

CREATING CONTEMPORARY ART MUSEUMS IN THE POST-SOVIET SPACE

FINAL REPORT OF FWF-FUNDED STAND-ALONE PROJECT CCAM: P 25079-G21

PROJECT LEADER: PD MAG. DR. WALTRAUD M. BAYER, UNIVERSITY OF GRAZ, AUSTRIA

DURATION: NOVEMBER 2012 – JANUARY 2016

Final Report in English

Including Summaries in German and English as well as attachments

Submitted on March 31, 2016

I. SUMMARY PR WORK

1. Kurzfassung: Entwicklung moderner Kunstmuseen im postsowjetischen Raum

Seit dem Millennium befindet sich der postsowjetische Museumsbereich im Umbruch: Neue Museumsprojekte, Erweiterungsbauten, Masterpläne, innenarchitektonische Entwürfe und Architekturwettbewerbe entsprechen hohen internationalen Standards. Von Riga bis Vilnius, von Moskau bis St. Petersburg planen international bekannte Architekten die Neugestaltung – wie die Pritzker-Preisträger Rem Koolhaas, Lord Norman Foster, Shigeru Ban, Renzo Piano und Zaha Hadid. Projektentwickler und Politik gehen konzertiert vor: Kultur- und Museumsprojekte werden zunehmend in einen breiteren Kontext gestellt. Sie fungieren als Katalysator für Stadtentwicklung. Slogans wie PermBao – ein Kunstwort aus Perm, der Kapitale im Ural, und Bilbao – veranschaulichen diesen Trend, der 2008 seinen Anfang mit dem PERMM Projekt nahm. In Russland hat die Regierungspartei *Einiges Russland* 2010 das Programm der „Kulturallianz“ angenommen, das die nachhaltige landesweite Entwicklung von zeitgenössischen Kunstmuseen vorsah. Die Entwicklung in den Jahren danach verlief wechselhaft und – parallel zum staatlichen und jeweiligen lokalen kulturpolitischen Kurs – unterschiedlich. Ungeachtet der mit 2012 zunehmenden Repression kam es auf staatlicher wie auf kommunaler Ebene zu einer Expansion und Erneuerung der Museen (etwa durch den regionalen Ausbau des staatlichen Museumsnetzwerks NCCA, den bewilligten Neubau New NCCA, das 2015 bereits realisierte Projekt GARAGE im Moskauer Gorkipark u. a.).

Das Projekt untersuchte die komplexen Beziehungen von Kunst, ökonomischem Kapital und Politik im neuen Russland. Thematisch lag der Schwerpunkt auf der Entwicklung der zeitgenössischen Kunstmuseen der letzten zwanzig Jahre – von den alternativen Anfängen der Perestroikazeit bis hin zur grundlegenden Neuorientierung von Kunst(-institutionen) im internationalen Kontext. Gegenstand der Studie waren ferner die treibenden Kräfte dieser Institutionalisierung – Repräsentanten der föderalen, regionalen und lokalen Kulturbürokratie, der neuen ökonomischen Elite und Einzelpersonen, die diesen Prozess nachhaltig beeinflussten. Von Relevanz erwies sich die Analyse der zeitlich wie regional teils stark variierenden kulturpolitischen Zielsetzungen.

Die Fokussierung auf den zeitgenössischen Museumsbereich griff ein wesentliches Desiderat der internationalen Forschung auf. Das Projekt basiert auf einer dichten empirischen Daten- und Quellenlage, großteils in russischer Sprache. Es nutzte digitales amtliches Material, das seit (der in der Ära Medwedew konzipierten) Reform Open Government RU auf einschlägigen Webseiten und Portalen zugänglich ist. Die Ergebnisse der thematisch und methodisch innovativen Arbeit wurden in akademischen Foren mit führenden Experten aus der Praxis diskutiert und überprüft. Sie werden als umfangreiche interdisziplinäre Studie im Einklang mit der Open-Access-Policy des FWF publiziert. Die Studie leistet einen wesentlichen Beitrag zur Museums- und Kulturwissenschaft Osteuropas.

2. Summary: „Creating Contemporary Art Museums in the Post-Soviet Space“

The millennium ushered in a veritable boom in post-Soviet museum restructuring, renovations, additions. Master-plans, new interior designs, and architectural competitions met advanced international standards. From Riga to Vilnius, from Moscow to St. Petersburg, art institutions have since been developed by renowned (inter)national architects, among them the Pritzker-award winners Rem Koolhaas, Lord Norman Foster, Shigeru Ban, Renzo Piano, and Zaha Hadid. Museum developers and political planners joined forces: They increasingly viewed cultural and museum projects as a catalyst for urban renewal in a broader context. Slogans such as PermBao – an acronym of the Ural capital Perm and Bilbao – were indicative of this trend. The project PERMM in the Urals launched in 2008 signaled major changes ahead. In 2010, *United Russia*, Russia’s ruling party, followed; it adopted the declaration “Cultural alliance” in an attempt to foster contemporary art and sustainable museum structures in major cities. The following years brought many twists and turns, but also a major expansion of the museum field (as exemplified by NCCA and their growing regional branch network, New NCCA, Garage and other projects) – despite political backlash.

The project examined the complex interrelationship of cultural, economic and political capital in the post-Soviet states, with special emphasis on the Russian Federation. The topical focus was on the process of institutionalizing contemporary art in already existing and in newly created museums as well as on transforming museums into contemporary, internationally competitive institutions. It comprised research on patrons and politicians acting in support of contemporary art – as representatives of the federal, regional or local cultural bureaucracy, of the new economic elite or as individual proponents. It shed light on the progressively changing field of museum studies and curatorial work. By focusing on the contemporary art museum development, the study conquered new terrain.

As a result of Open Government Russia, a policy initiated by the former President Medvedev, the project benefitted greatly from the growing archival material and empirical data published in the emerging online repositories of cultural and government institutions. It thus drew on rare official, non-profit and corporate empirical data (mostly in Russian) documenting contemporary museum policy and development from *perestroika* to Putin’s third presidential terms. The results of the project have been discussed (and published) in academic circles and presented in conferences; a monograph is due to be published according to Open Access regulations.

II.1 PROJECT REPORT: REPORT ON RESEARCH WORK

1.1 DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCH PROJECT, OVERALL GOALS

The project examined the complex interrelationship of cultural, economic and political capital in the post-Soviet states. The objective was to analyze the process of institutionalizing contemporary art in existing and in newly created museums as well as on transforming museums into contemporary, internationally competitive art institutions. It comprised research on patrons and politicians acting in support of contemporary art – as part of the new economic elite, as individual proponents and as representatives of the federal, regional or local cultural bureaucracy.

In early 2012, the project was conceived to cover the period of 1991 to 2011 and to focus on the development of the Russian Federation within the overall post-Soviet context. When the research started in late 2012, the dynamic development in the Russian Federation impacted on the course of the study: Profound changes in the specific museum and broader cultural context had to be considered, as these changes in turn reflected the domestic and foreign political transformation.

Chronologically, the period of 1991-2011 was extended to 2015: The work initially conceived to present an overview of the fundamental measures laid earlier during *perestroika* and the reforms ushered in around the millennium now extends to the changes under Medvedev and Putin's third presidential term.

Geographically, the focus on the Russian Federation with consideration of the general post-Soviet development remained. As the work progressed, a dual strategy was adopted: The broader interdisciplinary and cross-border comparative overall research was carried out until the spring 2015 (see below results of the symposium + typescript). This approach helped assess the specific development within the Russian Federation; the project leader (PL) is currently finishing a typescript planned to be published as a monograph on the Russian case.

Topically, major (new and / or transformed) museum initiatives and reforms had to be included: After numerous twists and turns, the central federal museum project New NCCA, an addition to the federal NCCA-network, was planned (and approved) by the team of Pres. Medvedev as part of an overall modernization campaign (along with high-tech hub Skolkovo, Russia's Silicon Valley, and fundamental, large-scale urban reforms, as in *Greater Moscow* or *Bolshaia Moskva*). It was to start construction from late 2012 on, but was stalled due to abrupt changes in federal and municipal politics. Despite the laying of the foundation stone in 2015, it still waits to be implemented (as of early 2016). In addition, the emergence of GARAGE Museum of Contemporary Art in Gorky Park, in May 2014, and the inauguration of its new main building in June 2015, had to be considered as the project progressed; it is based on a non-profit foundation funded by the oligarch Roman Abramovich and led by his partner Daria Zhukova. Prior to 2012, GARAGE operated as a broadly defined cultural

center. Upon setting up its new headquarters in Gorky Park in the fall of 2012, it has become the main rival of NCCA.

Empirical approach: The work schedule presented in the proposal in early 2012 could be maintained for most of the first two years, with one exception: The amount of work initially scheduled for interviews with leading museum personnel and patrons had to be reduced.

Other than a previous study on art collecting in the USSR, 1917-1991, which relied heavily on oral history sources (also carried out by the PL), the interviews for the current project yielded fewer quantifiable results; their outcome proved relevant in terms of an overall orientation and a better understanding of the complexities of Russian cultural life. The PL is grateful to all those persons interviewed prior to the project or in the course of it; their names will be listed in the planned monograph.

By the spring of 2013 it became clear that a greater amount of archival, mainly institutional material had to be incorporated. This was guaranteed by an emerging comprehensive online resource not in operation when the proposal was drafted.

OPEN GOVERNMENT RUSSIA: In late 2009 President Dmitri Medvedev had addressed the Russian public about the need to modernize the country fundamentally. His speech *Go, Russia!* (in Russian: *Rossia, vpered!*) underlined the need for a large-scale modernization program in many sectors – in the technological-industrial complex, the economy as well as in the socio-political sphere. Medvedev called for reforms in line with the challenges posed by globalization and the advance of the internet. He specifically demanded higher transparency in federal, regional and local government dealings as well as “a more effective cooperation” between society and political elites. In line with his vision to strengthen civil society, Medvedev launched an initiative, known as Open Government (OG) Russia. From 2011 on, the reform was planned by ca. 400 experts, later coordinated by a newly-formed ministry of OG; in 2012, it was approved by Putin and continued in his third presidency. In the summer of 2012 a public expert committee was founded to enable expert debate of issues prior to decision making. The OG reform was implemented in various ministries – to a varying degree.

As for the State Ministry of Culture, the material published online and stored in portals and repositories proved highly beneficial to the research. The PL could access important data, documents, regulations, decisions online, among them minutes of meetings, working groups and of sessions of the Public Advisory Council established in the Ministry, also public hearings, competitions, composition of juries and committees, decrees, legislation, museum projects, nominations, budgetary issues, even the results of political debates in the Duma.

Major federal cultural institutions followed suit. The NCCA, the National Centre for Contemporary Art (the country’s main contemporary art museum network with regional branches throughout Russia) from 2013 on published an avalanche of collection and exhibition data and archival material online. (The online site of the NCCA had not been very advanced previously). The NCCA with its branches

thus provides a comprehensive resource (including its central and local websites, portals and online data banks / repositories). Links on NCCA sites furthermore lead to portals and websites of private initiatives and foundations, blogs as well as digital editions of cultural media – thereby creating a broad spectrum of sources. As a result, the development of contemporary art museum in Russia could be traced back to 2000/2001 (in some cases even earlier) – through OG channels, links, pdf files, online archives, libraries and media.

Digital humanities are an only recently evolving field in Russia, less advanced than in other countries. Many of the links used initially were later rewritten or published under changed titles elsewhere, some disappeared. Also, as of 2014, the access to online repositories (portals, sites) was partially restricted for political reasons: several sites (e. g. blogs) used earlier now demand registration.

1.2 RESULTS, SIGNIFICANCE

The unprecedented large-scale access to archival and bureaucratic source material impacted considerably on the study: It allowed for thorough **empirical** research and an in-depth, nuanced analysis of the institutional background of contemporary art (CA) museums and the fundamental changes they went through – from perestroika to Putin’s third term. The data shed light on the interrelationship of political and cultural spheres: Both, the foreign and domestic political changes left its mark:

- The development of CA institutions on the **federal** level depended on political backing. This is exemplified by the endorsement of three cultural ministers: by E. Sidorov esp. up to the mid-1990s, later around 2000 by the energetic M. Shvydkoi, and around 2010 by A. Avdeev (jointly with Pres. Medvedev) in support of the first CA museum building, the so-called New NCCA.
- An analogous development occurred on the **local** and **regional** level. Some cases were analyzed by the PL: e. g. as for the *cultural alliance* program started in 2010 by Marat Guelman, Perm museum director until 2013, and supported by Pres. Medvedev and members of Putin’s party, United Russia. *Cultural alliance* aimed at raising awareness for the need to strengthen the position of CA and to finance infrastructural buildup in the regions. The PL documented the ‘Perm museum revolution’ in the Urals which was triggered by the then acting governor, a senator, Guelman and their teams, often brought from Moscow or abroad.
- On the **Moscow** municipal level, from 2011 on major museum reforms were initiated by the city councilor Sergei Kapkov, a long-term ally of Abramovich and a liberal member of *United Russia*. The reforms unleashed a modernization drive in state-of-the-art infrastructure and centralized cultural administration. Joining forces with big business, the creative milieu and, generally, the younger generation, the municipal administration revolutionized cultural life in the Russian capital until Kapkov’s resignation in March 2015.

- Contrary to the positive forces listed above, conservative, nationalist and repressive political representatives also left their mark. The crisis in Ukraine, the annexation of Crimea as well as the restrictions following the international sanctions imposed against Russia – all these events influenced cultural politics and stepped up repression. The PL included the **backlash** of these events in the project. This is exemplified by various (sub-) chapters in the planned monograph: For instance, the reorientation in federal cultural policy from 2013 had to be studied. The appointment of Vladimir Medinskii as cultural minister in 2012 led to a restructuring of the Russian cultural and museum sphere. For the first time since *perestroika*, the state intervened in cultural and museum projects on a scale unseen since the breakup of the USSR. With increasing state regulation, censorship and repression, a post-Soviet artistic canon was drawn up, publicly (controversially) discussed. Entitled ‘Foundations of State Cultural Policy’ (*Osnovy gos. kulturnoi politiki*), the draft was adopted in a fairly neutral version and signed by Pres. Putin in late 2014. The legislation entered into force immediately, regulating Russian culture on the federal, regional and local level.
- BOOM YEARS, 2005 to 2014: Contemporary art (in line with global trends) was long considered a penchant of a small creative, artistic and (to a lesser degree) commercial milieu; it was perceived as elitist, intellectual, a minority program that could not be translated to the majority of the population. In post-Soviet Russia, CA could not draw major audiences or yield commercial profits. In the 21st c. however a new generation of artists, museum staff, bureaucrats, young ‘oligarchs’, gallery owners, curators and critics (mostly trained abroad) entered the field: Backed by a booming economy, an emerging middle class and a now diversified upper economic and political class, CA acquired increasing support and prestige. The results were manifold: CA finally was taught at art academies, universities, colleges; residence programs were initiated. The number of CA exhibitions and events, galleries, foundations, art centers, biennials rose sharply. The first edition of the Moscow Biennial in 2005 contributed largely to this development. From 2009 on, CA increasingly became the domain of many globally versed wealthy people, notably (young) women, who acted as commissioners and trustees in biennials, juries, competitions in Russia and abroad; some of them started their own foundations, programs and even planned their own private museums. One was opened in 2015 (see below: GARAGE)
- BROAD CONSENSUS: As the empirical data showed, from 2005 on (and despite ideological differences), there was growing consensus in culture, politics and society that support in favor of CA was much needed. Investment in contemporary infrastructure, equipment, architecture and training was stepped up on all levels. Along with institutions of CA also traditional museums were redesigned accordingly: The popularity of CA led to the opening of CA departments even in classical museums. Thus, the Hermitage in St. Petersburg established a CA department in 2012 and in 2015 announced plans to open a CA museum outpost in Moscow, the Hermitage Modern Con-

temporary. The Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts announced plans for a Russian Tate Modern near Kazan Station, the V-A-C foundation commissioned Renzo Piano to redesign a former power plant, and the art foundation Breus is currently developing *Udarnik*.

- **SYMPOSIUM:** The main results of the transformative forces in Russian CA since the first biennial were discussed at the international, interdisciplinary symposium *Glocal Affairs: Art Biennials in Context* at Graz University. Art biennials as a driving force in contemporary museum development had been considered in the proposal. The relevance of biennials in the Russian Federation (as exemplified by the Moscow Art Biennial as well as the biennial formats in the Urals and the Volga region) were contrasted with and compared to CA and biennial development in the Caucasus, Central Asia and Turkey. Overviews of the global biennial research focus at ZKM Karlsruhe and of the post-war *documenta* served as comparative references for the Russian case. A special focus was devoted to the analysis of the tenth edition of the European art biennial held in Russia in 2014. With the conflict in Ukraine between Russia, Ukraine and the European Union, MANIFESTA X became a symbol for the embattled position of CA within the context of war and repression. Calls for boycott were numerous in the wake of Russia's censorship, NGOs and LGBT legislation, increasingly in the wake of the crash of Malaysia Airlines flight 17. Under dual pressure, exercised by the Russian authorities and the growing anti-Russian sentiment in most of Europe, M10 was given much attention – with two detailed first-hand accounts by MANIFESTA, Amsterdam, and the Hermitage CA Dept. The results were published in July 2015 (see below).
- **MONOGRAPH:** The results of the three-year-research will be published in a monograph. As of early 2016, the work on the first draft of the typescript is basically finished. It is currently co-read and peer reviewed; after a revising and correcting process, it will be submitted for FWF publication grant money (in line with Open Access policy). The monograph summarizes state-of-the-art research on federal, regional and municipal cultural and museum policy in support of CA, from the late 1980s to 2015. It consists of an introduction (starting with the Sotheby's Moscow auction and the reappraisal of non-Socialist CA, 1988), a major chapter on post-Soviet museum policy and institutions (1992-2015), a detailed case study of NCCA, the major federal CA museum network (1992-2015), a well documented case study on the new GARAGE museum of CA (2008-2015), complemented by a study of the Moscow cultural and museum revolution under Sergei Kapkov (2011-2015). Methodological and empirical issues are discussed in the conclusion: It specifies problems for researchers of Russian CA and CA institutions as well as generally for research in contemporary digital humanities. It sheds light on the new museum discourse (museum 2.0) with its aim to integrate topics of the global art and museum discourse in the transformed Russian debate (e. g. issues of gender, inclusion / exclusion, ethnic and racial minorities, religion, global vs. local, audience development, post-colonialism, public and institutional history).

1.3 PROJECT INFORMATION: DURATION – DEVIATION – PERSONNEL

The project ran largely according to plan; there were no changes of at least 25%. Due to the amount originally reserved for travel, translation and conference funds, due to special costs and minor savings, the duration could be extended by 3 months. The PL was in charge of carrying out the research and the organizational work (e. g. symposium). There was valuable support from several colleagues in various stages (as listed below.) No major items of EQUIPMENT were purchased.

2. PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT

The project was of high importance to the PL allowing for additional expertise in a hitherto unknown field. Although PL had carried out major 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, in digital humanities, in contemporary culture (1992-2015) and institutional critique. It allowed for innovative trans-disciplinary research of risk topics; it enabled the PI to gain rare overall insight into a highly complex, much diversified matter.

The project allowed for new and intensifying contacts with international colleagues and experts. PL gained factual knowledge in cooperation with practical expertise beyond the formal academic borders. Valuable theoretical and analytical knowledge was provided outside the field of East European studies. Notably the PL attendance of ICOFOM 37th International Symposium: New Trends in Museology (Sorbonne, Paris, 2014) and the APEX Archives Portal Europe (Trinity, Dublin, 2013) proved very helpful. The organization of the symposium *Glocal Affairs*, the preceding meetings, the interviews and exchanges in and on Eastern Europe shaped the project considerably.

Several work contracts were issued throughout the duration of the project to colleagues at RGGU, Moscow; Digital and Slavic Studies, Vienna; History Department, Graz University. These contracts never amounted to more than € 750 at a given time.

3. EFFECTS BEYOND THE FIELD can be assessed only after the publication of the planned monograph. So far, it can be said that both the symposium and the first publication of results were well received outside East European Studies. Two articles were published in the art journal PARNASS (see III).

4. IMPORTANT ASPECTS

Apart from the symposium *Glocal Affairs* (see 1.2 and III) organized by PL at Graz University, lectures (PPT) by the PL were held in project-related international conferences / academic setting:

- Avant, Garage! From Non-Profit Foundation to Moscow's Museum of CA, Amsterdam, 1/2016
- Art Biennials in the Russian Federation, Graz: *Glocal Affairs*, 4/2015
- Digital Sources in Contemporary Post-Soviet Museum Studies, DHLU Luxemburg, 12/2013
- Von d. Perestrojka zur Globalisierung: Zeitgenössische Kunstinstitutionen in Russland, Graz 5/15

III. ATTACHMENTS

1. Scholarly / scientific publications

1.1 Peer-reviewed publications

- Waltraud M. Bayer, Glocal Affairs: Art Biennials in Context. Conference report in English [Tagungsbericht], 27.04.2015, Graz, in: H-Soz-Kult, 09.07.2015
<http://www.hsozkult.de/conferencereport/id/tagungsberichte-6064>
- Reprint: H-Net Reviews in the Humanities and Social Sciences
<https://www.h-net.org/reviews/showpdf.php?id=44672>
- A detailed program of the symposium in English can be found in the reports published on H-Soz-Kult or H-Net Reviews as well as under the link below:
http://waltraudbayer.at/glocal_affairs.pdf
- Waltraud M. Bayer, *moscow contemporary*: Museen für zeitgenössische Kunst im postso-wjetischen Russland [Contemporary Art Museums in post-Soviet Russia]. Typescript in German, as of 02/2016.
Monograph in preparation, submitted for peer review in the newly founded Boehlau series: *Eastern Europe: Art and Cultural History*, edited by Robert Born, Michaela Marek and Ada Raev.
German original: *Das östliche Europa: Kunst- und Kulturgeschichte*, 2014 -
<http://www.boehlau-verlag.com/newbuchliste.aspx?id=1>
- If approved, FWF will be approached by the PL for funding the monograph in the category Open access / hybrid book publication

1.2 Non-peer-reviewed publications

- Waltraud Bayer, Manege frei! Catherine de Zegher kuratierte die V. Moskauer Biennale für zeitgenössische Kunst, in: PARNASS 4 (2013) 86-87 [Manezh hosts the Fifth Moscow Contemporary Art Biennial]
- Waltraud Bayer, Einschneidende Zäsur: Zum Umbruch in der Moskauer Galerienszene, PARNASS 4 (2012) 12-16 [Moscow Art Galleries Under Pressure]

1.3. Planned publications

Given the previous scientific record of the PL, the project broke new ground, as the PL had never worked extensively on contemporary art museums prior to this project. At the moment it is too early to announce any further publications as the PL's work contract with Graz University ended in early 2016 and thus the completion of the monograph is given priority. However, it could be of relevance to the international research community to publish further on the outcome of the

symposium *Glocal Affairs* as well as on aspects of the project research (e.g. generally on oligarch culture, art foundations and museum ventures). If the necessary funds can be raised, one or two additional publications should be in English.

In this context it has to be mentioned that a chapter of the planned monograph was presented at a conference organized by Amsterdam University: 'The art market in a global perspective', Jan. 28-30, 2016. Though not quite finished by then, the text could be downloaded for participants in the conference drop-box. If selected for conference publication in a peer-reviewed journal, the text would be in English. See the conference site:

<http://aissr.uva.nl/research/externally-funded-projects/sites/content13/the-globalization-of-high-culture/international-conference/international-conference.html>

<http://acgs.uva.nl/news-and-events/upcoming-events/content/conferences/2016/01/market.html>

2. Most important academic awards

The PL has received several academic awards in her career PRIOR to the start of the project, but none for the duration of the project from November 2012 to January 2016

https://online.uni-graz.at/kfu_online/wbforschungsportal.cbshowportal?pPersonNr=52001

3. Information on results relevant to commercial applications

Results are too early to assess. The planned monograph could be used beyond the academic field – e. g. for museum, exhibition and cultural projects.

4. Publication for the general public and other publications

- POSTER GEWI-TAG, UNI Graz, 2013: Zur Entwicklung zeitgenössischer Kunstmuseen im postsowjetischen Raum [Creating contemporary art museums in the post-Soviet space], University of Graz, Faculty of Humanities, June 20, 2013. The poster was produced in co-operation with the dean's office which launched a competition with the Graz-based school of graphic design ORTWEIN for a presentation of research projects in the humanities. The content was produced by the PL, the graphics by Stefanie Sackl, HTL-Ortwein. On the latter see: <http://www.ortweinschule.at/>
- Results of the research project were published for the public in various online and print media. See e. g. Till C. Jelitto, Der postsowjetische Kunstboom, in: *scilog*, FWF, Vienna, 07.12.2015, <http://scilog.fwf.ac.at/kultur-gesellschaft/3335/der-postsowjetische-kunstboom>
- Alice Grancy, Kundiges Mäzenatentum zeigt freche Kunst, in: Die Presse, Online-Version 11.12.2015; PRINT: 12.12.2015
http://diepresse.com/home/science/4885728/Kundiges-Maezenatentum-zeigt-freche-Kunst?_vl_backlink=/home/science/index.do

- WEBSITES: Information on the project is made available via the personalized academic online service at Graz University as well as via the general research website of the PL. The latter was originally set up to illustrate the research output of a previous FWF-funded project: Private Art Collectors in the USSR. The Installation of the website was then funded by FWF. It has since been in operation and updated. The site *Art Collecting in Eastern Europe, 1850-2010*, contains detailed information of all FWF-funded projects by the PL, publications and downloads.

www.waltraudbayer.at

The long-time University profile of PL ended operation in June 2015. Most of the content was transferred to a new site, called research portal, and updated in early 2016:

https://online.uni-graz.at/kfu_online/wbforschungsportal.cbshowportal?pPersonNr=52001

Also, events were commented via FACEBOOK and the website of Manifesta Biennial.

5. Development of collaborations

Numerous international scientific contacts in academic institutions, public and private museums, art foundations, at conferences (DHLU 2013, ICOFOM 37, APEx Dublin, Amsterdam Global Studies on the BRIC Countries, University of Graz), were instrumental throughout the project – at home and esp. abroad. They are listed in the three annual reports and will be thanked in the planned publication.

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

- N: NLD; G: F; E3; D: T: **MANIFESTA**: The Amsterdam-based office of Manifesta, the European Biennial of Contemporary Art, that (together with the State Hermitage Museum) co-hosted the tenth edition of Manifesta (M10) in St. Petersburg, 2014, contributed much (catalogue) material, practical expertise and specific biennial know-how to the research project. The contacts started in 10/2014 at the PL research trip to Amsterdam and continued in Vienna (meeting with H. FIJEN). In addition, the director of MANIFESTA Foundation, Hedwig FIJEN, MA, was a major contributor to the Graz symposium *Glocal Affairs*.

<http://m10.manifesta.org/en/home/>

N: RUS; G: F; E2; D: I + T: A Russian contributor of the St. Petersburg staff of M10, Anastasia LESNIKOVA, MA, an employee of the Hermitage department of CA, in 2015 was a visiting post-graduate student / curator in Rotterdam and was thus represented in the Graz symposium. Her local expertise both of the CA Hermitage department and of the organization of M10 was of high relevance to the symposium program and the section of the project on Hermitage XX/XXI.

- N: RUS; G: F; E2; D: I + T: Julia LEBEDEVA, MA, art historian and curator at **RGGU** Museum Center, Russian State University of Humanities, Moscow. She provided the PL with valuable advice and important background information (e. g. online links, literature, events, and data banks). She collected data on audience development in Russian CA and biennial exhibitions for the project. She participated in the workshop held in Moscow in March 2016 and thereby contributed greatly to clarifying controversial issues, correcting and finalizing the draft typescript.
- N: DEU; G: F; E2; D: I + T: Dr. Andrea BUDDENSIEG, **ZKM** Karlsruhe. Dr. Buddensieg is the co-leader of various research projects on global art and the museum and project leader of the exhibition **GLOBALE**, ZKM 2015/6. She has contributed much theoretical expertise, material to the project and a major lecture on the visualized biennial data program running at ZKM Karlsruhe. She is co-author of several book publications in English.
<http://zkm.de/person/andrea-buddensieg>; <http://zkm.de/globale>
<http://zkm.de/institute-forschungsstellen/forschungsstelle-fuer-globale-studien>
- N: DEU; G: F + M; E 2; D: I: **Department of Art History**, University of Graz, Austria: o. Prof. Dr. Sabine FLACH; Dr. Mira FLIESCHER; o. Prof. Dr. Edgar LEIN. All three German representatives of the Graz Art History Dept. contributed to / helped the research project variously: Prof. Flach, head of the department, together with her post-doctoral research assistant Dr. Fliescher jointly lectured on the history of post-war *documenta* at the symposium *Glocal Affairs*. The department acted as co-organizer. Prof. Flach and Prof. Lein also invited the PL to contribute to the interdisciplinary lecture series at the department in the summer term 2015: 'From extra-European to global art' (see link below). PL contribution: *„From perestroika to globalization: contemporary art institutions in Russia“*. [Von der Perestrojka zur Globalisierung: Zeitgenössische Kunstinstitutionen in Russland]
 The course was made accessible at the e-learning-platform *Moodle* at Graz University:
<https://kunstgeschichte.uni-graz.at/de/neuigkeiten/neuigkeiten/article/ringvorlesung-von-der-aussereuropaeischen-kunst-zur-global-art/>
- N: AUT; G: M; E2; D I + T: Mag. Dr. Wolfgang WEITLANER, formerly Slavic Studies, Business University, Vienna, currently independent. The project benefitted at various stages from his scientific-theoretical and practical expertise both from his doctoral thesis on nonconformist art in the former USSR and from his web-design / IT experience.

6. Development of human resources in the course of the project

As the PL had already completed her *venia thesis* on *Private Art Collecting in the Soviet Union, 1917-1991*, prior to the start of the project, no further academic human resources were required.

7. Application for follow-up projects

As said above, the interdisciplinary project broke new ground in so many aspects, thus the research should be continued – by the PL or by experts working in post-Soviet studies and in the evolving field of comparative international museum studies and digital humanities. Given the broad range dealt with in the course of the research, various (sub-) topics and issues should be addressed in greater detail. This pertains notably to the results of the symposium *Art Biennials in Context* (Graz, April 2015) which illustrated the high transforming impact of art biennials on the process of institutionalizing CA in the Russian Federation and the post-Soviet Space (and even outside, in Turkey). Moreover, this also pertains to the insufficient research so far undertaken on the fundamental cultural transformation in post-perestroika Russia and in the post-Soviet space. Generally, the post-perestroika era up to the third presidential term of Vladimir Putin is still poorly researched and not well understood. This has been recognized in Russia and abroad and is exemplified by several recent initiatives: Among them are the Moscow Gaidar Foundation (set up in honor of the former Prime Minister Yegor Gaidar) which is funding research on the post-Soviet period and the Berlin-based ZOIS; the latter (set up in reaction to the Ukrainian crises) will start operating in mid-2016 with a general research focus on the recent past.

Another major aspect that requires more research is the theoretical-methodological framework. This pertains to various approaches, notably to cultural sociology, cultural political changes under Putin's third presidential term, entrepreneurial (or Oligarch) culture (with reference to the impact of art foundations on museums). As the project work progressed, it became clear however that the empirical aspect had to be dealt with foremost (considering the lack of verified data).

The PL has checked into various options of funding follow-up research. However, currently there are no thematic calls in Austrian humanities the PL could respond to.

In addition, the results of the project could not be published (as originally planned) within the Graz University OA repository, as it is not peer-reviewed and currently used mainly as a repository for *secondary* OA publications. FWF, however, requires peer review for granting FWF funding of publication costs; also previous publication of FWF-funded research in OA non-peer-reviewed university channels contradicts FWF regulations of funding to first time publishing only.

Given the priority status of the planned monograph, however, no follow-up projects can be elaborated at the moment. The PL will discuss potential funding and steps with FWF.

NOTE: The report was finalized on March 31, 2016.