

1. Summary: “*Post-Soviet Art Museums in the Era of Globalization*”

The project examined the fundamental, varying and complex transformation art institutions in the former USSR have been exposed to since the demise of the Communist regime. Whereas their counterparts in the West have been confronted with the challenges posed by the new economic and political demands since then, former Soviet museums were burdened by an almost Herculean task: After 1990/91, due to the abrupt end of Communist cultural policy, they were faced with stifling financial problems, new demands of an abruptly emerging Capitalist market economy and the urgent need to restructure as institutions. Yet, the dismal financial condition was accompanied by an unprecedented amount of intellectual-artistic freedom as well as by open borders, unlimited access to hitherto unavailable information, and direct contact with the Western art world. With traditional values and ideological guidelines abandoned, new contexts, new territories, and new orders were explored. Museums proved receptive to global trends. The new era transformed directors into tireless lobbyists and fundraisers; they were pursuing (inter) national donors and partnerships. They were aided by international organizations (EU, World Bank, UNESCO), by individual sponsors and companies (IBM, Soros, Interros) and foreign governments. They used this backing to restructure their institutions, to reshape the collections displayed (in line with the altered art history canon and with their ‘national’ and/or imperial past), to expand and modernize facilities and to exchange art and ideas with the international community. By the turn of the millennium this first stage of restructuring collections and rehabilitating the (pre-) Soviet past was largely completed. In the decade to follow, the task was different, concerning museum planning in general: How to position museums in the 21st century in a national and international context was a major issue. How does museum development correspond with socio-economic issues, e. g. urban development? What architecture is best suited for new or revitalised museums? What master-plan (to use a recently inflated term in post-Soviet museum planning)? Characteristically, significant new structures – with the exception of KUMU, Tallinn – were broadly discussed only after ‘the nosy nineties’ (and so far implemented only in rare cases). What curatorial concept? How to deal with the legacy of Socialist Realism? Or with the most recent art trends backed by the economic elite? In order to address, analyse and describe these complex issues the project was carried out in close cooperation with academic and museum experts in- and outside the former USSR. Much knowledge was gained through an international conference organized in Graz. The study was based on archival, published and interview material (mostly in Russian) and relied on ambitious international research focuses (cultural, museum and global studies, memory research). Geographically, it covered major Baltic, Ukrainian and Russian centres, thus creating a comparative framework. The project conquered new terrain – both thematically and methodologically.

Kurzfassung

Die Forschungsarbeit „Postsowjetische Kunstmuseen im Zeitalter der Globalisierung“ untersuchte den fundamentalen und komplexen Transformationsprozess, den Kunstinstitutionen in der ehemaligen UdSSR seit dem Ende des Kommunismus durchliefen. Während Museen im Westen seit den neunziger Jahren sich kontinuierlich an geänderte ökonomische und kulturpolitische Bedingungen anpassen konnten, sahen sich ihre Pendanten im postsowjetischen Raum einer fast unlösbaren Aufgabe gegenüber: Nach 1990/91, mit dem abrupten Ende der kommunistischen Kulturpolitik, hatten sie mit lähmenden Finanzproblemen, erdrückenden Anforderungen der abrupt eingeführten Marktwirtschaft und der dringlichen Aufgabe zu kämpfen, sich als Institutionen neu zu positionieren. Die katastrophale ökonomische Lage wurde durch eine Reihe positiver Errungenschaften gemildert – durch ein ungeahntes Ausmaß an künstlerisch-intellektueller Freiheit, offene Grenzen, ungehinderten Zugang zu bis dahin zensierten bzw. unerwünschten Informationen und direkten Kontakt zur westlichen Kunstwelt. Mit dem Ende der von der Partei verordneten Richtlinien konnten neue Kontexte, neue Ordnungen, neue Gebiete erforscht werden. Museen orientierten sich an globalen Trends. Die neuen Anforderungen verwandelten Direktoren in unermüdliche Fundraising-Experten und Lobbyisten; sie suchten (inter-)nationale Sponsoren und Partner. Unterstützt wurden sie zunächst von internationalen Organisationen (EU, Weltbank, UNESCO), von einzelnen Sponsoren und Firmen (IBM, Soros, Interros) und ausländischen Regierungen. Mit dieser Unterstützung gingen sie daran, ihre Institutionen umzustrukturieren und zu modernisieren, ihre Sammlungen neu aufzustellen und den internationalen Austausch zu intensivieren. Um die Jahrtausendwende war die erste Phase der Umorientierung abgeschlossen; einige Museen waren zum Global Player (s. Eremitage) aufgestiegen. Seither verlief die Entwicklung noch dynamischer, wenngleich unter geänderten Prämissen: Nun galt das Hauptaugenmerk einer zeitgemäßen Museumsplanung – im nationalen und internationalen Kontext sowie im Kontext einer nachhaltigen urbanen Planung. Der rasante Anstieg von Museumsneugründungen und Zu-/Umbauten ebenso wie der allgemeine Transformationsprozess der letzten zehn Jahre zeigte eines: Prägend waren Diskussionen über die jeweiligen Masterpläne, unter Einbeziehung international führender Architekturbüros, über die sozio-ökonomische Relevanz dieser Bauten sowie über die aktuellsten Kuratoren-Konzepte. Die rein inhaltliche Neupositionierung der 1990er Jahre – die Neuaufstellung der Avantgarde-, Moderne-, kirchlichen Kunst sowie die Integration des Nonkonformismus und der aktuellsten, von der ökonomischen Elite finanzierten Trends anstelle des in die Depots relegierten sozialistisch-realistischen Erbes – griff nun zu kurz. All diese komplexen Fragenstellungen wurden international erstmals – auch im Rahmen einer Grazer Konferenz – untersucht. Die Ergebnisse der methodisch wie thematisch innovativen Arbeit basieren auf einer soliden empirischen Grundlage und liegen in einem breiten komparativen Bezugsrahmen (Russland, Ukraine, baltische Staaten) vor.

2.1 Report on the scientific work

2.1.1 The project examined the fundamental, varying and complex transformation art institutions in the former USSR have been exposed to since the end of the Communist regime. The project was conceived in 2007, at a time when the post-Soviet museum world was undergoing rapid and fundamental change in several of the successor states. The reasons for the project were two-fold: Firstly, the existing literature and source material, mostly in Russian, the Baltic languages, and partly in English, was only partially available to international museum experts. Also it was mainly descriptive and concentrated on the most important cases. As East European studies – with some exceptions such as Bamberg University and notably Anglo-Saxon colleagues – tend to neglect museum studies, and as museum work in the post-Soviet states is usually carried out by museum workers, i.e. by practitioners, the two fields rarely interact. Generally, approaches from cultural, museums and global studies, memory research, and cultural sociology are not (or not sufficiently) reviewed by museum personnel in Russia, Ukraine, Caucasus, and Central Asia. Though the situation in academic museum studies is improving markedly in the Baltic States and as for Russia in Moscow and to some extent St. Petersburg, empirical and analytical work on the project was more difficult to carry out than on previous research by the project leader (e. g. *Bourgeois Art Patronage, 1850-1917*; *Art Exports under Lenin and Stalin*; *Private Art Collecting in the USSR, 1917-1991*). Secondly, the transformation of post-Soviet museums had until then been reviewed and discussed by international research only marginally. It had been clear from the start that much empirical work had to be done in well-selected museums, archives, academic institutions and art centres. Given the innovative, interdisciplinary character of the complex subject matter and the vast geographical and chronological frame, the project was executed largely in line with the work program laid down in the application: that is empirical research and review of theoretical approaches, selected case studies, and the organization of an international conference. The only deviation from the application was the topical focus of the latter, though it was a logical result of the course of research (see 2.1.2)

2.1.2 Most important results

The project was of high relevance to the international scientific community in various respects: The broad [topical, geographical and chronological range](#) as well as the [duration](#) of three years allowed for both a general [overview](#) of a complex research matter and for [selected case studies](#). The additional funding of [research stays, workshops, and the international conference](#) allowed for a close cooperation with academic colleagues, museum and art experts, museum staff – in the Russian Federation, Baltic States, in Ukraine, also in international centres located outside the former USSR.

- a. [Geographical selection](#): Thorough empirical research focused on selected museums and institutions in the Russian Federation (Moscow, St. Petersburg, and Vyborg). The overall development in the Russian provinces, in Ukraine and in the Baltic States (Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia) was also included. The situation in the Southern Caucasus and Kazakhstan was reviewed marginally.
- b. [Chronological selection](#): Given the broad geographical range, research on the period [1990/91 to 2010](#) concentrated on three aspects: Firstly, a general overview on Soviet museums before 1990/91 and after 1991 shed light on Soviet museum politics, the transition period starting with perestroika and focussing on rehabilitation and re-assessment of once tabooed cultural legacies (until c. 1995), the re-strengthening of conservative, patriotic values in the latter part of the 1990s, finally the boom in contemporary art which interrelated with socio-economic changes and global trends, esp. since 2004/5.

WORK PROGRAM: Topical selection, case studies

Major topics were discussed in three major categories – in a general overview, in selected case studies and as part of an international conference.

Firstly, the [general overview](#) mentioned above (see b) required additional empirical and analytical work (see [joint publications](#) on various *perestroika*-topics). To understand the profound changes of late or post-Soviet museums adequately required much detailed work in selected case studies in addition to the general knowledge of the cultural changes in the wake of *perestroika*. This overview also included the growing role of entrepreneurial and corporate sponsorship, patronage, foundations, the aesthetic and political re-orientation, the influence of international organizations and partners, the incorporation of former Communist party buildings into major museums, the partial return of church property to the Orthodox Church, new art media, venues, court cases pertaining to art and museum exhibitions as well as the general changes occurring in cultural politics after 2000.

Secondly, [selected case studies](#) on major museums were carried out: The State Hermitage, St. Petersburg, was researched and analyzed – both in regard to a newly reassessed art and cultural canon (e. g. the re-formation of the Winter Palace display, issues such as trophy art and art exports) and in regard to the enormous expansion in St. Petersburg (Project: “The Greater Hermitage”, reconstruction of General Staff building; master-plan 2014 by Rem Koolhaas), as well as the expansion beyond Palace Square: e. g. opening (and recently partial closing) of branches in Las Vegas (together with Guggenheim), London (Somerset House), in Amsterdam, in Ferrara, (the projected joint venture with Guggenheim) in Vilnius, also the Hermitage branches within Russia, in Kazan’, Vyborg, and Staraia derevnia (see [publications](#)).

In addition, research was carried out on the State Russian Museum (+ branches), newly founded museums by oligarchs such as “Erarta” and “New Museum” (Novyi muzei), all St. Petersburg, as well as on the palace-museums in nearby Peterhof, Pavlovsk, Carskoe selo.

In Moscow research included the State Tretyakov Gallery, GTG, the overall thematic restructuring in its branches, changes in collection display, and the formation of a department on contemporary art (which until the court case in 2007 was headed by Andrei Yefrofeev). In this respect, the growing controversies with the Orthodox Church, repeatedly acting as censor in the field of contemporary art, were considered ([see workshops and report](#)). One sub-study was devoted to the EU-sponsored research program and jubilee exhibition at GTG honouring the 50th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome (*Europe. Russia. Europe*, see conferences)

Another Moscow case study was devoted to the Moscow Museum of Modern Art, MMoMA, run by Zurab and Vasilii Cereteli, its three branches and its profound restructuring in the wake of the First Moscow Biennial, 2005. The MMoMA is the most important result of a series of museum foundations (e. g. museums of Ilya Glazunov and Alex. Shilov) initiated by the former mayor Yuri Luzhkov ([see publications](#)).

A [major](#), still unpublished [report](#) is devoted to the growing network of the National Centre of Contemporary Art (NCCA or GCSI), its various branches, its pioneering role in formulating the need of a modern art infrastructure, of institutionalizing CA on a large scale within Russia (art and museum structures, biennial involvement, ‘Innovation’ prize, grants, stipends, publications, cooperation with international and corporate partners, master-classes). NCCA mediates between the art community and the state bureaucracy; its directorate was asked for expert opinion in recent court cases.

Further research on art structures formed after 2005 was partially [published](#) – e. g. on the first private art museum *art4.ru* and the art and gallery complex, *Vinzavod*.

Research also focussed on the restructuring of the State A. S. Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts (esp. on the annexed Museum of Private Collections and recent acquisitions such as the L. B. Talochkin collection) as well as the State Kremlin Museums. Partial results on the opening of the virtual exhibition at Ivan the Great Belfry, a joint venture of Darmstadt Technical University (CAD), RGGU and the Kremlin, were published. The opening of the Kremlin exhibition at the Belfry simultaneously exemplifies the attempts by national initiatives (e.g. *muzei budushchego* or www.future.museum.ru) to adapt traditional museums to prerequisites of the 21st century.

Museum development in other cities of the Russian Federation – such as the major initiative in Perm', Urals, or the Cultural Alliance program adopted by the leading party United Russia in order to foster new infrastructure were included in the general overview and the conference program.

As for Ukraine, research was carried out on the general museum development with special emphasis given to the situation in Kiev (rebuilding of Art Arsenal; Pinchuk Art Centre, Future Generation Prize, biennial involvement).

Finally, relevant sub-topics arising during the course of the project were taken into account: The Kremlin research commission on the art sales of the interwar period established by Pres. Medvedev in late 2008 was included in the major publication *Soviet Art Exports to Europe* (see publication). Also, research on art foundations was published in a conference volume on women art patrons (coll. Kolodzei).

Thirdly, the final year was devoted to the organization of an international conference held at Graz, June 18-19, 2010; museum experts from Estonia, the Russian Federation, Ukraine, Germany as well as (émigré) scholars from the USA were participating and lecturing on the institutionalization of contemporary art in the (post-) USSR, 1988-2010. All the lectures were of high relevance. The content was summarized in a typescript written by PL. For a detailed description see the links of the published program + conference report below.

PARTNERS: Many colleagues in museums, academic institutions in- and outside the ex-USSR. Valuable information came from the Hermitage (Piotrovsky, Matveev, Kostenko, Solomakha, Konivec, Filippova, Artemieva, Lisicina, Kudriavceva, Ozerkov), the Russian Museum (Karasik, Turkina), Vinzavod (Obukhova), MMoMA (V. Cereteli), NCCA (Bazhanov), Tretiakov Gallery (Vendelshtein, Iovleva, Yerofeev), KUMU (Helme), Russian Academy of Arts (Brumfield), Bowlt, USC, Mislér (Naples), Rutgers (Rosenfeld), Bamberg (Raev), Pavlovsk (Gafiffulin). On other partners see conf. program (2.2., 2.3) and publications (4. Attachment).

MAJOR FINDINGS were published in international (e) journals, book and catalogue publications or were publicly presented at conferences and workshops. It is expected to continue research in various forms and publish additional results. What was characteristic of this first project was the high relevance of continuous trans-disciplinary work and work with practical expertise in fields beyond the usual academic interdisciplinary work. Thus, publications on architecture, urban planning, and business as well as on legal aspects (court cases against curators, museum directors, artists in the representative conflict church vs. art/society) proved highly informative notably in the field of contemporary art, museum planning and recent social changes. Esp. the final year drew the focus on the contemporary segment. As for the application, one starting hypothesis was to show and document the relevance of early international support in the wake of perestroika (e. g. Soros, Ludwig foundations, Goethe Institute). The course of research and esp. the recent most changes in notably Russian art and culture since 2003/4/5 emphasized that East European experts rate the transformation within their countries higher. Among other aspects, this assessment decidedly shaped the program and goals of the conference in June 2010 which focussed on East European contemporary art in a very broad context – from the new appraisal of non-conformism both in the post-Soviet world and outside, in

auctions, museums, private collecting, to new art trends and their recent patronage both by the state, local authorities and by entrepreneurial and corporate sponsors. Other aspects justify this approach: New art, new structures, new patrons, new art media impacted and entered the traditional museum world, changing their policy significantly (Hermitage + 21st c., Kremlin Museums, Tretyakov Gallery, MMoMA, NCCA). In contrast, the empirical output of academic research such as at the Institute of Museum and Heritage Studies at St. Petersburg University and the RGGU Museum Department, Moscow, proved not relevant to the topic.

2.1.3 Information on the running of the project, use of available funding

The project ran according to plan; there were no changes of at least 25%. Nevertheless, in the final year it became clear that given the innovative, complex character of the project and the heterogeneous development in the selected post-Soviet states the focus of the conference had to be on one major aspect – that is the institutionalization of contemporary art (CA) (incl. the once underground culture). This specialization also resulted from the rapid development and profound impact CA would have on other 'traditional' art museums as well as on state and regional cultural policy. Moreover, this young field was characterized by one major advantage: It contributed to innovative cross-disciplinary research on this complex matter, as many of its experts are well rooted in international discourse. Due to this specialization a new partner was found in the Graz based Joanneum which hosted the conference. Due to this arrangement, costs originally scheduled for organization, rent, technical support were not accounted for, also costs for catering were much less. In addition, as the conference was held in English there were no costs for interpreting and translations. Finally, costs for transportation of the participants were much less than anticipated. Also, additional funding could be raised for the organization via the Austrian Federal Ministry of Science and Research (bm.w.f). Thus, due to the amount originally reserved for translations, due to the extra costs amounting to 5% of the over-all project sum, and due to the savings listed above the project was extended by four months. This extension was of utmost importance to the project leader, as several major findings, results and assessments were only achieved in the final year.

2.2 Personnel development

The project was of high importance to the project leader (PL) and several participants. As for PL, the project allowed for additional expertise in a hitherto unknown field. Although PL had carried out important projects on bourgeois art patronage in Tsarist Russia, on Soviet cultural policy (nationalization after 1917, art exports 1920/30s), on private art collecting in the USSR (1917-1991), the current project opened up new perspectives: in museum studies, institutional critique, and contemporary culture (1988/91-2010). It allowed for innovative trans-disciplinary research of risk topics; it enabled the principal investigator to gain rare overall insight into a highly complex, much diversified matter. It allowed for new and intensifying contacts with international colleagues and experts. As a result of the three-year-funding, PL was able to move beyond the formal academic borders: As it turned out, valuable factual knowledge was gained notably in cooperation with practical expertise; valuable theoretical and analytical knowledge was gained in cooperating with colleagues outside the field of East European studies: The HERA research program (Paris 04/2008), the Oslo EU conference "Exhibiting Europe" (European narratives in museum collecting, 04/2011) as well as the ongoing (since 2006) research program on global art and institutions by ZKM Karlsruhe (in all of which the project leader participated) provided much needed information on the current theoretical discourse.

The organization of the Graz conference, the preceding workshops as well numerous research meetings, interviews, exchanges in the Baltic States, in Russia and Ukraine helped shape the project. The latter was characterized by an ongoing involvement of younger colleagues: Sandra Frimmel, now working on a PhD thesis on *Art before Court* at Slavisches Seminar, Zürich University, was chairing a conference session at Graz. Thomas Skowronek, Humboldt University, is doing a comparative PhD thesis on art galleries in Poland and Russia

after 1989; he was attending the Graz conference. Jul'ja Lebedeva, doctoral student, RGGU Moscow, and Anna Zaitseva, Vinzavod, Moscow, helped the course of the project with valuable local expertise; due to medical problems both could not attend Graz conference.

2.3 Effects of the project outside the scientific field

Since the organization of the international conference (jointly between Graz University and Graz Kunsthaus, Joanneum) in June 2010 results of the research were published in media outside the scientific world. Thus, the comprehensive conference program was published on the website of Joanneum (resp. Kunsthaus), in their newsletter, as well as in the ICOM Austria newsletter. In addition, results of the research on the restructuring of the Kremlin museums – here the virtual exhibition in the belfry – were published in the research section of the journal of the Austrian Museum Union (Österreichische Museumsbund), *neues museum*. Finally, the influence by corporate collectors and sponsors on (private) art museums and venues were published in the research section of Austria's art journal, PARNASS; and a report on the Moscow biennial 2011 was published there as well (see appendix).

In April 2011, the project leader shared her expertise with R. Grabner in preparations of a workshop on art and religion in Eastern Europe held in late 2012 at Graz, *Kulturzentrum bei den Minoriten*.

In February 2012, the Austrian art museum *belvedere* has turned to PL for advice on an exhibit to be mounted in late 2012. The requests pertain to provenance issues of medieval art ("Meister von Schloss Lichtenstein"), partly preserved at *belvedere* and Russian museums.

The project was also popularized abroad: During her research at the Hermitage Amsterdam as well as the Hermitage branches in Ferrara, Ermitage Italia, and Vyborg, PL met with curators, executive and scientific personnel, and discussed the overall project with special relevance to the changes in the Hermitage, St. Petersburg. During a research stay in Kiev, both at Pinchuk Art Centre and at Art Arsenal, the project was discussed with special relevance to the Ukrainian situation. Finally, the project was amply discussed with a renowned specialist and museum director, Dr. Maria Tsantsanoglou, at Thessaloniki State Museum of Contemporary Art which also houses the avant-garde and non-conformist collection and archive of George Costakis. Prof. Dr. Tsantsanoglou's institution has been involved in many initiatives – in the 'Russian State Art Prize 'Innovation', NCCA, in cooperation with future private museums (Stella Art), Crimea Biennial, and initiatives in the Southern Caucasus.

3. Information on project participants

Work contracts (Werkverträge) were issued throughout the duration of the project – to some colleagues at RGGU, Moscow, *Fond Khudozhestvennye proekty*, Vinzavod, Moscow, Hermitage, St. Petersburg, Graz University, and Vienna Business University. They were all issued for very specific tasks – mostly paid by FWF, one minor contract was paid by Graz University (in the preparation of the conference 2010).

As these contracts each never amounted to more than € 750 at a given time, they are not listed here – in accordance with information received by FWF (Nov. 23, 2011).

The project received additional funding by the conference money granted by bm_w.f as well as by Joanneum and Kunsthaus Graz resp. This support is listed above (2.1.3)

4. Attachments

Open Access Policy: The project was started in 2008, before the introduction of open access policy by FWF. The project leader was informed in the final stage – final report – to consider this policy retrospectively.

Some of the published results – e. g. conference program, conference report – were already online. Generally, it was difficult to convey the urgency to the editors involved. Even recog-

nized journals such as Canadian American Slavic Studies and *Osteuropa* (Berlin) do not follow this policy. Some provide abstracts.

The project leader contacted all editors involved. Some provided pdf files that are now attached.

As of Dec. 2011, Graz University does not provide the option of publishing results of publicly financed research within academic repositories.

For this reason the files can be downloaded from the FWF-financed homepage *Art Collecting in Eastern Europe, 1850-2010*:

www.waltraudbayer.at

<http://waltraudbayer.at/index.php?menue=download>

http://waltraudbayer.at/index.php?menue=download&anchor=Open_Access_FWF_P20474

List 1

1a1 Scientific Publications, peer-reviewed

1. Waltraud Bayer: Das diskursive Museum. Das Moskauer MoMA stellt die Weichen neu, in: Osteuropa 12 (Berlin 2008), 117-123
<http://dl.oer.dgo-online.org/issues/dl/0812de.pdf>
2. Waltraud Bayer: Engagement für Dissens: Die Sammlerin Tatiana Kolodzeij, in: Dorothee Wimmer, Christina Feilchenfeldt und Stephanie Tasch (Hg.): Kunstsammlerinnen. Peggy Guggenheim bis Ingvild Goetz, Berlin 2009, 191-203
3. Waltraud Bayer: Soviet Art Sales to Europe, 1919-1936, in: Anne Odom and Wendy R. Salmond, eds.: Treasures into Tractors. The Selling of Russia's Cultural Heritage, 1918-1938 (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2009) 185-213 (enlarged, updated, illustrated version of below)
4. Waltraud Bayer: Soviet Art Sales to Europe, 1919-1936, in: Canadian American Slavic Studies Vol. 43, Nos. 1-4 (2009) 213-244
5. Waltraud Bayer: Dall'Ottobre Rosso allo Stalinismo. Il collezionismo privato nel regime sovietico, 1917-1953, in: Lucia Tonini (ed.), Il collezionismo in Russia da Pietro I all'Unione Sovietica (Naples: Università degli studi Napoli "L'Orientale", 2009) 173-193
6. Waltraud Bayer: The Unofficial Market: Art and Dissent 1956-88, in: Zimmerli Journal (Rutgers University, N. J. Fall 2008, published 12/2010) No. 5, 58-83
http://waltraudbayer.at/open_access/ZAM_08_pages_58_83_Bayer_1-22-09.pdf
7. Waltraud Bayer: Postsowjetische Kunstmuseen im Zeitalter der Globalisierung. Zur Institutionalisierung zeitgenössischer Kunst. Tagungsbericht. Internetmedium der Humboldt-Universität Berlin, H-Soz-u-Kult, 9.9.2010, https://online.uni-graz.at/kfu_online/%3Chttp://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/tagungsberichte/id=3272%3E

1a2 Non Peer-Reviewed Publications

1. Waltraud Bayer: Der virtuelle Kreml. Eine neue Multimedia-Ausstellung zeigt die wechselvolle Geschichte der Moskauer Residenz, in: neues museum – Die Österreichische Museumszeitschrift 3 (2011), 64-70
http://waltraudbayer.at/open_access/nm2011-3_S64-70_Web.pdf
2. Waltraud Bayer: Comprehensive conference program in English (incl. abstracts, biographies of participants, introduction, texts), in print and online: www.museum-joanneum.at/de/kunsthhaus/veranstaltungen_6/postsowjetische-kunstmuseen-im-zeitalter-der-globalisierung
3. Waltraud Bayer: Rosalind P. Blakesley, Susan E. Reid, eds.: Russian Art and the West: A Century of Dialogue in Painting, Architecture, and the Decorative Arts. DeKalb, Ill. 2007, in: Osteuropa 60 (Berlin 2010) H. 6, 167-169
4. Waltraud Bayer: Passion Bild – Russische Kunst seit 1970. Die Sammlung Arina Kowner. Herausgegeben und mit einer Einführung von Arina Kowner. Zürich 2010, in: Osteuropa 60 (Berlin 2010) H. 9, 132-133
<http://dl.oer.dgo-online.org/issues/dl/1009de.pdf>

5. Waltraud Bayer: Mari Laanemets: Zwischen westlicher Moderne und sowjetischer Avantgarde. Inoffizielle Kunst in Estland 1969–1978 (=humboldt-schriften zur kunst- und bildgeschichte), Gebr. Mann Verlag, Berlin 2011, in: Osteuropa 62 (Berlin 2012) H. 2, forthcoming

1b Publications for General Public

1. Waltraud Bayer: In heikler Mission: Private Sammler der russischen Avantgarde in der UdSSR, in: Russische Kunst aus den Nachlässen und Sammlungen Dauman, Ellenberg, Kljunkowa, Poletschko, Tomilina-Larionow und anderen. Von Jawlensky bis Kljun. Von Gontscharowa bis Maschkow. Katalog. Hrsg. v. Galerie Orlando. Zürich 2010, 3-11
2. Waltraud Bayer: Osteuropäische Kunstszene. Kunst als Ware und Kapitalanlage, in: Parnass 1 (Vienna 2008), 130-133
http://waltraudbayer.at/open_access/Osteuropaeische_Kunstszene.pdf
3. Waltraud Bayer: Die Hermitage Amsterdam: Russische Expansion an der Amstel, in: Parnass 4 (Vienna 2009) 108-112
http://waltraudbayer.at/open_access/Die_Hermitage_Amsterdam.pdf
4. Waltraud Bayer: Rewriting Worlds. Moskauer Biennale der Superlative, in: Parnass 4 (Vienna 2011) 78-79
http://waltraudbayer.at/open_access/Rewriting_Worlds.pdf
5. Waltraud Bayer: Postsowjetische Kunstmuseen im Zeitalter der Globalisierung. Newsletter ICOM 02/2010 (3.11.2010), in: Österreichisches Nationalkomitee
<http://www.icom-oesterreich.at/shop/shop.php?detail=1238058160>

1c Typescripts, Working Papers

1. *Moscow Contemporary – Art, Patrons, Institutions* (Paper, submitted to ZKM conference 01/2009)
2. *Europe – Russia – Europe*, typescript, submitted for Oslo conference *Exhibiting Europe*, April 2011
3. *Klein-Pompidou an der Moskwa – Das Staatliche Zentrum für Zeitgenössische Kunst – eine russische Erfolgsstory im Zeichen von Nachhaltigkeit und Stabilität*. (On the sustainable development of the National Center of Contemporary Art, its nationwide network and branches, 2010)
4. *Der Fall Erofeev. Zur Entsovjeterisierung der Museen in Russland* (On the court case against Andrei Yerofeev, curator at Tretyakov Gallery, and Yuri Samodurov, then director at Andrei Sakharov Museum). 2010.
5. *Post-Soviet Art Museums in the Era of Globalization: Contemporary Art + Institution*. Summary of all participants' presentations, lectures and discussions at Graz-based FWF-conference, 2010

List 2: Project-Related Participation in International Scientific Conferences

2.1. Invited Lectures

1. *On the Renaissance of the (Post-) Soviet Art Market: Formation, Trends, Characteristics, 1985-2005*, lecture at 31st Scientific Symposium „Unternehmen und Kunst in historischer Perspektive“ (=Enterprises and Art in Historical

Perspective), organized by the Gesellschaft für Unternehmensgeschichte (= Society for Entrepreneurial Research), Frankfurt/M. October 8-9, 2008

2. *Moscow Contemporary – Art, Patrons, Institutions*, lecture at ZKM (Center for Art and Media) Karlsruhe, Germany, June 29, 2009. Lecture was part of *Global Seminar: GAM – Global Art and the Museum*, organized by ZKM and Fritz Thyssen Foundation, June 21 – July 1, 2009
<http://www.globalartmuseum.de/site/event/353>
3. *Europe. Russia. Europe*. Lecture at Multicultural Museum Oslo, Norway, April 8, 2011, for EU-Conference *Exhibiting Europe: The Development of European Narratives in Museums, Collections and Exhibitions*
<http://www.ntnu.edu/exhibiting-europe/program>
<http://www.ntnu.edu/documents/1957019/7a40177f-7d11-4fab-b851-9e00f4f7bf20>
Lecture 1 = held in German, presented in powerpoint, abstract (1 p.)
Lecture 2 + 3: both held in English, presented in powerpoint, abstracts and comprehensive working papers, texts (each c. 7 p.)
4. *The Imperial Hermitage under Revolutionary Rule*, lecture at TU Berlin, at the international conference *Transnationale Museumsgeschichte 1750-1940*, Institut für Kunstwissenschaft und Historische Urbanistik, TU Berlin (DFG), Feb. 17-18, 2012
<http://www.kunstgeschichte.tu-berlin.de/index.php?id=559>

2.2. Conference Lectures

1. *From Perestroika to the Present – the Process of Institutionalization of Contemporary Art in the Post-Soviet World*. Lecture at international conference on *Post-Soviet Art Museums in the Era of Globalization*, organized by Graz University and Kunsthaus Graz, at Joanneum, Graz, June 18, 2010
2. *Sustainable Museum Infrastructure in the Post-Soviet Context*. Lecture. Introduction to and chair of final panel discussion, *ibid.*, June 19, 2010

2.3. Conference Participation, Posters

1. *Post-Soviet Art Museums in the Era of Globalization: Presentation of FWF-Project (Poster)* at HERA Joint Research Programme EU: Section on *Cultural Dynamics*, Paris, April 19, 2008

2.4. Conference Participation – other

1. *On the Creation of Institutions of Contemporary Art after Perestroika*. Presentation, Discussion, Workshop at *Fond Khudozestvennyye proekty (FKhP)*, Vinzavod, Moscow, November 29, 2009 (organized together with A. Obukhova), see poster
2. Organization of FWF-conference *Post-Soviet Art Museums in the Era of Globalization*, Graz, June 18-19, 2010

List 3: Collaborations

Numerous international scientific contacts in academic institutions, public and private museums, and art foundations were instrumental throughout the project – at home and esp. abroad. They are listed in the three annual reports and some, major collaborations, also in the final report here (2). Valuable insight was gained notably at the HERA Research Meeting, EU, Paris 2008, as well as at the EU-conference on *Exhibiting Europe*, Oslo 2011. The participants of the conference (as listed in the program attached) are not repeated here, though all of them were very instrumental in the course of the project.

As for the specific requirements here, the project leader selected the five top contacts according to the current output:

- a. N, E3, T: Director Peter Pakesch, Joanneum, co-organizer of the international conference *Post-Soviet Art Museums in the Era of Globalization*, held at Kunsthaus Graz (jointly with Graz University) on June 18-19, 2010
- b. I, E2, T + D: Aleksandra Obukhova, M.A., then *Fond Khudozhestvennyye proekty*, Vinzavod, Moscow, researcher + curator, co-organizer of the Moscow workshop *On the Creation of Institutions of Contemporary Art after Perestroika*, 11/2009, *ibid.* The workshop was accompanied by additional meetings and a final report by the project leader (typescript). The workshop clarified issues pertaining to the topical focus of the conference listed above.
- c. I, E2, T + D: The State Hermitage, St. Petersburg, including its branches (Amsterdam, Ferrara, and Vyborg) was instrumental in researching and understanding the complex process of transformation of a major post-Soviet museum into an art institution of the 21st century. Apart from the general director M. B. Piotrovsky, the vice-director for exhibition policies, V. Yu. Matveev, eight department heads and/or vice-department heads as listed above were (often repeatedly) involved in the course of the research in Russia alone. As for Amsterdam and Ferrara, the local staff there was involved as well (see annual reports). The output of this continuous exchange resulted in work proceedings, reports, and lately in two article publications by the project leader.
- d. I, E 1, T + D: Yulia Lebedeva, M.A., RGGU, curator at RGGU Museum Department (collection L. B. Talochkin), and PhD student there, helped shape the project with source material, data, valuable local background information, contacts – both on contemporary culture as well as on the RGGU-Kremlin-project (jointly with German universities, see publication). She was to act as assistant to the Graz conference, but fell seriously ill in the spring 2010 and returned to work at RGGU only in 2011.
- e. E, E 1, D: Dr. Andrea Buddensieg, ZKM Karlsruhe: Notably in the initial phase – in 2008 and mid-2009 – the exchange with *GAM: Global Art and the Museum*, ZKM, proved relevant in formulating the development of contemporary culture in the post-Soviet states in a broader international context.

List 4: Habilitations

4.1. Habilitation “Private Art Collectors in the Soviet Union, 1917-1991” was defended at Graz University in 2007, just before this project started.

Since then, there have not been any advertisements of full professorships in my field, in cultural and museum studies in Eastern Europe

List 5: Effects outside the scientific field

5.1 Organization of scientific events

- a. An international conference on *Post-Soviet Art Museums in the Era of Globalization. Contemporary Art and Institutions* was organized jointly by the project leader, PD Dr. Waltraud Bayer, Graz University, and by director Peter Pakesch, Joanneum, at Kunsthaus Graz, June 18-19, 2010. Apart from the organizers, all participants were from **outside** Austria (see respective links in section publications, IV Attachment, List 1, 1.a.1 + 1.a.2)
- b. In addition, relevant meetings with colleagues took part continuously during various research stays and conferences abroad (see annual reports and final report) as well as in the following 4 events: in the HERA Joint Research Programme EU, April 2008 (2.3), at the EU conference *Exhibiting Europe*, Oslo, April 2011 (2.1), at the *Global Seminar: GAM – Global Art and the Museum*, ZKM Karlsruhe, summer 2009, as well as in the workshop *On the Creation of Institutions of Contemporary Art After Perestroika*, jointly organized by Aleksandra Obukhova and the project leader at Vinzavod, Moscow, Nov. 29, 2009 (see IV Attachment, List 1, 2.4)

5.4 Effects beyond the scientific field

Results of the research project have already been amply published in articles, reviews, reports in research journals, conference proceedings, conference volumes, museums and gallery catalogues as well as in media published for a broader audience – in printed art and museum journals (Österreichischer Museumsbund, Parnass) as well as in internet media of electronic newsletters as ICOM Unesco, Joanneum, H-Soz-Kult (see publications). Thus, the results are partly available to museum and art experts outside the scientific field as well

5.5 Relevance of the project in the organization of the relevant scientific discipline

The project is of high relevance within the proper scientific discipline, as it is in line with the evolving field of international museum studies. Notably, the field of Eastern European and Baltic studies has recently seen a turn to interdisciplinary art, cultural and museum studies. The project leader herself has contributed significantly to art collecting and museums in Eastern Europe (1850-2010) since the 1990s.

List 6: Applications for follow-up projects

As the project on Post-Soviet Art Museums was the first of its kind by the project leader, this innovative field of study will be prolonged in some way. So far, however, it is too early to say whether research on this vast and complex topic will be continued through a follow-up project funded by FWF, other national or international projects). The project leader has checked into several research programs, but most thematic calls – e.g. WWTF and its second call *Diversity + Identity* (June 2011) – do not correspond with the topic, or as in the case of *for.muse* by the Austrian Science Ministry such calls were cancelled in the wake of the economic crisis. In addition, the Jubilee Fund of the Austrian Academy of Sciences is issuing a call in the humanities only in mid-2012. After having consulted other minor options within Austria, the project leader will discuss a potential follow-up project with FWF.