all the more necessary to question who is acting on behalf of whose contract and which interests are being catered to by whom. Given the current developments, I believe that these are precisely the questions that need to be raised in all areas of activity within the art field. With regard to the exhibition curated by Jeff Koons at the New Museum of Contemporary Art in New York, what seems reprehensible is not that it included works from the collection of Dakis Joannou, but rather that the web of interests behind the exhibition was never mentioned, neither in the exhibition nor on the part of the museum in any of its statements. On the contrary, it was suggested that the interests of the participating parties – the museum, the collector and the artists – were congruent.⁸⁶ To avoid this from happening, and to promote a critical, emancipatory practice it is crucial that we hone our perception of different interests and hierarchies once again, although we now know that these interests and hierarchies are no longer based on traditional oppositions, and alliances are anything but static. It is necessary to formulate a societal perspective in sync with ‘the logic of culture in the age of late capitalism’, which is not limited to, but rather challenges, economic questions and demands clear positions of itself and of all participating partners. Moreover, it is important to create regulatory frameworks and spatial contexts in order to facilitate public debate about our common demands and differences.

Barbara Steiner

Translation: Oliver Kossak

From the book: *The Captured Museum*, Jovis Publishers, Berlin 2010

1 ‘From Criticism to Complicity’ (1986). In: *Flash Art*. No. 129, pp. 46–49. This was already considered as commercialised from the very outset – in contrast to Andy Warhol, who first infused the world of commerce into the field of art and high culture.

2 Brian O’Doherty, Afterword, *Inside the White Cube* (1976). In: Wolfgang Kemp (Berlin, 1996) (ed.), p. 136 ff.

3 This development can also be seen parallel to an increasing political conservatism in the United States and in the majority of countries in Western Europe.

4 Douglas Crimp, ‘The Art of Exhibition’ (1984). In: *On the Museum’s Ruins* (Cambridge, London, 1997), p. 272.

5 Of course that doesn’t mean that there has never been such thing as a ‘corruptible’ artist before. But they were discussed and critiqued as individual cases. However, by insisting on artistic autonomy it was possible to define and maintain idealised boundaries, which de facto did not necessarily exist.

6 Crimp, p. 272.

7 Fredric Jameson, *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (Durham, NC, 1991). Jameson’s book was predicated on an essay, which he wrote in 1984 for publication in the *New Left Review*.

8 Today, there are a total of four Guggenheim Museums in New York, Venice, Bilbao and Berlin, with a fifth Guggenheim being planned in Abu Dhabi.

9 To name just two famous architects, the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao and the Guggenheim Hermitage Museum at The Hotel Venetian in Las Vegas were designed by Frank O. Gehry and Rem Koolhaas respectively. Concerning museum architecture Krens says 'It's important to impress. For a long time I looked for a symbol for the 'contemporary museum'. When we began planning the museum in Bilbao, our architect, Frank Gehry, asked me if there was anything particular I wanted the building to be. I said, basically I want Chartres Cathedral [...]' Ulrike von Knöfel, Ariane von Dewitz, 'Atemberaubend, riesig, pharaonisch' (Breathtaking, gigantic, pharaonic). In: *Der Spiegel*. <http://www.spiegel.de/spiegel/print/d-56299164.html>, 22.3.2008. Date: 22.2.2010.

10 However, Krens's expansion policy was highly disputable, and led to Peter B. Lewis, head of the Guggenheim Foundation's supervisory board, issuing an admonishment in 2005. Although Krens at first prevailed, he suddenly withdrew from office in 2008. He had come under too much pressure. Carol Vogel, 'Guggenheim's Provocative Director Steps Down'. In: *The New York Times*. http://www.nytimes.com/2008/02/28/arts/design/28muse.html?_r=1, 20.2.2008. Date: 22.2.2010.

11 Charles Esche, 'Eine Erziehungseinrichtung, eine computerisierte Datenbank der Kulturgeschichte, ein Träger für Aktionen' (An educational centre, a computerised database of cultural history, a means of action). In: *Mögliche Museen* (Possible museums). Barbara Steiner & Charles Esche (eds.) (Cologne, 2007), p. 28.

12 Crimp obliquely extends the critical stance – prevalent above all in the 1960s and 1970s – which perceived the urge of 'autonomous' art to ignore its immediate exploitability and functionality, as an either deliberate or unintentional, yet de facto always prevalent form of complicity with hegemonic (mostly conservative middle-class) values and ideals. Herbert Marcuse, 'Über den affirmativen Charakter der Kultur' (On the affirmative disposition of culture). In: *Kultur und Gesellschaft I* (Culture and society I) (Frankfurt am Main, 1965), pp. 66 & 67; Jürgen Habermas, *Legitimationsprobleme im Spätkapitalismus* (Legitimation Problems in Late Capitalism) (Frankfurt am Main, 1973), p. 110; Peter Bürger, *Theorie der Avantgarde*. (Frankfurt am Main, 1974), p. 63. Brian O'Doherty adopts a similar view, when he writes '≅ ...≅' and this is not the first time that aesthetic idealism and the art market vouch for exactly the same interests.' O'Doherty, p. 136.

13 The unabridged version of the quote is as follows: 'In the same way, this type of painting, which shrouds its own method is also obviously deceptive about the field of reference (location) within which it stands (museum/gallery). This type of painting considers this to be a neutral background and undercoat having no influence on the work and its subject matter.' Daniel Buren, 'Limites/Critiques' (1970). In: *Daniel Buren*. Exhibition catalogue Staatsgalerie Stuttgart (Ostfildern, 1990), p. 275.

14 Buren: 'If we do not draw into consideration the location (of the museum or gallery) or if we take it to be a natural given, then it becomes a mythical and deforming frame for everything presented within its bounds.' *Ibid.*, p. 277.

15 *Ibid.*, p. 290.

16 *Ibid.*

17 In the project *Position – Proposition*, which Buren carried out in 1971 at the invitation of the Mönchengladbach Municipal Museum, the artist linked 'formal' and 'cultural' frameworks. Buren glued strips of white and blue striped paper over the walls of the Municipal Museum – the same stripes as on Mönchengladbach's public buses. The areas where works from the preceding exhibition had hung before were left uncovered. The exhibition extended out over and beyond the museum – a variety of activities were announced and launched in unison in the respective participating cities of the Lower Rhine. They all finished differently depending on the type of project, the weather or the extent of destruction.

18 Cf. above all the works by Dan Graham, which investigate the reciprocal relationship between the gallery and the magazine. Magazines are points of reference, defining the work's referential context and 'functioning equally both as art and as art criticism'. Dan Graham, 'Meine Arbeiten für Zeitschriftenseiten – Eine Geschichte der Konzeptkunst' (My Works for Magazine Pages: A History of Conceptual Art). In: Ulrich Wilmes (ed.), *Dan Graham. Ausgewählte Schriften* (Dan Graham. Selected writings), Stuttgart, 1994, p. 18. See also Michael Asher's work for the Skulpturenprojekte exhibition in Münster in 1977. His installation *Münster (Caravan)*, which involved parking a caravan in constantly different locations in the city, departed from the idea of an artwork's conceptual and perceptual frames. These frames are decisive in determining the status of the object, for instance whether or not we are dealing with an abandoned caravan or a work of art, which functions as a tool and provides information concerning the relationship of the artwork to its respective location and surroundings. See also: Martha Rosler, 'Lookers, Buyers, Dealers, and Makers: Thoughts on Audience'. In: Brian Wallis (ed.), *Art After Modernism: Rethinking Representation*. (New York, 1999), pp. 311–340.

19 Andrea Fraser, 'From the Critique of Institutions to an Institution of Critique'. In: *Artforum* (No.1, Sept. 2005), pp. 278–283, p. 281.

20 Michel Foucault, *Dispositive der Macht. Über Sexualität, Wissen und Wahrheit* (Berlin, 1978), p. 119 ff.

21 Hans Haacke, 'All the Art That's Fit to Show'. In: *Museum by Artists*. A.A. Bronson and Peggy Gale (eds.) (Toronto, 1983), p. 152.

22 Fraser on Haacke: 'It may be Haacke, above all, who evokes characterizations of the institutional critic as an heroic challenger, fearlessly speaking truth to power – and justifiably so, as his work has been subject to vandalism,

censorship, and parliamentary showdowns.' Fraser, p. 283. In 1971, the director of the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum in New York, Thomas Messer, cancelled Haacke's solo exhibition at the museum six weeks before the opening. The reason for this was Haacke's work entitled *Shapolsky et al. Manhattan Real Estate Holdings, A Real Time Social System, as of May 1* (1971), which revolves around real estate ownership and speculation. At that time, members of the Guggenheim Museum board of trustees were allegedly involved in the real estate deals documented by Haacke in his work. The curator of the exhibition, Edward Frey, was dismissed from his job.

23 Barbara Kruger in conversation with Douglas Crimp. Abigail Solomon-Godeau, Krzysztof Wodiczko et al., 'Discussion'. In: *Discussions in Contemporary Culture*, Hal Foster (ed.) (Seattle, 1987), p. 52.

24 On Levine the following has been stated: 'The risk of Levine's position is that it might function ultimately in secret alliance with the static conditions of social life as they are reflected in an art practise that is concerned only with the work's commodity structure and the innovation of its product language.' Benjamin H.D. Buchloh, 'Allegorical Procedures: Appropriation and Montage in Contemporary Art'. In: *Artforum* (Sept. 1982), pp. 43–56, p. 48 ff. By re-enacting and photographing them again, Levine appropriated photographs by famous (male) photographers. The titles of her works refer to the appropriated images according to the following pattern: Sherrie Levine, [*title of the original work*], After [the respective artist's name, e.g. Walker Evans, Edward Weston etc.], present date. Levine's photographic re-enactments/reproductions served to subvert the laws of the market and its objective of fetishising an inherently reproducible medium to the ends of high prices. Furthermore, as the new 'author', Levine overwrote the works of her male colleagues. Kruger made use of a graphically powerful visual vocabulary, quoting advertising's attention-seeking modes of visual communication to convey her message of gender critique and anti-consumerism. A famous example is *I shop therefore I am* from 1987. Today, works by both Kruger and Levine sell at high prices on the art market.

25 Hal Foster, 'Readings in Cultural Resistance.' In: *Recordings. Art, Spectacle, Cultural Politics* (Seattle 1985), p. 173 ff.

26 Meyer, p. 252 & 253.

27 For him 'institutional critique (both in its classical as well as extended form), and activism (with which he combines the former) remain [...] the most convincing strategies for a definition of an art which claims to be political.' Ibid., p. 253.

28 Ibid., p. 252. To distribute its critical message, the activist group Gran Fury deliberately deployed graphic support systems and visual languages used in advertising. 'Kissing Doesn't Kill' (1989-1990) referred explicitly to the aesthetic employed by Benetton, however using it to campaign for a non-discriminatory AIDS policy. The group's work could be seen on public billboards and buses. Richard Meyer: 'This Is to Enrage You: Gran Fury and The Graphics of AIDS Activism'. In: *But is it Art? The Spirit of Art as Activism*. Nina Felshin (ed.) (Seattle, 1995), pp. 51–83.

29 'The intended place of his work's reception is the television broadcast, he often emphasised. But even if he were subsidised by public television channels (considering the "controversial" nature of his work this is unlikely), this support would be anything but pure. Art foundations and museums that depend on a pressurised NEA or affluent patrons are similarly problematic.' Meyer, p.252.

30 Ibid., p. 252 ff.

31 In the majority of cases, this also means that intrinsically complex works are perceived as reduced to a small number of characteristic traits. This makes it possible to even 'brand' critical practitioners without much difficulty. Moreover, the term 'institutional critique' has also become a brand in its own right. Fraser is self-critical about 'the critically shameful prospect of having played a role in the reduction of certain radical practises to a pithy catchphrase, packaged for co-optation.' Fraser, p. 279.

32 'Sometimes uninvited, he plasters benches and billboards with stripes, concocts various architectural and environmental structures or sculptures, and in general produces works whose site-specific, purposive, unapproachable banality has been interpreted to symbolize the death of the author, a challenge to the traditional commodity status of art, a critique of the institution of the museum – counter-establishment ideas when, like Mr. Buren, they emerged 40 or so years ago.' Michael Kimmelman, *Tall French Visitor Takes Up Residence in the Guggenheim*. <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/03/25/arts/design/25KIMM.html?fta=y>, 25.3.2005. Date: 12.3.2010.

33 'There is a stronger sense of being complicit with the production of desire, what we traditionally call beautiful seductive objects, than being positioned somewhere outside of it.' Haim Steinbach, 'From Criticism to Complicity'. In: *Flash Art* (No. 129) (1986), p. 46.

34 Stephan Schmidt-Wulffen, 'Von der Kritik zur Komplizenschaft (und zurück) – Notizen zur Rezeption der cultural studies in der amerikanischen Gegenwartskunst' (*From Criticism to Complicity (and back). Notes on the reception of cultural studies within American contemporary art*) (1998). Republished in: Stephan Schmidt-Wulffen, *PERFEKTIMPERFEKT* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 2001), p.154.

35 Steinbach, p. 49. This does not involve the discourses taking place before of after the work – the objects themselves are discursive. More on this later.

36 'In the talk at Pat Hearn the word "desire" is mentioned early on. As a counter-term of the rationality and

analysis of earlier forms of art, “desire” has become the guiding expression of the 1980s. Incidentally, the participants do not apply the term to the theories of desire expounded by Freud, Lacan and Deleuze. To them it simply means consumer desire [...].’ Schmidt-Wulffen, p. 153.

37 ‘Through tactile choices and presentation, the art object has now been placed in a discursive relationship with the larger scenario of the political and social reality of which it is part. In a self-conscious and ongoing dialogue with the social, political and intellectual climate of the time and place it will operate in, and with the entire process of its absorption.’ Ashley Bickerton. In: *From Criticism to Complicity*, p. 46.

38 Steinbach, p. 49.

39 Stephan Schmidt-Wulffen mentions the ‘paradox of “affirmative criticism”’, because ‘works of art are accepted as part of the marketing chain’. Stephan Schmidt-Wulffen, p. 154.

40 This binary effect discloses a certain proximity to the ‘pictures generation’, exploiting both the seductive power and critique of the image. In 1977, Artists Space in New York showed the group exhibition titled *Pictures*. This title was to be eponymous for a generation of artists who based their work on investigations of the mass media, specifically by means of the technical media provided by film and TV. These artists employed a double strategy aimed at generating seductive images whilst critically reflecting them at the same time. Douglas Eklund (ed.), *The Pictures Generation, 1974–1984*. Exhibition catalogue, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (New Haven & London, 2009). In contrast to these artists who seek to render critique visible, we are now dealing with the potential aspect of critique, whereby critique can be activated, but does not automatically have to be. This is where the recipient comes in.

41 Koons, pp. 47 & 48. ‘I think that through this procession of contingencies, discourses are being pulled together into the object itself, promoting an awareness of the fact that all meanings are contingent upon other meaning, where meanings are appropriated for their relationship to external forces, the larger social schema in which they’re involved.’ Ibid., p. 48.

42 Liam Gillick, *Maybe it would be better if we worked in groups of three?* (2008) Hermes Lecture, Camiel Van Winkel (ed.) (’s-Hertogenbosch, 2008), p. 11. This is an initiative organised by the Research Group of Visual Art, AKV/ St. Joost (Avans University) and the Hermes Business Network.

43 Gillick deliberately formulates his projects and reflections as open-sided, avoiding clear statements: ‘I am working in a nebulous cloud of ideas, which are somewhat partial or parallel rather than didactic.’ His texts are full of expressions like ‘nearly’, ‘might be’, ‘possible’ etc.. Liam Gillick, *Renovation Filter, Recent Past and Near Future* (Bristol, 2001), p. 20.

44 Mark Dion, quoted in: Meyer, p. 243.

45 Barbara Steiner, ‘Plamen Dejanov & Svetlana Heger’. In: Barbara Steiner (ed.), *ENTER KünstlerInnen, Publikum, Institution*. Commissioned by the Kunstmuseum in Lucerne (Lucerne, 1998), p. 8. ‘Heger & Dejanov are artists who developed the concept of their work, they are collectors who know the ways of the international art market, they mediate their own projects when it comes to finding potential collaborators and clients for their rental projects/products, and they repeatedly work in areas of activity that are considered as unlicensed and of low social status. And they go on holidays.’ Ibid.

46 Bordowitz, quoted in Meyer, p. 243 ff. According to James Meyer, around the mid-1990s, Dion and Bordowitz conducted numerous interviews with artists including Thomas Lawson, Dan Graham, Martha Rosler, Yvonne Rainer and Joseph Kosuth who ‘seemed to embody the concept of critical practice – a practice whose objective is to dissolve the traditional distinctions between the artwork and its production, or between the “actual” work of the artist as creating an artwork, and other activities such as activism or teaching.’ Surprisingly, the interviewees emphasised the fact that distinctions did exist and that they did not consider these activities as being equivalent.

47 Roberta Smith, *Colin de Land, Art Dealer Who Fostered Experimentation, Dies at 47*. <http://www.16beavergroup.org/mtarchive/archives/000018.php>, 19.3.2003. Date: 12.3.2010. Gallery owner Christian Nagel expresses himself similarly: ‘Colin de Land was not only a gallerist but also a simulacrum of an artist. His gallery was definitely his studio, and he understood it not only as an exhibition surface but as a social space.’ In: *Colin de Land American Fine Arts*. Dennis Balk (ed.) (New York, 2008), p. 246.

48 Ibid. In the US, works by John Dogg are held by the Rubell Collection in Florida. Works by Dogg were exhibited at the Kunsthalle Zurich in 2008.

49 In collaboration with architect Arno Brandhuber, KOW developed a spatial concept combining maximum adaptability according to use with maximum pragmatism of functionality. <http://www.kow-berlin.info/about/gallery>. Date: 25.4.10.

50 This extends as far as to include what is commonly referred to as ‘street culture’. Stephen Sprouse designed a strictly limited edition of handbags with graffiti-like elements, sold as the Louis Vuitton graffiti ‘Speedy’ or ‘Keepall’.

51 ‘Joining the architects and artists at the cocktail reception were a host of international celebrities, including Uma Thurman, Sharon Stone, Winona Ryder and Salma Hayek.’ In: *Louis Vuitton celebrates the re-opening of its Champs-Élysées store*. www.allbusiness.com/retail-trade/miscellaneous-retail/4438848-1.html, 10.10.2005. Date: 16.3.2010.

52 Sabine Lange, *Interview with Yves Carcelle*. <http://www.arte.tv/de/mode/1542324,CmC=1544050.html>. Date: 18.4.07. The spectacular building costing over an estimated 120 million euros was designed by Frank Gehry and is situated in the Jardin d'Acclimatation, near the Bois de Boulogne.

Sam Lubell, 'Louis Vuittons Luxury Architecture'. In: *Business Week*. www.businessweek.com/innovate/content/nov2006/id20061106_483439.htm?campaign_id=rss_daily, 6.11.2006. Date: 16.3.2010.

53 Louis Vuitton also depends on selling its products in large quantities all over the world to ensure both luxury as well as high sales figures.

54 Werner Spies, Speech held on the occasion of the Art Cologne Prize, awarded to Suzanne Pagé on 17 April 2008, *Laudatio von Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. mult. Werner Spies auf Suzanne Pagé anlässlich der Verleihung des ART COLOGNE-Preises am 17. April 2008 in Köln* (Cologne, 2008), p. 6. Also available on: http://www.bvdg.de/pdf/reden/Laudatio_Spies_080417.pdf. Date: 16.3.2010.

55 Many of the 300 collectors asked were not willing to cooperate. Finally, after negotiations, a total of 92 agreed to collaborate, of which two-thirds wished to remain anonymous. *Passions privées*. Exhibition catalogue, Musée d'Art moderne de la Ville de Paris (Paris, 1995).

56 Focusing on these or similar activities, the media have contributed to the rise of this tendency, with reports equally gratifying the demands of the art review, the society report and gossip.

57 After being a curator at the Musée national d'art moderne in Paris, Alison M. Gingeras is currently an adjunct curator at the Guggenheim Museum. Francesco Bonami works as a Manilow Senior Curator at the Museum of Contemporary Art in Chicago. He is also artistic director of the Fondazione Sandretto ReRebaudengo per l'Arte in Turin, the Fondazione Pitti Discovery in Florence and the Centro di Arte Contemporanea Villa Manin in Udine. He was the director of the Venice Biennale in 2003.

58 <http://futuregenerationartprize.org>. Date: 24.2.2010. See the mentors' statements on video. The prize money is 100,000 euros. See also: <http://pinchukartcentre.org/en>. Date: 24.2.2010. Members of the international jury include the collector Eli Broad, rock musician Elton John, fashion designer Miuccia Prada, the Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation's director Richard Armstrong and Alfred Pacquement, director of the Musée Nationale d'Art Moderne, Centre Georges Pompidou. A short list of artists is nominated by approximately 100 art experts from all over the world. <http://www.artmagazine.cc/content44990.html>. Date: 11.12.09. The jury unites prominent individuals from international museums and the world of fashion, and also includes a superstar from the world of glam rock as an added extra. Such a megalomaniac cluster is ostentatious: big names as mediators and jury members plus considerable financial means.

59 <http://www.museum-brandhorst.de/index.php?id=28>, Date: 24.2.2010. In the cases cited here, no information is given concerning the interests and interrelations behind them. This was criticised, also with reference to the Brandhorst collection. See: *Ich fürchte die Sammler, auch wenn sie Geschenke bringen. Der Trend zum uniformen Museum* (I am afraid of collectors, even if they bring gifts: The tendency toward the uniform museum). Feature by Florian Zeyn, Bayerischer Rundfunk/Bayern 2 (Bavarian Broadcasting Corporation), 26.2.2009, 8.30 p.m..

60 Presumably, the record sale was manipulated by the artist himself, who was involved as one of the buyers. Stefan Koldehoff, *Der Künstler kauft sich selbst* (The artist buys himself). <http://www.sueddeutsche.de/kultur/379/417145/bilder/?img=0.0>, 25.6.2008. Date: 10.3.2010.

61 Although Hirst was not paid guaranteed sums by the auction house, conversely he did not have to pay any commission for the delivered works. Holger Liebs, *Ich bin Kunst* (I am art). <http://www.sueddeutsche.de/kultur/85/310018/text/>, 12.9.2008. Date: 10.3.2010. See also the press release by Sotheby's at: http://www.sothebys.com/app/paddleReg/paddlereg.do?dispatch=eventDetails&event_id=28883, 15.9.2008. Date: 10.3.2010.

62 The reference to the democratisation of distribution is particularly interesting in view of the fact that some auction houses embark on sensational alliances with other players in the art business, like the gallery Haunch of Venison and Christie's, or the Saatchi Gallery and Philipps de Pury. In this way, the art market's price policy is primarily controlled by only a few.

63 Parallel to activities pertaining to being a highly successful 'art market artist', since the 1980s, Hirst is also active as a curator, producer, publisher and collector, and as such has significant influence on contemporary art discourse.

64 On this, Hirst recounts, 'I had an argument with an assistant who used to paint my spots [...] When she was leaving, and she was nervous, she said, "Well. I want a spot painting. I've painted loads for you. I've painted these spot paintings for a year, and I want one." A year in the studio, getting paid a fiver, a tenner an hour, whatever it is. So I said, "I'll give you a cheque for seventy thousand quid if you like. Why don't I just do that? Because you know you're going to sell it straight away. You know how to do it. Just make one of your own." And she said, "No I want one of yours." But the only difference between one painted by her and one of mine is money.' Damien Hirst. In: Gordon Burn, *On The Way To Work* (London, 2001), p. 82.

65 On the deterioration of Hirst's work *The Physical Impossibility of Death in the Mind of Someone Living*, Rose-Maria Gropp writes, 'if there is an icon of art from the 1990s then it is Damien Hirst's shark preserved in

formaldehyde. But now the shark is disintegrating. Are we allowed to replace the shark with a new one, or would that adulterate the authenticity of the artwork?' Rose-Maria Kropp, *Unfrischer Fisch* (Old fish). <http://www.faz.net/s/RubEBED639C476B407798B1CE808F1F6632/Doc~ECDAD35A7EA8D419F8754E3D10A0EDEEA~ATpl~Ecommon~Scontent.html>, 30.6.2006. Date: 10.4.2010.

66 Robert Preece, 'Why I Love Damien's Skull'. In: *Sculpture*. <http://www.artdesigncafe.com/IMG/pdf/why-i-love-Damien-Hirst-diamond-skull-Robert-Preece-Sculpture.pdf>. Date: 23.5.2010.

67 'Hype, Buzz, Glamour and Art. A Conversation with Patricia Ellis.' In: *Sculpture*. The analysis of the role of mass media with respect to the perception of art is also a key concern in Robert Preece's text about Tracey Emin. Preece investigates Emin's work with reference to how it is covered by media reports, i.e. to how Emin attempts to gain control by strategically inverting this process. Robert Preece, 'ARTIST over – and in – the BROADSHEETS'. In: *Parkett* (No. 63, 2001), pp. 50–54.

68 A possible reading of the work as a critique of consumerism was supported by a second work included in the exhibition, which, consisting of a large text on the gallery walls, literally functioned as the shoe's contextual frame. *A Short Catalogue of Things That You Think You Want: A Text by Zadie Smith for the Anniversary Issue of the Face*, 05/2000, 2001, consists of a text by Zadie Smith published in the magazine *Face*, in which the author reflects upon the symbiosis of art and commerce. Nicolai deliberately uses this text as a 'frame' to present thematically interrelated works. Olaf Nicolai, <<rewind>> **forward**. Susanne Pflieger & Olaf Nicolai (eds.). Exhibition catalogue, Städtische Galerie Wolfsburg (Wolfsburg Municipal Museum) (Ostfildern-Ruit, 2003), p. 152.

69 As a rule, the infringement of copyright is subject to severe punishment. Louis Vuitton sued the German Red Cross (Deutsche Rote Kreuz) aid organisation for offering a fake Louis Vuitton handbag in a second-hand clothes store in Marburg. In June 2009, *Spiegel Online* reported: 'Luxury brand files suit against charity organisation. The luxury company Louis Vuitton sues Red Cross charity shop for selling counterfeit handbag. The poor people's store has to pay the French company a fine of 2,600 euros. Politicians are indignant.' *Nobelfirma Louis Vuitton verklagt Rotes Kreuz*. www.spiegel.de/wirtschaft/0,1518,631914,00.html. Date: 22.6.2009.

70 Luc Boltanski and Ève Chiapello, *Der neue Geist des Kapitalismus* (The new spirit of capitalism) (Constance, 2003), p. 526 ff.

71 Irit Rogoff, *What is a Theorist?* <http://kein.org/node/62>, 08.4.06. Date: 12.4.2010.

72 Ibid., and Irit Rogoff, 'Was ist ein Theoretiker?' (What is a theorist?). In: Martin Hellmold et al. (eds.), *Was ist ein Künstler? Das Subjekt der modernen Kunst*. (What is an artist? The subject of modern art) (Munich, 2003), p. 274. Although both essays by Irit Rogoff cited here have different titles, they are very similar. In the second text, Rogoff emphasises that 'criticality is a significant component of visual culture and not to be separated from an open-mindedness toward new areas of knowledge and the simultaneous rejection of conventional models of analysis and theoretical allies.', *ibid.*, p.274.

73 In terms of appearance and manner of speech, Castleton/Fraser is indistinguishable from other docents in American museums.

74 'Damaged Goods Gallery Talk Starts Here'. In: Andrea Fraser, *Works. 1984 to 2003*. Yilmaz Dziewior (ed.), exhibition catalogue Kunstverein Hamburg (Cologne, 2003), p. 108. See also Andrea Fraser, 'Damaged Goods Gallery Talk Starts Here (Excerpt)', *ibid.*, pp. 240–243.

75 In *Welcome to the Wadsworth: A Museum Tour*, a project at the Wadsworth Atheneum in Hartford, Connecticut in 1991, Fraser divested herself of her alter ego. From that time on she would act under her own name.

76 *Inaugural Speech* was recorded on videotape. It exists as both a single-channel video and as a two-channel video installation. The single-channel video includes recordings of speeches by politicians and the audience's responses at the opening. In the two-channel video installation, the projection showing the artist faces the projection showing the audience opposite. This information is taken from Andrea Fraser, *Works. 1984 to 2003*, p. 194. Cf. Fraser's speech and sources cited by herself in: *ibid.*, pp. 271–275.

77 The collector received a copy of the video of the performance, published in a edition of five copies.

78 In his most recent exhibition series, Gillick expands his compiled vocabulary to explicitly include numerous locations, continuously reconfiguring it according to the institutional demands and site-specific collaborations. Responsibility is clearly delegated to the respective cooperation partners, viewers and visitors.

79 Gillick, *Renovation Filter: Recent Past and Near Future* (Bristol, 2000), p. 16.

80 See also Alexander Koch, 'Kunstfeld 8'. In: *Text – L'art pour l'art* (Issue 5, Sept. 2007), p. 3 & 5. Koch distinguishes between eight parallel fields, each with its own protagonists and value systems: the 'representational' field, the 'monetary' field, the 'corporate' field, the 'creative' field, the 'therapeutic' field and the 'emancipatory' field.

82 Of course that is not to say that there never were such alliances between opposing groups in the past. However, they were effectively blanked out as soon as the myth of art as being incorruptible was in jeopardy.

83 'Nevertheless one should not underestimate the complexity of such an entrepreneurial framework. Because traditional roles and relationships between architect, client, builder and curator no longer exist; partnerships and modes of production become highly delicate.' Markus Miessen, 'A protest against forgetting: the making of the

Tschlin library'. In: Markus Miessen (with Hans Ulrich Obrist, Ralf Pflugfelder, Arianna Ricciotti, Michelle Nicole and Rudolph Schürmann), *Save Haven* (Vol. 15, 4/2008), p. 111. For many years, Obrist's archive was located in his hometown of St. Gallen, then at the University in Lüneburg, and at the moment it is stored in an apartment in Berlin, waiting to be shipped back to Switzerland. In between, the archive toured various countries. It comprises over 20,000 books, 1,400 hours of interview tape recordings and DVDs, hundreds of postcards and assorted other artefacts. Ibid., pp. 111-112.

84 The reason for selecting a remote location is that 'visitors will have to make a deliberate attempt to come and see it. This would hopefully stimulate a serious and rigorous engagement with the archive.' Miessen, p. 114. nOffice (Markus Miessen, Magnus Nilsson, Ralf Pflugfelder) are currently planning the project's realisation.

85 Another example is the Platform Garanti Contemporary Art Centre in Istanbul, which is run by the Garanti Bank. The director of the art centre, Vasif Kortun, utilises the possibilities offered to him by the bank, but also enforces contractual measures whereby specific rights, such as access to the archive of Turkish art for example, are guaranteed in case of conflict. Conversation with Vasif Kortun (Istanbul, 30.4.2010).

86 Christiane Fricke, 'Zum Dreieck Atelier, Galerie und Museum' (On the triad of studio, gallery and museum). In: *Handelsblatt* (yet unpublished when the present publication was printed). See also: Harald Szeemann: *Kunst auf Sendung*. 3 sat online, 11.12.2003. <http://www.3sat.de/page/?source=/ard/60504/index.html>, Date: 12.5.2010

87 With respect to Koons, Niklas Maak perceives the museum's declaration of bankruptcy and self-disempowerment, 'for the New Museum was founded in 1977 so as to offer an alternative space for art beyond economic interests and established power structures. Its founder, Marcia Tucker, quit her position as curator of painting and sculpture at the Whitney Museum of American Art to invent the New Museum as a means of exhibiting alternative art alternatively. She wanted to exhibit the work by those artists who otherwise would not be exhibited. [...] Thanks to Marcia Tucker, many artists without a lobby or collectors to support them were given their first opportunity to exhibit – among them was a young man whose first exhibition at the New Museum in May 1980 included sculptures comprising brand new vacuum cleaners as "a critique of consumer culture". His name was Jeff Koons.' Niklas Maak, 'Die gekaufte Kunstgeschichte' (The bought history of art). In: *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* (No. 51, 2.3.2010), p. 31.