

Post-Soviet Art Museums in the Era of Globalization

Contemporary Art + Institutions

International conference
Friday, June 18 – Saturday, June 19, 2010
June 18, 10–18, June 19, 10–15

Kunsthau Graz, Space04

Organized by Graz University
in cooperation with Kunsthau Graz
Waltraud Bayer, Graz University;
Peter Pakesch, Kunsthau Graz
Conference language: English

This text is published on the occasion of
the international conference

**Post-Soviet Art Museums
in the Era of Globalization**

Contemporary Art + Institutions

Friday, June 18 –
Saturday, June 19, 2010

After 1990/91, with the end of Communist cultural policy, art museums in the former USSR were faced with stifling financial problems, new demands of an abruptly emerging Capitalist market economy and the urgent need to restructure as institutions. Yet, the dismal financial and institutional conditions were accompanied by an unprecedented amount of intellectual-artistic freedom as well as by open borders, unlimited access to hitherto unavailable (or tabooed) information, and direct contact with the Western art world. With traditional values and ideological guidelines abandoned, new contexts, new territories, and new orders were explored. Museums proved receptive to global trends.

This interdisciplinary conference will conquer new terrain – both thematically and methodologically. It addresses and analyses the fundamental transformation process in the field of contemporary art – a process initiated by the now legendary auction organized by Sotheby's in Moscow, 1988. The auction led to a politically motivated reassessment and commercial appreciation of art which until then had been associated with political dissent. The individual conference contributions will allow for a more nuanced knowledge and balanced analysis of the long, hard 'walk' through institutions during the 1990s and the growing reputation of contemporary art after 2000, notably after 2005, the steadily growing backing by official cultural policy as well as the increasing patronage by the new commercial elite.

Program	Session II: From Underground to a New Territory of Contemporary Art	Saturday, June 19, 2010
Friday, June 18, 2010	14:30–18:00 Chaired by Sandra Frimmel, Vaduz	Session III: Museum Development: Government, Business, People
Session I: Entering the Global World		10:00–15:00
10:00–13:00 Chaired by Peter Pakesch, Graz	Valerie L. Hillings, New York: <i>Reconciling Two Histories: Post-1953 Official and Unofficial Soviet Art in RUSSIA!</i>	Chaired by Marek Bartelik, New York
Peter Pakesch, Graz: Welcoming address		Nikolai Molok, Moscow: <i>Private or Public: Collectors vs. Museums</i>
		Sirje Helme, Tallinn: <i>Museum Politics in Independent Estonia, 1990-2010: A Period for Adaptation</i>
Waltraud Bayer, Graz: <i>From Perestroika to the Present – the Process of Institutionalization of Contemporary Art in the Post-Soviet World</i>	Konstantin Akinsha, Washington DC: <i>Culture Wars: Art vs. Religion in Post-Communist Russia</i>	Coffee Break
	Coffee Break	
Alla Rosenfeld, New York: <i>National Identity vs. Globalization in Contemporary Art: The Russian Dilemma</i>	Yuri Avvakumov, Moscow: <i>Post-Soviet Museum and Exhibition Architecture</i>	Closing discussion: <i>Sustainable Museum Infrastructure in the Post-Soviet Context</i> , chaired by Waltraud Bayer, Graz
Coffee Break		14:00–15:00 Guided Tour of Kunsthaus Graz
Marek Bartelik, New York: <i>Dissemination and Reception of New Russian Art on a Global Scale: The Case of Ilya and Emilia Kabakov</i>	Anna Zaitseva, Moscow: <i>Art Institutions 2005–2010: From the Moscow Biennale to Apartment Exhibitions</i>	
	Dinner 19:30	
Lunch Break 13:00–14:30		

Abstracts

Waltraud Bayer “From Perestroika to the Present – the Process of Institutionalization of Contemporary Art in the Post-Soviet World”

The proclamation of perestroika unleashed revolutionary changes in late and post Soviet culture that (among other aspects) fundamentally transformed the art and museum world of the USSR and its successor states. Cultural policy was revalued and repositioned; one of the immediate results was the reassessment of art history and the publicly discussed rehabilitation of those movements hitherto tabooed or simply neglected. The dual system of official and unofficial culture vanished practically overnight. What had been dubbed “other”, nonconformist or dissident art and what had been produced privately for private audiences was no longer considered unofficial. On the contrary, this art was now ideally suited to represent the late USSR abroad. Consequently, this reorientation was reflected in the changed exhibition and museum policy.

For the first time, the Graz conference project seeks to understand, describe, and analyze the process of institutionalization of contemporary art within a broad chronological frame. It comprises the past 20 years, from 1988/89/91 to 2010, starting with the commercial appreciation of nonconformist art as a result of the first international art auction organized by Sotheby’s in Moscow in July 1988 and the promise to establish a museum of modern art in Moscow. The unprecedented success on the international art market was, however, short lived; it did not translate into market

success and quick institutional reforms at home. Years of hard, slow work followed in the 1990s. Despite the liberal cultural policy under Yeltsin and despite considerable foreign support (UNESCO, EU, foundations such as Soros, Ford, etc.), success and setbacks went hand in hand.

The conference focuses on political measures and private initiative taken to establish sustainable cultural infrastructure. It considers the creation of departments of contemporary art in traditional museums such as the Tretyakov Gallery, Moscow, the Russian Museum and the Hermitage, St. Petersburg. It draws attention to such bold projects as the Perm (Contemporary) Arts Museum, the projected ‘Russian Bilbao’ in the Urals. It concentrates on the strategic function of the National Centre of Contemporary Art (NCCA, 1992) and its systematic build-up of a national network which as of now maintains several branches in major Russian cities. In addition, the conference considers the increasing relevance of international art fairs and biennials (Art Moscow, Moscow International biennial of CA since 2005) as well as the Russian representation at major analogous foreign events which (were) are financed or co-financed by the Russian government.

As a result, institutions instrumental in training future art and museum specialists (universities, academies) gradually acquired a new profile: they adopted new aesthetic norms; they hired new personnel (e.g. Ajdan Salakhova, Russian Academy of Arts, RAKh). To be sure, this process has only started and the main work has so far been carried out by privately founded institutions such as the Moscow-based Institute of Problems

of CA (Iosif Bakshtejn) and several master classes (established at NCCA and later at MMoMA). The latter ones were instrumental in addressing questions of institutional critique and formulating alternative canons and structures.

In the Russian context, the interrelation between market, art and politics is especially close. Be it the sponsoring of art events by the new economic elite, corporate collecting, privately-run galleries, donations – contemporary art is widely dependant on private initiative and corporate wealth. After 2004/5, this close interrelation has become even more influential.

One aspect to be discussed is the increasing role of religion especially that of the Orthodox Church and groups affiliated with it. Notably since 2003, religious and political lobbying groups act as censor incriminating contemporary art (see the court cases against the organizers of the exhibitions “Caution, religion!”, also “Forbidden Art”, Russia 2)

Besides, the conference addresses the role of the city administrations, for instance the foundation of the Moscow Museum of Modern Art by mayor, Yuri Luzhkov, and the president of the art academy, Zurab Cereteli, a politically prestigious but (until most recently) publically much criticized project. In this respect, it is useful to compare developments in other Soviet successor states, notably the former Baltic republics which quickly and visibly responded to new international trends after 1990/91. The foundation of KUMU, Tallinn, Estonia, was a milestone in this development and is thus represented here.

Chronologically, the conference topic ends with the proclamation of cultural minister Avdeev in July 2009 to establish a federal museum of new art in Moscow on the premises of the NCCA.

The aim of the conference is to shed light on the process of the institutionalization of CA over the past 20 years by drawing on new empirical data, an innovative theoretical approach and the interdisciplinary expertise of international experts in art, culture and museum studies, architecture, as well as curators and art critics. Based on this approach, the conference seeks to analyze the peculiarities of the post-Soviet development in relation to the overall international trends.

Alla Rosenfeld “National Identity vs. Globalization in Contemporary Art: The Russian Dilemma”

Globalization is generally identified as the acceleration and intensification of interconnectedness among the people, financial enterprises, cultures, and governments of different nations, stemming from advances in transportation, communication, and information technologies. This interconnectedness has, in turn, given rise to the political, economic, and cultural convergence of nations formerly separated by ideological and other differences – a striking contrast to the bipolarity that divided East and West during the years of the Cold War. While some writers anticipated that globalization would lead to a homogeneous global culture, the last decade has shown that this notion, like other cultural and sociological theories on the subject, did not hold true; the world today, as before, is far from unified.

The careers of various contemporary Russian artists dramatically illustrate one of the leading effects of globalization: individuals' increased access to countries or cultures that were formerly inaccessible, due to ideology, geography, or a combination of the two. Some Russian artists, for example, have American green cards or hold dual citizenship – Russian and American, or Russian and European. And through enhanced opportunities for international networking, numerous Russian artists have established contacts with foreign galleries that are now representing them and their work. Indeed, the art world has become so de-centered that nowadays it's not unusual for a Russian artist to

live in New York or Berlin and have a solo exhibition in Moscow.

My presentation offers some tentative reflections on the complex and ambiguous role of globalization in post-Soviet visual culture, seeking to address questions such as the following: Has contemporary Russian art expanded its purview, or has it remained more localized in its vision? If some Russian artists have successfully transformed their cultural difference in order to enhance their international art-world appeal, does it mean that their art has lost its distinctive national identity, its innate Russianness? Do those Russian artists who emigrated to the West enjoy a special “national” distinction in the international art market, or are they simply considered international contemporary artists much like, for example, their American, French, or German counterparts? Generally speaking, can the traditional coexist alongside the effects of cultural globalization?

My lecture will demonstrate how important Russian émigré artists such as Erik Bulatov, Vitaly Komar and Alexander Melamid, Alexander Kosolapov, Leonid Lamm, and Leonid Sokov have preserved the roots of their indigenous Russian culture, albeit with varying degrees of attachment to their native cultural context. These artists consider themselves both a part of the post-Soviet art scene, as well as participants in the international discourse on contemporary art.

Marek Bartelik
“Dissemination and Reception of New Russian Art on a Global Scale: The Case of Ilya and Emilia Kabakov”

This presentation will focus on the reception and dissemination of works by Ilya Kabakov (and his wife Emilia, later) after the artist obtained his first major commission in the West – *The Supper*, from the Kunstverein in Graz in 1987 – and had his first “total installation” presented at Ronald Feldmann Gallery in New York City in 1988. Ilya Kabakov’s activities will be placed in the context of the international success of Russian art in the late 1980s and early 1990s and its public reception. What attracts the Western viewer and art institutions to the “political cosmology” of Ilya and Emilia Kabakov? Special attention will be paid to the international position of the Russian artists, as the ones who have superbly contextualized and conceptualized the Soviet and Russian experience in their works, while blurring the boundaries between the real experience of the *homo sovieticus* and the ideas related to that cultural and political construct developed in the West during and prior the Cold War period.

Valerie L. Hillings
“Reconciling Two Histories: Post-1953 Official and Unofficial Soviet Art in RUSSIA!”

In 2005, a team of Russian and American curators was assembled by the Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation to organize *RUSSIA!*, a major survey exhibition of Russian art from icons to the present under the patronage of then-President Vladimir Putin. After a successful run at the Guggenheim Museum in New York, it was decided to take a slightly retooled version of the show to the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao in 2006.

The section of RUSSIA! dedicated to art since 1953 presented the curatorial team with the challenge of how to negotiate the period of history when Socialist Realism was the official style in the Soviet Union yet artists working unofficially were pioneering innovative approaches widely considered in retrospect to be more significant contributions to art history. The unique architecture of the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum had an impact on how the curatorial team could narrate these parallel chapters. Both were presented on the same ramp of the museum, thereby forcing their simultaneous division and juxtaposition within the same space. Moreover, the import of inclusion or exclusion of given artists within what was ostensibly a survey of the stars of Russian art history made the selection process particularly complex.

In an effort to address imperfections in the New York exhibition, the curatorial team paid close attention to this section when reconfiguring it for Bilbao, making both conceptual and spatial

changes that altered how the material was presented. While the members of the curatorial team were able to correct some of the perceived problems of the New York presentation, they still encountered some irresolvable challenges in bringing together official and unofficial Soviet art within a single framework.

In this paper, I will outline the historical and curatorial issues that my co-curators and I considered in determining the checklist for this section of the *RUSSIA!* exhibition in both New York and Bilbao. Looking at this topic from the perspective of both curator and art historian, I will seek to elucidate differences in how one can navigate this period in the format of an exhibition versus a text. And in so doing, I will seek to provide a provisional answer to the question: how might we reconcile the past in dealing with this period of Soviet art history in the present?

Konstantin Akinsha
“Culture Wars: Art vs. Religion in Post-Communist Russia”

Conflict between contemporary artists and religious activists, often supported both by the church hierarchy and the government officials started in Russia in 1989. Avdei Ter-Ogon’an became its first hero and casualty. His performance *The Young Godless*, an ironic comment about the history of the Soviet state-sponsored atheism and the new role of the Orthodox Church in the post-communist Russia provoked public outcry. The prosecutor’s office instituted investigation accusing the artist in violation of the article 282 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation about “Incitement of hatred, or enmity, and also about humiliation of human dignity.” Ter-Ogon’an left the country and after few years spent in a refugee camp was granted political asylum in the Czech Republic. The case of Ter-Ogon’an proved to be just a touchstone. The law about “Incitement of hatred” proved to be a useful device in the hands of the officials, who started to use it against contemporary art establishing the situation of de facto censorship.

In January 2003 the exhibition *Caution, Religion* organized by the Andrei Sakharov Museum and Public Center was pogromed by a group of thugs. However it was not the radicals, who faced the legal prosecution. In March of 2005 despite of loud protests of human rights groups the Court of Taganskii district of Moscow found Yurii Samodurov, the director of the museum, and Ludmila Vasilevskaia, the official of the center guilty of inciting the hatred against religion and sentenced them to the fine of 100.000 rubles each.

The victory of the religious fundamentalists on one hand led to the increase of self-censorship in museums and different institutions dealing with contemporary art. From another hand it inspired religious group to initiate “copy-cat cases”, such as the current case against the Andrei Erofeev and Yurii Samodurov, organizers of the exhibition *Prohibited Art* – 2006.

The conflict between contemporary art and religion in Russia today has tendency to develop into the war between art and new state ideology established by Putin’s/Medvedev’s government.

Yuri Avvakumov “Post-Soviet Museum and Exhibition Architecture”

Twenty years has been sufficient time for a change to take place in the space of contemporary art. For example twenty years ago in international practice, museum functionalism was replaced by spatial minimalism, the museum as building took on the look of an attractive sculpture, former factory buildings were added to museum spaces. With the exception of the latter, and even in that case with some provisos (former Moscow industrial buildings Winzavod and the Garage are purely exhibition spaces), these architectural trends have passed Russia by, largely because the contemporary art museum in Russia has never been part of the global tourist industry and is not presented as profitable. With the exception of Moscow and St Petersburg, and more recently Perm, contemporary art exhibitions attract minimal numbers of visitors and don’t require any special conditions. In Russia contemporary art has yet to enter the public space of cities. The changes in the exhibition of visual art took place at the same time as in the art itself, which grew in size literally before our eyes, attempting to work together with the space and with multimedia. The net curtains, hanging wires and carpet runners disappeared from the exhibition spaces. As did the so-called “central displays”, the specially-designed exhibition panels which were meant to symbolise the basic idea behind the exhibition. The division between the lower category of exhibition (non-figurative art) and the higher category (figurative, “ideologically” responsible art) disappeared from the state evaluation of project planning.

Accordingly, gallery exhibitions and art fair booths look exactly like their western counterparts. Since not a single contemporary art museum has been built in the country in the past 20 years there is no comparison to be made on that score. One can only reflect on government policy in this area.

Anna Zaitseva “Art Institutions 2005-2010: From the Moscow Biennale to Apart- ment Exhibitions”

Today the infrastructure of contemporary art and its merits and shortcomings (i.e., the question of institutions that form the art milieu) is being actively discussed in Russia. The very foundations for such discussions appeared relatively recently after *Perestroika*. This is understandable, because only official art had an infrastructure during the Soviet period, while the only institutions of the “underground” (the forerunner of contemporary Russian art) were artists’ studios and apartments, whilst the artists themselves were simultaneously critics, curators, theorists, and viewers. The social changes have impacted the art scene as well: the first private gallery appeared in 1989, the National Centre for Contemporary Arts was founded in 1992, and the ArtMoscow Fair was first held in 1996. All of this opened contemporary art to the public at large, yet its audience continued to be a few hundred adepts. One can say without exaggerating that the turning point was the Moscow Biennale that first took place in 2005. It brought contemporary art to an audience of unprecedented size and changed its social status. On the surge of public interest in contemporary art, several centers opened in Moscow in the 2000s. They include, in chronological order, Proekt_Fabrika (founded in 2005), the Winzavod Centre for Contemporary Art (2006), and the Garage Center for Contemporary Culture (2008), whose activities will be examined in the report in more detail. At the same time, one should mention another trend of the past two years: numerous examples of the self-organization of

artists, especially the young ones. We are referring in particular to the revival of apartment exhibitions and the organization of the first artist-run fair entitled Universam in the autumn of 2009. These artists' initiatives are a critical response to the particularities of institution-building in Russia in the 2000s and promote reflection on current problems. They will be discussed in the final part of the report.

Nikolai Molok **“Private or Public: Collectors vs. Museums”**

1. Most of today's museums arose from private collections. As a result of expropriation (nationalization) or according to the collectors' will. Some collectors gave their art treasures to the state (Tretiakov), others established private museums (Shchukin).

2. History of art-collecting in post-Soviet Russia is rather short – 15 to 20 years. In spite of this, many collectors have already started to think about their collections' future. Indeed, just few of them are ready neither to share with state museums nor to establish a private museum. The reason for the first is quite obvious: state museums in Russia don't have enough money to care about just another set of art works (some museums don't have money even for insurance purposes), so collectors are worried whether or not their pieces are included in a respective museum's permanent collection, not less than how their items are preserved there.

There are three main reasons of private collectors' unwillingness to establish private museums: 1. private collectors distrust the state (“new nationalization to follow”) – this attitude dates back to the Soviet era, but is still an issue; 2. they consider post-Communist Russian society as being not ready to appreciate private collecting as a form of private property (many Russians still think that art works available at auctions organized by Sotheby's or Christie's should not be sold but returned to Russia as a part of national heritage); 3. private collectors (of traditional Russian art, first of all) understand quite well that their collections are of less importance than

those of the state museums (“why to go to a private museum if you have the Tretiakov Gallery”).

3. Behind this there is one more – and most considerable – reason: there is no articulate understanding of what is required to found a private museum, and what its functions are. Igor Markin's Art4.ru museum in Moscow is the only experiment up to date. But because of the global crisis, this experiment seems to be all over. At the moment Stella Kesaeva is the only Russian collector to declare openly her willingness to establish her private museum in the near future.

4. Museum exhibitions of private collections are the most appropriate answer to the 'private-public' dilemma today. Marat Guelman, Viktor Bondarenko, Pierre Brochet among others have shown their collections in the museums throughout Russia, Stella Kesaeva – in the museums in Vienna and Venice. But this is not just about museumification of a private collection, but rather about obtaining of some museum experience.

Sirje Helme **“Museum Politics in Independent Estonia, 1990–2010: A Period for Adaptation”**

The main issue of my paper is how the extreme decade – the 1990s – influenced today's Estonian art, the attitude of artists and value criteria. My aim is not to offer an overview of the events and artists, but to focus on the following issues:

1. Specifying the concept – what is contemporary art in recent Estonian art history? We have consensually made a forceful decision – with this term we determine art from 1990/1991. We thus get rid of discourses with which we tackle art during all but the very end of the Soviet era. To treat the Soviet period, we rely on discourses of the so-called different modernisms and different avant-gardes.

2. The major factors for change in the early 1990s included financial aid from George Soros and political interest in supporting the country which had regained its independence. Internally, the decisive element was the change of generations; the most significant artists now were those who graduated in the late 1980s or were still studying in the early 1990s.

3. The most original activity in the 1990s that gave the best artistic results was focusing on the e-world and its relevant possibilities. There was fascination not only with the new opportunities available to artists, but also with more extensive theoretical problems such as freedom on the internet, interactivity, community and identity in the global infosphere, strategies for

participation etc. This resulted in the series of conferences and exhibitions entitled *Interstanding*. The same period boosted the Estonian video art as well. Today's development is the opposite – there is an increased interest in, for example, painting. The part of video art is marginal (except for the artists of the 1990s). At the same time, entering the digital world has proceeded painlessly. Artists use the virtual world to explain their ideas (blogs, Facebook etc), although they have more faith in the material world.

4. The early 1990s were free of institutions; it was a kind of wild time. The state lacked all means of realising a clear cultural policy. The Ministry of Culture, state museums, the Artists' Association and other institutions played no particular role in art life during the first half of the 1990s. The financial sources were the Soros Contemporary Art Centre and since 1994, the independent Cultural Endowment, which has become the main source of financing culture. An essential element of the process of institutionalisation was the opening in 2006 of the new museum, the Kumu Art Museum. In 2008 Kumu was elected as Museum of the Year by the European Museum Forum. With the strengthening of the role of the Art Museum of Estonia, various non-profit artistic organisations have emerged as opposition, mainly in order to organise exhibitions of young artists. This shows the different trends and integrity of the development of local art life.

In sum: the 1990s created a space that largely influenced and determined the development of art also in the subsequent decade. The period of adaptation

and change was drawing to close during the second half of the last decade, and the Art Museum of Estonia had an essential role in it.

Konstantin Akinsha

born in Kiev, Ukraine, attended Shevchenko Art School (B. A. degree in painting), Kiev, later studied art history (Moscow State University, M.A.), Ph.D. (University of Edinburgh). Professor, researcher, lecturer, curator, and art critic. Restitution specialist, member of Presidential Advisory Commission on Holocaust Assets in the United States, Washington, DC. Author of numerous publications, among them: *The Holy Place* (New Heaven: Yale University Press. Fall 2007, co-authored with Gregorii Kozlov and Sylvia Hochfield); *AAM Guide for Provenance Research* (Washington DC: American Association of Museums, 2001, co-authored with Nancy Yeide and Amy Walsh); *Beautiful Loot: Soviet Plunder of European Art Treasures* (New York: Random House, 1995, co-authored with Gregorii Kozlov and Sylvia Hochfield).

Yuri Avvakumov

Moscow architect, artist, curator, born in Tiraspol in 1957. He graduated from the Moscow Architectural Institute in 1981. Since the early 1980s he has worked with the heritage of the Russian Avant-garde, with AGITARCH studio since 1988. 1984–2000: Curator of and participation in the exhibitions of PAPER ARCHITECTURE (genre of conceptual design in the late USSR) in Moscow, Ljubljana, Paris, London, Milan, Frankfurt, Cologne, Brussels, Zürich, Cambridge, New Orleans, Austin, Amherst, Volgograd etc. Participated in the Venice Biennale several times – in 1996 ('Sensing the Future: The Architect as Seismograph'), in 2003 ('Utopia Station') and in 2008 ('BORNHOUSE'). His work is represented in numerous public collections: State Russian Museum, St. Petersburg/

State Tretyakov Gallery, Moscow/State Museum of Architecture, Moscow/Deutsches Architekturmuseum, Frankfurt-am-Main/Victoria & Albert Museum, London/ZKM Museum of New Art, Karlsruhe/Stella Art Foundation etc.

Marek Bartelik

teaches modern and contemporary art at The Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science and Art in New York City. He has also taught art theory at Yale and MIT. Dr. Bartelik is a graduate critic-in-residence at the Maryland Institute College of Art in Baltimore, Maryland. Currently, he serves as a Co-President of AICA-USA and Vice President of AICA International.

Waltraud Bayer

is a senior research fellow (PD, senior-post doc) at Graz University, Austria, specializing in Russian and (post-) Soviet cultural and museum studies. She teaches, lectures, and writes on collecting, museums, and the art market in Eastern Europe. Her book publications include 'Die Moskauer Medici: Der russische Bürger als Mäzen, 1850 bis 1917' (1996, *The Moscow Medici: Bourgeois Art Patronage in Tsarist Russia*), 'Verkaufte Kultur: Die sowjetischen Kunst- und Antiquitätenexporte, 1919–1938' (2001, *Russia's Sold National Treasure: Art Exports to the West*), and 'Gerettete Kultur: Private Kunstsammler in der Sowjetunion, 1917–1991' (2006, *Private Art Collectors in the Soviet Union*).

Sandra Frimmel

born 1977, studied art history and literature in Berlin and St. Petersburg and graduated from the Humboldt University Berlin. She co-curated several exhibitions in Russia and Germany and from 2007–2009 co-founded and co-run an exhibition space in Berlin. Since 2008 she is working as curatorial assistant in Kunstmuseum Liechtenstein, Vaduz. She lives in Berlin and Zurich. In her research she focuses on Russian contemporary art, especially on the correlation between artistic, social, and political processes. She is currently working on a dissertation about art in court in Russia from 1990, especially stressing the exhibition *Beware, Religion!* 2003.

Publications include: „Von Perestrojka bis Putin. Die russische Gegenwartskunst zwischen künstlerischer Autonomie und staatlicher Kontrolle“, in Arina Kowner (Ed.): *Passion Bild. Russische Kunst seit 1970. Die Sammlung Arina Kowner*, Zurich 2010; „Künstlerische Botschaften aus der Lagune. Der sowjet-russische Pavillon auf der Biennale di Venezia 1990 zwischen Modernisierungsbestrebungen und Kulturkolonialismus“, in Velminski, Wladimir (Ed.): *Sendungen. Mediale Konturen zwischen Botschaft und Fernsicht*, Bielefeld 2009; „How Free are the Arts in Russia Today?“, in *kultura (Russian Cultural Review)* 4/2007 (guest editor); *New Forms of Dialogue Between Art and Society. kultura (Russian Cultural Review)* 4/2006 (guest editor).

Sirje Helme

graduated in art history from Tartu University, Estonia, in 1973; MA in 1995; PhD studies at the Estonian Art Academy on post-war modernism and avant-garde in Estonia. Since 1974, she served as editor, and later as editor-in-chief of the Estonian art magazine 'Kunst' ('Art'). She is an art critic, lecturer, curator and administrator; from 1992–2005 she acted as director of the Center for Contemporary Arts, Estonia, and from 2005–2009 as director of Kumu Art Museum. Since January 2009 she has been director-general of Art Museum of Estonia (including Kumu). Numerous publications, among them in Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Russia, Finland, Poland, Germany, Denmark, USA etc. Together with Prof. Jaak Kangilaski, she co-authored the book 'A Concise History of Estonian Art'. She has curated exhibitions in Poland, Hungary, Germany, Finland, Russia, Estonia. From 1999 up to 2005 she served as Estonian commissioner of the Venice Art Biennale. In her academic life she has concentrated on the theory and history of Estonian post-war art. She is a lecturer at Tartu University and the Estonian Academy of Arts.

Valerie L. Hillings

earned her B.A. with distinction in art history from Duke University and her M.A. and Ph.D. in art history from the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University, where she concentrated on 20th-century European and American art, with a special focus in Russian art. Dr. Hillings joined the curatorial staff of the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum in 2004, and since that time she has coordinated, curated, and co-curated exhibitions at the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, the Guggenheim

Museum Bilbao, Deutsche Guggenheim, the Guggenheim-Hermitage Museum, as well as other venues in Europe and Australia. Her exhibition projects have included *RUSSIA!*, Hanne Darboven's *Hommage à Picasso; The Guggenheim; and Picturing America: Photorealism in the 1970s*, among others. In late 2009, she was appointed Associate Curator of Collection and Exhibitions for the Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation's Abu Dhabi Project. Dr. Hillings is tasked with working on collection building and exhibition planning for the future Guggenheim Abu Dhabi Museum, scheduled to open in Abu Dhabi, the United Arab Emirates, in 2013. In addition to her Guggenheim assignments, she has published and publicly lectured on various topics in post-World War II and Russian art in Australia, Europe, the Middle East, and North America. From 2007 to 2009 she served on the jury for the Kandinsky Prize for Russian contemporary art.

Nikolai Molok

born 1969, Moscow.
1991: graduated from Moscow State University, Art History Department
1991–2003: State Institute of Art Studies, Moscow
1993: post-graduate student, Central European Institute, Prague
1997: Ph.D. History of Art
1996–2000: Itogi Magazine, art section writer
2000/01: Vremya Novostey Newspaper, art section writer
2001–06: Izvestia Newspaper, art section writer
2002–09: ArtChronika Magazine, editor-in-chief
Since 2009: Stella Art Foundation, Director of Development
Numerous publications, among them the

catalogue editions of the Moscow Contemporary Art Biennale II ('Footnotes on geopolitics, market, and amnesia', 2007) and III ('Against Exclusion', 2009)

Peter Pakesch

studied architecture at the Graz University of Technology, 1973–1979. While still a student, he worked for the Forum Stadtpark and the steirischer herbst as an artist and exhibition manager. After living in the USA, he started his own art gallery in Vienna in 1981. In 1985, he co-founded the Grazer Kunstverein society together with Helmut Strobl. Until 1986 he was the society's artistic director. Following various international exhibition projects, he was the manager of the Kunsthalle Basel from 1996 to 2003. In January 2003 he was appointed Artistic Director and Artistic Manager of the Universalmuseum Joanneum. The main focus of his work in 2003 was to position the Kunsthaus Graz and develop a program for it.

Alla Rosenfeld

is a Research Associate for European Evaluators in New York. From October 2006 to February 2009, Dr. Rosenfeld was Vice President and Senior Specialist for Russian Paintings at Sotheby's, New York. Prior to joining Sotheby's in 2006, she worked at the Jane Voorhees Zimmerli Art Museum, Rutgers University, N.J. She was Curator of Russian Art at the Zimmerli from 1992 to 2006, and also served as Director of the Zimmerli's Russian Art Department from 2002 to 2006. During Dr. Rosenfeld's tenure at the Zimmerli, she organized many exhibitions of Russian and Soviet art and was an editor, co-editor, and/or contributor to numerous publications,

including *Art of the Baltics* (Rutgers University Press and the Jane Voorhees Zimmerli Art Museum, 2002); *Defining Russian Graphic Arts, 1898–1934* (Rutgers University Press and the Jane Voorhees Zimmerli Art Museum, 1999); From *Gulag to Glasnost* (Thames and Hudson, 1995). Dr. Rosenfeld's independent curatorial projects include the traveling exhibition *A World of Stage* (2007), presented at the National Museum of Modern Art, Kyoto, and the Metropolitan Teien Art Museum, Tokyo, among other venues. She has lectured widely on Russian art topics both in the U.S. and abroad at locations that include the Museum of Modern Art and the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum. Dr. Rosenfeld has taught many courses at Rutgers University during her tenure as Curator of Russian Art at the Zimmerli. Dr. Rosenfeld received her M.A. in the theory and history of art at the Academy of Fine Arts, St. Petersburg, Russia, in 1987, and her Ph.D. in modern and contemporary art at the Graduate Center, City University of New York, in 2003.

Anna Zaitseva

born 1978, Moscow. Art Historian. She graduated from the State Russian University for Humanities, Moscow, and from the Institute of Contemporary Art, Moscow.

2008: Award winner 'Innovation-2008' (State Prize in the field of CA), nomination in the category 'Curatorial project of the year' (for the exhibition 'Apples Fall Simultaneously in Different Orchards')

2006/07: director for exhibition program of the Moscow Biennale Art Foundation. Since 2007 member on the Advisory Board of the WINZAVOD Centre for Contemporary Art, Moscow

2003–05: 1st Moscow Biennale of Contemporary Art, chief project coordinator & catalogue editor

2003: *In Between Spaces*, curator, in collaboration with Max Ilyukhin, Central House of Artist, Moscow

2002–04: *Moscow-Berlin. Berlin-Moscow, 1950–2000*, project coordinator and assistant catalogue editor

Sponsoring/funding:

**FWF, Austrian Science Fund
bm.w.f, Austrian Federal
Ministry of Science and
Research**

FWF
Der Wissenschaftsfonds.

BM.W.F^a
Bundesministerium für Wissenschaft und Forschung