

**Q1 WHY DO YOU GO  
TO ART FAIRS  
AND BIENNALES?**

1-29

**Q2 IS THE GROWING  
DIVERSITY OF MODELS  
PRESENTING LARGE  
SURVEYS OF ARTISTS  
A GOOD DEVELOPMENT  
FOR PRODUCING  
NETWORKS?**

31-49

**Q3 HOW DOES THE  
ART MARKET IMPACT  
ON YOUR INVOLVEMENT  
IN ART?**

51-67

**+ HOW DID YOU START  
SELLING YOUR WORK?  
COLLECTING?**

69-79

## CONTRIBUTORS

- John Armleder** ..... 35, 55  
Artist
- Sarah Baker** ..... 24, 48, 66  
PILOT:2 artist
- Lars Bang Larsen** ..... 23, 47, 65  
Writer and curator
- Nathan J.D. Barlex** ..... 24, 48, 66, 78  
PILOT:1 artist
- Beagles & Ramsay** ..... 22, 45, 64, 77  
Artists collaborative
- Kjetil Berge** ..... 10, 37, 55, 73  
Artist
- Thorsten Brinkmann** ..... 23, 47, 65, 77  
PILOT:2 artist
- Mikko Canini** ..... 16, 43, 62, 76  
Artist
- Ruth Claxton** ..... 4, 36, 54, 72  
PILOT:1 artist
- Céline Condorelli** ..... 5, 35, 53, 72  
Architect
- Caroline Corbetta** ..... 23, 42, 62  
Independent curator
- Kerry Duggan** ..... 20, 46, 64, 77  
Artist
- Flora Fairbairn** ..... 7, 35, 54, 72  
Curator/art consultant
- Berit Fisher** ..... 18, 43  
Independent curator
- Free Association** ..... 2, 33, 52, 70  
Independent curatorial group
- Jean-Claude Freymond-Guth** ..... 26, 49, 67, 77  
Artist and curator *Les Complices\**, Zurich
- Helen Frik** ..... 9, 37, 73  
PILOT:1 artist
- Filomeno Fusco** ..... 26, 49, 67  
Director *Feld fur Kunst*
- Rainer Ganahl** ..... 8, 37, 54, 73  
Artist
- Pauline Graham** ..... 25, 49, 66, 78  
Collector
- Rosanna Guy Greaves** ..... 17, 43, 62, 76  
Artist
- Bruce Haines** ..... 16, 43, 61, 76  
Curator
- Chris Hammond** ..... 4, 34, 53, 70  
Director *MOT*
- Tzu Nien Ho** ..... 13, 41, 58, 74  
PILOT:2 artist
- Elinor Jansz** ..... 13, 41, 60  
Publisher *Four Corners Books*
- Deirdre King** ..... 10, 39, 57, 74  
Artist
- Klega** ..... 27  
Artist
- Pil & Galia Kollektiv** ..... 2, 34, 53, 71  
Artists
- I-Chen Kuo** ..... 4, 34, 53, 70  
PILOT:2 Artist
- Juozas Laivys** ..... 24, 48, 66, 77  
PILOT:2 artist
- Seulgi Lee** ..... 11, 40, 58, 74  
PILOT:2 artist
- Jiyoon Lee** ..... 23, 47, 65  
Art critic and independent curator
- Jean-Conrad Lemaitre** ..... 15, 43, 61, 75  
Collector
- Peter Lewis** ..... 18, 44, 63, 76  
Curator *Redux*

**David Mabb**..... 6, 34, 53, 72  
 Artist and course leader MA Fine Art Goldsmiths

**Rory Macbeth** ..... 7, 44, 62, 78  
 Artist and co-founder of PILOT

**Nicole Mollett**..... 13, 38, 56, 73  
 PILOT:1 artist

**David Mollin** ..... 12, 40, 58, 74  
 PILOT:1 artist

**Syd Mostow**..... 22, 46, 65  
 PILOT:2 artist

**Lars Nilsson** ..... 11, 39, 57, 74  
 PILOT:2 artist

**Matthew Poole**..... 24, 39, 66  
 Co-director MA in Gallery Studies, University of Essex, and co-founder of PILOT

**Max Presneill** ..... 8, 36, 54, 72  
 Artist and director *Raid Projects* (Los Angeles) and *Mark Moore Gallery* (Santa Monica)

**Victoria Preston**..... 9, 38, 56  
 Independent curator

**Sean Rogg**..... 11, 40, 58  
 PILOT:2 artist

**Giorgio Sadotti**..... 11, 39, 57, 74  
 Artist

**Hideuki Sawayanagi** ..... 12, 40, 58, 75  
 PILOT:2 artist

**Liliane Schneiter**..... 22, 46, 64  
 Art historian

**Gabriela Schutz**..... 8, 36, 73  
 PILOT:1 artist

**Liam Scully**..... 9, 37, 55, 73  
 PILOT:1 artist

**Dallas Seitz**..... 3, 33, 52, 70  
 Artist and director of *1000000mph* projects

**Neville Shulman**..... 26, 49, 67, 78  
 Explorer, writer, mountaineer, director  
*International Theatre Institute*, chair of *Theatre Forum*, collector

**Terry Smith**..... 26, 48, 66, 78  
 Artist

**Polly Staple**..... 7, 37, 56  
*Frieze Art Fair* curator and editor at large *frieze*

**Tayto et Tayto**..... 4, 35, 53, 71  
 La Pomme de Terre a Basé des Facilitators

**Tercerunquinto**..... 21, 45, 64, 77  
 PILOT:2 Artists

**John Timberlake**..... 9, 38, 55, 74  
 Artist and writer

**Gijsbrecht Van Der Heul**..... 12, 40, 60, 75  
 Artist

**Andrea Viliani** ..... 14, 41, 60  
 Curator

**Danh Vo**..... 17, 44, 63  
 PILOT:2 artist

**Edward Wakefield**..... 13, 41, 58  
 Artist and sea captain

**Jeni Walwin** ..... 20, 45, 63  
 Independent curator and writer

**Lawrence Weiner**..... 6, 35, 53, 71  
 Artist

**Ray White** ..... 32  
 Freelance curator

**Ed Young**..... 14, 42, 60, 75  
 PILOT:2 artist

**WHY DO YOU GO  
TO ART FAIRS  
AND BIENNALES?**

**IS THE GROWING  
DIVERSITY OF MODELS  
PRESENTING LARGE  
SURVEYS OF ARTISTS  
A GOOD DEVELOPMENT  
FOR PRODUCING  
NETWORKS?**

**HOW DOES THE ART  
MARKET IMPACT ON  
YOUR INVOLVEMENT  
IN ART?**

Q1

WHY DO YOU GO  
TO ART FAIRS  
AND BIENNALES?**Free Association***Independent curatorial group*

**Art fairs** We visit art fairs because of our chosen profession. They attract artists, and art professionals. They present an important chance to gather information and meet colleagues (existing and new). They are an expanded playground where a large selection of private sector arts activities unites in a single location for a brief period of time.

**Biennales** Biennales are interesting because they reflect the cultural and political ambitions of the cities and countries that stage them.

**Pil & Galia Kollektiv***Artists*

**Art fairs** All art fairs are modelled on the great exhibition of 1851, widely regarded as the eighth wonder of the world in the eyes of the proud millions, nearly a third of the entire population of Britain at the time, who stormed the Crystal Palace as if it were the Gucci stall at Selfridges on the first day of Spring sale: a perfect display of Victorian Imperialism aided by the might of scientific progress.

There is only one God at the contemporary art fair and that is the market. The ideological ardour of the great exhibition is replaced with a cold professionalism, the noisy industrial machinery with IBM-like cubicles, the bewildered cries of the masses with the rustle of silk ties. This is not to say, of course, that art and commerce should be mutually exclusive. On the contrary, romantic notions like the suffering, social incompetence and poverty of the artist have marginalised art and severely damaged its truly subversive potential. In this respect, the art fair's frank display of exchange value is actually a refreshing alternative to the discretely invisible economy of the gallery – anyone who's known the pleasures of late night Tesco disco can't object too much to the idea of an art supermarket.

But this is the wrong kind of market, the wrong kind of economy. Definitely not your neighbourhood friendly independent record shop,

Q1

not even Tesco on a weeknight, but more of a mega-DFS – repetitive, synthetic and unpleasantly lit, where medium range decorative objects are handed over to nice suburban couples for a reasonable price. The equivalent of the high street flagship megastore, the populist aesthetic of the art fair has its appeal. We go to browse and sneer and be overwhelmed.

Nevertheless, being neither quite so affordable nor entirely representative of most still staunchly traditional art commerce, we find the art fair insufficient. We need supermarkets to ride up and down superfast with our trolleys, but more farmers' markets, shops and boutiques still need to be established, alongside other models of artistic consumer activity.

**Biennales** (See above) Biennales are just supermarkets with no tills, where all discussion of money is prohibited even though the same interests ultimately govern them too. Polite and politically correct messages are tacked on to raise the credibility of work involved by the time it reaches the art fairs.

**Dallas Seitz***Artist and director of 1000000mph projects*

**Art fairs** I have only really gone to art fairs for the last few years and only in London. I have said before that art fairs are for dealers and collectors not for seeing a good show as they are an overall look at who a gallery is representing and generally not a considered show. It is of interest for myself to see how much works are selling for, who are the big commercial successes of that fair and which galleries are representing which artists.

I also see the art fair as a place of networking. Collectors like to meet the artist they are buying and I suppose it is good business on the artists' part to be on hand for these types of meetings. But they are set up like any other market and I always expect that towards the end of the fair you will spot dealers waving works in the air and shouting out "two for a fiver."

**Biennales** I have gone to a few biennales to support friends showing there, to see a wide range

of international artists often not visible, and to get a sense of what concerns are being investigated by artists and curators world-wide.

I am often disappointed as an artist and find that, like so many facets of the art world, biennales are now completely commercially led. They have become, again, a place for dealers and curators to go shopping.

### Chris Hammond

Director *MOT*

**Art fairs** I try not to unless invited. I don't find an art fair to be a particularly interesting context in which to view work, although I must admit a slight fascination with the art world's desire to celebrate its dependence upon the market.

Sometimes they offer the only opportunity to view a particular artist's work and for that reason I might be tempted along.

**Biennales** I would choose to go to biennales on the same principle, as a guest or if there was something of particular interest that I wanted to see. Biennales are like any other exhibition, there are good ones and bad ones, they are just a lot bigger and therefore have the potential to succeed or fail on a larger scale. I much prefer the intimacy of the isolated exhibition.

### I-Chen Kuo

PILOT:2 artist

A curator recommended me to participate in these kinds of activities, and I, myself, love to create new artwork constantly.

### Tayto et Tayto

*La Pomme de Terre a Basé des Facilitators*

Tayto go to art fairs to pick up loose lady but to biennales to find a love wife.

### Ruth Claxton

PILOT:1 artist

I have only been to one – I went to see the art,

but the most interesting thing was to see how the machine behind it became visible. I have never been to a biennale.

### Céline Condorelli

Architect

I often think that artists should not get to art fairs at all, but only biennales. The workings of the art market and its particular actors seems detrimental and a relatively cruel and uninspiring spectacle for who is involved in the production of the work.

I need to see the work and how it is being done out there - beyond the confines of my studio it is almost like talking about work; there seems to be a conversation taking place in biennales much more than fairs but still, between what is being presented, how galleries/places/curators/countries want to be seen and the work produced that one knows and sees in studios and from friends, there is always a dialogue and a strange exchange, a sudden transformation of the work in its new context and placement.

I am not always sure if I instinctively look at work that is relevant to me (as often it is not) or work that I like – and in this instance it is a much more distant look or observation – or is it also that one does not necessarily do the work that one is naturally attracted to... The collecting, selecting, hanging and presenting of a sum of parts as a resulting summary survey, the state of things at a place and time always seems an attempt to capture the moment, present or future, real or fictional; a moment that can then be remembered as such and therefore is created by this very artificial juxtaposition that is the fair or the biennale.

The fair or the biennale is a created context of different curatorial criteria – no more or less just other.

And of course fairs/biennales are always contexts within which one actually talks and engages quite intensively with works.

The ways that galleries occupy the relatively minuscule spaces they are allocated in art fairs (always strangely proportional to an actual

Q1

## WHY DO YOU GO TO ART FAIRS AND BIENNALES?

dimension), or countries their pavilions, often reveal interesting displacement and identity strategies. How do you condense the essence of what a particular gallery or even more conceptually, a particular country is about at a particular time? The careful selection, of works and artists, but also of furniture, objects and supports (like particular sets of catalogues, hidden or not, plinths, shelves or even cards and pieces of paper) and the way they are placed and displayed to create a specific type of reduced environment, uncovers spatial strategies not always explicit or consistent with other more obvious curatorial and market ones. This is always a source of inspiration and interest to me as an architect working in art contexts.

### Lawrence Weiner

Artist

**ART FAIRS** BY INVITATION.

**BIENNALES** BY INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE.

### David Mabb

Artist and course leader MA Fine Art Goldsmiths

I have only ever been to one art fair, which was Frieze last year. I am not wildly enthusiastic about going again this year. Last year's event bored and depressed me. It reduced art to its commodity value; what is interesting about art - what else it might mean - was obliterated. I have been to the Venice Biennale four times (I have also been to Documenta twice and the both Munster Sculpture Festival and Manifesta once). I go to the Venice Biennale because Venice is a fascinating city, and without trying too hard it is possible to become totally immersed in contemporary art. This has its down side as well, of course. The Arsenale is far too big, making it difficult to devote much energy to work in which I might be interested in another context. Each year I succumb to the "oh no, not another video" syndrome after an hour or so. The Giardini is more engaging because its history as a showcase for competing imperial powers gives the work a broader political context within which it can

Q1

be understood. Documenta, whilst not a Biennale, is curated more as a whole exhibition, makes a lot more sense, and is a better way of getting a view on what is happening in the art world. It seems a pity that the increased importance of the art fair is blurring the boundaries between art fairs and biennales. With the increased commercialisation of the art world, the critical voices and movements of the 20th Century are almost silenced: the commodity reigns supreme in the valuation of art.

### Flora Fairbairn

Curator/art consultant

I go to both art fairs and biennales for the same reason - to investigate what artists are up to in other countries and to find artists who I may not already know about, who I might want to show in forthcoming shows. Also to see which galleries are representing which artists.

### Polly Staple

*Frieze Art Fair curator and editor at large frieze Research.*

### Rory Macbeth

Artist and co-founder of PILOT

**Art fairs** Curiosity. I have been increasingly aware of how art-fairs are becoming more and more powerful. Galleries are selling a greater and greater percentage of work through art fairs, and it's clear that as a result they're often less inclined to experiment. Work being represented is more restricted, in that it is just stuff that will sell, or galleries go to the other extreme and use the fair as some sort of advertising gimmick (bricking up their gallery space etc).

Obviously the vast majority of artists are outside art fair representation (often for very good reasons), and recent trends have intensified this. PILOT was formed in 2004 to at least symbolically redress the balance, by providing a large scale platform to unrepresented artists, and give curators and writers a genuinely useful research

tool. We have used some aspects of art fairs as a model, and we have made it coincide with Frieze/Zoo etc to capitalise on the art-world influx, and to highlight our own very different agenda. PILOT does not charge anyone for entry, it does not charge the artists, or the nominators. PILOT does not charge any commission if a sale is made. The talks and events are free, as is the coffee, food, and drink that accompanies them (as far as our resources stretch). This publication is free. Year-round access to the archive, online and in hard copy at Limehouse Town Hall, is free etc....which obviously makes me skint (which is worrying), and sound a bit like a hippy (very worrying), but nonetheless I still think it's a good idea.

**Biennales** A bit like the above, and to laugh at how they often pretend to be non-commercial.

### Max Presneill

*Artist and director Raid Projects (Los Angeles) and Mark Moore Gallery (Santa Monica)*

**Art fairs** To network, to see what is out there and what commercial trends are appearing, to travel, to make new friends in that order, as a professional. I personally really like the getting together, partying part that always accompanies these things. It is fun and relaxing and doesn't make you feel guilty because you can justify it as work related!

**Biennales** To gawk and be a fanboy again, even if a critical and sometimes cynical one!

### Rainer Ganahl

*Artist*

I only go when I am involved somehow or when it is in front of my house. Usually good parties, good-looking people, good vibration, good overkill.

### Gabriela Schutz

*PILOT:1 artist*

I don't travel especially to art fairs, so I have been only in the Frieze. I went initially to see what's happening around the world, and to make

contacts, although I did not make any contact. It was so big and overwhelming that I didn't think anyone would be interested in talking to me. However I went to the Venice Biennale because I love art and wanted to see what's happening there. I did not go to the opening, and not for any connections reason.

### Helen Frik

*PILOT:1 artist*

**Art fairs** A feeling that I have to, to add to general knowledge about prices, trends, galleries: not so much wanting to, or curious for the art that will be there.

**Biennales** To see art in the flesh.

### Liam Scully

*PILOT:1 artist*

**Art fairs** Only when I am offered a free invite am I able to go to art fairs. This is because I, Liam Scully, am very poor. God knows why I am even a qualified artist as I was too poor to go to art school. I went anyway.

**Biennales** Due to fine friends and the odd gallery giving me invites I have been to a few. Purely for the free drinks and cheap banter. I cannot afford art although I would love to collect it and I cannot afford alcohol although I love to drink it.

### John Timberlake

*Artist and writer*

**Art fairs** To look at/experience the art.

**Biennales** To look at/experience the art.

### Victoria Preston

*Independent curator*

Art fairs always provoke mixed reactions in me. Often it's hard to see the art among the throngs of people, though it's a great opportunity to network and catch up with friends, particularly those working abroad. I have been going to Basel for many years, and particularly enjoy Liste in the

old Warteck Brewery.

Obviously the point is buying and selling art, but I enjoy the fringe events too – I remember Arco 2003 being particularly good with a series of curator talks.

Biennales are hard work, but I try not to miss them. Venice is a particular challenge – so many other distractions that it's hard to focus on contemporary art. It's easier in unobtrusive towns like Kassel (admittedly Documenta is not a biennale, but presumably the question is referring to events that are large and non-commercial).

I will visit the Guangzhou Triennale in November and it will be interesting to see how this experience compares with those in the west.

### Kjetil Berge

Artist

I go to art fairs and biennales to see art. I am curious to see what friends and colleagues are up to. The spectacle can be entertaining even if there are few good pieces - the energy and investment involved can create a buzz and activity which in turn makes the event an important trading ground for ideas and contacts.

### Deirdre King

Artist

I go to art fairs mainly if any of my own or a friend's work is being shown – in other words, for professional/social reasons - they are not a good place to engage with work. It's difficult for work to communicate in an environment curated by commerce. With a theme like art-as-best-seller, even the best work can come across as trite.

However, the commercial side of art is a reality; it's interesting to see what work is being pushed, to consider how trends are created. It's also necessary because it forms part of the context – economic but also conceptual and aesthetic - in which we work as artists.

Biennales are more interesting. There is a real attempt to present what is going on in art practice at a more serious level. Inevitably, biennales are

also a bit conservative because, in the main, artists are shown who are already well-established, so their work is well-known.

But it's good to see their work and what is going on in different countries and think about the ideas in the biennale. Both art fairs and biennales help you to keep your finger on the pulse (on different, but overlapping pulses) in different ways.

### Lars Nilsson

PILOT:2 artist

**Art fairs** For the social/professional exchange.

**Biennales** For the art and the social/professional exchange

### Giorgio Sadotti

Artist

**Art fairs** Because I am a sadist

**Biennales** Because I live in hope.

### Sean Rogg

PILOT:2 artist

I have a love hate relationship with art fairs, which can be represented by the way I feel when I walk in to and when I walk out. Excitement, anticipation and curiosity versus exhaustion, slight exhilaration (from the few works that inspire me) and hunger (since I've never been able to afford the over priced food). I go because I feel that it's a great way of seeing what's happening in the art world on a global level rather than just in the city I happen to be living in. Although usually when I leave the strongest emotion is sensory over-load.

This is not the ideal way to see art. Most of the work blends together in my mind into a hazy art-soup.

### Seulgi Lee

PILOT:2 artist

I would go to note new propositions, venues and meetings.

**David Mollin**

PILOT:1 artist

Art Basel is the only fair I tend to go. I like the atmosphere of Art Basel, particularly the gallery area. I like to see all the gallery directors and their assistants busy. In fact I like to see them all working in the same building, a near nine to five open plan scene with paper activity and tickety-tick keyboards. I like the set-like rickety quality of each gallery, including their rare moments of self-expression as to whether to have a carpet or grey painted concrete flooring. The Walter Matthau-esque bright red telephones on each desk that might or might not be connected, the odd tilted and fragile video dragged out of its dark space, and the uncanny appearance of everyone who was at Venice two days previously, in dry clothing. The eye-watering boredom of reality and the last day of the fair. The cubby-holes hidden out of view where you can still find someone represented if you crane your neck. The aesthetic tension that only money can bring to the table. I could go on. Venice, on the other hand, is an exhausting obligation, for whatever reason. It smells of damp and I personally find it harder to avoid pneumonia in Venice than in Cork. I have not got round to dragging myself around any other biennales although the two Pragues looked fun.

**Hideuki Sawayanagi**

PILOT:2 artist

Because I want to see artwork.

**Gijsbrecht Van Der Heul**

Artist

Art fairs are like bars, it's always nice to meet strangers, to see what's fashionable and good for selling my work. Biennales are like listening to "The very best of...", you don't have to listen to the rest.

**Tzu Nyen Ho**

PILOT:2 artist

**Art fairs** We have one big art fair in Singapore - and I'm almost always either out of the country or very busy in the period of the Singapore Art Fair.

Perhaps I've always felt no great compulsion to visit it. Then again, one art fair is very different from another, and I'm really curious to experience other fairs.

**Biennales** Going to biennales is always a rather stressful event, but it has become quite crucial for me as a way to understand developments in contemporary art - not only as an event to encounter artworks that are in circulation, but also to understand the way in which these practices are framed, and presented.

**Nicole Mollett**

PILOT:1 artist

**Art fairs** To see commercial art.

**Biennales** To see more art.

**Edward Wakefield**

Artist and sea captain

Though I have little experience of going to art fairs and biennales (with exception to an execrable art fair at the GMEX in Manchester last year) I appreciate their importance. I find commercial or institutionally "acceptable" art fairs (and subsequently the work shown therein) problematic.

However the chance to communicate with people from a series of different locales is intrinsically important to productive communications and practices; more so if the exchange of ideas and experiences is not under institutional control. Empowerment through subterfuge!

**Elinor Jansz**Publisher *Four Corners Books*

They're useful in order to see a lot of art I wouldn't otherwise get to see in London. With most art fairs,

the prickly carpet, harsh lighting (and atmosphere of a vacuum cleaner salesman's conference) is far from ideal, but it's better than just reading about the work or seeing reproductions.

### Ed Young

PILOT:2 artist

I have never been to an art fair. I visited the 50th Venice Biennale to make a documentary and buy a Cattelan T-shirt.

### Andrea Viliani

Curator

First, we must ask ourselves another question: Are art fairs and biennales the most suitable showcases to present every kind of artist's work? The answer is: It depends on the artist and work, of course.

Talking with several artists, we soon sense that such events offer conditions to present their work that are often far from ideal. In some cases we have the feeling that these artists, once invited to exhibit in fairs and biennales, intentionally adopt a low profile, working well below the level of the curator's expectations. Art fairs and biennales, with the explanatory layouts typical of such large collective events, are not neutral contexts, but actually have a specific identity of their own and give rise to certain expectations. These expectations have become increasingly clearly defined over recent years, in parallel with the economic expansion of the art market and the number of institutions active within it, and with the growing professionalism of the role of artist and curator. These latter developments are exactly something to which events such as fairs and biennales respond in a positive way, while they are less helpful in other connections.

The Italian artist Micol Assaël, who was recently asked to make a site-specific work for an art fair, came up with a project that was judged incompatible with the context in which it was to be set. Although such occasions may call for provocative projects, likely to highlight the curatorial role played by events such as

contemporary art fairs, clearly the provocation proposed by Assaël was not of the kind, called for here.

Conversely, however, there are projects, and artists, which are felt to be absolutely suited to these same contexts: for them, such contexts are, or have become, the *ideal frame of reference*. I am thinking here of Maurizio Cattelan, a regular guest at recent Venice Biennales. Cattelan presented a site specific project as part of the Wrong Gallery's programme at the last Frieze Art Fair, which was undoubtedly critical of the art fairs' art (the artist Tino Seghal used the gallery's booth as a temporary white cube where some young guys performed the artist's intervention, the price for which was to be paid by the collector without receiving anything material in return). This kind of work was extremely successful precisely because it proved to be an expected, and fun (fun-expected?) analysis of that same system to what many art goers were looking for in Frieze. Good job Tino!

To come back to your question, when we visit events such as fairs or biennales, but also when curators draw up their schedules or set determined structures and operational platforms, my view is that we/they should above all bear in mind *if this is the best showcase to experience the work of this artist*. Even if this entails destroying the uniformity of the whole, it will serve the purpose of greater critical responsibility. So my reply is: "I go to art fairs and biennales because they are the best showcases for the artists who has been invited!"

PS: In this context the direction taken by the organisers of the forthcoming Istanbul Biennale strikes me as an interesting example.

### Jean-Conrad Lemaitre

Collector

I go to art fairs because it is a good opportunity to meet other collectors and gallerists and curators, etc... It is always a very special ambiance sometimes I also see new artists works which are interesting.

Biennales I think can be very interesting because they show a diversity of works from many different horizons. Again it is a big jamboree of all people involved with art and it is nice to see many friends there, have a good time, and talk about art.

### Bruce Haines

Curator

**Art fairs** To see where the money is, and to remind myself of the benefits of working in the public sector.

**Biennales** They offer a rare opportunity to travel and are an efficient way to shop for international artists and to see how artists from home shape up in these contexts, often rather well.

### Mikko Canini

Artist

I go to fairs and biennales for the same reason: the strange pleasure to be had in the excess of random and overlapping interpretive moments created by seeing so much work in such a concentrated space. But the question is structured in two parts; what is at stake in this distinction?

The obvious point about fairs being about galleries and the consumption of art, and biennales being about artists and some form of curated vision is fair enough. Certainly this basic distinction leads to events that differ, more or less, in both form and content. However, this argument fails to recognize that these exhibition models have, thanks to the increasing popularity and profitability of contemporary art, largely converged and no longer appear opposed.

For most, the price tags that accompany artwork at both fairs and biennales remain invisible. The work might be for sale at a fair, but not for the lay viewer (who nonetheless experiences something of the giddiness that attends such displays of excessive wealth). And while the work might not be explicitly for sale at a biennale, the well-connected and moneyed collector will have no difficulty finding something to purchase (a something rendered more valuable

for having been nominated as culturally important). One only has to speak to the participating artists to appreciate that fairs are not strictly commercial enterprises, and that biennales are not immune to market forces.

For those of us troubled by the ever-extending reach of commerce and the distribution of cultural power amongst those whose authority derives from their wealth, the distinction between fairs and biennales appears critical. But the question remains, is the overlap of market and culture any less significant when hidden within the mechanisms that constitute a biennale (negotiations with collectors and gallerists over the exhibition of works, the additional economic value works derive from being shown in that context, the inevitable sponsorship deals, etc.) than when it is made explicit in a fair? Maybe not, but it is perhaps important to hold on to an ideal of a space for culture divorced from market considerations, even if such a space has never really existed.

### Danh Vo

PILOT:2 artist

For me its not so relevant to know why people are going to art fairs but I believe that fairs in general are a phenomena that you can't ignore- it's a thing that's going to have much power in the future and of course because its a place where certain people can spend a lot of money in no time. That's where we are heading and that for me is important to be aware of.

I stopped travelling to biennales because I got stressed. Now I just go to the Berlin biennale because I'm living there and it's convenient.

### Rosanna Guy Greaves

Artist

I go to art fairs and biennales quite simply to see the work. By their nature, unfortunately both venues are always too overwhelming and full of work to see anything at its best. However they are a good way of seeing a lot of things in one go and getting a feel what is going on in other countries

01

## WHY DO YOU GO TO ART FAIRS AND BIENNALES?

or contrasting ways of putting on a show.

If one can leave having seen one or maybe two things that really stays with them or got them thinking then that's pretty good.

### Berit Fisher

*Independent curator*

To get an overview on current national and international art.

### Peter Lewis

*Curator Redux*

**Art fairs** I don't often go to the art fairs, but if I do, I have a dull time, face to face with the mediocre, generating their displays of contempt. The extended family of banking. It's like going to enjoy a night out at Natwest. The art? I suppose that one should exploit the opportunity to rob someone, make a buck, and speak of the 'aesthetic'. After all, the history of art and connoisseurship is also the history of banking, or acquisition [a polite word] of wealth.

The art fair is established on the basis of trade and the 'salon', and, has colonial precedents [e.g. The Paris World's Fair of 1900 arguably gave birth to Art Nouveau, or the idea of new style, cemented upon the trophies from its colonies. It's old news.] Right now I can't even think about the worth of a contemporary art fair properly given what is happening both in Iraq and, hopefully fatal to Bush's 'business' government, in New Orleans.

Is it true that an American company has bought up the Frieze art fair? An artist 'friend' told me recently 'I just want to be on the winning side'. I'm not comfortable with that. I believe its life [style] is moribund, and on a doom loop, if uncritically founded on the precedence of 'new' imperialism. I think also that as 'festivals' they are guaranteed to disappoint, of shared or celebratory time; time flows between people, there is no goal, nothing to gain but time. At the art fair there is neither space nor time, or at least very little, other than forced through one's contemplation of avarice and boredom, one's own desire to be entertained.

01

Be honest. Anybody who goes to 'discover' a little 'gem' or to get the whiff of celebrity must be entirely happy visiting without the discomfort of thinking, with the powerlessness of thought within its closeted Law, or else a Guardian art critic. I am as susceptible to it as the next man, his resentment; to temper the fear of singularity is also mine. Would I feel differently if Gagosian represented and sold all my work for millions? It's questionable. "But I need the money" he replied.

**Biennales** At the risk of being cast as an archetype hypocrite, [I am] I will admit to having curated a number of biennales, 2003-2004, [including as Chief Curator at Sharjah 6, in the Middle East, guest curator and writer, at Venice Biennale of Architecture, invited by the curator of the German Pavilion, Francesca Ferguson, and at Sao Paulo, for UAE, for the Noorderlicht Festival of Arab Photography, 2003, and as a curator of the Summer Festivals held annually at Bregenz, invited by Wolfgang Fetz, since 1998. The Festival is also, as are biennales, a force of contradictions, and vice versa.

Biennales are, if not worse than fairs, also dismal in terms of anticipation. Structures are in some rare cases slightly looser, in terms of making something from their difficulty in terms of an innocence, and thereby closer to making a situation, or they may present a subject with an incalculable and indiscernible event that requires a commitment – something is happening... Even now at PILOT, [as an 'anti-fair' or 'anti-biennale'] by chance, to take a risk, which will invent through the logic of a kind of revolt; a biennale can emerge, non-literally, in an emergency, as another kind of temporality, and therefore may force something through its institution by proposing new generic law; i.e that another logic may dissolve the prescribed one.

If one notes that the rise of the biennale grows exponentially to 'third' world tourism, then also that some governments are decidedly totalitarian, you can guess what I mean. Impossible confusion and more hatred and exploitation, more money, more everything.

However this dreadful situation allows for

01

## WHY DO YOU GO TO ART FAIRS AND BIENNALES?

taking a risk, something that an art fair does not want to do. I can't imagine being under surveillance for one's writing and curating of 'dangerous' words and works of art from within an art fair. Or can I? 'You may think you know what's going on, Mr. Giddes, but you don't says John Huston's evil character in Polanski's 'Chinatown'.

Evil is part of the process of truth. 'This is Chinatown, Giddes, anything can happen.' The current interest in 'Arab' art and its biennialisation is acutely severing and concealing of truth. I take the view of the importance of intellectual life, not by trading logic with trade. At least the biennale 'takes you there', as a submission to thinking. It just never stops hurting.

There is also in Europe a landscape of festivals [bienales] that does allow space for experiment, something the far more conservative countries of USA and UK do not permit, although they would claim to, in relativist terms, as liberal democracies. [Think of Mr. Deller's 'communitarian' conceits, [as doublethink] also his social work with American Puritans. "He's one of us," proclaims the Sovereign].

Saleable, pretty, and nasty, as David Batchelor writes in his book Chromophobia, with dubious intention, of the victory of the moral, grey men over those of colour. This is not a judgement, but a submission to a universal thought, of the powerlessness of thought as it circulates within all forms of 'statist' law. [Alain Badiou's term]. Politics must be quickly and invisibly turned back to a state of convalescence or at least into a pumpkin.

### Kerry Duggan

Artist

To look at art.

### Jeni Walwin

Independent curator and writer

**Art fairs** I rarely visit art fairs.

**Biennales** Biennales traditionally offer a good opportunity for a large quantity of work from artists around the world to be viewed in a short

01

space of time in a single location. This opportunity is only lost when a similar list of artists begins to appear at each biennale.

### Tercerunquinto

PILOT:2 artists

En el caso de ferias de arte podemos hablar de algunas experiencias pues solo en una hemos mostrado material como propuestas mas relacionadas a la venta de archivos y documentos paralelos y en otro par, en el área de proyectos especiales, hemos aplicado con proyectos específicos que intentaban intervenir en este contexto. Estos proyectos intentaban insertarse en la redefinición del uso de suelo y de la renta, de la plusvalía a partir del contrato de una galería en este tipo de espacios (convention centres) y de las dinámicas generadas en este tipo de circunstancias.

En el caso de las bienales la decisión ha sido realizar obra en un sentido más experimental, obras en sitio que se integran al espacio de exhibición, tomando en consideración sus aspectos físicos, históricos o políticos o en un sentido mas amplio que integre aspectos del contexto urbano. En este sentido las obras son puntuales (al igual que lo que hemos intentado hacer en el caso de las ferias) aunque no siempre resulte satisfactorio pues hemos identificado incongruencias con el statement que postulan.

In the case of art fairs we can talk about experiences. We only show material as a proposal related to sale of archives and documents. These are aside the work. In the other hand, in the area of special projects, we have applied with specific projects, which has to be inserted in these contexts. These projects managed with a definition of the use of the ground and the rent of it, the surplus in relation to a contract of a gallery in these kinds of space (convention centres) and the dynamics generated in these types of circumstances.

In the case of the biennales the decision has been to make works in a more experimental way,

works in situ that are connected to the exhibition space, considering the physical aspects, the historical or political uses and/or in a wider sense that could integrate aspects of urban context. In this sense the works are more precise (at the same time we try to do that in the fairs) even when the results are not always satisfying, because we have seen incongruence in some cases with the statements the institutions are proposing.

### Beagles & Ramsay

Artists collaborative

**Art fairs** To sell work.

**Biennales** In search of pain.

### Liliane Schneider

Art historian

As a theorist involved in critical studies and a researcher in autonomous art research and networking structures (currently teaching in the CCC critical curatorial cybermedia study programme at the Ecole supérieure des beaux-arts of Geneva, Switzerland) I go to art fairs or biennales only if those semi-commercial machines, have made an effort to offer conferences, talks or seminars.

### Syd Mostow

PILOT:2 artist

I've gone to fairs and biennales out of curiosity to see what is being shown, what gallery is showing whom, see what other artists are doing, and out of a sense of obligation to my career. Art fairs are like 3 ring circuses where every gallery does it's act and every artist is a circus performer. I don't see myself as a circus performer when I am busy in my studio, but after attending an art fair I can't help seeing myself as circus animal jumping through a ring of fire.

### Caroline Corbetta

Independent curator

To put it plainly, I go to biennales as I have to: it's part of my job. You go there to see art, but also to meet people. With art fairs, it's more or less the same... in fact, the networking thing is more present there. Personally I don't like very much going to fairs as I have a limit: I can barely discern artworks bundled in endless rows of booths with scarce or zero conceptual frame – something that might unfortunately happen also at biennales.

### Torsten Brinkmann

PILOT:2 artist

**Art fairs** It's good to know what it means when art goes on the market and how it looks like then.

**Biennales** On the biennales you can see art which is not produced for selling. I go on both of them to meet people with the same interests.

### Lars Bang Larsen

Writer and curator

Both are types of events that typically attract an international crowd of art professionals of all stripes, so when I go, I go to catch up with the people from other places I already know and maybe to make new contacts. Apart from that, both contexts are good for being updated about current concerns in art – and then it is up to yourself to figure out what you want to do with being updated!

Concerning Biennales, they might be more emphatically international forums than other types of exhibitions, and tend to be viewed as more prestigious. But a biennale is not necessarily a generic format. In principle biennales have the potential to be as diverse as any other art exhibitions.

### Jiyeon Lee

Art critic and independent curator

**Art fairs** To check the current international market trend and see some possible small pieces of works we might not have seen for the museum

and gallery shows.

Also there are many interesting appendix projects along with, like some symposium and talks, and some other interesting exhibitions (eg. 'Unlimited').

**Biennales** To see how the concept of the show is working under the big projects like that. Also to see what sort of concept applied to present National pavilions and National representative.

### Nathan J.D. Barlex

Artist

I've only ever been to art fairs as a gallery technician. So I suppose I'd have to say: "to get paid".

### Juozas Laivys

PILOT:2 artist

I'm participating in biennales because it's sometimes very sad to see who are participating in these exhibitions. Otherwise it's a good possibility to see if my work looks sad to be seen in that context.

### Sarah Baker

PILOT:2 artist

To me, art fairs are kind of like Renaissance fairs without swords and dragons. I find them useful for spotting celebs'. Last year at Frieze Art Fair I saw Madonna. She is very small with big eyes and walks smooth like a cat. She left a wake of euphoria in her trail.

### Matthew Poole

Co-director MA in Gallery Studies, University of Essex, and co-founder of PILOT

For research, art fairs and biennales are both convenient for catching up on work that I've either been too busy or (more likely) too lazy to go to see elsewhere in smaller group, or solo, shows.

However, if the work isn't conceived or considered for the specific conditions of the

context of the biennale or the art fair, it can look and feel like when you put your (indoor) furniture in the garden; it seems smaller and dirtier, and less significant that when it was carefully choreographed in the livingroom. I enjoy the creativity, imagination and criticality that the theatricality of exhibitions engenders in work.

Art fairs and biennales have too much 'harsh daylight', so to speak. They have swelled to such huge proportions in order to compete with each other globally that they cannot but fail to satisfy the intellectual or aesthetic demands of those wishing to engage with artwork closely. They must operate with the cold frank structure of trade shows, only thinly veiled by an interest in the artwork. Their economic and political functions of international diplomacy and global distribution for the mercantile class within the art world are clearly transparent. This is always a crucially important study for anyone involved in art production, but I find isn't really very helpful in developing an intimate engagement with the works shown. I find that it's academically satisfying to see the wrinkles, but it's better to feel the force of work within curated projects.

What is useful to see more clearly though by the 'harsh light of day' of biennales and art fairs are the social relationships of the artworld. What's great fun at these weird 'school excursion-type' events is indulging in the pleasures, commensurate with watching car-crash TV type shows like 'Wife-Swap' or 'Holiday Showdown', of seeing and interacting with people out of their familiar context. Working holidays, which, lets face it describes international travel to biennales and art fairs, can be a horrifying way to see the mettle of friends, colleagues, and acquaintances.

### Pauline Graham

Collector

I go to art fairs and biennales to deepen my understanding of art, the better to connect with it; to keep in touch with developments; above all to enjoy.

**Jean-Claude Freymond-Guth***Artist and curator Les Complices\*, Zurich*

So far we have not gone to art fairs with *Les Complices\**, as we don't represent anyone. PILOT is a premiere, as it is an interesting new version of a networking model. The broad publicity and the networking possibilities as well for *Les Complices\** as the nominated artist seem favourable. Privately art fairs are interesting overviews on the art market and good ways of meeting people.

Biennales are like art fairs: good overviews on contemporary art and a great chance to meet many people during little time; but less focused on the art market.

**Terry Smith***Artist*

I only go if invited, that is to exhibit work.

**Filomeno Fusco***Director Feld fur Kunst*

Because my work as an artist and curator depends not that much on the art-market I am not deeply involved and interested in the fair-business.

Visiting biennales and off-exhibitions is more of my interest – to obtain a general view of contemporary artists as well as of the design and the concept of current exhibition-making. Even though there are to many biennales lacking any new input on modern art, you need to stay in touch with art production and presentation. But the real chance to discover new artists and strategies is based on the work of the off-gallery-scene.

**Neville Shulman***Explorer, writer, mountaineer, director**International Theatre Institute, chair of Theatre Forum, collector*

Knowledge, experience, inspiration and the occasional (very occasional) flash of enlightenment.

**Klega***Artist*

Dear Pilot,

For some time I wondered why I do not have any answers to your questions, although they apparently do relate to art in some way.

As an artist myself, who does not like to commit himself to anything except to practice only, without competence of anything in particular, I look at these questions with indifference. I am a sponge – I look around – but not at anything in particular. I get excited, but only to recollect. Information is indifferent, it is serendipity that is the stronger force (especially within the grotesque labyrinth of portals and archives). The experiments of art are not scientific since we do not deal with a pre-determined 'factum' – information in this sphere is as incidental as the artist. The conclusion is that "structures surrounding and enabling contemporary art" as you call them, themselves deceive and restrict, or better 'in-form' in its proper sense, if they are seen as benign.

I am afraid that any 'strategy' in this field is lacking by default, because any strategy is determined by a presupposed understanding of the situation. This is not the case for art in any meaningful way. This is why all the structures feed fictional information as long as they are unable to deal with the 'other' (yes, I am embarrassed to use this word – it's just a convenient short-hand), i.e. what is exactly invisible to these structures themselves within the horizon of art. Art as a mere strategy 'towards' a 'market', and this is where your questions are directing their answers, seems to fall short by its very intentionality.

So, these questions relate to art only in its migration through an administrative reality that is ideally expunged out of its products (or made into its superficial subject). They are questions concerning the current socio-economic performance of those who have investment in this particular industry; bureaucracy, systems, strategies - all those things invisible (more or less) within the product-commodity itself. Does it, however, impact on the production of art itself? Do

Q1

WHY DO YOU GO  
TO ART FAIRS  
AND BIENNALES?

these eco-infocratic rituals penetrate into the studios? What results would such a formation of the production of art necessarily bring forth in its play other than that art reflects the play of the market within its data-bases, show-pieces and various administrations; a speculative tautology. Not new in itself, certainly not since the late seventies, is this persistence of the idea that there is an insidious, deceptive and determinate structure that needs to be appropriated by the producers (or whichever politically active group appoints itself to do so) to finally liberate themselves from (art) market determination and deception. All networking, information-gathering, market-research will only enhance the mystery of a "market", a system that is to be reacted to (with observance). This way all parameters are automatically determined by exactly that which becomes more invisible, more fictional, the more it is observed.

All this is well known.

There is something else, not exactly new either, that is disconcerting. It is this extreme amplification that emanates from those gigantic show-pieces like fairs and biennales and all its media-feedback. It appears to be the amplification of 'white noise' (or maybe I am hard of hearing), rather than something particular becoming visible. There is something uncanny when art is shown on art fairs; there is no space between the art: it is all figure and no ground; but maybe that's for a future set of questions. The size: name-lists, numbers, turn-over determine success, only rarely is there a glimpse of development – the tune is lost in the buzz; anyway, most of the time it will be drowned out by the volume of the next giga-event. Development, "emerging" as it is called, has changed in the saeculum of total amplification. The "emerging" artist is suddenly enlarged, multiplied, amplified to the n-th degree without 'growth'. Emergence without growth is fiction. So it appears that in the age of giga-amplification the "show" is justly what it says on the tin: fiction.

Oh, yes, I also do collect; Kippenberger is said to have answered to the question why he is collecting art, by saying, that it is just to remind

himself that he doesn't need to do everything...  
Couldn't put it better myself.

Greetings from the garden-path.

Q1

**WHY DO YOU GO  
TO ART FAIRS  
AND BIENNALES?**

**IS THE GROWING  
DIVERSITY OF MODELS  
PRESENTING LARGE  
SURVEYS OF ARTISTS  
A GOOD DEVELOPMENT  
FOR PRODUCING  
NETWORKS?**

**HOW DOES THE ART  
MARKET IMPACT ON  
YOUR INVOLVEMENT  
IN ART?**

## Ray White

Freelance curator

I think that whether it is good for artists needs to be approached from a number of angles; what is 'good' for artists, and which artists are we talking about? Inclusion in any overview or archive can be seen as a good thing for any individual artist, increasing their exposure and improving their CV.

So the question becomes who produces these resources, and why? As the dissemination of information becomes more and more diverse, which resources are considered important? And does this merely produce another level of official approval? What about artists working in under-represented ways, in difficult to commodify ways (there are still some) or artists that just aren't interested in these processes? Are these lists and archives just another way of attempting to legitimise a subjective profession? If the real networks being produced are ones between the bodies that produce these surveys, who ultimately benefits? Perhaps this is an overly cynical view. The opportunity to raise their visibility is one that few artists can afford (often literally) to ignore.

I am currently involved in the staging of an Art Fayre. Its stated aim is to bring together artist-led organisations that work in collaborative ways. If we accept that most artist-led organisations are, at least initially, set up to promote the artists that do the leading, how does this partial and partisan approach to further collaboration help or hinder the individual artist? In not attempting to be definitive in any way, it does at least avoid the trap of officially recognising one form of artistic manifestation over another, whilst celebrating one that remains on the fringes of commerciality. Living in Newcastle upon Tyne, most artists are, by default, on that fringe. Attempts are now being made by certain parties to correct this apparent injustice by aping commercial models, becoming agents rather than curators, producing surveys and publications of 'established' artists in the region. Is this either desirable or realistic?

Of course, this growing diversity in representation does allow individuals the opportunity to represent themselves by creating

their own presence. That can easily turn someone from an artist into a representer of art, with an almost inevitable downgrade in artistic status.

So again: which artists are we talking about? Well, one man's meat is another man's poison, and as it seems that everything is now officially bad for you, maybe it's up to the individual to decide what table they want to dine at. Although overall it seems that that invitation is still with the institution, not the artist.

## Free Association

Independent curatorial group

We don't know, but we suspect not. There is a danger that large collections of information and voices become sprawling and incoherent in these contexts. The large number of voices often engaged in these surveys means their individual specific concerns may become lost and demystified, diluted into a list of 'boxes ticked' in order to fit a structural remit. Discussing mutual concerns and forging meaningful friendships in this context is also difficult, as the large numbers of people involved can make them cold and impersonal forums. We're rather old-school about the way networks of artists (and projects) are produced; meet people at openings and chat in the pub after.

## Dallas Seitz

Artist and director of 1000000mph projects

I hate looking at work on the Internet. I still prefer studio visits as limiting as that is locationally and financially for my space 1000000mph projects. I don't even buy books from the net... When I buy something I want to touch it, flip through it, so to speak, and then walk home with it. Commercially, I believe a lot of collectors want to buy it if it is on the cover of a magazine or has some pedigree. This makes sense as they want to buy work that has a historical presence which means being archived somewhere no matter how small that article or mention is. I think for artists the best networks are the ones they create for themselves.

Q2

IS THE GROWING DIVERSITY OF MODELS PRESENTING LARGE SURVEYS OF ARTISTS A GOOD DEVELOPMENT FOR PRODUCING NETWORKS?

Q2

...Getting in where they fit in. CREAM is great exposure for the artists in it but it's a coffee table book... Didn't it come in an inflatable pillow at one time? Need I say more?

### Chris Hammond

Director *MOT*

The best way to get noticed is to stand apart from the crowd. The best networks for artists are those that they develop themselves.

### I-Chen Kuo

PILOT:2 artist

I believe so, and hope to see more possibilities for us to network with each other.

### Pil & Galia Kollektiv

Artists

Any exposure is good exposure, but there is a growing secondary market in artists' support networks, books and websites, from which most often the artists profit the least. The universalistic assumption that all artists can be classed together as such can be misguided and these endeavours are unlikely to replace more organic communities based on academic affiliations, areas of interest and common practices.

### David Mabb

Artist and course leader MA Fine Art Goldsmiths

It is a complete waste of time for artists to put their work on databases, something often advocated by careers advisors who teach "entrepreneurial skills" in Fine Art Departments. No one with any credibility ever curated a show of contemporary art by looking at databases (except museum databases where the art is already in a collection and so validated). The art world is organised around contacts - through knowing artists and their work. I have never looked at CREAM. I have read about it though, and seen it in its blow-up plastic transparent pillow that's

presumably there to protect it from people who want to throw up all over it. As its title suggests, it's a compilation of a trendy elite. I cannot imagine how it could produce a network for artists.

### Tayto et Tayto

La Pomme de Terre a Basé des Facilitators

No, all planned models are a disease of the body. The record is clear. Mass hysteria has been characteristic of large surveys. Large surveys are a disease of the mind because they are associated with delusional convictions that are not susceptible to falsification by rational argument. Tayto prefers speed networking on the open market, at a race or in niteclub.

### Céline Condorelli

Architect

No model will ever create a network as such but the discourse it generates can, and this should be the measure of its success.

### John Armleder

Artist

Things just follow their course, and you do what you should, or what you like, or stay in bed. Or none of the above. Surveys bring nothing, other than surveys. But you can take advantage of them, and feel that everything might be one day available. Then you will start asking to whom, for what...

### Lawrence Weiner

Artist

FOR PEOPLE WHO WATCH A LOT OF TV (MONITORS).

### Flora Fairbairn

Curator/art consultant

Yes I should think so, although as a curator, I don't use them much.

**Ruth Claxton**

PILOT:1 artist

The Internet in particular has the potential to increase the visibility of a wide range of practices that are based outside of the traditional geographical centres and that's got to be a good thing. However I think the most interesting examples are those that attempt to engage artists in some kind of continuing dialogue, as it's through that, not just uploading images and hoping that someone might stumble across them, that meaningful networks are formed.

**Max Presneill**

Artist and director *Raid Projects* (Los Angeles) and *Mark Moore Gallery* (Santa Monica)

I am unconvinced about the networking application as far as artists go except inasmuch as curators/gallerists may find artists they are unaware of through these different arenas. Each of those areas you mentioned also seem to me to be quite separate and requiring different answers. Databases and archives require the kind of work that I am unsure many curators and other art professionals are really willing to do. There really is just way too much stuff out there. Reading survey books is often more direct but both are still far less effective than seeing exhibitions firsthand or reading reviews (this increasingly online, yes) or hearing first through the grapevine, then doing the research. The art fairs work as a one-stop shop in this regard. In some situations more information is a good thing. Realistically for those of us that curate, or exhibit artists in varying ways, the sheer diversity of sources just means too many choices, too much to see and read when time is always at a premium. Selectively using one's time is a major skill in our world.

**Gabriela Schutz**

PILOT:1 artist

My work is shown in a couple of websites. I guess it's good, though I have never sold any paintings through that.

**Polly Staple**

*Frieze Art Fair* curator and editor at large *frieze*

This is a convoluted and confusing question (the use of the word 'archive' here for example doesn't make sense), that implies any answer will be loaded. Yes.

**Rainer Ganahl**

Artist

Anything anybody does for artists is good.

**Helen Frik**

PILOT:1 artist

No idea. I would think so: it's an armchair way to browse, thus easy and less time-consuming, however totally bereft of any 'real' confrontation with the materiality and concrete presence of art.

**Liam Scully**

PILOT:1 artist

I believe it probably is. I just have never got off my arse to use these facilities. I will though because I hear with this method even shit artists get breaks. It seems to me that it is how hard you try that determines if you get anywhere in the art world... oh and a bit of luck. My problem is that my work is really good, I just don't try hard enough to get it seen. Even writing this is a major step for me. I rely way too much on luck and I ain't getting any of that my way. I'm telling yeh.

**Kjetil Berge**

Artist

I have enjoyed publications like *CREAM*. I have also been contacted on the basis of databases and archives and find them useful and inevitable. Archives where the basis of inclusion is hidden I find suspect.

Q2

IS THE GROWING DIVERSITY OF MODELS PRESENTING LARGE SURVEYS OF ARTISTS A GOOD DEVELOPMENT FOR PRODUCING NETWORKS?

Q2

### John Timberlake

Artist and writer

It will produce networks for those with the discretionary powers to create opportunities for artists, or those who wish to develop such powers for themselves. Of course that can include artists, but given the ascendancy of professional curation and journalism in the current art scene it is more likely to mean primarily those involved in various forms of cultural management, criticism and promotion, whether they are artists or not. To what extent an artist can utilize such networks depends on their networking and strategizing skills, rather than their artistic ones per se. Having said this, there might sometimes seem a pressure on artists to conflate the two - in this environment a brilliantly successful art practice would probably be one similar to Helen Highwater's piece CAN I GET YOU / SOMETHING (?) which emerged as a performance built around networking and strategizing, although by definition such an intervention acknowledges its roots in the marginalisation of the artist him/herself, and it's not an approach I personally find very interesting.

### Nicole Mollett

PILOT:1 artist

No doubt countless artists' careers have benefited from being included in these databases (myself included), but they do produce a deluge of meaningless catalogues.

### Victoria Preston

Independent curator

It's a good development but it has its limitations. It's obviously impersonal and will never replace an artist's personal network or those chance encounters that may catalyse fruitful collaborations. It's probably useful for curators, critics and researchers, but it has its limitations here too. I recently used these methods to research artists' residencies and the result was extreme blandness with nearly every residency claiming to be "located in a pastoral idyll,

committed to utopian ideals". In other words, it's very hard to establish points of differentiation without actually having visited a place and met with individuals.

### Matthew Poole

Co-director MA in Gallery Studies, University of Essex, and co-founder of PILOT

Only if the structure of such systems allows artists included to control or otherwise have input into the way in which they are represented, and where that representation will be distributed.

### Deirdre King

Artist

Overall I think it's good - anything that facilitates tracking down and making visible work and artists is useful, and anything that makes clear the reality that there are thousands of artists, rather than a few hundred is also good. Different and conflicting models, surveys, etc. help to stop the art market scabbing over to create an elite - that exerts a negative impact on practice because it is in danger of setting a benchmark for what 'successful' work should be, discouraging experimentation and dulling art down. Surveys and the networks which arise from them keep the art world (artists, dealers, investors) mobile, challenging the status quo because they constantly reinvent the 'canon' (or stop the canon existing).

### Lars Nilsson

PILOT:2 artist

It's good for distribution of information but the physical presence of both the work and the artist is crucial for me to get further.

### Giorgio Sadotti

Artist

Probably not because it may lead to an over-simplified (mis)understanding.

Q2

IS THE GROWING DIVERSITY OF MODELS PRESENTING LARGE SURVEYS OF ARTISTS A GOOD DEVELOPMENT FOR PRODUCING NETWORKS?

Q2

**Seulgi Lee**

PILOT:2 artist

It seems like the answer is hidden in your question. Yes. It is one means to develop networks for artists.

**Sean Rogg**

PILOT:2 artist

Absolutely.

**David Mollin**

PILOT:1 artist

'A good development for producing networks for artists?' not of artists? Interesting idea. I'm sure it doesn't do any harm; anything that might help artists to mix is a good thing as isolation is a killer. They can now go online and engage in looking at each other's CV's and get really wound up. Whether this leads to more fruitful relationships, I don't know. At some point you have to pick up the phone and reach out, see where it leads... a warm hug at a private view, an unguarded smile, a whisper here, a whisper there, eye contact and a juicy cut from a cold shoulder stored in some lock-up. 'And what might you be up to, sir?' could be the next question, and not from the mouth of an art publication.

**Hideuki Sawayanagi**

PILOT:2 artist

Yes it is.

**Gijsbrecht Van Der Heul**

Artist

I couldn't tell. I don't use it. My networks grow by chance and I believe in destiny. Those archives on the Internet create an ocean to drown in. Art becomes like driftwood. It's scary to see how even your own work starts emerging in those networks, without you knowing it.

**Tzu Nyen Ho**

PILOT:2 artist

I find it very difficult to comment on this in such general terms – every survey is a different creature. The answer depends as much on the nature of artists' practices, and the nature of the survey. There are surveys that are backed up by global circulatory systems and publicity mechanics, and there are surveys that fester in dark and lonely corners of the Internet. The infrastructural characteristics of the survey and the kinds of practices that are surveyed are often, but not always, mutually determined.

**Edward Wakefield**

Artist and sea captain

I think that it's a really positive move to have more websites/surveys to produce networks. As an artist in Birmingham I've found my opportunities have grown twofold through joining Midwest, for instance, being able to communicate with national and international contacts in forums etc. I'm editor of a creative writing website and have found that's a really good way of communicating with other people, and finding creative spaces to fill too. Events such as Nanasaur in Nottingham, which brought several groups from around the country, were successful due to the Internet.

**Elinor Jansz**Publisher *Four Corners Books*

Of course it depends on who is compiling these databases. These surveys can be quite interesting but I think they seldom give you a strong sense of individual artists' works, so in some cases I think they're probably little more than a roll call.

**Andrea Viliani**

Curator

Names, bio-bibliographies, images, comments and analyses, once incorporated into the relevant models, do not always serve any purpose apart from the self-referential updating of the various

operators active within the art system, causing the system itself to be speeded up, and ultimately also encouraging phenomena of art fashion,. To be productive within the art system as a whole, these instruments of documentation - increasingly numerous and differentiated - must become instruments for production, not just information. They should yield up not just relationships but actual networks, where experiment and propose models and possibilities for the experiencing of art. Such models should look more one to the other, for example, like systems designed to safeguard the specificity of each subject and proposal, but also accessible and worthy of consideration on several levels. The archive, for example, is already an explanatory model, and, when deployed in certain contexts, it should be made capable of becoming a showcase. CREAM itself is presented as a paper Biennale. To continue in this direction cannot but be useful to the creation of real networks, capable not of reducing but of multiplying the possible ways of presenting art and artists, stimulating emotions and reflections upon the work and adding to the inexhaustible resources for its documentation.

### Ed Young

PILOT:2 artist

Yes.

### Caroline Corbetta

Independent curator

I see the above mentioned diverse models for presenting art as extensions of the same institutional network. For artists it is therefore important, if not necessary, to be featured in them as it attests that he/she is part of the system, with its critics, its galleries, its magazines...

On the other hand, those presentations are also important as they can reach a wider, non-professional audience; but the big risk is that the artworks are uncritically perceived, and exploited, as mere images.

### Jean-Conrad Lemaitre

Collector

I think that any new technology that permits to inform a wider audience about the works of artists is welcome.

### Bruce Haines

Curator

I don't think compendiums of artists help generate personal networks which must be the most useful for artists.

### Mikko Canini

Artist

I couldn't say. The only thing that resembles a network in my own life has developed more through personal connections.

### Rosanna Guy Greaves

Artist

In some ways it is inevitably helpful to have some sort of organised artist listing, but not necessarily for the artists themselves. There are simply too many artists producing work, particularly in London. In terms of producing networks FOR artists, I expect these databases do not often lead to people finding fulfilling engagements with someone else's work. However, that is quite a rare thing and is often based on something specific and not necessarily to do with art directly.

They are maybe more useful for producing networks OF artists for other people.

### Berit Fisher

Independent curator

Yes, these surveys perform as an interface between fast accessible information and profound research.

Q2

IS THE GROWING DIVERSITY OF MODELS PRESENTING LARGE SURVEYS OF ARTISTS A GOOD DEVELOPMENT FOR PRODUCING NETWORKS?

Q2

## Rory Macbeth

Artist and co-founder of PILOT

Not necessarily good, just the same from a new angle. The ones with a specific agenda tend to sideline the artwork. The more 'open' ones present a shit-load of art, and seem to say "have a look through this shit-load of art... you might find something good". This is more of a problem the more 'open' the approach is. I guess the ultimate version would be a list of all art. In other words, it ends up just being a new way that you can access stuff that is good for *some* researchers and good for *some* types of art. The problem seems to be that they are mostly *for* artists, not *by* artists. In my experience all the contacts I really value I have made at first hand, at private views, or in the pub afterwards. PILOT was thought of as a result of discussing stuff in a pub, and we wanted to make it function on as many network levels as possible... as an event, a show, an archive, a website, a set of talks, a chance to meet people, a party, etc. For this reason PILOT does not want to get bigger and lose its informal atmosphere, but intends to (for want of a better word) franchise the idea out (for free obviously), so that it can happen alongside any art fair, anywhere, as a genuinely workable network, using the PILOT name as long as whoever organises it adheres to its basic principles.

## Danh Vo

PILOT:2 artist

It never crossed my mind that these models were used for producing networks for artist, I guess I'm still doing it the old fashioned way by having support by other gay artists and faghags because we are having an illusion of sharing something in common.

## Peter Lewis

Curator *Redux*

Yes, as the digital is a truth process, capable of puncturing the prevailing discourses and initiating the discourse of the subject from the void it

creates. Like the river of slime in 'Ghostbusters', it's transversatile. Think it and it materialises. Books/projects like Cream, though, are just more reactionary 'lists' [Who thought up the title?] and obey 'statist' law, not truth. Knowledge is not a truth. Refer to Alain Badiou's 'Handbook of the Inaesthetic' for a much better argument and analysis than I can offer here. I am thinking more of the possibility of a universalism brought about by disrupting discourses and epistemologies with non-literal approaches such as the web. Networks of artists or 'Non-artists' are not singularities, but they anticipate a truth process.

## Jeni Walwin

Independent curator and writer

Diversity, flexibility and variety in abundant supply will usually generate opportunities for the largest number of artists.

## Tercerunquinto

PILOT:2 artists

En muchos sentidos son útiles como herramientas para la investigación, para la interconexión entre artistas, curadores, investigadores, ect, pero este criterio se vuelve limitado al ofrecer de pronto solo un directorio básico, lo que puede hacer de esto una herramienta un tanto superficial. En este sentido siguen siendo un reto para la comunicación de las ideas.

In many ways they are very useful tools for research; for the connection between artists, curators, researches, etcetera. But the criteria of these compilations could be very limited because it offers a short basic index, which could be very superficial. In this sense there is still a challenge to the communication of the ideas.

## Beagles & Ramsay

Artists collaborative

We're unsure as to whether these models are generally intended to produce networks for artists.

Q2

IS THE GROWING DIVERSITY OF MODELS PRESENTING LARGE SURVEYS OF ARTISTS A GOOD DEVELOPMENT FOR PRODUCING NETWORKS?

Q2

They obviously provide useful pick and mix selections of artists for various purposes but perhaps they're more geared to producing employment opportunities for curators and publishers.

### Kerry Duggan

Artist

This question is probably less about networks for artists and more about marketing.

### Liliane Schneiter

Art historian

Is the notion of large surveys of artists relevant within the perspective of art research, artists as researchers involved in a cosmopolitical practice, in the polis and in the cosmos? I am interested in the development of a cosmopolitical and aesthetic perspective where art practices meet the ethical requirements of the common world. Until now, no art survey in databases, archives or books helps for shaping artists' networks lead to a common world based on the creative openings suggested by artists. Artists provide a plurality of small worlds in re-combining autonomous networks. They exercise their political judgment and imagine the destiny of a common world. See tester or hackitectura or meate networks.

<http://www.meate.ch>

<http://www.e-tester.net/eus/index.asp>

<http://hackitectura.net>

<http://mcs.hackitectura.net/tiki-index.php>

### Syd Mostow

PILOT:2 artist

I think work on the web is a poor substitute for the real thing, and databases tend to level all the work out into a generic mush. It is a bit like renting a movie and seeing it at home on your TV instead of the experience of going to the cinema. Although you get the general idea, you are missing an important part of its essential quality. Databases are convenient. Although art survey books are

more appealing than data-base archives, as they look better and are slicker in presentation, they still have that best of quality that lacks in any depth. Getting a notion of something is not the same thing as the direct experience of something. But an accumulation of notions does create a sense although a very limited sense of what is out there, and fortifies the perception of an art world that exists. I don't know if this is good or bad, as information in itself seems beneficial. What worries me is the essence of what the art experience is will get lost in all this mediatization where the thing in itself will disappear completely and all that will be there is its substitute, the meditated image.

### Torsten Brinkmann

Artist

Yes.

### Lars Bang Larsen

Writer and curator

The models you quote are very different. Possibilities for creating viable networks depend on the degree of interaction that organisers and mediators facilitate between the people involved. Regarding survey books, they can – provided they work according to their intention: acquaint a wider audience with artists and artistic strategies. But I don't see how they can be a tool for developing networks for artists. Surveys can make people more known, but that is something else. Basically, networks for artists are made by artists.

### Jiyeon Lee

Art critic and independent curator

The answer is not a straightforward yes/no. The explosion of information availability brought about not the lifting of networking/knowledge uplift of individual as was first originally thought, but rather 'information deflation', basically making information more trivial and unimportant.

Similarly, the current large surveys of artists

Q2

IS THE GROWING DIVERSITY OF MODELS PRESENTING LARGE SURVEYS OF ARTISTS A GOOD DEVELOPMENT FOR PRODUCING NETWORKS?

Q2

can become like that. If one just has a telephone directory-like database, then all it would show is information.

Networks of people are more important and essential to get a right source of research and further collaboration, I believe.

### **Sarah Baker**

PILOT:2 artist

When I think of "networks for artists," I think of the pub, which was once described to me by a wise old man as the most important place for artist to network.

### **Juozas Laivys**

PILOT:2 artist

All the approaches are good and right if they are purposeful.

### **Terry Smith**

Artist

The best network for artists exist on two levels. On the local, it is important that friends engage with each other's work. That there is an open, critical and competitive environment. It is also important that we operate internationally. That we develop links, the web is a great tool, but without some selection it is impossible to filter everything. Now and again there is a cull of art magazines and a rush to invent new ones, this seems to me to be a good attitude. We need to be critical and questioning of all the assumptions that dominate current debates. And it's important for artist to regain the initiative rather than leave to the curating world's 'Band of Brothers and Sisters'

### **Nathan J.D. Barlex**

PILOT:1 artist

Probably, but I find them calculated, depressing and charmless. A grey wash of talent rendered impenetrable by sheer volume.

### **Pauline Graham**

Collector

Yes, so long as the newer models do not exclude, replace or reduce the more personal connections.

### **Neville Shulman**

Explorer, writer, mountaineer, director

*International Theatre Institute*, chair of *Theatre Forum*, collector

Diversity of models provided is always a good thing but not necessarily a great thing. Sometimes there is overkill and those wanting to influence art collectors, experts and enthusiasts should practice 'natural selection' to achieve greater impact and results.

### **Jean-Claude Freymond-Guth**

Artist and curator *Les Complices\**, Zurich

They are a good way of involving in the international art business more independently for up coming artists and a interesting alternative for curators alike. It would be great if these models could work together with established networks.

### **Filomeno Fusco**

Director *Feld fur Kunst*

Generally I think that producing of networks is an important attitude in contemporary art and becomes an increasing impact as an artist strategy. Survey of artists is anyway necessary for curators to develop new forms of presentation and inspiration and for artists, especially outside the established art business, to get public attention for their works.

**WHY DO YOU GO  
TO ART FAIRS  
AND BIENNALES?**

**IS THE GROWING  
DIVERSITY OF MODELS  
PRESENTING LARGE  
SURVEYS OF ARTISTS  
A GOOD DEVELOPMENT  
FOR PRODUCING  
NETWORKS?**

**HOW DOES THE ART  
MARKET IMPACT ON  
YOUR INVOLVEMENT  
IN ART?**

### Free Association

*Independent curatorial group*

In terms of Free Association, it doesn't. We are committed to working as independently as possible, all members working without a fee. These people are art professionals, with day jobs in the field. This enables us to be a self-funded enterprise to a degree, affording a great deal of autonomy to work only on projects which interest us. We forge working relationships with like-minded artist and curator initiatives overseas. Through joint projects and exhibitions, we aim to find common discourse, raising the profile of artists from the UK in the specific country we're working in, along with that region's artists here in the UK. Ours is a mutually beneficial promotional arrangement for the two hosts and the artists, existing regardless of art market movements, as sales are not the aim.

### Dallas Seitz

*Artist and director of 1000000mph projects*

As an artist and a facilitator to artist's projects with 1000000mph projects I romantically like to think I am outside of the art market but realize this is not true. We live in a commercially lead world across the board and I want to make money as much as the next person. I however resent that artists' or artist run spaces are forced into believing they are less successful if they are not part of this market. Being Canadian I have also experienced a different type of arts funding and system of artist run space where by an artist or space is funded based on the merit of the work itself not the salability of the work. I think art prizes like beck's futures is a good example of how much the tail is wagging the dog....everyone up for these supposed new artist's prizes are already represented by a dealer. The commercial world is representing all forms of work and collectors are buying it which is great all around but there is still a feeling as an artist that we are being guided rather than guiding.

### Chris Hammond

*Director MOT*

Like the sword of Damocles.

### I-Chen Kuo

*PILOT:2 artist*

My expertise is not in developing my significance in art market. My job is to develop my thoughts through arts.

### Pil & Galia Kollektiv

*Artists*

Philosophically more often than in practice.

### Tayto et Tayto

*La Pomme de Terre a Basé des Facilitators*

The art market is very impacting. It's Tayto's only reason for being in the art. Tayto embrace market forces and encourage more research competition within the cultural professions. By moving to open, transparent, value-driven cultural system where informed consumers have the ability to shop for art based upon cost, availability, and research outcomes, the supply will be driven by demand. Greater competition will yield better research outcomes.

### Céline Condorelli

*Architect*

At the cost of seeming naïve: very little.

### David Mabb

*Artist and course leader MA Fine art Goldsmiths*

It doesn't, except that my exclusion from the art market inevitably means marginalisation.

### Lawrence Weiner

*Artist*

IT DETERMINES THE LEVEL OF COMFORT WITHIN YOUR ENDEAVOR.

**Flora Fairbairn***Curator/art consultant*

Often (not always) the success of the shows I curate is dictated by the amount of sales I make and the type of work that sells well is sometimes dependent of the art market.

**Ruth Claxton***PILOT:1 artist*

Very little, though I am interested in how artists based outside London have begun, out of necessity, to create their own 'economy' in order to engage with it. It seems to me to be an interesting shift that a number of regional artist-led projects have developed commercial arms in order to begin representing artists.

**Max Presneill***Artist and director **Raid Projects** (Los Angeles) and **Mark Moore Gallery** (Santa Monica)*

It makes it a necessity to travel to the art fairs now. The new hierarchy is increasingly attuned to the fairs as barometers of hipness and success. Travel is good! But the scramble to join the ranks is difficult, often frustrating, humiliating sometimes and feels a bit like a Hollywood version of high school, with its In Crowd, connectedness vibe. Being on the inside pissing out is much preferable here, of course. Success in the market is also useful because it allows one to take chances on other less obviously commercial artists and to trust ones own instincts better. Hopefully this helps diversity of program within the gallery. The bottom line is that it is how I pay my bills, regardless of how much of an art fanboy I happen to be.

**Rainer Ganahl***Artist*

Not at all. Given the fact that my conceptually oriented art making – studying foreign languages, reading books, discussing things, writing, sleeping and dreaming, going to lectures, reading newspapers etc... – has not much to do with art

per se, I would do my work even without any art world at all. My artistic work is structured in a way that I learn something. Showing or selling is secondary.

**John Armleder***Artist*

The art market is a spread. So it's quite messy, sometimes sticky. You can always afford some glue. Someone bought it. That's how that started.

**Liam Scully***PILOT:1 artist*

The art market has no impact on my involvement in art, I make art for me and no fucking market. If someone buys my work it is a huge honor because I have not tailored the work for a particular market. The person has purchased a very real piece of work from my heart not for the mart. However the prospect of making mass produced sellable art has crossed my mind, I have witnessed people make a killing this way and I am allways skint. It really breaks my heart. But I cant fucking do that. When a market opens up for my work I believe it will be a pure and natural process, where people are bying the real deal. Its Art, not a god damn product.

**Kjetil Berge***Artist*

I would not like the art market to have any impact on my involvement in art. I think that my best bet for making good work is to avoid thinking about the art market.

**John Timberlake***Artist and writer*

I sell my work, via supportive gallerists, to collectors. Validation is important for many artists. All forms of validation involve some form of social intercourse, and in this society that includes money. Early in my career I initially hoped for

press reviews as the form of validation (simply because I did not see myself as part of any network which would expose my work to collectors) and I was pleased when I was mentioned in reviews. When I started to sell work, I saw this as a form of validation also, although obviously, like many artists, I strive to imaginatively transcend the conditions of the given economic and cultural moment to ensure the content of my art has as much autonomy as possible in relation to the pressures of the market.

### Nicole Mollett

PILOT:1 artist

We have a complex love/hate relationship.

### Victoria Preston

Independent curator

If by art market, the current buying frenzy for contemporary art as evidenced in auction house prices is meant: not at all. If, however, the art market intersects or encompasses the broader field of cultural production, then the answer is more complex. I see a growing polarisation between art that is popular because it is decorative and art that is respected because it contains a message or a point of identification with the spectator. "Art is not decoration; it is a crucial agent in contemporary culture and society, with the potential for formulating essential insights into their structure and mechanisms."

This creates the potential for an interesting dialogue with collectors with a discourse that gets people to reflect on their own motives for collecting art.

\*Misiano, V. & Zabel, I., (2003, Spring / Summer No. 1). MJ – Manifesta Journal, The Revenge of the White Cube, p4.

### Polly Staple

Frieze Art Fair curator and editor at large frieze

I currently work with and art fair.

### Deirdre King

Artist

It forms part of the context in which I work and sets up tensions in my practice and attitude towards it, as well as throwing up practicalities that I have to deal with. Besides aesthetic, intellectual and social factors, commercial ones also form my working context. The art market registers itself in what I do, either as a force to work with or against.

In reality, that means working out how to survive in a market driven context – to maintain visibility and the integrity of the art work without caving in to the pressure of equating artistically successful work with financially successful work (although they sometimes coincide). It means resisting the pressure to turn my practice into a production line of formulaic work after the success of selling work.

The challenge is to keep it live, to develop and risk a possible dip in sales: markets don't like change, they like a branded, consistent, recognizable product because stability seems to allow investment to appreciate. There is a reluctance in the art world to acknowledge that artistic value, however difficult to describe, is increasingly confused with market value. The success of a 'product' tends to influence the terms by which subsequent 'products' are marketed and succeed. The fact that an artist may or may not enjoy financial success is neither here nor there; what's important is to realise how the understanding of what art is, the terms in which it is described, how it is made, is affected by the financial markets.

### Lars Nilsson

PILOT:2 artist

I have a quite ambiguous relation to it; It is world as we know it – both representative and business as usual but also in certain aspects really perverse.

### Giorgio Sadotti

Artist

Softly..... I wish it were otherwise.

**Sean Rogg**

PILOT:2 artist

I have had to make the majority of my work so far with out being involved directly in the art market. But I have always kept a close eye on what my peers are up to, what is selling and for how much and numbers of editions, etc...

**Seulgi Lee**

PILOT:2 artist

I can meet a new public for my artwork.

**David Mollin**

PILOT:1 artist

Hugely, in a small dark self-contained and highly focused area with the words 'Schiesser' along the elastic.

**Hideuki Sawayanagi**

PILOT:2 artist

I don't know.

**Edward Wakefield**

Artist and sea captain

I'm not sure how the art market impacts on my involvement with art. I've never sold any work, and so it follows that I have a resistant stance to saleable pieces.

**Tzu Nyen Ho**

PILOT:2 artist

The 'art market' is not a unified, cohesive 'entity'. This is particularly so in my own experience of art industry in Singapore, where it seems to me that there has always been a thriving market for more traditional paintings, ceramics, Chinese calligraphy, etc. These artists, who are able to survive and even thrive in a particular 'market' are however, completely alienated from another art market - which for the lack of a better term, we may call the 'contemporary art market', where the

Biennale system seems predominant.

I think the very split between these two markets, which for the ease of communication, we may simplistically term in binary terms as 'conventional' and the 'contemporary', defines the situation of Singaporean art. Many of my peers and colleagues doing 'contemporary' art find themselves and their works circulated in different parts of the world - the more successful ones garner a degree of 'symbolic' capital which however cannot be translated into monetary returns. There is simply no private demand for their works, no interests from collectors. The local art Museum too, sadly has not been active enough in acquiring these works.

This split between the two markets is a historical situation we are enmeshed in. And attempts by some artists to crossover have generally yielded uninteresting results. For myself, I see it as integral to the artistic project attempts to invent your own 'market' or at least to create ways of regulating your own relationship to existing ones. This is as interesting to me as the final art 'product'.

In my current project - 4 x 4 - Episodes of Singapore Art, I've attempted to explore the different economies of scales of different industries, so I tried to tap into the television broadcast market as a way to finance my artistic project. The budget which I eventually obtained is peanuts to the broadcast industry, but quite princely for the average contemporary visual arts practitioner in Singapore. Of course working in this manner brings about its own set of problems and limitations, for I have to contend with the inertia and the profit driven mindset of the media industry, which can be quite unpleasant, to say the least. However, if successful, this project can be broadcasted to millions of viewers - theoretically the biggest possible public, who can in turn assess and even record the work, free of charge, without stepping out of their houses.

I think experimentations with markets - thinking supply about it - is an important component of my practice.

### **Gijsbrecht Van Der Heul**

Artist

The art market is like a curious neighbour, I can't stand his face in my studio. I am on a mission. I know what I have to do.

### **Ed Young**

PILOT:2 artist

It doesn't. I don't really sell any work.

### **Elinor Jansz**

Publisher *Four Corners Books*

As a publisher of art books, I can't tell how much, if at all, the art market impacts on what I do. It's certainly not something I consider when deciding which books to publish – but then I don't think I'm paying that much attention to the book market either.

### **Andrea Viliani**

Curator

In all probability, the various institutions have not yet fully developed the potential that the art market could generate once it was fully incorporated into such bodies. Distinctions should be made, and there are well-known ethical rules that must be respected. But the market exists at a level which precedes the work's mere presentation to the public, or its sale. Indeed the art market has become the ultimate sphere of reference for the work of many artists today: I am thinking of those strategies, which we might call conceptual, deployed by pop artists to characterise a type of artist who takes the market as his field of action, a figure recently analysed by Alison Gingeras in an essay published in the catalogue of the collection of Dakis Joannou.

But I am also thinking of artists who coexisted with these ones - such as the recently deceased Steven Parrino - and who have continued to maintain that it is possible to remain extraneous to the market, and not just ideologically. Our current experience of art is strongly conditioned

by this more or less intense relationship with the market, and by the contradictions that such a relationship has generated. Apart from admitting as much, who work, like me, into art institutions should also be more courageous in the face of this absolutely contemporary phenomenon, both from a critical and from an operational viewpoint.

Exhibitions within fairs, such as the one which Harald Szeemann curated at the Bologna Fair, the panel discussions of ARCO, and the *Art Statements* of Art Basel and Art Basel Miami, are examples of a gradual institutionalisation, of the art market, which experiments with, and gives innovative form to its various manifestations. Whereas the inverse phenomenon, that is, the entry of the art market into the art institution and, at least, some confrontation between the two, is much more passive and less creative, and naturally calls for thorough debate and considerable caution. But I believe that a clear-sighted and imaginative engagement with the art market is one of the tasks of this generation of curators.

### **Jean-Conrad Lemaitre**

Collector

The art market does not really impact on the development of our collection. I think that collecting art is acquiring works you like and has nothing to do with financial speculation. Of course the art market may at times reflect the demand for an artist. THE MARKET and fashion are not dictating my choices.

### **Bruce Haines**

Curator

Perhaps it causes some anxiety about who you show, whether or not they are going to be hot, are currently hot or are too hot. Then you get gallerists behaving like bouncers, shielding their artists from invitations to work with you in the hope they get a better offer.

### Mikko Canini

Artist

While I recognize the role that the market plays in shaping the cultural landscape, it has always appeared to me as something of an intruder, assigning value in very precise, but ultimately meaningless, terms, and as such is extraneous to my involvement in art.

### Rosanna Guy Greaves

Artist

The art market is not something I wish to take into consideration when making work. It does however have an impact as I tend to make work specifically for a space so the exposure from one show can help to gain trust from curators or organisers to let me create new works for future shows.

### Caroline Corbetta

Curator

It does not impact – at least not on an intentional level. In the global network I was just referring to the market is becoming more and more influential and it compulsorily interacts with critical and curatorial practices.

### Rory Macbeth

Artist and co-founder of PILOT

I try not to let it affect my practice as an artist, but it does add pressure once you are perceived as being on the market treadmill. Since some of my stuff sold, galleries have taken me to one side and said "...how about making some nice paintings now...?" -looking at what I've done recently, this has perhaps made me make some spectacularly unsaleable pieces.... so I guess it has had an effect.

As for PILOT, the overbearing nature of market forces has shaped our agenda absolutely, and in spite of our structure, we are still being offered inclusion in major commercial events, and have had offers of a 'commercial wing' to the PILOT event etc... There is clearly money in not making

any money. Needless to say we have politely turned these down...

### Danh Vo

PILOT:2 artist

I came from Denmark where 95% of the art world is subsidized, so there isn't any market; I mean that doesn't create more liberated artists, it's just another way of control and at the same time it supports very much a regressive and romantic idea of the artist role. In many ways I prefer the impact of the market because it's so real and you can't escape from it: you have to be there and deal with it.

### Peter Lewis

Curator Redux

With indifference. I am not personally inspired by the market, its allegiance to the bureaucratic, the sovereignty of branding, the morality of success, the 'fashionability' of the "[Land]" project, 'relational aesthetics'... This could be sniggered at, as a heroic gesture of jealousy on my part but ultimately the dismissal forces 'me/we' through. I don't want to spend all my time with the dogs. Universities should be a place for research and thought, and the danger is that the market enters here too. Where can the dust lie? There is no 'market'; there is no 'art'.

### Jeni Walwin

Curator and writer

When I first began working with artists the art market had little or no influence on the projects in which I was involved. This was in part due to a personal commitment I had at the time of placing artists' work before a public without reference to the commercial sector. However, in recent years my interest in seeking out a greater range of opportunities for supporting artists has expanded to include the selling of their work, and this has coincided with an increasing crossover between the public and private sectors.

### Tercerunquinto

PILOT:2 artists

Hasta ahora el mercado ha sido un evento paralelo al trabajo, aunque no incidente, pues es visto bajo la óptica que todo material puede ser “comerciable” y que puede tener una circulación propia e independiente a lo que nosotros estamos interesados en hacer que es producir y debatir ideas y criterios.

Till now the market has been a parallel event to the work, but not inextricably linked. It is seen under the lens through which almost all material could be “commercial” and could have its own distribution and be independent to what we are doing, which is to produce and debate ideas and criteria.

### Beagles & Ramsay

Artists collaborative

It is a nipple.

### Kerry Duggan

Artist

Well I’ve been asked to exhibit my work in an “art market” but I do not set out to make work for this purpose.

### Liliane Schneiter

Art historian

Art markets are conflicting with each other and are apparently incompatible with the aim shared by cosmopolitical art practices exploring a common world in a sustainable manner. Most art networks bear on the conditions to be met in a socializing virtue of international trade. For example, net artists, preliminary commitment goes beyond economic markets when those artists participate to the Creative Commons or to the Free Licence Movement (GNU). They are working beyond the globalization of financial, economical and art markets. Two prevailing ideas stand beyond the art market’s concern: common access and shared

knowledge in fluxes and flows with respect for singular worlds and matter where people and narratives live.

### Syd Mostow

PILOT:2 artist

The art market is a great motivating factor which has turned the carrot dangling in front of the artist’s nose into a golden carrot with all its psychological and emotional ramifications — being so heavy, when it swings back and forth, it whacks you in the face and pokes you in the eye.

### Torsten Brinkmann

PILOT:2 artist

When the art market likes your work, it pays your rent.

### Lars Bang Larsen

Writer and curator

Which market? There’s the commercial market, but also the institutional and academic markets. A Marxist analysis of the marketplace seems outdated, as it primarily deals with ownership. Today markets are in representation as much as anything. I work with the artists whose work I find interesting, irrespective of whether or not they are represented by a commercial gallery.

### Jiyoon Lee

Art critic and independent curator

It doesn’t make that much impact on my curatorial practice directly. But eventually, to measure some aspects of the success for the show can rely on the further invitations for the artists presented and some possible collection made for the museum and gallery after the show. This can be particularly applied to young artists.

**Sarah Baker**

PILOT:2 artist

If the artist continues to do what the artist truly wishes to do – the artwork will be that much more important in the long run, and therefore that much more valuable.

**Matthew Poole**

Co-director MA in Gallery Studies, University of Essex, and co-founder of PILOT

At the moment I spend my time analysing the big glossy adverts in Artforum plotting coordinates on a graph whose axes represent cash spent on advert (x-axis) in relation to whether the advert makes me like the artist's work more or less (y-axis). I think I know what the conclusions might be, but hope otherwise.

**Juozas Laivys**

PILOT:2 artist

All the approaches are good and right if they are purposeful.

**Terry Smith**

Artist

None whatsoever.

**Nathan J.D. Barlex**

PILOT:1 artist

With regards to making work, I try to ignore trends within the art market, as it seems contrary to creating original work. As for the structures that support Art making – i.e. galleries, funding bodies, etc. – it's important to get a handle on where what you are doing is likely to be appreciated and supported.

**Pauline Graham**

Collector

It helps my understanding, makes me more involved and induces me to buy.

**Neville Shulman**

Explorer, writer, mountaineer, director

*International Theatre Institute*, chair of *Theatre Forum*, collector

It is necessary because it provides opportunities to compare quality, prices and the all important presentation of artists and their works within a context which enables the 'grey matter' to consider who is doing what, when and how.

**Jean-Claude Freymond-Guth**Artist and curator *Les Complices\**, Zurich

As a non commercial art space we don't chose our artistic collaborations according to commercial interests. The art market nevertheless is one factor that we are working with, but we want to remain independent and chose our collaboration with the art market only to what seems interesting for our programm and development.

**Filomeno Fusco**Director *Feld fur Kunst*

As I am not that much involved in the art market, because of my work with public, conceptual and off-art, it has no strong impact on my projects.

**HOW DID YOU START  
SELLING YOUR WORK?  
COLLECTING?**

**Free Association**

Independent curatorial group

Free Association does not sell any artwork.

Free Association does not collect any artwork.

**Dallas Seitz**

Artist and director of *1000000mph* projects

**Selling** My first sale was to a Real Estate agent...

A work for his new house and he paid me with two large salmons he caught in a British Columbia river.

Since then I have worked with several commercial spaces over the last ten years some of which have been able to sell various works, others which have not. I think video/installation artists' have a tougher time starting out and our main audience for purchase is large collections, museum sales and video archives.

**Collecting** I started collecting in high school. I traded a painting with my art teacher for a work of her's that I still love. I continued this trade with other artists since then. All the works I have in my collection are about a time and place in my life and are really important to me... I wouldn't sell anything I have in my collection... Although sometimes it is tempting.

**Chris Hammond**

Director *MOT*

A few years after founding MOT people started to pay for my time and ideas. As I don't make objects then I guess that this is the closest I get to selling my work.

**I-Chen Kuo**

PILOT:2 artist

**Selling** If somebody willing to buy my works, I'll sell them. But, so far, I have not made any deal yet.

**Collecting** I do not collect others' works because I do not have enough funds. Therefore, I can only do best in my artworks. Then hopefully start collecting soon.

**Pil & Galia Kollektiv**

Artists

**Selling** Our first exhibition included an auction of cheaply purchased and hastily modified plastic toys, with a real Sotheby's auctioneer. This was followed by a free T-shirt handout and several cheap fanzine style exhibition catalogues and CDs.

Since then, we have been offering our animated videos for sale at affordable prices at exhibitions, the equivalent for us of live music gig CDs. Because such alternative sales/distribution methods have always been so important to us, it felt strange when we finally had the opportunity to sell some installation work to 'real' collectors. We'd always wanted to hate rich collectors, but the experience taught us to see them more in terms of visual vinyl junkies, not that different from ourselves.

**Collecting** Having realised that art collecting could be more than just investment hoarding (see above), we determined to start our own collection by inviting swaps with fellow artists.

**Tayto et Tayto**

La Pomme de Terre a Basé des Facilitators

Years ago Tayto ran across the key rings at the Guggenheim, and with a meal, Tayto got, the wind up Warhol. Tayto was thrilled with the thing, and kept it on the desk at work. Next thing you know, Tayto would just... happen... to buy one meal a week and got all of the set except 'Orange Disaster'. Then they had the Contemporary Art Society Meals. That did it. Tayto then began to collect with a passion. Tayto has purchased every Contemporary Art Society recommendation, even those only loosely connected to art, such as Liam Gillick's flight stubs, since then. Then Tayto discovered that you can routinely find the contemporary art at flea markets, tube stations and art fairs.

**Lawrence Weiner**

Artist

BY OFFERING IT FOR SALE.

**Céline Condorelli***Architect*

**Selling** I never did sell, never really wanted to either but galleries have tried to package my work as sellable even though it is very much dependent or focused on being site-specific and responding to a specific brief – therefore not to be sold. I think the work is sometimes for sale because people do not know what else to do with it or where to place it, which is more of a comment on the ambiguous position of my practice and architectural works than on the art market.

**Collecting** I only collect artists' work that I have a personal relationship to. I do not know any other way to approach art that I should live with.

**David Mabb***Artist and course leader MA Fine Art Goldsmiths*

I haven't started "selling" my work, meaning deliberately going out and selling work to a market. When someone does buy, it has always been by accident, as a by-product of another activity. Individuals and organisations have approached me and asked to buy paintings because they have seen the work or heard me talk about it.

**Flora Fairbairn***Curator/art consultant*

I'm a curator/art consultant – the collectors I have started selling to have come to shows that I have curated and become clients that way.

**Ruth Claxton***PILOT:1 artist*

Someone asked me if they could buy a piece. I said yes.

**Max Presneill***Artist and director Raid Projects (Los Angeles) and Mark Moore Gallery (Santa Monica)*

**Selling** As an artist myself it was collectors seeing

my work in exhibitions and developing a relationship over time.

**Collecting** By swapping work with other artists.

**Rainer Ganahl***Artist*

**Selling** I was approached by a dealer.

**Collecting** I started trading my work for the work of some friends.

**Gabriela Schutz***PILOT:1 artist*

Through personal contacts and through the final degree exhibition. After graduating it was through my personal contacts in my homeland. In the UK I find it hard to sell, and I do through gallery that sell to offices, through exhibitions and personal contacts. From my experience it is Americans who mainly buy, even in the UK.

**Helen Frik***PILOT:1 artist*

**Selling** Commercial gallery.

**Collecting** Swapping with colleagues.

**Liam Scully***PILOT:1 artist*

**Selling** Luck and of course a quality product. It is hard to know who is the real lucky one. The Buyer I suppose. So Go On.... Buy Buy Buy Liam Scully's work!

**Kjetil Berge***Artist*

My work was first sold to dedicated friends and loyal family.

**Nicole Mollett***PILOT:1 artist*

By chance.

**John Timberlake***Artist and writer*

Initially directly from artist organized group shows. Subsequently gallerists became interested in my practice and found they could sell my work.

**Deirdre King***Artist*

Sales came through exhibiting.

**Lars Nilsson***PILOT:2 artist*

**Selling** Through galleries.

**Giorgio Sadotti***Artist*

**Selling** I haven't yet but as I said earlier I live near hope.

**Collecting** In some ways this question might have more relevance to me than the previous one but that would relate to a linguistic notion where I would have to pretend that I didn't understand what you were referring to as being collected.

**Seulgi Lee***PILOT:2 artist*

It started by selling a drawing of a project.

**David Mollin***PILOT:1 artist*

I just decided one day to knuckle down and get on with it.

**Tzu Nyen Ho***PILOT:2 artist*

Due to the nature of my recent projects, the process of selling it is different each time. The current project that I'm working on – 4 x 4 – Episodes of Singapore Art (2005) is sold to the local broadcast station, and has potential of being

picked up many times over by other broadcast stations. The last project that I worked on Utama – Every Name in History is I (2003), which contains a film and a set of 20 paintings, is in the midst of being sold to a museum. I have received offers from various interested parties – both private individuals and institutions to purchase some of the paintings, but I've turned them down due to my desire to see the project remaining intact as a whole. However, the film component of the project has been sold to a number of interested individuals as DVDs. I have also developed this work into a performative lecture, where I have been paid per performance for it.

Earlier when I was making more paintings, people who purchased my works were friends and acquaintances who followed the trajectory of my work. I was never particularly interested in inserting the paintings into the Singaporean commercial art gallery circuit, not in its current state, at least.

**Hideuki Sawayanagi***PILOT:2 artist*

Some collector saw my work and bought it.

**Gijsbrecht Van Der Heul***Artist*

I didn't start! They did!

**Ed Young***PILOT:2 artist*

I don't really sell any work.

**Jean-Conrad Lemaitre***Collector*

My wife and I started collecting in Spain, 23 years ago, and it was partially to have a better understanding of the culture of that country where we lived at the time, and also because Spain in 1982 and after has a very active art scene: it was the time of the Movida.

We sell works sometimes, because they might no longer fit our collection, and these sales help finance new acquisitions. We think that rotating a collection is very healthy, because a collection is the reflection of individuals and people change with time.

### Bruce Haines

Curator

During the first show I ever worked on, which was with Ian Hamilton Finlay at Oriol Mostyn in North Wales in 1996, I bought a screen-print by him called 'Citron Bleu', a sketch of a boat in the shape of a lemon, which cost me £30. I should have got its partner print of a boat builder's plans for a boat in the shape of a lemon too.

### Mikko Canini

Artist

I started selling work by accident. Then I started making video and stopped selling work.

### Rosanna Guy Greaves

Artist

I started selling my work to the public through small exhibitions.

But I am far more interested in getting the opportunity to make work for interesting places to develop my own engagement with my practice and to not be limited by mediums that lend themselves to sales.

### Peter Lewis

Curator *Redux*

**Selling** I didn't.

**Collecting** People give me their work or trust me to look after it. The 'collector' is a player in a language game and also the title of a film starring Terence Stamp as one.

### Tercerunquinto

PILOT:2 Artists

Las ideas que tenemos es el manejar la documentación como un producto de venta, el recuperar del archivo de trabajo los materiales que pueden hacer de la lectura de la obra una revisión estética del mismo proyecto.

The idea we have is to manage the documentation as a sale product, taking materials from the archive that can be read as schedules and ideas of the same project.

### Beagles & Ramsay

Artists collaborative

We first exhibited small drawings in nice frames.

### Kerry Duggan

Artist

By invitation to exhibit as part of a fundraising exhibition.

### Torsten Brinkmann

PILOT:2 artist

In exhibitions.

### Jean-Claude Freymond-Guth

Artist and curator *Les Complices\**, Zurich

When we opened *Les Complices\** in 2002 it was clear that we would not identify by denying the aspect of commercial interests in art. We have been selling works if there was interest, but it was never our interest to show work in order to sell it.

### Juozas Laivys

PILOT:2 artist

I started from the very lowest level – streets, local fairs. Sometimes I'm giving my works as gifts to people.

HOW DID  
YOU START  
SELLING  
YOUR WORK?  
COLLECTING?

### Rory Macbeth

Artist and co-founder of PILOT

I started selling properly when I had my work included in LISTE as a last minute add-on (and perhaps because I could drive down from London and bring other works with me). All my stuff sold, and more commissioned, and my work started to be taken seriously (occasionally) by galleries, which felt like a very strange shift in attitude, considering it was the same work that seemed to be so studiously ignored before. But quite handy.

### Terry Smith

Artist

**Selling** First of all to friends. Which is also how I began to collect.

### Nathan J.D. Barlex

PILOT:1 artist

This bloke came up to me at a show I was in and said, "I like your painting. How much?" We got chatting and I delivered it the following week. Word spread and soon I was inundated with calls from galleries, independent curators and collectors all wanting to see more of my work. I got my first big show in New York and sold everything. I'm currently working on a project in Switzerland. Okay, so the first bit was true.

### Neville Shulman

Explorer, writer, mountaineer, director

*International Theatre Institute, chair of Theatre Forum, collector*

Collecting art was a natural progression from interests in antiques and complements my exploring ancient peoples and tribes and witnessing the emergence of new cultures.

### Pauline Graham

Collector

As a collector, I started buying in markets pictures I liked. I then became a member of the

Contemporary Art Society which has been seminal in my development in the field.