

UNIVERSITÄT LEIPZIG



Master Thesis

Art to Collect Art: Acquisition Policies of Museums of Modern Art from 1980s to the Present

Author

Kateryna Gorlenko

Academic degree aspired
Master (MA)

Wien, 2010

Studienkennzahl :	A 067 805
Studienrichtung:	Individuelles Masterstudium: Global Studies – A European Perspective
Supervisor:	Ao. Univ-Prof. i.R. Dr. Gernot Heiss

Table of Contents

<i>List of tables</i>	4
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	5
<i>Abbreviations</i>	7
<i>Introduction</i>	8
1. Museum of Modern Art	17
1.1. The Role Art Museums Play in Our Life	18
1.2. New Perspectives for Museums of Modern Art	21
1.3. Is the Future of Museums of Modern Art in Danger?	25
2. Tate Modern	30
2.1. Tate Modern: Foundation History	30
2.2. Acquisition Policy of Tate Modern	33
2.3. Latest Acquisitions at Tate Modern	35
2.4. Latest Exhibitions at Tate Modern	37
3. MUMOK	40
3.1. MUMOK: Foundation History	40
3.2. Acquisition Policy of MUMOK	43
3.3. Latest Acquisitions at MUMOK	47
3.4. Latest Exhibitions at MUMOK	49
4. Stedelijk Museum	51
4.1. Stedelijk Museum: Foundation History	51
4.2. Acquisition Policy of Stedelijk Museum	54
4.3. Latest Acquisitions at Stedelijk Museum	55
4.4. Latest Exhibitions at Stedelijk Museum	57
5. MoMA	58
5.1. MoMA: Foundation History	58
5.2. Acquisition Policy of MoMA	62
5.3. Latest Acquisitions at MoMA	65
5.4. Latest Exhibitions at MoMA	66

<i>Conclusion</i>	69
<i>Tables</i>	77
<i>Bibliography</i>	89
<i>Abstract (English)</i>	93
<i>Abstract (Deutsch)</i>	95
<i>Curriculum Vitae</i>	97

List of tables

<i>Table 1 Tate Modern acquisitions of non-Western artists (1980-2010)</i>	76
<i>Table 2 Tate Modern exhibitions of non-Western artists (1980-2010)</i>	77
<i>Table 3 MUMOK acquisitions of non-Western artists (1980-2010)</i>	78
<i>Table 4 MUMOK exhibitions of non-Western artists (1980-2010)</i>	80
<i>Table 5 Stedelijk Museum acquisitions of non-Western artists (1980-2010)</i>	81
<i>Table 6 Stedelijk Museum exhibitions of non-Western artists (1980-2010)</i>	83
<i>Table 7 MoMA acquisitions of non-Western artists (1980-2010)</i>	84
<i>Table 8 MoMA exhibitions of non-Western artists (1980-2010)</i>	87

Acknowledgements

The work on my master thesis took almost nine months, during which I researched literature on the topics of modern and contemporary art and museums exhibiting it. All of this would not have been possible without the invaluable help and support of many people from different corners of the world.

First of all, I would like to express deep gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Gernot Heiss, from the University of Vienna, who was my guide and mentor during the whole process of research and writing and generously supported me with advice and critique.

I am also very grateful to the workers of the *MUMOK* and *Stedelijk Museum Libraries* (in Vienna and Amsterdam respectively), with whom I had the pleasure to communicate personally and who helped me to find a lot of important materials for my thesis. Unfortunately, I was not able to get to *Tate Modern* in London and *MoMA* in New York, but the excellent help of their staff and their kind readiness to assist in my research remotely was unbelievably precious and valuable.

While working on my thesis during the last three months, I was also doing an Internship at *International Foundation Manifesta* in Amsterdam. This was a very important and useful practical experience for me; but at the same time an opportunity to get to know the world of contemporary art better. That is why I would like to express my appreciation and gratefulness to the Director of *IFM*, Hedwig Fijen, and all my colleagues with whom I had pleasure to spend these amazing and fruitful months in the Netherlands.

Finally, I want to thank my family for their unbelievable support, encouragement and inspiration during this time – without them I would never have managed to participate in the Program MA *Global Studies – A European Perspective* and as a result to work on this thesis. Thank you for being there for me whenever I needed!

Abbreviations

- ❖ CAM – contemporary art museum.
- ❖ CoBrA – derived from the French names of the cities of Copenhagen, Brussels and Amsterdam. The artists who founded the CoBrA group during a major international conference held in Paris in 1948 came from these three European capitals. A curled snake became the symbol of the movement.¹
- ❖ ICOM – International Council of Museums – the international organization of museums and museum professionals which is committed to the conservation, continuation and communication to society of the world's natural and cultural heritage, present and future, tangible and intangible.²
- ❖ MoMA – The Museum of Modern Art, New York (the United States).
- ❖ MUMOK – Das Museum moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien, Vienna (Austria).
- ❖ SMBA – Stedelijk Museum Bureau Amsterdam (the Netherlands).
- ❖ VvHK – Vereniging tot het Vormen van een Openbare Verzameling van Hedendaagsche Kunst / Association for Forming a Public Collection of Contemporary Art (the Netherlands).

¹ <http://www.cobra-museum.nl/en/cobra.html> (14.08.2010).

² <http://icom.museum/mission.html> (22.08.2010).

Introduction

Changes which have taken place in the world during the last decades, in the time when *globalization* is at its most obvious stage of development, brought us to the idea of emergence of a new global art scene. One of the most debatable questions among art professionals and critics, the same as professionals from all other fields, is about the unity and interpenetration of global and local. The main focus is on the degree to which the processes on global and local levels are interrelated, interdependent and/or able to coexist.

To get a more complex picture of the processes of globalization running in art sphere at present it is very important to understand what the reasons for the changes were and how they occurred. First of all, these changes were and still are the result of the transformation of attitude towards the very concept of art. If previously we were talking mostly of *Westernization* and *Eurocentrism* in art, currently the focus of artists, art critics, professionals and connoisseurs of art shifted towards other parts of the world. It is not just that people want to see something more exotic and unknown before in art. The art from the new emerging countries is becoming more and more popular because the access to it is open and quite easy presently. As Edward Said once very rightly noticed about Eurocentric position of Western world:

[...] Europe had only considered its own culture and its peculiar expressions as universal in contrast with the so-called indigenous cultures, considered as regional phenomena. Since the 19th century, art and culture were comprehended through a

euro-centric point of view, while the claim for universality made this euro-centricity unconscious for most people.³

Many art researchers of the globalization processes are still very critical and ambiguous about the shift from the West towards the so-called *Third World* or countries which were considered as *marginal* or *peripheral* in the past. The problem is that many art historians still consider the *other* art only in ethnic terms, for them it is not good enough to be represented on the international level in galleries, museums or other art institutions together with the *Western* art. But nevertheless, *non-Western art* penetrates into our life via different ways and forms. What I personally find very attractive and interesting in the phenomenon of *global art* (if we can call contemporary and to some extent modern art so) is that it is not a movement in one direction only – from some previously unknown exotic locations, but also interest of the Western artists towards presenting themselves and their works outside of the boundaries of the Western art scene. So it is a movement in both directions, a movement which crosses borders and overcomes boundaries.

Another question crucial for this research is the very notion or concept of art which is used today. So how do we define art in general? Where do we draw the line of distinction between the modern and contemporary art? Do they intersect or are these two absolutely independent art currents? What connections are there between global, contemporary and modern art?

³ Silvia Naef – Nada Shabout, *From Local to Global: Visual Arts in the Eastern Mediterranean between International Markets and Local Expectations*, 2006, p. 2.

To answer this question I think it is vital to define first what we call modern art and what we call contemporary art. For example, *Tate Guide to Modern Art Terms* defines *modern art* as:

[...] the broad movement in Western art, architecture and design which self-consciously rejected the past as a model for the art of the present. Hence the term modernism or modern art, Modernism gathered pace from about 1850 and proposed new forms of art on the grounds that they were more appropriate to the present time. It is thus characterized by constant innovations.⁴

The modern movement in general terms was defined by such characteristics as ideal, very often even utopian, life vision and longing for progress. The culmination of modern movement in art is considered to be *abstractionism* and its currents in 1960s, which became the dominant art trends then. Later other currents in art appeared which were opposed to the former and thus gained the name of *postmodernism*.

The main problem with the definition of *contemporary art* is that it has many forms currently. Some of these are quite new and some have just developed to absolutely different forms with time. *Performance, action, happening, installation*, etc. – all these art forms make it quite difficult to give a clear definition to contemporary art. As mentioned in the catalogue to the public space art event *To Actuality* curated by Maia Damianovic (2002):

[...] in our cosmopolite reality, we feel compelled to give things multinames and multipurposes – an exhibition, for example, is not just that, but a “platform”, a museum is a shop and a cafe,

⁴ Simon Wilson – Jessica Lack, *The Tate Guide to Modern Art Terms*, London, 2008, p. 130.

and a performance is not a performance, but a form existing in parallel to other relays that can be simultaneously mobilized.⁵

The same can be said about the contemporary notion of an *art work*. The boundaries between what can be called a work of art and what cannot be defined as such are so vague and unclear that not only audience but also art professionals face this problem presently:

Anything, literally anything, could be a work of art: any object, any process, any event. There are no more rules or demands that have to be met if something is to be accepted as a work of art [...] Anything could be a work of art, provided there is an artist who designates it as such; an artist who claims: “This is a work of art,” and subsequently presents the object, process or event of his or her choice to the public for assessment.⁶

As an example of this approach we can take the art project 70X7. *The Meal Act XVI* presented by Lucy Orta in the frames of the already above mentioned public space art event *To Actuality*. The project was to invite twenty-one guests each of whom was supposed to bring seven other people to participate in an open air meal on Waltherplatz, the central piazza in Bozen/Italy. These twenty-one guests were specifically selected from different nationalities, different political and socio-cultural groups. The main idea of the artist was to stimulate the communication of these totally different people who probably would never gather all together under daily life circumstances.⁷ At first glance such a project can seem to have nothing in common

⁵ Maia Damianovic, *To Actuality*, Bozen, 2002, p. 55.

⁶ Valentijn Byvanck, *Conversations in Contemporary Art. Lectures and Debates Witte de With 2001*, Rotterdam, 2001, p. 19.

⁷ Damianovic, *To Actuality*, Bozen, p. 46.

with art, but at present when artists are becoming more and more concerned with different political, social and environmental issues, such art projects are a usual thing.

Let us take another example of an art performance. In 1996 an artist from Germany Andreas Slominski put a tyre around a lamppost in the city of Munich. But his idea was not to do it simply like that but to draw public's attention toward his creation (otherwise who could claim it to be a work of art?). So he decided to get support from the local authorities by being provided with technical assistance such as excavator and crane to dig out a lamppost and to put a tyre on it from below and not from above, what would have been much easier. Afterwards he took pictures of his creation and published them in a catalogue, thus affirming its art status.⁸

So coming back to the question of contemporary and modern art, I would like to mention here Aleksandr Solovyov, an art critic and curator of the *Pinchuk ArtCentre*⁹ (Kyiv/Ukraine). As he states, it is very easy to be under the impression that contemporary art is what is being created now. In the reality it is an absolutely wrong statement. The roots of contemporary art can be traced in the beginning of the twentieth century. It has undergone many changes and modifications (from *modernism*, *avant-garde*, *post-avant-garde* etc). What brings us to the idea that modern and contemporary art are really connected to a great extent, and sometimes it is difficult to draw clear line between the two because their aims go in the same direction. So Aleksandr Solovyov states the following in regards to the notion of contemporary art: "This is the so called 'actual' art. It is radical and provocative. It is critical towards

⁸ Byvanck, *Conversations in Contemporary Art*, Rotterdam, p. 21.

⁹ <http://pinchukartcentre.org/en/> (17.02.2010).

society and authorities, to the limits of art itself. It is a phenomenon which requires the liquidation of all taboos.”¹⁰

Art has always played an important role in our lives. On the one hand, art is a tool for expression, a message to the public which helps to show what artists and people in general actually think about this world and everything what happens in it. On the other hand, art as a message helps us to understand some hidden parts of our life or something we avoid or do not want to see and accept. Art gives us link between present and past, and at the same time it goes ahead of its' time. Art is a prophet of its' kind; it works on the level of feelings, not the level of intellect (at least not purely at the intellectual level). That is why art expresses the mood of society, its anxieties and worries, even if society itself still does not realize it or is not ready for it. Of course, such a vision of art can seem a little bit idealized, but I think the initial idea of art and its role should go approximately in this direction.

For me personally the biggest interest in writing about art in the context of globalization is the fact that when globalization is being referred to, such fields as politics, economics or social life are being touched upon in the first line. But to my mind art sphere can also be a great example of how our world is getting more and more *globalized* or even better to say *glocalized*. It gives us as much space for research of this question the same collectively as the other fields mentioned above. Sometimes it is very difficult to define where the sphere of its influence begins and ends, but that is exactly what makes the research of the *art globalization* even more interesting and intriguing.

¹⁰ *Museum of Contemporary Art – Laboratory of Creative Ideas and Visual Improvisations*, Kyiv, 2007, p. 124.

And finally I would like to turn to the main focus of my paper, and namely the role which the museums of modern art (and they are slowly being transformed into contemporary art museums/CAMs) play in the art world. I find it quite interesting how these museums are trying to broaden their sphere of interests in global terms by acquiring works of contemporary artists from the countries which simply did not exist on the art map of the world previously. I would like to have a closer look on their acquisition policies during the last thirty years, as it will help me personally and the reader interested in this topic to get a better picture of the situation. The choice of the time frame was not accidental but based on the political and social changes which occurred in the world starting from 1980s. These changes had a great impact on the art world too as they *opened many doors* which have been closed until that time.

The very notion of the *art museum* in the twenty-first century (which can be considered presently as one of the leading art institutions) and its functions are quite different from those of the art museum in previous centuries. In the time of globalization, when the technologies are very highly developed, an art museum is not just a building for storing and exhibiting of art works.

Presently an art museum “[...] is not only the space where art is being shown. This is the space where art is constantly happening, where it is being born”¹¹. It is a lab, a center of creativity; and sometimes it goes even further, when art professionals argue that an art museum of the twenty-first century is a virtual space, where everybody participates in a creative process: visitors or spectators together with artists,

¹¹ *Museum of Contemporary Art*, Kyiv, p. 114.

critics, curators and other art professionals. “CAM is an innovative cultural machine, which realizes all aspects of communication and creativity in contemporary art.”¹²

Also artists themselves changed the attitude towards art institutions and among them art museums at present. The relations between an artist and an art museum were always quite difficult but especially we can observe such a tendency in the age of global art. In *New Institutionalism* Jonas Ekeberg states the following in regards to this question: “The working methods of artists have changed, with artists no longer forming their strategies in opposition to a traditional or static institution. Artists trained to operate in an ever-expanding art field now seem to require an institution that is as flexible and open as they are.”¹³ But all these questions of course require more attention and discussion. I will come back to some of them in the next chapters, though some which do not have a very direct connection to my paper I will have to skip.

To complete my research I have chosen four museums of modern and contemporary art around the world and would like to have a closer look at their acquisition and exhibition policies during the last three decades. These museums are: *Tate Modern* (London, 2000), *MoMA* (Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1929), *MUMOK* (Museum moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien, Vienna, 1979) and *Stedelijk Museum* (Amsterdam, 1895). My choice can seem strange at first, but it was quite a conscious one. I have decided upon ones of the leading art museums in the world which have always focused on Western art (art from Western Europe and Northern America) and are located on the territory of the Western art world on

¹² *Museum of Contemporary Art*, Kyiv, p. 116.

¹³ Jonas Ekeberg, *New Institutionalism. Verkestet No. 1*, Oslo, 2003, p. 11.

purpose. I think exactly these two points make such a choice very reasonable; the research of the above-mentioned museums will allow us to see whether there was really a shift from Eurocentrism towards a more global perspective in the hemisphere with a very conservative approach towards art.

I. Museum of Modern Art

[...] the very idea of a museum of modern art implies an institution that is forever willing to take risks and court controversy. The challenge for the Museum is to periodically reinvent itself, to map new space, metaphorically as well as practically; to do this it must be its own severest critic.¹⁴

In this paper museums of modern and contemporary art are used as an example of cultural institutions to investigate the impact which globalization has on the development of art in general, and modern and contemporary art in particular. By analyzing acquisition policies of museums of modern and contemporary art I will try to trace the latest changes which have occurred in the art world and see how the main trends in this field changed in recent decades. I would like to understand, first of all, how the processes of globalization are reflected in the acquisition systems of museums of modern and contemporary art. For this purpose I have chosen four art museums with quite a respectable reputation. They are *Museum moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig* (MUMOK) in Vienna, *Museum of Modern Art* (MoMA) in New York, *Stedelijk Museum* in Amsterdam and *Tate Modern* in London. I will focus on the last thirty years of the existence of these museums (so far it is possible) and their acquisition and exhibition activities.

My choice may seem a little bit strange at first as all of these museums represent the Western art world (three of them are located in Western Europe and one in the United States). But it was actually the main reason why I decided to include

¹⁴ Harriet Schoenholz Bee – Cassandra Haliczzer, *MoMA Highlights. 350 Works from The Museum of Modern Art New York*, New York, 2004, p. 17.

them into my research; it can show us whether globalization is influential and powerful enough to change the idea of art even there where the art traditions and canons were formed many years ago and where the concept of art seems to be very difficult to review and reconsider.

But before focusing on these four art museums and their acquisition policies I would like to have a closer look at the institution of a museum of modern art *per se*, to see how it developed during the time of its existence and how its concept changed during this period of time. I will start with the analysis of the general question about the role art plays in lives of people around the world and also about the mission of museums of modern and contemporary art.

1.1. The Role Art Museums Play in Our Life

Usually it is very difficult to define what the role art and art museums play in our life. For many decades debates about this question have been conducted very vigorously and intensely. Jens Hoffmann, the curator of the project *Institutional Ethics/Institutional Aesthetics* at *Bergen Kunsthall*¹⁵ in Norway, once raised in regards to this the following questions: “What is in fact the role and function of an art institution today? What can it offer to the public? What possibilities does an institution have in shaping an understanding of culture, art and politics? What is its impact on a local community? What does the public expect from an art institution?”

¹⁵ http://www.kunsthall.no/default_e.asp (18.08.2010).

Why should anybody care?”¹⁶ Depending on the time frame different functions of art prevailed in the past but at present there are several of them which seem to play the most important and significant role and these functions are: educational, communicative/social, and of course aesthetical.

I would like to start from the educational function because its importance seems quite obvious in the times of progress and knowledge which are characteristic for our generation. Educational function is the one which makes art so important in our life, which confirms its vital necessity for human beings with their yearning for new knowledge and new experiences. That is why presently art museums are very often considered to be not only cultural, but also to higher extent educational institutions. John Kaldor, a collector from Sydney/Australia, also confirms this idea in his statement:

If I can sum it up in one sentence, the role of a museum is to educate, to open the eyes, from young to old, to the wonders of art regardless of the period or the style. One of the greatest pleasures I have when visiting a museum is seeing the excitement of young schoolchildren being guided.¹⁷

Art museums are considered to be places of communication, of exchange of ideas and opinions; they are spaces which bring people together in real life, what becomes a more and more rare phenomenon in the times of globalization and high technologies; spaces where people are encouraged and inspired to think and share their experience with the others. Here I would like to quote what Janusz Byszewski

¹⁶ Ekeberg, *New Institutionalism*, Oslo, p. 10.

¹⁷ Irene Gludowacz – Silvia van Bennisen – Susanne van Hagen, *Global Art*, Ostfildern, 2010, p. 138.

states in his article *The Other Museum – Some Questions* concerning the importance of a real dialogue between artists via their works in art institutions and audience:

In a museum this contact [*between art and an audience*] is often reduced to a monologue of the art, a monologue of the artists, a monologue of the museum workers. And those who come here just listen and sometimes read some information. Of course they can accept or reject it, but for all practical purposes they are passive.¹⁸

So the main issue is how to make an audience active, how to build this lively communication between visitors and artists, how to let people express themselves, to participate in the creative process and not only to observe it?

Jagdish Bhagwati, a well-known journalist for *The Economist*/New York, is not directly involved in the art world, but in his interview for *Hatje Cantz Publishing House* about global art he concludes the following:

Maybe our children will watch only the internet, and visiting museums will become obsolete. Yet, museums provide a socializing experience and a shared way – unlike the Internet, where you are glued by yourself in front of a screen – of enjoying an aesthetic experience in the company of your family or friends; that is surely unique.¹⁹

Presently nobody will deny that art is of vital importance for people, their development and self-definition and museums of modern and contemporary art are becoming places which bring art and audience closer to each other.

¹⁸ Janusz Byszewski, “The Other Museum – Some Questions” In: *New Strategies for Communication in Museums. Proceedings of ICOM/CECA’96*, Vienna, 1997, p. 34.

¹⁹ Gludowacz – van Bennisen – van Hagen, *Global Art*, Ostfildern, p. 290.

1.2. New Perspectives for Museums of Modern Art

It is very difficult to give a clear definition to art. It is of the same difficulty to give a clear definition to an art museum presently. Everything what will be discussed further can be applied to every museum to higher or lower extent. But while referring to a museum in general, I am talking, first of all, about museums of modern and contemporary art.

During the lengthy existence of such an institution as a museum its notion can change many times. What we call a museum today is quite, if not totally, different from what our predecessors called a museum hundreds of years ago. The *International Council of Museums* has been concerned with this question over the last fifty years and tried to create a common definition for museums all around the globe. So according to the latest version of the Statute of *ICOM* (which was approved by the sixteenth General Assembly of *ICOM* in 1989 and amended by the eighteenth General Assembly in 1995) a museum is “a non-profit-making, permanent institution in the service of society and of its development, and open to the public which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits, for purposes of study, education and enjoyment, material evidence of people and their environment”.²⁰

Presently, museums’ activities and interests, the same as those of most other institutions, have radically shifted towards the demands of their customers/visitors. The contemporary museum’ visitors do not want to just observe what the curators or museum directors think is appropriate to show. They are getting more and more

²⁰ Kenneth Hudson, “The Museum Refuses to Stand Still”. In: *Museum Studies. An Anthropology of Contexts*, Oxford, 2004, p. 85.

demanding and exquisite in their choices, as they have more access to information.

For example, in the article *The Museum Refuses to Stand Still* by Kenneth Hudson we also find this idea:

[...] the most fundamental change that has affected museums during the half-century [...] is the now almost universal conviction that they exist in order to serve the public. The old-style museum felt itself to be under no such obligation. It existed, it had a building, it had collections and a staff to look after them, it was reasonably adequately financed, and its visitors, usually not numerous, came to look, to wonder and to admire what was set before them. They were in no sense partners in the enterprise. The museum's prime responsibility was to its collections, not to its visitors.²¹

Presently, if a museum wants to be successful and attractive for the visitors it should be competitive – it should be very creative and ready to surprise, fascinate and intrigue its audience. A museum is not just a mere cocoon for its permanent collection, but a whole entertainment complex, a vivid and developing creature. But unfortunately all these evolution processes are a two-sided coin: they have their pros and cons. If on the one hand, art museums are becoming more and more *visitors-friendly* and the art is becoming available for everybody, on the other hand, the audience is becoming less and less conscious in terms of understanding art. This very accessibility to art plays on visiting art museums because they are *in vogue*. And again Kenneth Hudson confirms that in his article:

It is worth remembering that since the end of the Second World War the number of museums in the world has increased enormously. Three-quarters of the museums we have today were not there in 1945. This massive growth has been

²¹ Hudson, “The Museum Refuses to Stand Still”, Oxford, p. 85.

accompanied by a remarkable broadening of the types of museum available and by the creation of a completely different kind of public. During the past thirty years especially, the museum-going public has changed a great deal. Its range of interests has widened, it is far less reverent and respectful in its attitudes, it expects electronics and other modern technical facilities to be available as a matter of course, it distinguishes less and less between museum and an exhibition, and it sees no reason to pay attention to the subject-boundaries so dear to academically minded people.²²

But though we live in the times of globalization, mass consumption, and highly developed technologies, we should remember that an art museum is, first of all, an educational institution, an institution which is supposed to provoke people to think critically and to develop their esthetical taste.

As we can clearly see the art world and particularly its institutional part represented by museums has changed very much in recent decades. It is more *visitor-oriented* now. It started to take into account visitors' tastes and wishes. Unfortunately this fact does not always influences the development of the art world in a good way. It has become fashionable to go to museums, especially those which exhibit contemporary art, but this choice is not always a conscious one. People presently are mass consumers and very often they treat art just as an object of consumption. Of course it does not mean that art professionals do not care about the artistic side of the collections and exhibitions anymore, but they do face more problems and challenges in making the right choice in the acquisition procedures. And sometimes it becomes more and more difficult, because for many visitors the main interest lies not in the aesthetics of art works, but in the fact that these artworks can become a good entertainment for them, what also Kenneth Hudson underlines:

²² Hudson, "The Museum Refuses to Stand Still", Oxford, p. 86.

A very important feature of the majority of the museums today, in contrast to what characterized them in the mid-1940s, is the extent to which they have become visitor-centered. This amounts to saying that, as good shopkeepers, museum directors are slowly coming to think of the customers first and the goods on sale second.²³

I would say that everything Kenneth Hudson mentioned about the evolution of museums in general can also be applied to the development of a museum of modern and contemporary art in particular. And if not every museum of modern art underwent all of the stages of such a development, the picture which we get from the description of a new museum model responds to the reality of a museum of modern and contemporary art. But of course all that does not mean that we should be very pessimistic about the future of museums of modern and contemporary art. With the help of new strategies and policies, with an intelligent approach toward the new concept of a museum which will take into account all the demands of the art consumers, but at the same time think about the real value of its collection, an art museum can have a chance to survive and to evolve to become an important part of our globalized world. Here I want to quote what Eilean Hooper-Greenhill states about this idea in *Changing Values in the Art Museum*:

Museums are at point of change. The possibility of cultural re-opening, of reinterpretation, of re-negotiation, is deeply exciting. Museums today have the opportunity to push at existing borders, to change current relationships, to manipulate and break down old orthodoxies, to enable a broader, more inclusive approach to a more inclusive society. Through developing their communicative functions in creative and

²³ Hudson, "The Museum Refuses to Stand Still", Oxford, p. 88.

innovative partnership with their audiences, art museums can become vital new institutions for the 21st century.²⁴

I would like to finish this subchapter with the words of Stefan Horsthemke from *AXA Art* in Cologne who seems to be very positive about the future of museums of modern and contemporary art. In his interview for the editors of *Global Art* he mentioned that “whatever happens, the public museums will survive as the custodians of art and culture”²⁵. Hopefully he is right!

1.3. Is the Future of Museums of Modern Art in Danger?

Globalization has activated changes in all spheres of our life, such as political, economic, social, cultural etc. Sometimes these changes occur quite naturally, so that we do not notice them, but sometimes they are very rapid and effect lives of many people in quite an unexpected way. In any case, we cannot ignore these changes and we should realize that globalization is a part of our life. If we are talking in terms of contemporary art, the situation seems to be very unclear, because both globalization and contemporary art are so to say realities of our present. That is why it is so difficult to predict what forms both of these phenomena will take in even the near future. Hans Belting in his Introduction to *Contemporary Art and the Museum* states the following about the future of art museums: “As long as the outcome of globalization

²⁴ Eilean Hooper-Greenhill, “Changing Values in the Art Museum. Rethinking Communication and Learning”. In: *Museum Studies. An Anthropology of Contexts*, Oxford, 2004, p. 573.

²⁵ Gludowacz – van Bennisen – van Hagen, *Global Art*, Ostfildern, pp. 304-305.

is still a largely clouded mirror, the art museum's future remains unpredictable, both with respect to its survival and its possible change of profile"²⁶.

As we have seen previously, some authors are being very optimistic about the development of museums and especially art museums. On the contrary to their opinion, Brien O'Doherty already back in 1972 was very critical about the future of museums because of several reasons. First of all he claimed the following:

The Museum age, which reached its Augustan apogee with the post-World War II boom in art education, in special exhibitions, in collecting, in museum-building, is finally over. Museums, once permanent fixtures by which to negotiate our spiritual journeys, have suddenly revealed infirmities in their foundations that have threatened them with collapse. Like many institutions in the late sixties, they were abruptly thrust from their historical context into their vicissitudes of contemporary life, where the problems of the entire society – many of them irrelevant to art museums – were brought to bear on them.²⁷

So according to his opinion the future of the museums is in doubt, because “the museum is in a state of physical, financial, esthetic and spiritual disarray”²⁸. I cannot agree with his statement and claim that museums are dying, as we have many examples of successful art museums now (especially taking into account that they managed to survive already four decades from the time of the above-mentioned publication), but of course it is not fair to totally deny that museums face difficulties presently, such as mediocre interest in art itself, or financial problems.

²⁶ Peter Weibel – Andrea Buddensieg, *Contemporary Art and the Museum. A Global Perspective*, Ostfildern, 2007, p. 32.

²⁷ Brian O'Doherty, *Museums in Crisis*, New York, 1972, p. 2.

²⁸ Ibid.

Also Lisa Dennison from *Sotheby's* in New York agrees that the future of art museums is endangered. Her main argument lays in the shift of power and influence from the art museums towards the auction houses and private galleries:

[...] museums are in difficult position today because they don't seem to have the power to speak with the same authority that they had in the past. More and more people are learning about art from galleries and auction houses. Museums need to build their permanent collections, but what we are seeing is a phenomenon where collectors don't want to gift their art in perpetuity to a museum that may put it in the basement storerooms. Collectors want their collections to be living, breathing entities – and this makes museums less relevant to them at this time.²⁹

Of course, it is hard to deny the fact that museums of modern and contemporary art are facing difficulties today what was already stated here. Together with the demanding public they have financial problems, too and for those museums which do not have reliable sponsors and permanent sources of financing or are oriented toward a small definite audience, it is really very difficult to survive. Nancy Hanks admits this reality in her Foreword to the book of Brian O'Doherty *Museums in Crisis*:

The situation of our museums, some threatened with permanent closure and others curtailing their activities and availability to the public, is evidence of a serious but characteristic dilemma: the greater the public interest, the greater the financial burden.³⁰

In the same book Max Kozloff states that museums can survive only if they are “under the corporate wing”. According to his assumption the future of museums

²⁹ Gludowacz – van Bennisen – van Hagen, *Global Art*, Ostfildern, p. 256.

³⁰ O'Doherty, *Museums in Crisis*, New York, p. ix.

of modern art is very uncertain and it is a big question whether they can be accepted as “arbiters in the reception of serious contemporary art”.³¹ In his opinion almost forty years ago (when the book was first published) the image of a museum of modern art changed drastically because of many reasons:

The more the objects of private collecting reverted to public hands, the more inevitable it became that the economic interests behind that collecting would move to control the public houses of art. Museums are, or will soon be treated like, entities in a conglomerate. Moreover, with a different sponsor for each ambitious exhibition, the museum becomes subject to a carrousel of backers, each feeling entitled to have its interests acknowledged.³²

At the same time Ingvild Goetz, one of the most important international collectors of modern art of today, does not talk about the death of museums of contemporary art, but for her the financial difficulties these museums face are obvious and very serious:

The public museums are under increasing financial pressure and becoming more and more dependent on collectors and gallery owners, all of whom are pursuing their own – primarily economic – interests. For this reason many museums are putting on shows aimed at drawing in large numbers of people. Success, so the reasoning goes, consists in having as many visitors to your exhibition as spectators at an international football game, and letting them set the cash registers ringing. This is a pretty dangerous trend. I think it must be possible for public museums to show important artists who don't have great popular appeal, who are perhaps reserved and difficult to understand. That really would be exciting. And it's really the only way for public museums to fulfill their mission of educating the public.³³

³¹ O'Doherty. *Museums in Crisis*, New York, p. 147.

³² *Ibid*, p. 156.

³³ Gludowacz – van Bennisen – van Hagen, *Global Art*, Ostfildern, pp. 118-119.

So thus she brings us back to the main question of this paper and namely *globalization of art*, she sees in it a way out for art museums being in the state of crisis. But in the end she adds that the situation in Europe is not that critical so far, though of course it does not mean that art museums in the Old World or other regions do not face any problems nowadays:

In the long term the idea of having a system of publicly funded museums may well indeed peter out, particularly if they no longer fulfill their educational mission. This is less true of Europe, where we are still very much rooted in a museum tradition and in the idea that the purpose of these institutions is to educate the public, than in the new markets such as, for example, China or the Emirates.³⁴

So the picture emerging from these speculations is a very ambiguous one. On the one hand, art museums these days are gaining more and more attention, as they become more open to the public and its interests. But on the other hand, it is very difficult to predict what the outcome of all these changes will be. The question remains unanswered: will museums of modern and contemporary art overcome all the obstacles on their way to successful future or will they just “die out”? Only time will show us which scenario will emerge.

³⁴ Gludowacz – van Bennisen – van Hagen, *Global Art*, Ostfildern, p. 120.

II. Tate Modern / London

If Tate Modern is exemplary of the museum in the age of globalization – and indeed it is the most visited museum of modern art in the world, welcoming nearly five million visitors per year – then it is because today's global museum is a space of conflict, diverse functions, and mixed political effects.³⁵

2.1. Tate Modern: Foundation History

Tate Modern is one of the four galleries which compound the Tate family and display art works of the Tate Collection. The part of the Collection presented at Tate Modern is compound of works of international modern and contemporary art. Tate Modern was opened by Her Majesty the Queen on May 11, 2000, and is located in the heart of London and defined as the national gallery of international modern art. According to the summary of the first years of its existence, “Tate Modern has since proved an extraordinary success, exceeding all expectations. In the first year it had an astonishing 5.25 million visitors, making it by far the most popular modern art museum in the world.”³⁶

As most other museums of modern and contemporary art around the globe Tate Modern claims to have highly significant cultural and educational role by being one of the main mediators between audience and artists of modern and contemporary art. This idea is reflected in the *Tate Acquisition and Disposal Policy* which contains the rules applicable to all four of Tate galleries:

³⁵ Belting – Buddensieg, *The Global Art World: Audiences, Markets, and Museums*, Ostfildern, 2009, p. 256.

³⁶ *Tate Report 2000-2002*, London, 2002, p. 7.

Tate's mission, drawn from the 1992 Museums and Galleries Act, is to increase the public's knowledge, understanding and enjoyment of British art from the sixteenth century to the present day and of international modern and contemporary art.³⁷

International modern and contemporary art exhibited at Tate Modern is being defined as art starting from 1900 up to the present day. The decision to establish Tate Modern was reached in the end of 1980s when it became clear that the Tate Collection has grown to such an extent that a separate space for the international modern and contemporary art was necessary.

Tate Modern is situated in *Bankside Power Station* which was initially designed by Giles Gilbert Scott and built between 1947 and 1963. At the time when the Tate Gallery decided to acquire a site there (between 1981 and 1994) for the future Tate Modern, the whole building, except an operational London Electricity sub-station, was unoccupied.

The redundant Bankside Power Station proved an astonishing discovery; a building of enormous size, great architectural distinction, superbly sited opposite St Paul's Cathedral and in a fascinating and historic, if neglected area, next to the rebuilt Globe Theatre. An international architectural competition was held, which over seventy architects entered, including some of the world's most distinguished. The final choice was the young Swiss practice, Jacques Herzog and Pierre de Meuron.³⁸

The Tate Collection of modern and contemporary art presents masterpieces from the most significant art movements starting from *Fauvism*. According to the plan of the Tate Modern founders from the very beginning it was supposed to become

³⁷ *Tate Acquisition and Disposal Policy*, London, 2009, p. 1.

³⁸ <http://www.tate.org.uk/modern/building/history.htm> (19.05.2010).

one of the best and most important collections of modern and contemporary art in the whole world.

Tate Modern's displays consist of four wings [...]. At the heart of each wing is a large central display, or 'hub', which focuses on a key period in the development of twentieth century art. These four seminal periods are Surrealism, Minimalism, Post-war innovations in abstraction and figuration, and the three linked movements Cubism, Futurism and Vorticism. Around these "hubs" a diverse range of related displays present works which anticipated, challenged or responded to these four major movements.³⁹

Facing different challenges of the globalised world, many museums are trying to broaden their physical and geographical borders through expanding their activities in other countries. But comparing to the other famous art institutions, which are trying to work globally (e.g. *Louvre* in Paris with its plan to set a new branch in Abu Dhabi or *Guggenheim* in New in New York with its branches in Berlin, Bilbao and Venice) Tate Modern chose a different strategy for its development. It focuses mostly on the publicity through such media, cyberspace or specific educational, cultural and art events for every target group. In regards to this we read in *The Global Art World*:

The museum maintains a highly innovative website, which offers wide-ranging publicity services for its exhibitions and events and also archives extensive webcasts of lectures and conferences. Internal diversification also describes the institution's own departmentalization toward the stratification of its audience, categorized as increasingly differentiated and commercially targeted demographic fields, comprising virtually all age groups and various types visitors, members, and donors, from programs for children to assistance with bequeathed contributions.⁴⁰

³⁹ <http://www.tate.org.uk/modern/about.htm> (19.05.2010).

⁴⁰ Belting – Buddensieg, *The Global Art World*, Ostfildern, pp. 257-258.

In later sections I would like to have a closer look at acquisitions and exhibitions of Tate Modern with an intention to identify what the main tendencies in these fields are. But before that I think it can be interesting to see how the Tate positions itself in this respect on the basis of its acquisition policy.

2.2. Acquisition Policy of Tate Modern

Tate has a common acquisition policy for all four of its galleries. Though their main areas of interest are different they all are supposed to follow the same rules in their exhibition and acquisition activities:

Tate aims to acquire art works of outstanding quality in all the areas for which it is responsible. It seeks to expand the range and texture of the art Collection, and through its acquisitions to frame and address changing historical narratives.⁴¹

Thus Tate pays much attention towards changes happening in the world and tries to reflect them in its Collections. Concerning the area of interest in making acquisitions of international art in *Tate Acquisition and Disposal Policy* it is stated the following:

The focus of Tate's international collection has traditionally been on the art of Western Europe and North America. Since 2000, the Board of Trustees have extended this remit to embrace international and modern contemporary art from a more global perspective, where such art has a connection or a relevance to the principal areas of the collection and to contemporary British audiences.⁴²

⁴¹ <http://www.tate.org.uk/collections/newacquisitions.htm> (01.06.2010).

⁴² *Tate Acquisition and Disposal Policy*, London, p. 1.

Here we can see that Tate's acquisition and exhibition activities shifted from a purely Western towards a more global art, which is the main interest in this research paper. But to understand how deep this shift is we need to have a closer look at the latest exhibitions and acquisitions of Tate Modern further in this chapter.

The Tate aims to build a collection of the highest quality in all the relevant current Medias. As mentioned above one of the main focuses of the Museum's acquisition policy in recent years was a broadening of the geographical remit of its Collection. It is one of the main reasons of the recent acquisitions of art works from the regions of Latin America and Asian Pacific, according to Tate's own statement. Interest of the Museum in these two regions is one of the guidelines in its Program for the present and near future. But whether it is only a plan or a reality, further examination will show us.

The following statement from *Tate Acquisition and Disposal Policy* is very interesting taking into account Tate's claims to discover art from new regions: "Potential acquisitions of contemporary art are considered by artists who have already made a significant contribution and have achieved national or international recognition."⁴³ It looks like despite the fact of Tate's openness to a more global perspective it is still very much oriented towards acknowledged art (at least in terms of its acquisition policy).

There are several ways of making acquisitions to the Collection of Tate such as through purchase, gift, bequest or works allocated by the Government in lieu of tax. There are also different ways of funding for the extension of the Tate Collection,

⁴³ <http://www.tate.org.uk/collections/newacquisitions.htm> (01.06.2010).

such as a grant provided by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport, individual and group donations, or funding from the charitable organizations.⁴⁴

The procedures of making an acquisition to the Collection are very complicated and depend on every specific case, but the general rules (applicable for all the Tate galleries) are the following:

All works of art proposed for acquisition are considered through the same procedures, whether proposed internally or from an external source. Initial proposals are discussed and assessed by teams of specialist curators, and their recommendations are considered by The Acquisitions Group. Final assessments are then made by the Director and the Collection Committee, with all decisions resting ultimately with the Board of Trustees.⁴⁵

According to the information provided on the official webpage of the Tate it spends approximately £1.5 million on acquisitions of artworks every year. But thanks to such bodies as, for example, Heritage Lottery Fund and The Art Fund this sum increased significantly during the last years.

2.3. Recent Acquisitions at Tate Modern

As already mentioned in the previous subchapter according to its own Mission Statement The Tate is focused at present on two main regions beyond the already explored territory of Northern America and Western Europe; and these two regions are Latin America and Asian Pacific. For example, this idea is being underlined in the

⁴⁴ <http://www.tate.org.uk/collections/newacquisitions.htm> (01.06.2010).

⁴⁵ Ibid.

Tate Report for the years 2000-2002 (though here also acquisitions by Israeli artists among others are mentioned):

Two significant developments have occurred. The first is the gift from Joseph Hackmey of a group of works by contemporary Israeli artists, a number of which comment both directly and obliquely on the political tensions in the Middle East. Works by David Reeb, Micha Ullman, Roi Kuper, Gilad Ophir, Michael Gross and Moshe Gershuni all enter the Collection for the first time. The second is the new thrust towards collecting contemporary Latin American art. *The Penelope* by Leonilson was presented by members of the Bezerra Dias family, while the Trustees of the American Fund acquired major works by Ernesto Neto and Adriana Varejao that have been lent to Tate. A photographic work by Vik Muniz depicting a recreation in dust of a prop piece by Richard Serra was purchased by the American Collectors Forum and lent by the American Fund.⁴⁶

We can also trace the latest tendencies in the Museum's acquisition policy on the basis of the recent purchases and gifts of the new non-Western names (*Table 1, p. 76*) which can give us a more real picture. Unfortunately it was not that easy to make a comprehensive analysis of all the acquisitions done by The Tate in the field of modern and contemporary art during the last thirty years as their volume is huge and the data available is quite unsystematic. But from the information which I, nevertheless, managed to gather from the staff of The Tate I can draw the following general conclusions: Tate Modern tries to acquire artworks of many non-Western artists presently and the geography of these acquisitions is very broad. Thus in its Collection Tate Modern has works of artists from Eastern Europe (Russia / Victor Alimpiev, Poland / Magdalena Abakanowicz), Asia (China / Fei Cao), Latin America (Mexico / Carlos Amorales), Africa (Uganda / Zarina Bhimji), Middle East (Iran /

⁴⁶ *Tate Report 2000-2002*, London, p. 40.

Nazgol Ansarinia, Mahmoud Bakhshi Moakhar) which are of course only some examples from the long list. I do not mention here also the names of artists who are considered to belong to the non-Western art scene but are already world-acknowledged and well-known not only among art professionals but among the general audience, too.

2.4. Recent Exhibitions at Tate Modern

Except for the exhibitions of the world-famous and influential modern and contemporary artists such as Picasso, Rothko, Giacometti, Lichtenstein, Warhol etc, who belong to the so-called Western art world, Tate Modern is trying to broaden the boundaries of its exhibition activities (the same as it is doing within its acquisition policy) and to bring some new non-Western names onto the British exhibition art scene. As we can see from the *Tate Report* of 2002-2004, the Museum highlights its role as one of the most important institutions in Britain (and in the world to some extent) in promotion of international modern and contemporary art:

Complementing these modern exhibitions are shows by contemporary international artists. Since 2002, we have featured [...] in a group exhibition called *Common Wealth* 13, the collaborative artists Jennifer Allora and Guillermo Calzadilla, as well as Thomas Hirschhorn, Carsten Höller and Gabriel Orozco.⁴⁷

Of course it is difficult to claim that for example Gabriel Orozco can be called a non-Western artist at least in the frames of this paper, as he already has quite a renowned reputation in definite art circles and is not a new name not only on non-

⁴⁷ *Tate Report 2002-2004*, London, 2004, p. 233.

Western but also on Western art scene. But Tate Modern also emphasizes its significant role as an art institution willing and able to promote new unknown names, and to higher extent of those artists from the non-Western art world. In regard to this The Tate states the following:

The trust that has been established between Tate Modern and its audience has enabled the gallery to present Collection displays and exhibitions that are rooted in rigorous scholarship, and frequently champion art and artists that are not widely known. One example is the monographic exhibition mounted this year [2008-2009] of the Brazilian artist Cildo Meireles. Although an established figure in the contemporary art world, the work of Meireles was largely unknown to the general public. And yet a combination of his mesmerizing artworks and Tate Modern's ability to bring an audience to new art and ideas meant that over 75,000 people came to see the show.⁴⁸

I tried to have a closer look at the exhibition activity of Tate Modern during the last thirty years, focusing on the exhibitions of non-Western modern and contemporary artists. The results of this investigation can be found in *Table 2* (p. 77). As we can see from the table (the data is selective and does not include all the exhibitions, but only the major ones) Tate Modern had a number of exhibitions by non-Western artists, though the Museum's activity in this field can be assessed mostly starting from the year 2000. But taking into account quite a short history of existence of Tate Modern, such a fact seems to be quite logical. What is also very problematic in case of Tate Modern is to trace which regions are of the most interest for the Museum (what was a problem in case of its acquisition activities, too). Thus it had exhibitions of artists from Eastern and Central Europe (Slovakia / Roman Ondak, Romania / Dan Perjovskchi, Matei Bejeranu), Latin America (Brazil / Helio Oiticica,

⁴⁸ *Tate Report 2008-2009*, London, 2009, p. 43.

Columbia / Doris Calcedo, Mexico / Damien Ortega), Africa (Benin / Meschac Gaba, Morocco / Latifa Echakhch) and Asia (China / Cui Xiuwen, India / Amrita Sher-Gil, Mali / Mohamed Camara). But of course its scope even presently is very scarce compared to the amount of exhibitions by the Western artists, even if Tate Modern has one of the main guidelines of its recent policy to broaden its horizons in regard to the geography of the art being exhibited in its halls. As the exhibitions of the non-Western artists are not numerous and do not follow any specific scheme, it makes the research even more difficult and does not give the opportunity to draw any clear conclusions out of it.

III. Museum moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien (MUMOK)/Vienna

The aim of MUMOK is to preserve, enlarge, analyze, and make available to the public the collection of artworks from the 20th and 21st centuries, compiled since the opening of the Museum of 20th Century Art, by applying state-of-the-art scientific and museological methods. The Museum serves as collection site, archive, research institution, and exhibition venue.⁴⁹

3.1. MUMOK: Foundation History

The Museum moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien has a very changing already more than 40-year-old history, which has meanwhile overcome not only the third name, but also the third address.⁵⁰

The roots of the Museum moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien go back to September 20, 1962, when *Museum of the 20th century* – later renamed into *20er Haus* – was opened in *Schweizer Garten* (*Swiss Garden*). It was located in the building of the former *Austrian Pavilion* for the Brussels EXPO (1958) designed by Karl Schwanzer, and after the decision to make a museum out of it the building was adapted to serve as an exhibition venue. The first director of the Museum Werner Hofmann was quite successful in making significant modern art acquisitions in the first few years and created a consistent collection out of them. But at present the Museum is famous not only because of its Collection, but also because of various art and cultural activities

⁴⁹ <http://www.mumok.at/about/mission-statement/?L=1> (25.06.2010).

⁵⁰ Wolfgang Drechsler – Rainer Fuchs – Ulrike Müller, *Museum Moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien*, München, 2002, p. 7: Das Museum moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien blickt bereits auf eine über 40-jährige, sehr wechselhafte Geschichte zurück, was sich nicht nur im mittlerweile dritten Namen und der dritten Adresse niedergeschlagen hat.

included in its Program. Unlike many other museums of modern and contemporary art, MUMOK emphasizes its interest not only in the present but also in the past, seeing one of its main missions to make a connection between the two of these time dimensions:

A key concern [*of MUMOK*] is the debate on contemporary art. For this reason the Museum organizes events and discussions designed to raise awareness for new and experimental art, as well as to convey information on recent art history and theory. MUMOK's commitment to both history and present and its museological, scientific and educational mission demands its profound engagement in the collection, research and communication of international artworks of modernism, the recent past, and the present.⁵¹

Finally, under the current name MUMOK was opened on April 26, 1979, in the *Palais Liechtenstein*. Since the exhibition space in the *20er Haus* was very limited it was decided to move to the new venue. The initial idea of this change belonged to Hans Mayr –President of the *Wiener Künstlerhaus* at that time. In the year 1977 he organized an exhibition in Vienna showing modern art from the Collection of Peter and Irene Ludwig from Aachen. And during this very exhibition the Ludwig family agreed to make a permanent loan of a number of modern art works to the city of Vienna. After further negotiations of the Austrian Committee with Mr. and Mrs. Ludwig it was agreed upon even bigger amount of art works from their Collection to be exhibited, what was another reason for the new extended exhibition space. In 1981 about half of the loaned artworks from the Ludwig Collection came into possession of the newly created *Austrian Ludwig Foundation* (by the then Federal Minister of Science and Culture Herta Firnberg and the Ludwigs). Other donations of the

⁵¹ <http://www.mumok.at/about/mission-statement/?L=1> (25.06.2010).

artworks were made in 1991 and “as an expression of gratitude both exhibition venues were renamed into Museum moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien”⁵². The Austrian Ludwig Foundation is responsible for such activities of the Museum as preserving and presenting the artworks, making acquisitions and providing support of the artistic activities.

The present location of the Museum moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig is in the *MuseumsQuartier* (former royal horse stables) situated in Vienna’s historical centre. The relocation made it finally possible for the Museum to show all the art works from its Collection at the same place. The official opening occurred there on September 15, 2001. “The cubic basalt-covered building was designed by the architects *Ortner & Ortner* and features 4.800 square meters of exhibition space for the main works of the collection of modern and contemporary art, which as a whole comprises more than 7000 works.”⁵³

The MUMOK Collection comprises of art works of the following art movements: *Fluxus*, *Nouveau Réalisme*, *Viennese Actionism*, *Pop Art*, and *Photorealism*. Thus the Museum “offers a unique blend of art focusing on society and reality as well as of performative art of the 20th century”⁵⁴. In the Mission Statement of the Museum it is clearly explained that MUMOK is highly interested in the processes which happen in our global world presently, especially it pays much attention to the questions of interdependence of international and local and on how this process is reflected in modern and contemporary art.

⁵² <http://www.mumok.at/about/history/?L=1> (25.06.2010).

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ <http://www.mumok.at/about/mission-statement/?L=1> (25.06.2010).

As the largest Austrian museum for international modern and contemporary art, MUMOK promotes the museological integration of Austrian art and art discourse into an international context and simultaneously conveys internationality within its local environment. MUMOK communicates the social relevance of art by illustrating the changes in art perception and their causes, both historical and contemporary. With reference to the present, MUMOK participates in the socio-political discourse and opposes tendencies which challenge the freedom of art and cultural policy.⁵⁵

As at present Vienna is considered to be one of the most *comfortable* cities for living in Europe with its long historical tradition and its rich contemporary cultural life, it is trying to support this status and promote itself via different means, and art plays a significant role in this process. That is why it is not surprising that MUMOK as one of the most famous Austrian museums attracts so much attention today.

3.2. Acquisition policy of MUMOK

Opening of the Museum moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien was a very important event in the cultural life of the city of Vienna. There were a lot of gaps in regards to art representation in Austria at that time and MUMOK was supposed to fill them:

The Museum moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien is by definition Austria's only state-own museum for international modern and contemporary art. It possesses the only comprehensive collection of international critical Modernism, and its collections covering the postwar period afford an

⁵⁵ <http://www.mumok.at/about/mission-statement/?L=1> (25.06.2010).

overview of the most important developments in Euro-American art, at least until the 1970s.⁵⁶

So as we can see from the above statement, the initial idea of MUMOK was to create and exhibit so-called Western art and namely art from Western Europe and Northern America. The question again is to what extent we can talk about the shift from this Eurocentric towards a more global perspective in the acquisition and exhibition policy of the Museum? Concerning this problem MUMOK claims the following in one of its publications:

The newer part of the collection [...] reflects the heterogeneity of recent artistic developments in a prototypical and necessarily fragmentary way, while continuing to maintain the high standards of a state museum and adapt the museum's traditional educational role to today's realities. Intensified collecting activities [...] have prompted an in-depth strategic and conceptual reorientation.⁵⁷

So basically it can be concluded that the Museum is trying to follow the latest trends in the development of modern and contemporary art and to present it to the Austrian audience and the foreign visitors. The high interest of the Museum to different forms of art can be traced what is reflected in the variety of activities proposed in the Program of the Museum.

Through its collecting history, which displays a sustained preference for critical, object-related, performative, and conceptual art, MUMOK defines itself as a discursive museum. This self-definition shapes and facilitates all decisions leading to the necessary concentration of activities – regardless of the direction they take. It has also shaped the character of the new

⁵⁶ *Why Pictures Now. Fotografie, Film, Video Heute*, Nürnberg, 2006, p. 17.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

focus of collecting in the broad field of photography, film, and video in today's art [...].⁵⁸

At present the Collection of the Museum consists of art works from the fields of not only painting, sculpture, objects and graphics, but also architectural models (e.g. by Adolf Loos, Gerrit Rietveld and Philip Johnson), furniture, cutlery and glass (e.g. by Josef Hoffmann). Werner Hofmann once stated: "Art is a very diverse phenomenon and the top works represent only a small part of it. That is why I am not as much interested in international celebrities as in the art currents which are characteristic for our century"⁵⁹. This attitude towards collecting in the acquisition policy of the Museum led to existence of not only internationally renowned art pieces, but also to the less famous ones. This fact exactly can be very interesting in the frames of my research: to see whether the Museum is ready and willing to show new names from different parts of the world, and not only those already acknowledged by art professionals and general public.

The big shift in the exhibition and acquisition policy of the Museum can be observed starting from 1990s when the new Director Lóránd Hegyi was elected. It happened exactly in the times of huge changes in political terms in Europe such as for example the end of the communists' regime in Eastern European countries, the fall of the Berlin Wall and of the Iron Curtain. All these changes led also to the shift in cultural policies of many countries. First of all the interest towards the new emerging economies of the Eastern Europe awoke, but also towards far remote

⁵⁸ *Why Pictures Now*, Nürnberg, p. 17.

⁵⁹ Drechsler – Fuchs – Müller, *Museum Moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien*, München, p. 7: Kunst ist ein breit gelagertes Phänomen, von dem die Spitzenwerke nur einen Auszug enthalten. Es geht mir deshalb weniger um internationale Zelebritäten als darum, die charakteristischen Strömungen darzustellen, von denen die Kunst unserer Jahrhunderts getragen wird.

countries – “those territories outside Europe which were considered to be peripheral zones according to the Western perspective (Israel, Japan, Latin America)”⁶⁰.

Hegyí then argues that the recent acquisitions of important artists from the 60s, 70s, and 80s (such as Ilya Kabakov, Stanislav Kolibal, Karel Malic, Miroslav Balka) are the ideal continuation of the Collection of classic Avant-garde in Central Europe (Frantisek Kupka, Lajos Kassak, Laszlo Moholy-Nagy, Henryk Stazewski etc).⁶¹

In one of his articles about MUMOK Lóránd Hegyí emphasizes the interest of the Museum towards art which was considered peripheral for quite a long time and started to be acknowledged in Western Europe only after the new political and social changes in the world:

Contemporary art coming from Central and Eastern European countries long regarded as periphery, as well as art coming from the Southern European countries equally perceived as fringe areas from a Western perspective (Portugal, Spain, Greece), have both found their way to our Museum. What is more, we have also turned out attention to art from non-European countries such as Brazil, Argentina, Israel, Japan, and Korea. Because of these two factors, the collection of the Museum moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien can now interpret Western art in a broader and multicultural context more in line with the current political and cultural situation.⁶²

And further on Lóránd Hegyí also adds the following concerning the changes which occurred in the perception of art previously and now:

⁶⁰ Drechsler – Fuchs – Müller, *Museum Moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien*, München, p. 18: ... ebenso die jener außereuropäischen Gegenden, die aus der westlichen Perspektive als Randgebiete galten (Israel, Japan, Lateinamerika).

⁶¹ Ibid: Hegyí verweist weiter darauf, dass die Neuankäufe bedeutender Künstler der 60er, 70er und 80er Jahre (z. B. Ilja Kabakov, Stanislav Kolibal, Karel Malic, Miroslav Balka) die Sammlung der klassischen Avantgarde in Mitteleuropa (Frantisek Kupka, Lajos Kassak, Laszlo Moholy-Nagy, Henryk Stazewski u. a.) ideal fortsetzen.

⁶² Lóránd Hegyí. *Zwischenquartier. Interim Quartiers*, Vienna, 2001, p. 19.

In this regard our collection policy reflects the sweeping changes in the way art was looked upon in the eighties and ninetieth, the break with ahistorical, abstract, universalistic, formalistic, and evolutionist models, and the adoption of an anthropological mentality stressing concrete ethno-cultural, historical and ideological determinations.⁶³

The interest towards the art from Eastern and Central Europe is very strong in MUMOK presently, too. It can be traced on the example of latest acquisitions and exhibitions in the Museum, what unfortunately cannot be said about the other regions.

3.3. Latest acquisitions of MUMOK

In case of the Museum moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien it is not that easy to get direct access towards the information about latest acquisitions as it is not accessible on the official webpage of the Museum and on the basis of the separate catalogues it is possible to get only a vague and incomplete picture. Still after some research in the archives of MUMOK and talking to its staff, I came to the conclusion that the Museum was more oriented towards exploring the new territories of Central and Eastern Europe during the last thirty years (what is also stated in the policy of the Museum and was already mentioned above). This interest in the art of neighboring, much unexplored countries started quite a long time ago, as Irene and Peter Ludwig acquired a lot of art from the then Eastern Bloc (actually they were among the first Western collectors who seriously started to incorporate art from Eastern Europe into their Collection) a lot of which were donated to MUMOK later. This acquisition

⁶³ Hegyi. *Zwischenquartier. Interim Quartiers*, Vienna, pp. 19-20.

activity continued especially actively during the directorship of Lóránd Hegyi who explained it this way:

This city [*of Vienna*], both culturally and historically, has always been inextricably linked to the Central European region, and it is still perceived as the first Western outpost for artists and intellectuals from Central and Eastern Europe.⁶⁴

And in the Preface of the catalogue to one of the latest exhibitions in the Museum *Gender Check* we can read another statement which proves this idea:

MUMOK functions as an interface and conduit between Western and Eastern Europe and thereby continues a tradition of artistic cooperation with Eastern European artists, art experts, and institutions.⁶⁵

Thus in the Collection of MUMOK for the last thirty years (*Table 3, p. 78*) we can hardly find any examples of art from Latin America or Africa. As one of the exceptions for example the artwork of Nora Aslan from Argentina can be mentioned.

In the catalogue to the exhibition of Mexican art in MUMOK called *Zwischenzonen* it is also mentioned that Jose Clemente Orozco is so far the only Mexican artist whose works are represented in the Collection of the Museum and although there are art works of some other artists from the Latin America, such as for example Robert Matta, Rodrigo Penalba, Fernando Botero etc, they can hardly be considered as non-Western artists as all of them “developed their works in Europe or in the United States”⁶⁶.

⁶⁴ Hegyi. *Zwischenquartier. Interim Quarters*, Vienna, p. 28.

⁶⁵ *Gender Check. Checking Gender & Verifying History. Femininity and Masculinity in the Art of Eastern Europe*, Vienna, 2009, p. 8.

⁶⁶ *Zwischenzonen, La Colección Jumex, Mexico*, Vienna, 2009, p. 241.

And though there are works of artists from Asian region, their number is very limited (these are mostly art works of Japanese – Masato Nakamura, Takako Saito or Yoshimasa Wada – and Chinese artists – Lu Zhirong or Jun Yang). So the trends in acquisition policy are quite clear in case of MUMOK: the Museum is very much interested in the art from Central and Eastern Europe and to lesser extend in Asian region. But art from other parts of the world does not seem to attract much attention and are not significantly represented in the Collection of the Museum.

3.4. Latest exhibitions of MUMOK

The same tendency can be traced in the exhibition policy of the Museum moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien. Most of the exhibitions by non-Western artists or collectives held during the last thirty years (*Table 4, p. 80*) are of the artist from the Central and Eastern Europe or from Asia. For example in 2003 there was an exhibition devoted to contemporary art and video from Poland, in 2009 – exhibition by Agnieszka Kalinowska from Poland also, in 2010 – exhibition *Gender Check*, representing new names in Eastern European art. In the catalogue to the last one the authors again underline the importance of art from Eastern Europe for the exhibition activity of the Museum: “The museum is currently fulfilling its historical function as a bridge between ‘East’ and ‘West’ by mounting exhibitions of major works of Viennese Actionism and related international movements in Eastern European exhibition centers [...]”⁶⁷.

⁶⁷ *Gender Check*, Vienna, p. 8.

Among the recent exhibitions of artists from Asian region *China – Facing Reality* in 2007-2008 can be mentioned. But in this case it is also not very clear whether this exhibition can be considered as one of the facts proving a more global approach in the exhibition policy of the Museum. In one of the publications of MUMOK it is mentioned that *China – Facing Reality*, the same as other recently organized exhibitions of photography, video and film were “conceived from a thematic and non-geographical perspective [...]”⁶⁸. We can also take as an example exhibition held in 1991 *Japanische Kunst der achtziger Jahre*, which was organized as an attempt to rethink the notion of non-Western art and to show the integration of new art regions into the Program of the Museum.⁶⁹

And among those very rare exhibitions of the artists from the other regions we can take as an example recent *Zwischenzonen* from Mexico held this year in MUMOK. In Preface of the catalogue to this exhibition the authors state the following:

Our collaboration with *La Coleccion Jumex* has revealed, for the first time, the dimension of the blind spot with respect to Latin America that the Museum has been harbouring in so far as its collection and its exhibitions were concerned.⁷⁰

So as we can see the Museum moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien is trying to exhibit new non-Western artist during the recent years, though the Museum definitely favors art from some regions more than from the others.

⁶⁸ *Zwischenzonen*, Vienna, p. 241.

⁶⁹ *Japanische Kunst der achtziger Jahre*, Wien, 1991, p. 7.

⁷⁰ *Zwischenzonen*, Vienna, p. 241.

IV. Stedelijk Museum/Amsterdam

The Stedelijk Museum collects and presents modern and contemporary art and design, to inform and inspire wide and varied audiences, locally, nationally and internationally. It combines the roles of traditional museum and platform for the contemporary visual arts, acting in the cultural and social context of Amsterdam and on the basis of its own rich and unique collections, through a multi-faceted programming of shows and other activities.⁷¹

4.1. Stedelijk Museum: Foundation History

Stedelijk Museum was opened in Amsterdam in 1895. Initially it was planned as a museum for exhibiting different unique and exotic things, such as antiques, coins, jewels, timepieces, knickknacks etc.

“It was a quiet, civilised museum for the Amsterdam bourgeoisie in a time when there was nothing as troublesome as modern art,” wrote Director Rudi Fuchs in the Bulletin on the occasion of the Museum’s 100th anniversary in 1995.⁷²

Everything started when in 1895 VvHK (Association for Forming a Public Collection of Contemporary Art) moved to the Stedelijk Museum from the Rijksmuseum where it showed its Collection of contemporary art by French and Dutch masters. At that time Stedelijk Museum resembled though more a storehouse for varied art pieces than a real museum with a clear guidelines and mission.

⁷¹ <http://www.stedelijk.nl/> (19.06.2010).

⁷² Ibid.

Very quickly the Museum filled up with a very diverse collection, ranging from banners of citizen's militia units to an apothecary's shop and lying-in room from the Medical/Pharmaceutical Museum. Between 1920 and 1940 the largest part of this collection moved on to other quarters. Only after the early 1970s, when the last period rooms also disappeared, was the Stedelijk exclusively a museum for modern art.⁷³

Twenty years later (in the beginning of 1990s), after Stedelijk Museum finally gained its more or less stable status as a museum of modern art, *Bureau Amsterdam* (SMBA) was opened as its additional *project space*. The building of SMBA is located in the center of the city in the former clothing workshop. Bureau Amsterdam focuses mostly on the exhibitions of the Amsterdam-based artists which work in an international context and create their art works in the fields of painting, sculpture, video, photography, performance, installation, design and new media. SMBA also organizes exhibitions abroad and lecture evenings six times a year in which leading art historians, critics, theorists and artists discuss issues in contemporary visual culture. For twenty years already SMBA promotes its activities under the motto *We Show Art*. In the article *The Stedelijk's Hip Daughter Turns 10* in *Amsterdam Weekly* we can read the following lines about the connection between Stedelijk Museum and SMBA:

The Stedelijk Museum Bureau Amsterdam is a child that's far different from its parent, the Stedelijk Museum. As the city's main museum for modern and contemporary art undergoes renovation and occupies temporary space in the much-talked-about Post CS building, the little Bureau is showing its 81st exhibition in the same small gallery it has occupied for 10 years.⁷⁴

⁷³ <http://www.stedelijk.nl/> (19.06.2010).

⁷⁴ Marinus De Ruiter, "The Stedelijk's Hip Daughter Turns 10". In: *Amsterdam Weekly* (28 July – 3 August 2004).

According to the statement of its Director Martijn van Nieuwenhuyzen SMBA was established to become an ideal base for the young artist's concepts and ideas. Along with traditional video installations, architectonics and digitalia, SMBA deals with fashion, business enterprise and advertising projects. But the administration of the Museum goes even further in its free and innovative approaches such as by organizing cooking workshops, record release parties or even temporary playrooms for kids in its building.⁷⁵ In article in *Amsterdam Weekly* from 2004 devoted to SMBA's 10th anniversary it is stated that "the program of the SMBA over the past ten years can be read as the surprising, investigative and experimental story of art in the 1990s and the beginning of the 21st century."⁷⁶

Whether such approach is good or not is very difficult to estimate at least at this stage, as SMBA is a very young art space. But nevertheless, while struggling with numerous problems all of the time, SMBA became a model for imitation at least in the Netherlands:

[...] the special position that SMBA has as a stage for presenting current Amsterdam visual art, and internationally as a space for wild experiments by artists who come from all corners of the earth. The successful model of a separate art space that is only very loosely connected with the mother institution [...] was later copied in the Netherlands in The Hague (GEM) and Leeuwarden (Bureau Leeuwarden), among others.⁷⁷

Further in this chapter I am going to analyze acquisition and exhibition policy of the Stedelijk Museum only, not referring to SMBA Program, for the reasons

⁷⁵ De Ruiter, "The Stedelijk's Hip Daughter Turns 10" (28 July – 3 August 2004).

⁷⁶ Sebastian Diaz Morales, "10 Years SMBA: We show art". In: *Bulletin Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam*, jrg. 16, nr. 5/6 (dec. 2003), p. 52.

⁷⁷ Ranske Janseen, "10 Years SMBA". In: *Bulletin Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam*, jrg. 17, nr. 1 (mrt. 2004), p. 50.

mentioned above, such as that Bureau Amsterdam functions quite separately from its mother-institution and that it focuses on the achievements of the Amsterdam-based artists to the greater extent. I mentioned Bureau Amsterdam and its history in details with an intention to avoid the misunderstanding and to make it clear why I am not taking its Program into account in my further research.

4.2. Acquisition policy of Stedelijk Museum

Stedelijk Museum possesses a great Collection of the artworks dated from the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, which was donated by the VvHK first in 1949 (217 artworks) and later in 1962 (101 artworks). Later on starting from the beginning of the twentieth century its Collection was enriched by the long-termed loans and gifts from private collectors (P. Boendermaker, F. Koenigs and P.A. Regnault). For more than forty years (1930-1972) the Museum also housed the Van Gogh Collection (which consisted of the works by Van Gogh himself, the same as works by his contemporaries from the Collection of Theo van Gogh), which was one of the main interests for the visitors of the Museum. The decision to give it to the Van Gogh Museum was highly criticized at that time, but Stedelijk Museum considered it to be more appropriate for the Collection to have its own building.⁷⁸

The new era started for the Stedelijk Museum with the appointment of Willem Sandberg as its Director in 1945 who was famous for his controversial exhibition program.

⁷⁸ <http://www.stedelijk.nl/> (19.06.2010).

In the 1930's the Stedelijk's ambitions grew and a growing awareness of its position as a modern art museum was to stimulate new initiatives. Its true dedication to 'modern' art came after the Second World War under the directorship of Willem Sandberg. Until then the goals formulated by the former directors of the Stedelijk Museum – C.W.H. Baard and D.C. Roell – pertaining to modern art were connected to the actions of the VvHK, the acquiring of loans for the museum and the initiating of a number of national and international modern art exhibitions.⁷⁹

Sandberg started to collect CoBrA and also acquired many artworks by *classic moderns*. “Under his directorate photography, applied arts, industrial and graphic design also received a serious place in the acquisitions policy.”⁸⁰ The Museum also possesses great collection of *Abstract art*, presented by works of Malevich, Mondrian, Van Doesburg, Rietveld etc, the same as of *American Pop art*, *Arte Povera* and *Minimalists*. Starting from 1970s there have been many exhibitions in the Stedelijk Museum devoted to video art and in 1980s a Video Room designed specifically for this art was opened. So at present the building of the Stedelijk Museum (still under reconstruction) is devoted exclusively to the art works of the modern and contemporary artists.

4.3. Latest acquisitions of Stedelijk Museum

Though Stedelijk Museum has the longest history among those four museums which were selected for this research, it is not that easy to get information about its

⁷⁹ Nana Leigh, *Building the Image of Modern Art. The Rhetoric of Two Museums and the representation and Canonization of Modern Art (1935-1975): The Stedelijk Museum in Amsterdam and the Museum of Modern Art in New York* (Thesis), Leiden, 2008, p. 25.

⁸⁰ <http://www.stedelijk.nl/> (19.06.2010).

acquisitions. The data is not available at the official webpage of the Museum and is accessible only in its Library from the year reports of the Stedelijk Museum. So after studying the reports starting from the year 1980 I managed to draw some general conclusions about the questions which interest me in frames of this paper. According to the data which I obtained (*Table 5, p. 81*) I would state that starting from 1980s Stedelijk Museum was to a higher extent interested in art from Central and Eastern Europe. Thus in its permanent Collection we can find works of artists from Poland (Jerzy Murawski, Tomasz Ciecierski, Roman Cielewicz etc), Russia (Timur Novikov, Oleg Maslov and Viktor Kuznetsov etc), Ukraine (Oleg Tistol), Croatia (Darko Fritz). This tendency was more or less stable for two decades, including exceptions from some other countries from regions of Asia and Middle East (Mitsuo Katsui, Menashe Kadishman, Yuk-Lin Tang, Rachid Ben Ali etc). But starting approximately from the year 2005 we observe that a big shift in the direction of Asian countries occurred. During the last five to six years the Stedelijk Museum acquired mostly works of artists from Japan (Eikoh Hosoe, Tatsumi Hijikata, Ikko Tanaka, Tadanori Yokoo, Masuteru Aoba etc), China (Chen Zhengda, Lu Liang) and South Korea (Kum-nam Baik, Sung-Ik Bae).

Though Stedelijk Museum does not have any specific guidelines in its acquisition policy concerning the works of non-Western artists, it is still obvious that during the last thirty years the Museum had quite a big interest to such kind of art.

4.4. Latest exhibitions of Stedelijk Museum

As we can see from the provided information on exhibition activities of the Stedelijk Museum during the last thirty years (*Table 6, p. 83*) there was quite a big amount of exhibitions by non-Western artists. The tendency is again in the direction of countries of Eastern and Central Europe (Czech Republic / Vojta Dukat, Jitka Hanzlova, Hungary / Andre Kertesz, Poland / Henryk Tomaszewski, Russia / Timur Novikov) and South East Asia (Japan / Keiichi Tahara, Tetsumi Kudo etc, China / Fang Lijung, Yang Fudong, Vietnam / Danh Po, India / Amar Kanwar). If we take, for example, the region of Middle East, there were not that many exhibitions at the Stedelijk Museum during the last three decades, though there was a number of exhibitions by the Israeli artists, as for example by Aviva Uri, Izhar Patkin and Ram Katzir. I think it is a very interesting fact, as in other four museums we hardly can observe such an interest towards art from Israel. Though I must admit that during my research on the Stedelijk Museum using its archives I had such a feeling that the Museum is still very much oriented on the Western art. Also it supports and promotes Dutch art to a very high extent, what goes in line with its initial idea as being first of all a museum with national character, and only then with an international one.

Another interesting observation concerning exhibition and acquisition activities of Stedelijk Museum can be that there is a direct connection between the two of them. It looks like many of the artworks which first are being exhibited in the Museum are later on acquired by it.

V. The Museum of Modern Art (MoMA)/New York

The Museum of Modern Art is a place that fuels creativity, ignites minds, and provides inspiration. With extraordinary exhibitions and the world's finest collection of modern and contemporary art, MoMA is dedicated to the conversation between the past and the present, the established and the experimental.⁸¹

5.1. MoMA: Foundation History

The establishment of the Museum of Modern Art goes back to the beginning of the twentieth century. It was an initiative of three influential patrons of the arts, Miss Lillie P. Bliss, Mrs. Cornelius J. Sullivan, and Mrs. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., all of whom were devoted connoisseurs of art. MoMA was supposed to become a progressive educational institution, “a laboratory for the study of the ways in which modernity has manifested itself in the visual arts”⁸². The main focus of the Museum is presently on modern (starting from 1880s) and contemporary art. Its Collection possesses artworks from different categories, such as painting, sculpture, drawings, prints, architecture and design, photography, film, video, posters, illustrated books, and manuscripts.⁸³

⁸¹ <http://www.moma.org/about/index> (16.05.2010).

⁸² Bee – Haliczzer, *MoMA Highlights*, New York, p. 16.

⁸³ *The Official Museum Directory* 2001, New Providence, 2001, p. 933.

When the Museum of Modern Art was founded in 1929, its founding Director, Alfred H. Barr, Jr., intended the Museum to be dedicated to helping people understand and enjoy the visual arts of our time [*modern art*], and that it might provide New York with ‘the greatest museum of modern art in the world’.⁸⁴

From the very beginning the Museum of Modern Art was a huge success. During the next ten years of its existence it moved three times to different locations and finally, in 1939, settled down in the midtown of Manhattan, in New York. But as time passed, the Museum’s Collection extended and its ambitions continued to develop, that is why MoMA needed more space for the realization of all of its grandiose plans. While being the first Director of MoMA Alfred Barr decided upon the multi-departmental structural organization of the Museum which resulted in division of the Museum space into departments devoted for Architecture and Design, Film and Video, Photography, in addition to Painting and Sculpture, Drawings, Prints and Illustrated Books. The expansion of the Museum according to the plan of the architect Philip Johnson took place first in the 1950s, and later in 1960s. In 1984 the exhibition space of the Museum was doubled thanks to the renovations of Cesar Pelli, a famous Argentine architect.⁸⁵

The beginning of the new millennium signified also the beginning of new MoMA – extended, modernized and ready to satisfy demands of the most exquisite connoisseurs of art, the same as art professionals. At present, except of two main exhibition galleries, MoMA houses education and research centre with classrooms, auditoriums, and training workshops, expanded library and archives, but also enlarged sculpture garden. It was the last but at the same time the most impressive and

⁸⁴ <http://www.moma.org/about/history> (16.05.2010).

⁸⁵ Ibid.

ambitious renovation of the Museum done since its establishment:

Designed by Yoshio Taniguchi, the new MoMA features 630,000 square feet of new and redesigned space. [...] The new Museum opened to the public on November 20, 2004, and the Cullman Building opened in November 2006.⁸⁶

At present the rich MoMA Collection, which was always the core element of the Museum's policy, contains the best examples of the modern and contemporary art. The Museum's doors are open six days a week for the visitors who come from different corners of the world to enjoy its impressive Collection.

From an initial gift of eight prints and one drawing, The Museum of Modern Art's collection has grown to include over 150,000 paintings, sculptures, drawings, prints, photographs, architectural models and drawings, and design objects. MoMA also owns approximately 22,000 films and four million film stills, and MoMA's Library and Archives, the premier research facilities of their kind in the world, hold over 300,000 books, artist books, and periodicals, and extensive individual files on more than 70,000 artists. The Museum Archives contains primary source material related to the history of MoMA and modern and contemporary art.⁸⁷

As discussed in the first chapter of this paper, the concept of a museum of modern and contemporary art changed over the past decades greatly. As presently there is a trend towards the development of museums into huge cultural, educational and entertainment centers, MoMA can be taken as one of the examples of such an evolution (especially in regard to the fact that from the very start it was supposed to be an art and educational institution). At present the Museum of Modern Art in New York has a very wide variety of activities aimed at different categories of visitors,

⁸⁶ <http://www.moma.org/about/history> (16.05.2010).

⁸⁷ Ibid.

different ages, different demands and different tastes.

In addition to gallery talks, lectures, and symposia, the Museum offers special activities for parents, teachers, families, students, preschoolers, bilingual visitors, and people with special needs. The Museum's Library and Archives contain the leading concentration of research material on modern art in the world, and each of the curatorial departments maintains a study center available to students, scholars and researchers. In addition, the Museum has one of the most active publishing programs of any art museum and has published more than 1,200 editions appearing in twenty languages.⁸⁸

Nevertheless in the times of global changes, of the fast development of different fields, of huge competition, museums should be opened to different forms of collaboration in order to develop further and to stay attractive for its audience. That is why I would like to briefly mention the cooperation of MoMA with P.S.1⁸⁹ in this chapter. MoMA P.S.1 is one of the largest and oldest non-profit art institutions in the United States. It was established as an exhibition space and focuses mostly on the experimental innovative contemporary art. MoMA P.S.1 holds about fifty exhibitions a year and deals with visual arts, the same as with music and performance programs.⁹⁰

In January 2000, the Museum and P.S.1 exercised a Memorandum of Understanding formalizing their affiliation. The final arrangement results in an affiliation in which the Museum becomes the sole corporate member of P.S.1 and P.S.1 maintains its artistic and corporate independence. This innovative partnership expands outreach for both institutions,

⁸⁸ <http://www.moma.org/about/history> (16.05.2010).

⁸⁹ <http://ps1.org/about/> (16.05.2010): MoMA PS1 was founded in 1971 by Alanna Heiss as the Institute for Art and Urban Resources Inc., an organization devoted to organizing exhibitions in underutilized and abandoned spaces across New York City. In 1976, MoMA PS1 opened its first major exhibition in its permanent location in Long Island City, Queens, with the seminal Rooms exhibition. [...] For the next twenty years, the building was used as studio, performance, and exhibition spaces, in support of artists from around the world. After a building-wide renovation, MoMA PS1 reopened in 1997, confirming its position as the leading contemporary art center in New York.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

and offers a broad range of collaborative opportunities in collections, exhibitions, educational programs, and administration.⁹¹

This kind of cooperation is another step in development for The Museum of Modern Art. In this way MoMA shows that it is open for new forms of work, striving to improve and to use every opportunity to preserve its status as one of the best museums of modern and contemporary art in the world.

5.2. Acquisition policy of MoMA

The Museum of Modern Art with its innovative approach towards presenting art became an exemplary for many museums in the United States. The reason for this fact can be that the United States till very recently did not have a strong artistic tradition, as let us say some European countries. Only starting from the 1930's this field began to develop there and thus very fast. The Museum of Modern Art in New York played a very important role in this development what is stated, for example, in *Issues in Art and Education*:

The unchanging display of permanent collections gave way to a systematic policy of mounting exhibitions devoted to modern movements and retrospectives of living artists under the inspired curatorship of Alfred Barr. The Museum of Modern Art [...] was born. Here was an important moment for the museum facing the inevitable question of marginalization. As a result of a creative, as well as the political, social and cultural upheavals taking place in the early and mid twentieth century, artists were released from art's traditional categories of object

⁹¹ <http://www.moma.org/about/history> (16.05.2010).

making, media and craft practices. Easel painting has ceased to rule the roost.⁹²

One of the main achievements of MoMA is without any doubt its great Collection of modern and contemporary art. According to Alfred Barr, the Museum was supposed to focus on the art which was produced at the actual time what he defined as contemporary art. He then stated the following: “The Museum’s collection ought to be like a torpedo advancing through time, with the leading edge in the present and a narrow trailing end in the past. The great commitment of energy and buying should be to what is going on now”⁹³. This famous quote defining the concept of a modern and contemporary art collection became a model for many other art museums around the world.

Through the leadership of its Trustees and staff, the Museum manifests this commitment by establishing, preserving, and documenting a Collection of the highest order that reflects the vitality, complexity, and unfolding patterns of modern and contemporary art [...].⁹⁴

In forming of its Collection the team of MoMA desires for perfection as it does always in its work. It is a very difficult task for a museum to preserve its status as one of the best in the world, especially if this museum focuses on modern and contemporary art. In this case it can be very easy to get into trap of making a wrong decision while making the next acquisition and to be sure what will be considered as a masterpiece in some decades from now. In its Collection Policy concerning the main idea of making new acquisitions MoMA states the following:

⁹² William Furlong – Polly Gould – Paul Hetherington, *Issues in Art and Education. The Dynamics of Now*, London, 2000, pp. 24-25.

⁹³ *Ibid*, p. 21.

⁹⁴ http://www.moma.org/docs/explore/CollectionsMgmtPolicyMoMA_March09.pdf (16.05.2010).

The ultimate purpose of the Museum declared at its founding was to acquire the best modern works. While quality remains the primary creation, the Museum acknowledges and pursues a broader educational purpose: to build a collection that is more than an assemblage of masterworks, one that provides a uniquely comprehensive survey of the unfolding modern movement in all visual media.⁹⁵

There are some main rules of acquisition policy stated in the Mission of MoMA which should be followed by the Museum's Team while making decision upon its next acquisitions. First, all the intended acquisitions should be relevant to the Museum's Collection Policy. The Museum should also be capable to house and take a proper care of its new acquisitions according to the generally accepted museum practices. Only those art works with a firmly established legal status have the right to be considered as intended acquisitions. But if for some reasons the art work does not respond to these criteria but is still desirable by the Museum, it can be acquired for its Study Collection.⁹⁶

There are also different ways of making a new acquisition to the Collection and a strict procedure of approval of a possible new acquisition, such as purchase, gift, fractional interest gift, bequest or exchange, which are very often the result of "the fruit of relationships nurtured through the years, from generous donors and friends"⁹⁷. All the works offered for acquisition must be approved by Curatorial Staff and the Director first, and the Trustee Committee afterwards. To get an agreement of the Trustee Committee the curators should provide an evidence of the historical value of an artwork, its relevance for the Collection and connection to the other art works

⁹⁵ http://www.moma.org/docs/explore/CollectionsMgmtPolicyMoMA_March09.pdf (16.05.2010).

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Bee – Haliczzer, *MoMA Highlights*, New York, p. 19.

already present there. In some specific cases the Trustee Committee can delegate its authority to the Chief Curator (in consultation with the Director) to make a decision about an acquisition. Also the Director of the Museum has the right to approve an acquisition if it is impossible for the Trustee committee to hold a meeting for making such a decision.⁹⁸

5.3. Latest acquisitions of MoMA

The Museum of Modern Art made quite an impressive amount of acquisitions during the last thirty years comparing to the other museums of modern and contemporary art. It is quite understandable taking into account that forming of the Museum Collection is one of the main aims of MoMA. Those acquisitions mentioned in *Table 7 (p. 84)* are only a part from the long list, and namely acquisitions of the artworks by non-Western artists. As we can see there are a few trends which can be traced in the acquisition policy of the Museum in this field during the given period of time. Most of the art works acquired starting from 1980s and during the next ten years are those of Japanese artists, some of them of Russian, Polish, Indian and Latin American artists; in the 1990s the tendency stays almost the same, but starting from the new millennium it shifts towards the interest in works of artists from different Asian countries, such as South Korea and China, but also from South Africa. That is quite a new tendency in the policy of the Museum, but not a very

⁹⁸ http://www.moma.org/docs/explore/CollectionsMgmtPolicyMoMA_March09.pdf (16.05.2010).

surprising one as these are countries which gain more and more attention these days because of definite political and social reasons.

Among the acquisitions of the non-Western artists done by the Museum we can see both acknowledged and new or not very famous in the Western art world names. For example, to the first category belong art works of Joji Yamamoto (Japan), Anish Kapoor (India), Ilya Kabakov (Russia), Tadao Ando (Japan), Vik Muniz (Brazil). Among those less acknowledged we can name Shohei Imamura (Japan), Carlos Diegues (Brazil), Andrzej Pagowski (Poland), Ximena Cuevas (Mexico), Igor Moukhin (Russia), Jia Zhang Ke (China), Goran Paskaljevic (Serbia).

While trying to get more definite information about the recent acquisitions of art works of non-Western artists from the staff of MoMA, I got an answer that the Museum in its acquisition policy is guided first of all by such criteria as the value of an art work and its relevance for the Collection, and does not pay much attention towards the nationality of an artist. But I still would claim that the Museum of Modern Art, as any other art museum willing to preserve its high status, cannot deny and ignore the fact of the shift in the contemporary art world in terms of its geography and the influence which this shift has on acquisition policies of art museums these days.

5.4. Latest exhibitions of MoMA

Exhibition activity of The Museum of Modern Art is not less impressive than its acquisition activity. Only since its affiliation with P.S.1, what has not such a long history, MoMA exhibited more than 2,000 artists, and some of these exhibitions were acknowledged as the most provocative during the last years. On the official webpage of MoMA we can read the following statement concerning its exhibitions:

The Museum maintains an active schedule of modern and contemporary art exhibition addressing a wide range of subject matter, mediums, and time periods, highlighting significant recent developments in the visual arts and new interpretations of major artists and art historical movements. Works of art from its collections are displayed in rotating installations so that the public may regularly expect to find new works on display. Ongoing programs of classic and contemporary films range from retrospectives and historical surveys to introductions of the work of independent and experimental film- and videomakers.⁹⁹

The exhibition activity of the Museum of Modern Art (*Table 8, p. 87*) shows how its policy changes with time and reflects the general shifts in the world influenced by the processes of *globalization*. During the last thirty years we can see that the focus of MoMA shifted from mainly Western (Western European and Northern American) art towards a more global perspective. Of course, it is quite clear that the Western art still plays the main role in the exhibition policy of the Museum, but the new tendencies cannot be denied, anyway. Thus starting from 1980s the art from such countries as Russia and some other post-Soviet and Eastern European countries, India, Japan, Arab countries and China to some extend (especially in the last few

⁹⁹ <http://www.moma.org/about/history> (30.05.2010).

years) seem to awake much interest and became the permanent part of the Museum's exhibition program. Among other exhibitions of non-Western artists I would like to name a few such as for example by Catalina Parra (Latin America, 1982), Kyoko Kumai (Japan, 1991), Guillermo Kuitka (Argentina, 1991), Manuel Alvarez Bravo (Mexico, 1997), Monika Sosnovska (Poland, 2006), Sigalit Landau (Israel, 2008).

I want to mention here again that even if The Museum of Modern Art does not state openly that it follows the latest trends in the global art world and exhibits much of so to say new and unknown before art in its walls, we still can trace this fact on basis of its latest exhibition activity. I would agree that sometimes not so numerous exhibitions of non-Western artists can be lost among exhibitions of titans of the contemporary Western art world. But even such famous art museum as MoMA cannot resist the influence of global changes presently.

Conclusion

This paper had as its aim to investigate the latest tendencies in art world under the influence of processes of *globalization* and to see how open the Western art world is towards these changes at present. For example, Julian Stallabrass explains this global movement in the art sphere in her article *The Fracturing of Globalization* in the book *Now Is the Time: Art & Theory* the following way:

The art world really became a world following the collapse of Eastern European communism from 1989 onwards. Biennials sprouted in new markets across the globe, artists from Asia, Africa and South America began to appear in major exhibitions in significant numbers, contemporary art scene evolved outside the USA, Japan and Europe, and it became plausible to conceive of the art world less as a constellation of fixed centres and more flocks of private jets.¹⁰⁰

Thanks to globalization the art world really became more *open* and less *conservative* (if I have the right to call it this way) as more artists from different countries around the globe got an opportunity to become real participants in it. The art world presently belongs not only to those few well-known artists with world-acknowledged names and renowned reputation but is ready to welcome also artists whose names were famous only in their own countries, or even their own cities (thus on a very local level) before. But of course we should not overestimate the advantages of globalization (I am talking in terms of the art world here only), as along with

¹⁰⁰ Jelle Bouwhuis –Ingrid Commandeur – Gijs Frieling, *Now Is the Time: Art & Theory. 21st Century*, Rotterdam, 2009, p. 65.

openness and more freedom it brought also many negative things such as for example the clash of interests on local and global levels, change of the attitude towards the value of art presently and its relation to money. And the question which we still will need to answer in the future in regard to all these points is whether all the changes happened for better or not? Julian Stallabrass while doing a research also faces these problems of globalized art world:

The art boom, now recognized as a bubble, has tended to produce a particular kind of work: spectacular objects that serve well as conversation pieces in the living rooms of billionaires. The focus on money, prestige and celebrity is in tension with the qualities of art that make it most valuable to that very elite, for it should gesture towards the higher realm of autonomous action and absolute, individual freedom, and not to the grubby world of the bottom line. [...] Thus art may be seen as a paragon of globalized culture, in which the lingua franca is not American, and not even the English language, but simply money.¹⁰¹

But except of this controversial question of *art globalization* in general there are some other questions which are also crucial in the art world presently. For example, the status of an artist in the contemporary art world: how can we define a non-Western artist presently? Depending on what factors is this notion constructed? Because today as we live in more or less boundaries-free world we cannot do it only on the basis of national belonging of an artist. Lóránd Hegyi rightly questioned in one of the catalogues to the exhibitions held previously in MUMOK: “Is an artist who was born in Israel and lives and works in Paris, such as *Absalon*, an artist from Israel, an Israeli artist or a French artist of Israeli descent?”¹⁰² So can such an artist be considered as non-Western or not? Who or even what decides upon this? It

¹⁰¹ Bouwhuis – Commandeur – Frieling, *Now Is the Time: Art & Theory*, Rotterdam, p. 70.

¹⁰² MAKOM. *Zeitgenössische Kunst aus Israel*, Wien, 1993, p. 13.

became also a big obstacle for me in writing my thesis. As to my opinion the only person who can answer these questions is an artist her- or himself, but of course in most cases access to such information is very restricted.

At the same time we can claim that the centers of art at present are not limited by only a few acknowledged metropolises, such as New York, London, Berlin or Paris, but we also observe the emergence of many new of them, for example in the cities of Beijing, Moscow, New Delhi, Abu Dhabi etc. In *Now is the Time: Art & Theory* we can also find this idea: “In the last few years [...] there have been profound and very rapid commercial changes, particularly in the rise of Chinese, Indian and Russian art, and with it of indigenous markets.”¹⁰³ Many art professionals are still very critical towards these new emerged art centers, but nobody already can deny their existence and their influence in the contemporary art world.

Coming to the question of museums of modern and contemporary art, I would like to shortly mention once again some main ideas concerning the change of the concept and the new model of an art museum. So during the last four to five decades the attitude towards a museum *per se* changed very drastically. Presently we see attempts to create absolutely new model of a museum, though not always these attempts are very much successful or their ideal vision is sometimes far from the reality. Anyway, the main idea at present is that a museum should be more of a laboratory type, of a creative center, where there is enough space for an experiment and a real connection between an artist and audience. For example, Magaly Cabral in the article *Global Museum* proposes the model which has three functions. Only on the

¹⁰³ Bouwhuis – Commandeur – Frieling, *Now Is the Time: Art & Theory*, Rotterdam, p. 66.

condition on their existence to the author's mind can the ideal vision of a museum be accomplished presently:

[...] one in which its main functions – preservation, research/documentation and communication – are given equal attention. And even more: that these main functions are thought of as educational ones. [...]; one in which its social function is the main objective: to help people to understand and to discuss their present from knowing their past; one in which its professionals work in an interdisciplinary way. Approaches from different disciplines [...] must be brought together to discuss the museological process.¹⁰⁴

But there is also another side of the problem which most of art museums face at present. Peter Weibel talks about it in his article *The Museum of the Future*. He suggests that the museum of the future is the one which takes into account two main changes in the art world nowadays: “These two changes, that of the building – which thus has become a digital media ship – and that of the digital image, are now trying to interlink. This is the future of the museum”¹⁰⁵. This means that in the twenty-first century – digital age, age of total computerization and new high technologies – we just cannot deny the fact that a museum is becoming more and more a virtual space, a space which should be able to provide its audience with the latest developments of the digital art world. According to Peter Weibel again, “the image has found a new host medium. The oil painting was a host medium; then the image found new host media – photography, film, video, computers”¹⁰⁶. The same can be said in architectural terms: a new museum needs a new, improved and modernized building.

¹⁰⁴ Magaly Cabral, “Global Museum” In: *New Strategies for Communication in Museums. Proceedings of ICOM/CECA'96*, Vienna, 1997, p. 119.

¹⁰⁵ Peter Weibel, “The Museum of the Future” In: *New Strategies for Communication in Museums. Proceedings of ICOM/CECA'96*, Vienna, 1997, p. 39.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid*, p. 37.

And it is not just an ideal vision, but a reality which most museums face today. We have seen it previously, while the foundation histories of the four museums participating in the research were discussed. All of them are on the stage of an architectural development and reconstruction (e.g. Stedelijk Museum in Amsterdam) or have already undergone this stage a few years ago (e.g. MoMA in New York or MUMOK in Vienna), or as in case of Tate Modern got its own permanent building only a decade ago. New museum buildings become not only the manifestation of new art millennium, but the symbols of cities, countries or even continents sometimes. Here I quote Peter Weibel again, “This type of contemporary museum is a post-modern phenomenon derived from 1980s trends. Museums were constructed which tried to provide a good-looking building able to control the behavior of, and attract, the masses”¹⁰⁷.

And now I would finally like to come to the main topic of this paper, and namely the research on the four chosen museums of modern and contemporary art. The initial idea of my thesis was to investigate their acquisition and exhibition policies and on the basis of the acquired information make a comparison which will help us to understand the latest trends in the global institutional art world.

The first conclusion I would like to draw is that Western art museums (those with a long art tradition located on the territories of Western Europe and Northern America) are really becoming more and more open to the non-Western art presently. And we observe this phenomenon first of all on the example of their own acquisition policies, or in case when such are absent (or at least not available in a specific form for

¹⁰⁷ Weibel, “The Museum of the Future”, Vienna, p. 37.

the wider audience) on the basis of their mission statements or their year reports. All the four museums claim to be very much oriented towards the incorporation of non-Western art into their permanent collections. Thus the Museum moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien is very much oriented on the representation of the art from Central and Eastern Europe, while Tate Modern claims to explore art from the new territories mostly of the Asian Pacific and Latin American regions. The Stedelijk Museum is also interested to the higher extent in the art from Central and Eastern Europe. At least this trend can be observed on the example of its latest acquisitions (mostly until the year 2000). In case of MoMA it is very difficult to say something definite, as the Museum does not position itself as being oriented towards art from any specific region/s which was/were not presented in its collection before, though claims to be very globally oriented in general in collecting and exhibiting of art presently.

As I had a more detailed description of the results I got from my investigation of the acquisitions and exhibitions of every museum in the previous chapters I would focus here mostly on the general comparison and will try to define the common and distinctive features in the activities of these four museums. Thus I would state that MUMOK goes really in a line with its acquisition policy, as in the reality it definitely focuses mostly on the art from Central and Eastern Europe both in its acquisitions and exhibitions. Comparing to MUMOK I would claim that Stedelijk Museum also pays much attention to the art from this region, though it is not stated clearly by the own policy of the Museum. Besides Stedelijk Museum pays much attention to the art from Asian region, especially in the last couple of years, what cannot be said about

MUMOK, though it also had some acquisitions and exhibitions of artists from Asia. The other two museums – MoMA and Tate Modern – have, on the contrary, their interests more in the field of Latin American and Asian Pacific art. But again in case of MoMA, it is not totally clear from its own policy, art from which regions is favored by the Museum. I would also say that MoMA though claiming to be oriented towards new art, still mostly acquires and exhibits acknowledged artist, even if they are from non-Western countries.

Another interesting thing that we can observe on the example of these four museums is that some of them collect and exhibit the same artists, which again can show us which regions awake more interest presently. For example, the Stedelijk Museum and MUMOK acquired art works of Anna Jermolaewa from Russia, both in 2000; or there were exhibitions by Cildo Meirales from Brazil in Tate Modern and MoMA (in 2008-2009 and in 1990 respectively) and exhibitions of Felix Gonzales-Torres from Cuba in MoMA and the Stedelijk Museum (in 1992 and in 1995-1996 respectively). It is also interesting that in case of the Stedelijk Museum, for example, art works which are being exhibiting in the Museum first, are being acquired by it later on (works of Timur Novikov from Russia exhibited in 1993, were acquired then in 1993 and 2000; or works by Henryk Tomaszewski from Poland exhibited in 1991, were acquired in 1994 and 1998). The same can be said about MoMA: it acquired works by Felix Gonzales-Torres, Rikrit Tiravanija from Thailand and Zhang Peili from China (unfortunately I managed to get only years of their creation, but not of their acquisition by the Museum; anyway, all of them were acquired after 1990s) and also had exhibitions of the same artists in 1992, 1997 and 1998-1999 respectively. Also

some of the museums like to repeat exhibitions of the same artists in some time, as did the Stedelijk Museum with exhibitions of Vojta Dukat from Czech Republic in 1980 and 1997.

So in the end we can come to the general conclusion, that museums of modern and contemporary art really broadened their sphere of interest in the last few decades. Though sometimes it is difficult to say for sure which regions are the most popular presently, we can state that non-Western artists get more and more attention and chances to be exhibited in the walls of acknowledged museums and get their place in the permanent collections of these museums.

Table 1 Tate Modern acquisitions of non-Western artists (1980-2010)

Artist	Title	Year of purchase	Category	Country	Way of purchase
Magdalena Abakanowicz	Embryology. 1978-80	2009	Sculpture	Poland	Presented anonymously.
Victor Alimpiev	Sweet Nightingale. 2005	2009	Video	Russia	Purchased from Regina Gallery, Moscow with funds provided by Outset Contemporary Art Fund.
Carlos Amorales	Interior vs. Exterior. 1997-2003	2004	Photograph	Mexico	Presented by Tiqui Atencio and Argo Demirdjian.
Nazgol Ansarinia	Living Room. 2005	2010	Video	Iran	Purchased using funds provided by the Middle East North Africa Acquisitions Committee.
Avigdor Arikha	R.B. Kitaj 1982/1983	1987	Print	Israel	Presented by the artist.
Mahmoud Bakhshi Moakhar	Air Pollution of Iran 2004-2006	2010	Object	Iran	Purchased using funds provided by the Middle East North Africa Acquisitions Committee.
Zarina Bhimji	Out of Blue 2002	2003	Video	Uganda	Presented by Tate Members, accessioned 2004.
Fei Cao	Whose Utopia? 2006	2007	Video	China	Presented by the Asia Pacific Acquisitions Committee.
Fernanda Gomes	Untitled 2004	2008	Object	Brazil	Purchased with funds provided by the American Fund for the Tate Gallery, courtesy of the Latin American Acquisitions Committee.
Naoya Hatakeyama	Lime Hills (Quarry Series) 1988	2007	Colour photograph on paper	Japan	Presented by Richard and Judith Greer
Shirazeh Houshiary	Beating of her Wings II 1987	1987	Acrylic, pencil and collage on paper	Iran	Presented by the Weltkunst Foundation.

*The list of acquisitions is based on the materials provided by the Tate Acquisitions Coordinator Rosa Bacile and is selective.

Table 2 Tate Modern exhibitions of non-Western artists (1980-2010)

Title/Artist(s)	Country	Date
<i>Untitled</i> : Julia Loktev, Julika Rudelius and Cui Xiuwen	Russia/Germany/China	July – September 2004
<i>Untitled</i> : Mohamed Camara	Mali	2 October – 21 November 2004
<i>Untitled</i> : Damien Ortega: <i>The Uncertainty Principle</i>	Mexico	23 April – 12 June 2005
<i>Level 2 Gallery</i> : Meschac Gaba	Benin	25 June – 21 August 2005
Dan Perjovskchi: <i>The Room Drawing 2006</i>	Romania	25 March – 23 June 2006
<i>Level 2 Gallery</i> : Roman Ondak	Slovakia	29 July – 17 September 2006
Amrita Sher-Gil	India	28 February – 22 April 2007
Helio Oiticica: <i>The Body of Colour</i>	Brazil	6 June – 23 September 2007
<i>Level 2 Gallery: Artist Platform</i> –Matei Bejeranu	Romania	8 September – 9 September 2007
<i>The Unilever Series</i> : Doris Calcedo – <i>Shibboleth</i>	Columbia	9 October 2007 – 6 April 2008
<i>Level 2 Gallery</i> : Latifa Echakhch – <i>Speaker's Corner</i>	Morocco	19 September – 23 November 2008
Cildo Meireles	Brazil	14 October 2008 – 11 January 2009

*The list of exhibitions in the table is based on the information accessible on the official webpage of Tate Modern and that received from the worker of the Tate Gallery Records Lisa Cole. The list is selective.

Table 3 MUMOK acquisitions of non-Western artists (1980-2010)

Artist	Title	Category	Year of pur.	Way of purchase	Country
Nikolaj Andronow	Das Fenster unseres Hauses 1981	Öl auf Hartfaserplatte	1991	Museum Moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien, Leihgabe der Österreichischen Ludwig Stiftung	Russia
Srdan Apostolovic	Return Sabotage Master 1995	Zwei Holzkisten mit je zwei Eisenobjekten	1997	Museum Moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien	Serbia
Nora Aslan	Alfombra 1997	Mischtechnik	2000	Museum Moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien	Argentina
Veronika Bromová	Zunge aus der Serie <i>Viens</i> 1996	C-Print	2004	Museum Moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien, Schenkung aus Privatbesitz	Czech Republic
Igor Chelkovski	Farbige Architektur 1986	Holz, Ölfarbe	2001	Museum Moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien	Russia
Braco Dimitrijevic	Triptychos post historicus: Eva oder Meret vom Paradies herabsteigend 1994	Äpfel, Regenschirme	1994	Museum Moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Anna Jermolaewa	Ein/Aus 1999	VHS	2000	Museum Moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien	Russia
Gülsün Karamustafa	Men Crying 2001	Digi-Beta	2005	Museum Moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien	Turkey
On Kawara	5 Datumsbilder 2001-2005	Acryl auf Leinwand	2006	Museum Moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien, Leihgabe der Österreichischen Ludwig Stiftung	Japan
Lu Zhirong	Ostdorf in Beijing 1994	Schwarzweiß-Fotografie	1998	Museum Moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien	China
Motti Mizrachi	Ohne Titel 1993	Boxhandschuhe, Neon	1993	Museum Moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien	Israel
Masato	For the square	---	1998	Museum Moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien	Japan

Nakamura	– Barberpole 1992			Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien	
Izhar Patkin	Russians 1990	Perforierte Laserprint- Collage	1992	Museum Moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien	Hungary
Takako Saito	Music-Bottle 1983	Glas, Papier	1993	Museum Moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien, Leihgabe der Österreichischen Ludwig Stiftung	Japan
Yoshimasa Wada	Earth Horn 1987	Leitungsrohre	1993	Museum Moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien, Leihgabe der Österreichischen Ludwig Stiftung	Japan
Jun Yang	Camouflage - LOOK like them - TALK like them 2002-2003	Digi Beta	2005	Museum Moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien, erworben mit Unterstützung von Telekom Austria	China

*The table of exhibitions is based on the information accessible in the archives of the Collection Department of MUMOK and is selective.

Table 4 MUMOK exhibitions of non-Western artists (1980-2010)

Artist/Title	Date	Country
<i>Zwischenzonen – La Colección Jumex</i>	16.10.2009 – 07.03.2010	Mexico
<i>Gender Check – Rollenbilder in der Kunst Osteuropas</i>	13.11.2009 – 14.02.2010	Countries of Eastern and Southeastern Europe
Agnieszka Kalinowska: <i>Draughty House</i>	17.04 – 14.06.2009	Poland
<i>China – Facing Reality</i>	26.10.2007 – 10.02.2008	China
Plamen Dejanoff: <i>Planets of Comparison</i>	17.03 – 21.05.2006	Bulgaria
<i>Öffentliche Rituale. Kunst/Videos aus Polen</i>	22.03 – 25.05.2003	Poland
<i>Expressin. Mitteleuropäische Kunst seit 1960</i>	30.11.1987 – 26.01.1988	Central Europe
<i>Zeichen im Fluß</i>	20.06 – 09.09.1990	Central Europe
<i>Japanische Kunst der achtziger Jahre</i>	15.02 – 07.04.1991	Japan
<i>MAKOM. Zeitgenössische Kunst aus Israel</i>	27.04 – 13.06.1993	Israel

*The table of exhibitions is based on the information available at the official webpage of MUMOK and catalogues of exhibitions available at the MUMOK Library. The list is selective.

Table 5 Stedelijk Museum acquisitions of non-Western artists (1980-2010)

Name	Title	Category	Way of purchase	Year of purchase	Country
Jerzy Murawski	The last supper 1981	painting	purchase	1981	Poland
Tomasz Ciecierski	Polipy 1982	painting	purchase	1983	Poland
Wladimir Zakrewski	Untitled 1992	three-dimensional work	purchase	1983	Poland
Timur Novikov	Russland 1991	painting	purchase	1993	Russia
Oleg Tistol	Project of the Poltava Battle 1991	painting	purchase	1993	Ukraine
Darko Fritz	Eurokaz 1991	poster	purchase	1993	Croatia
Yasuhisa Kohyama	Ceramic object 1992	contemporary applied arts	purchase	1994	Japan
Roman Cielewicz	Amis protegez 1993	poster	purchase	1994	Poland
Henryk Tomaszewski	Ars Erotica'93. Muzeum Narodowe W Warszawie, Styczen 1994	poster	gift	1994	Poland
Mitsuo Katsui	Hana. 10 th anniversary of Tategumi Yokogumi 1993	poster	gift	1994	Japan
Shin Matsunaga	Hiroshima appeals 1989	poster	gift	1994	Japan
Shigeo Toya	Seifa Utaki 1993	drawing	purchase	1995	Japan
Mieczyslaw Gorowski	Skulptur/Grafik Fran Krakow 1988	poster	gift	1995	Poland
Menashe Kadishman	Horse 1992	three-dimensional work	purchase	1996	Israel
Seiichi Furuya	Schattendorf 1981	photo	purchase	1997	Japan
Oleg Maslov and Viktor Kuznetsov	Zaigryvajushchie Tritony; Igrajuscchie Tritony 1994	photo	gift	1997	Russia
Piotr Mlodozieniec	Poster 1997	poster	purchase	1998	Poland
Henryk Tomaszewski	Piekno i Wygoda na co dzien 1992	poster	gift	1998	Poland
Yuk-Lin Tang	Flute Joyeuse 1996	photo	gift	1999	China
Azumi, Shin & Tomoko	Chair and Footstool 1998	design	purchase	1999	Japan
Rachid Ben Ali	Untitled 2000	painting	gift	2000	Marocco

Edward Dwurnik	Bystryca Klodzka 1980	painting	gift	2000	Poland
Alexei Kostroma	Looking into the Sun 2000	painting	gift	2000	Russia
Timur Novikov	Zakat Nemetskogo Romantizma 1994	print	gift	2000	Russia
Rachid Ben Ali	Miscellaneous 1999	painting	purchase	2000	Marocco
Anna Jermolaewa	Das Quartett 1999	film	purchase	2000	Russia
Fiona Tan	Facing Forward 1999	video	purchase	2001	Indonesia
Helena van der Kraan	Helena as Madonna (Without Child) 1992	print	purchase	2002	Former Czechoslovakia
Avery Preesman	Coral House Westpunt 2001- 2002	photo	gift	2002	Netherlands Antilles
Runa Islam	Tuin 1998	film	purchase	2002	Bangladesh
Tiong Ang	School 1999-2001	video	purchase	2002	Indonesia
Ron Arad	Oh Void 2 (easy chair) 2004	design	---	2003/2004	Israel
Sara van der Heide	Untitled 2003	painting	---	2003/2004	South Korea
Eikoh Hosoe, Tatsumi Hijikata, Ikko Tanaka, Tadanori Yokoo	Kamaitachi 2005	photo	purchase	2005	Japan
Rachid Ben Ali	Untitled 2002	painting	gift	2006	Marocco
Sang-Soo Ahn	Bomb fishes 1991	poster	gift	2007	South Korea
Masuteru Aoba	Kose	poster	gift	2007	Japan
Sung-Ik Bae	Korea Book Fair 2004	poster	gift	2007	South Korea
Kum-nam Baik	The Style of Korea 2002	poster	gift	2007	South Korea
Chen Zhengda	The European Art Market 2004	poster	gift	2007	China
Shigeo Fukuda	Trickart Exhibition 2005	poster	gift	2007	Japan
Amar Kanwar	The torn first pages 2008	industrial design	purchase	2008	India
Shin Matsunaga	Chaumont Festival 2009	poster	gift	2009	Japan
Makoto Nakamura	Nakamura:30 Mona Lisa's	poster	gift	2009	Japan
Lu Liang	Miss Litfield 2008	poster	gift	2009	China

*The table is based on the information obtained from year reports of the Stedelijk Museum and is selective.

Table 6 Stedelijk Museum exhibitions of non-Western artists (1980-2010)

Date	Artist(s)/Title	Country
04.04-18.05.1980	Vojta Dukat	Czech Republic
05.02-21.03. 1982	Keiichi Tahara	Japan
02.09-23.10. 1983	Andre Kertesz	Hungary
27.01-11.03. 1984	Veron Urdarianu	Romania
04.05-11.06. 1984	Aviva Uri	Israel
16.05-28.06. 1987	Siah Armajani	Iran
10.03-29.04. 1990	Izhar Patkin	Israel
20.04-26.05. 1991	Henryk Tomaszewski	Poland
28.06-25.08. 1991	Tetsumi Kudo. <i>Retrospective</i>	Japan
10.10-29.11. 1992	Shigeko Kubota: <i>video-sculpturen 1975-91</i>	Japan
18.09-07.11. 1993	Timur Novikov: <i>new works</i>	Russia
01.12.1995.-07.01. 1996	Felix Gonzales-Torres	Cuba
13.03-20.04. 1997	Vojta Dukat	Czech Republic
04.10-23.11. 1997	Wisława Szymborska	Poland
28.02-13.04. 1998	Fang Lijung: <i>From Beijing to Amsterdam and back again</i>	China
02.05-14.06. 1998	Ram Katzir	Israel
16.12.2000-25.02.2001	Malick Sidibe: <i>Photography</i>	Mali
17.03-27.05.2001	Jitka Hanzlova	Czech Republic
01.10.2005-15.01.2006	Yang Fudong	China
25.07-30.08. 2008	Docking Station. Danh Vo: <i>Package tour</i>	Vietnam
05.09-30.09. 2008	Docking Station. Amar Kanwar: <i>The torn firts pages</i>	India

*The list is based on the materials provided by the staff of the Stedelijk Museum Library and is selective.

Table 7 MoMA acquisitions of non-Western artists (1980-2010)

Artist	Title	Category	Country	Way of purchase
Toshiyuki Kita	Wink Lounge Chair 1980	Design	Japan	Gift of Atelier International, Ltd.
Shohei Imamura	Vengeance Is Mine 1980	Film	Japan	Gift of Janus Films.
Carlos Diegues	Bye Bye Brazil 1980	Film	Brazil	Acquired from Dan Talbot.
Hector Babenco	Pixote 1980	Film	Brazil	Acquired from Dan Talbot.
Seiichi Furuya	Graz 1980	Photograph	Japan	Gift of the Edward and Marjorie Goldberger Foundation.
Andrzej Pagowski	Wolf's Smile 1982	Poster	Poland	Purchase.
Krzysztof Kieslowski	Blind Chance 1982	Film	Poland	Acquired from Film Polski.
Mako Idemitsu	Great Mother Part II: Yumiko 1983	Video	Japan	Gift of Margot Ernst.
Hou Hsiao-hsien	Summer at Grandpa's 1984	Film	China	---
Trinh T. Minh-ha	Naked Spaces: Living I Round 1985	Film	Vietnam	---
Shiro Kuramata	How High the Moon Armchair 1986	Design	Japan	Gift of the manufacturer.
Aleksandr Askoldov	The Commissar 1967-1987	Film	Russia	Acquired from Gerald Rappaport.
Tadanori Yakoo	Japanese Society for the Rights of Authors, Composers, And Publishers 1988	Poster	Japan	Gift of the designer.
Edin Velez	Dance of Darkness 1989	Video	Puerto Rico	Gift of the Jerome Foundation.
Tadanori Yokoo	Fancydance 1989	Poster	Japan	Gift of the designer.
Kazuo Kawasaki	Carna Wheelchair 1989	Design	Japan	Gift of the designer.
Shiro Kuramata	Miss Blanche Chair 1989	Design	Japan	Gift of Agnes Fund in honor of Patricia Phelps de Cisneros.
Arata Isozaki	City in the Air: "Ruin of Hiroshima". Project 1990	Architectural print	Japan	Gift of the architect in honor of Philip Johnson.
Felix Gonzalez-Torres	Untitled (Death by Gun) 1990	Prints	Cuba-Puerto Rico-US	Purchased in part with funds from Arthur Fleisher, Jr., and Linda Barth Goldstein.

Agnieszka Holland	Europa Europa 1990	Film	Poland	---
Toshiyuki Kita	The Multilingual Chair 1991	Design	Japan	Gift of the manufacturer.
Toyo Ito	Shimosuma Municipal Museum, Shomosumamachi, Nagano Prefecture, Japan 1991	Architectural model	Japan	Gift of the architect.
Irata Isozaki	Convention Hall, Nara, Japan 1992	Architectural drawing	Japan	Gift of the artist.
Reiko Sudo	Jellyfish Fabric 1993	Design	Japan	Gift of the manufacturer.
Ximena Cuevas	Bleeding Heart 1993	Video	Mexico	Gift of the Mexican Cultural Institute.
Rirkrit Tiravanija	Untitled (Apron and Thai Pork Sausage) 1993	Multiple	Thai	Purchased with funds given by Linda Barth Goldstein.
Takeshi Ishiguro	Rice Salt-and-Pepper Shakers 1994	Design	Japan	Gift of the designer.
Teiji Furuhashi	Lovers 1994	Video installation	Japan	Gift of Canon, Inc.
Toyo Ito	Mediatheque Project, Sendai, Japan 1995	Architectural model	Japan	Gift of the architect in honor of Philip Johnson.
Igor Moukhin	Moscow, May 9 1996	Photograph	Russia	Gift of the Junior Associates of the Museum of Modern Art.
Vik Muniz	Mass from the series "Pictures of Chocolate" 1997	Photograph	Brazil-US	The Fellows of Photography Fund and Anonymous Purchase Fund.
Reiko Sudo	Origami Pleat Scarf 1997	Design	Japan	Gift of the manufacturer.
Zhang Peili	Eating 1997	Video installation	China	Gift of the Junior Associates of the Museum of Modern Art.
Aleksei German	Khroustaliyov, My Car! 1998	Film	Russia	Acquired from Sodaperega.
Jia Zhang Ke	Xiao Wu 1998	Film	China	Acquired from Kit-Ming Li, with funds provided by the Junior Associates of the Museum of Modern Art.
Cai Guo-Qiang	Borrowing Your Enemy's Arrows 1998	Sculpture	China	Gift of Patricia Phelps de Cisneros in honor of Glenn D. Lowry.
Young Joon Kim	Jahajae, Heyri Art Valley, Paju-si, Gyeonggi-do	Architecture and Design	Korea	Gift of Young-June Kiehm.

2001-2003				
Goran Paskaljevic	San zimske noti (Midwinter's Night Dream) 2004	Film	Serbia	Purchase through the Acquisition Fund.
Goran Paskaljevic	Optimisti (The Optimists) 2006	Film	Serbia	Purchase through the Acquisition Fund.
So Young Kim	Treeless Mountain 2009	Film	Korea	Gift of Oscilloscope Laboratories

*The list of acquisitions is based on the information accessible on the official webpage of MoMA and on the information taken from the printed edition *Modern Contemporary: Art at MoMA since 1980*¹⁰⁸ and is selective.

¹⁰⁸ Kirk Varnedoe – Paola Antonelli – Joshua Siegel, *Modern Contemporary: Art at MoMA since 1980*, New York, 2001.

Table 8 MoMA exhibitions of non-Western artists (1980-2010)

Artist(s)/Title	Country	Date
Catalina Parra	Latin America	November 13, 1981-January 3, 1982
<i>Posters</i> by Starowieyski	Poland	April 11-June 4, 1985
Projects: Magdalena Jetelova	Czech Republic / lives in Germany	March 14-April 28, 1987
Projects 21: Cildo Meireles	Brazil	March 17-May 1, 1990
Kyoko Kumai	Japan	May 3-June 18, 1991
Guillermo Kuitka	Argentina	September 13-October 29, 1991
Felix Gonzalez-Torres	Cuba	May 15-June 30, 1992
<i>Latin American Artists of the Twentieth Century</i>	Latin America	June 2-September 7, 1993
Bul Lee/Chie Matsui	Korea/Japan	January 21(23)-March 25, 1997
Manuel Alvarez Bravo	Mexico	February 19(20)-May 18, 1997
Rikrit Tiravanija	Argentina	April 1(3)-June 1, 1997
Yayoi Kusama	Japan	July 8(9)-September 22, 1998
Zhang Peili	China	October 28, 1998-February 2, 1999
<i>Structure and Surface: Contemporary Japanese Textiles</i>	Japan	November 11(12), 1998-January 26, 1999
Shigeru Ban	Japan	April 26(30)-August 1, 2000
Projects 72: John Armleder / Piotr Uklanski	Switzerland/Poland	June 1-August 1, 2000
Projects 70: Janine Antoni, Shahzia Sikander, Kara Walker	Bahamas/Pakistan/US	November 22, 2000-March 13, 2001
Monika Sosnowska	Poland	August 30-November 27, 2006
Projects 85: Dan Perjovschi	Romania	May 2, 2007-August 27, 2007
Projects 87: Sigalit Landau	Israel	March 19-July 28, 2008

*The list of exhibitions is based on the information available on the official webpage of MoMA and is selective.

Bibliography

1. Bee, Harriet Schoenholz, Cassandra Haliczzer (eds.), *MoMA Highlights. 350 Works from The Museum of Modern Art New York*, New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2004.
2. Belting, Hans and Andrea Buddensieg, *The Global Art World: Audiences, Markets, and Museums*, Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz Verlag, 2009.
3. Bouwhuis, Jelle, Ingrid Commandeur, Gijs Frieling, Domeniek Ruyters, Margriet Schavemaker and Christel Vesters (eds.), *Now Is the Time: Art & Theory. 21st Century*, Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 2009.
4. Bydler, Charlotte, *The Global Artworld Inc.: On the Globalization of Contemporary Art*, Uppsala: Uppsala University Press, 2004.
5. Byszewski, Janusz, "The Other Museum – Some Questions". In: Hadwig Kräutler (ed.), *New Strategies for Communication in Museums. Proceedings of ICOM/CECA'96*, Vienna: WUV-Universitätsverlag, 1997.
6. Byvanck, Valentijn (ed.), *Conversations in Contemporary Art. Lectures and Debates Witte de With 2001*, Rotterdam: Witte de With, 2001.
7. Cabral, Magaly, "Global Museum". In: Hadwig Kräutler (ed.), *New Strategies for Communication in Museums. Proceedings of ICOM/CECA'96*, Vienna: WUV-Universitätsverlag, 1997.
8. Corbonell, Bettina Messias (ed.), "The Museum Refuses to Stand Still". In: *Museum Studies. An Anthropology of Contexts*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2004.
9. Damianovic, Maria (curator), *To Actuality*, Bozen/Bolzano: AR/GE Kunst Galerie Museum, Galleria Museo, 2002.
10. De Ruiter, Marinus, "The Stedelijk's Hip Daughter Turns 10". In: *Amsterdam Weekly*, 28 July – 3 August 2004.
11. Drechsler, Wolfgang, Rainer Fuchs und Ulrike Müller (Her.), *Museum Moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien*, München: Prestel Verlag, 2002.
12. Ekeberg, Jonas (ed.), *New Institutionalism. Verkestet No. 1, 2003*, Oslo: Office for Contemporary Art Norway, 2003.
13. *Expressiv. Mitteleuropäische Kunst seit 1960*, Wien: Museum moderner Kunst, Museum des 20. Jahrhunderts, 1987.
14. Furlong, William, Polly Gould and Paul Hetherington (eds.), *Issues in Art and Education. The Dynamics of Now*, Wimbledon School of Art in Association with Tate Publishing, 2000.

15. *Gender Check. Checking Gender & Verifying History. Femininity and Masculinity in the Art of Eastern Europe*, Catalogue to the exhibition, Vienna: Museum moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien, 2009.
16. Gludowacz, Irene, Silvia von Bennigsen and Susanne van Hagen (eds.), *Global Art*, Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz Verlag GmbH & Co KG, 2010.
17. *Hängeregistratur des Museums moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien* (accessible in the Collection Department of the Museum moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien on demand).
18. Hegyi, Lóránd, *Zwischenquartier. Interim Quarters*, Vienna: Das Museum moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien, 2001.
19. Hooper-Greenhill, Eilean, "Changing Values in the Art Museum. Rethinking Communication and Learning". In: Bettina Messias Corbonell (ed.), *Museum Studies. An Anthropology of Contexts*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2004.
20. <http://icom.museum/#> (22.08.2010).
21. <http://icom.museum/mission.html> (22.08.2010).
22. <http://pinchukartcentre.org/en/> (17.02.2010).
23. <http://ps1.org/about/> (16.05.2010).
24. <http://www.cobra-museum.nl/en/cobra.html> (14.08.2010).
25. http://www.kunsthall.no/default_e.asp (18.08.2010).
26. <http://www.moma.org/about/history> (16.05.2010).
27. <http://www.moma.org/about/index> (16.05.2010).
28. http://www.moma.org/docs/explore/CollectionsMgmtPolicyMoMA_March09.pdf (16.05.2010).
29. <http://www.mumok.at/about/history/?L=1> (25.06.2010).
30. <http://www.mumok.at/about/mission-statement/?L=1> (25.06.2010).
31. <http://www.mumok.at/presse/> (20.03.2010).
32. <http://www.stedelijk.nl/> (20.03.2010).
33. <http://www.tate.org.uk/collections/newacquisitions.htm> (01.06.2010).
34. <http://www.tate.org.uk/modern/> (17.02.2010).
35. <http://www.tate.org.uk/modern/about.htm> (19.05.2010).
36. <http://www.tate.org.uk/modern/building/history.htm> (19.05.2010).
37. Hudson, Kenneth, "The Museum Refuses to Stand Still". In: Bettina Messias Corbonell (ed.), *Museum Studies. An Anthropology of Contexts*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2004.

38. Janseen, Ranske, “10 Years SMBA: We Show Art” In: *Bulletin Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam*, jrg. 17, nr. 1, mrt. 2004.
39. *Japanische Kunst der achtziger Jahre*, Ausstellungskatalog, Wien: Museum moderner Kunst, Museum des 20. Jahrhunderts, 1991.
40. Leigh, Nana, *Building the Image of Modern Art. The Rhetoric of Two Museums and the representation and Canonization of Modern Art (1935-1975): The Stedelijk Museum in Amsterdam and the Museum of Modern Art in New York*, Thesis, Leiden: University of Leiden, 2008.
41. *List of exhibitions of the Stedelijk Museum* (accessible only in printed version in the Stedelijk Museum / Amsterdam).
42. *MAKOM. Zeitgenössische Kunst aus Israel*, Ausstellungskatalog, Wien: Museum des 20. Jahrhunderts, 1993.
43. Morales, Sebastian Diaz, “10 Years SMBA: We Show Art”. In: *Bulletin Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam*, jrg. 16, nr. 5/6, dec. 2003.
44. *Museum of Contemporary Art – Laboratory of Creative Ideas and Visual Improvisations*, Round table, Kyiv: ICF EIDOS, 2007.
45. Naef, Silvia and Nada Shabout, *From Local to Global: Visual Arts in the Eastern Mediterranean between International Markets and Local Expectations*, Workshop, 2006.
46. O’Doherty, Brian (ed.), *Museums in Crisis*, New York: George Braziller, 1972.
47. *Öffentliche Rituale. Kunst/Videos aus Polen*, Ausstellungskatalog, Wien: Museum moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien, 2003.
48. *Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam. Year Report, 1978-1984*, Amsterdam: Stedelijk Museum, 1984.
49. *Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam. Year Report, 1991, 1993-1997*, Amsterdam: Stedelijk Museum, 1997.
50. *Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam. Year Report, 1998*, Amsterdam: Stedelijk Museum, 1998.
51. *Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam. Year Report, 1999*, Amsterdam: Stedelijk Museum, 1999.
52. *Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam. Year Report, 2000*, Amsterdam: Stedelijk Museum, 2000.
53. *Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam. Year Report, 2001*, Amsterdam: Stedelijk Museum, 2001.
54. *Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam. Year Report, 2002*, Amsterdam: Stedelijk Museum, 2002.
55. *Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam. Year Report, 2003-2004*, Amsterdam: Stedelijk Museum, 2004.

56. *Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam. Year Report, 2005*, Amsterdam: Stedelijk Museum, 2005.
57. *Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam. Year Report, 2006*, Amsterdam: Stedelijk Museum, 2006.
58. *Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam. Year Report, 2007*, Amsterdam: Stedelijk Museum, 2007.
59. *Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam. Year Report, 2008*, Amsterdam: Stedelijk Museum, 2008.
60. *Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam. Year Report, 2009*, Amsterdam: Stedelijk Museum, 2009.
61. *Tate Acquisition and Disposal Policy*. Approved by Board of Trustees on 8 July 2009, London: Tate Publishing, 2009.
62. *Tate Report, 2000-2002*, London: Tate Publishing, 2002.
63. *Tate Report, 2002-2004*, London: Tate Publishing, 2004.
64. *Tate Report, 2008-2009*, London: Tate Publishing, 2009.
65. *The Official Museum Directory 2001*, 31st edition, Volume I, "Institutions", New Providence: NRP (National Publishing's Database Publishing Group), 2001.
66. Varnedoe, Kirk, Paola Antonelli and Joshua Siegel (eds), *Modern Contemporary: Art at MoMA since 1980*, New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2001.
67. Weibel, Peter and Andrea Buddensieg (eds.), *Contemporary Art and the Museum. A Global Perspective*, Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz Verlag, 2007.
68. Weibel, Peter, "The Museum of the Future". In: Hadwig Kräutler (ed.), *New Strategies for Communication in Museums. Proceedings of ICOM/CECA'96*, Vienna: WUV-Universitätsverlag, 1997.
69. *Why Pictures Now. Fotografie, Film, Video Heute*, Nürnberg: Verlag für moderne Kunst / Herausgegeben von Museum Moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien, 2006.
70. Wilson, Simon and Jessica Lack (eds.), *The Tate Guide to Modern Art Terms*, London: Tate Publishing, 2008.
71. *Zeichen im Fluß*, Ausstellungskatalog, Wien: Museum des 20. Jahrhunderts, 1990.
72. *Zwischenzonen, La Colección Jumex, Mexico*, Catalogue to the exhibition, Vienna: Museum moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien, 2009.

Abstract (English)

This paper in general terms is an attempt to research the processes of *globalization* and their impact on the contemporary art world presently. There are several questions which are of the main interest for this research, namely the notion of *global art* and the connections between global, contemporary and modern art, the same as definition of *a non-Western artist*. Also the concept of *museums of modern and contemporary art* is being investigated, whereas debates around the new model of an art museum in the 21st century are being observed.

The main goal of this paper is to find out whether museums of modern and contemporary art – being among the most important and influential art institutions presently – incorporate non-Western art into their permanent collections and how often they exhibit works of non-Western artists in their halls these days. Under the notion of *non-Western art* I understand art from the countries which were previously considered as peripheral or marginal, those countries which were not represented on the map of the art world a few decades ago, those countries which did not belong to the Western art world (countries outside the regions of Western Europe and Northern America). To investigate this question four world-renowned art museums have been chosen: *Tate Modern* in London, *MoMA* in New York, *Stedelijk Museum* in Amsterdam and *MUMOK* in Vienna. Being art museums with long historical *Eurocentric* art tradition (even if some of them, as for example Tate Modern, were created only one decade ago) these museums are trying to present themselves as the best examples of art museums at present. So the question is to what extent these

claims can be taken seriously? Are these museums really open to the changes happening in the global world and ready to follow the latest art trends? Whom from the non-Western art world these museums consider to deserve to be represented in the walls of their buildings?

Abstract (Deutsch)

Diese Masterarbeit ist im Allgemeinen ein Versuch, die Prozesse *der Globalisierung* und ihre Auswirkungen auf die zeitgenössische Kunst heutzutage weltweit zu erforschen. Es gibt einige Fragen, die das Hauptinteresse für diese Forschung bilden, nämlich den Begriff *der globalen Kunst* und die Verbindungen zwischen der globalen, zeitgenössischen und modernen Kunst, wie auch den Begriff *des nicht-westlichen Künstlers*. Auch das Konzept *der Museen moderner und zeitgenössischer Kunst* wird untersucht, während Debatten rund um das neue Modell eines Kunstmuseums im 21. Jahrhundert beobachtet werden.

Das Hauptziel dieser Arbeit ist es herauszufinden, ob Museen für zeitgenössische und moderne Kunst – als eines der wichtigsten und einflussreichsten Kunstinstitutionen heute – nicht-westliche Kunst in ihre ständigen Sammlungen übernehmen und wie oft sie Werke von nicht-westlichen Künstlern in diesen Tagen in ihren Hallen zeigen. Unter dem Begriff *der nicht-westlichen Kunst* verstehe ich Kunst aus den Ländern, die zuvor als peripher oder marginal betrachtet wurden, jene Länder, die vor ein paar Jahrzehnten nicht auf der Landkarte der Kunstwelt zu finden waren, diejenigen Länder, die nicht zur westlichen Kunstwelt (Länder außerhalb der Regionen von Westeuropa und Nordamerika) gehörten. Zur Untersuchung dieser Frage wurden vier international bekannte Museen ausgewählt: *Tate Modern* in London, *MoMA* in New York, *Stedelijk Museum* in Amsterdam und *MUMOK* in Wien. Als Kunstmuseen mit langer historischer Eurocentric Kunsttradition (auch wenn einige von ihnen, wie z.B. Tate Modern, erst seit einem Jahrzehnt existieren) sind diese

Museen gegenwärtig bestrebt, sich selbst als die besten Beispiele für Kunstmuseen zu präsentieren. Die Frage ist also, inwieweit diese Forderungen ernst genommen werden können? Sind diese Museen wirklich offen genug, um die Veränderungen in der globalen Welt zu akzeptieren und bereit den neuesten Trends in der Kunst zu folgen? Wen von den nicht-westlichen Künstlern halten diese Museen für würdig, um an den Wänden ihrer Häuser vertreten zu sein?

CARRICULUM VITAE

Personal data

Last name **GORLENKO**
First name **Kateryna**
E-mail kateryna.gorlenko@gmail.com
Date of birth 07/06/84
Place of birth Brovary/Ukraine

Education

30/06/2006 Master Degree in Philology, Teaching, Translating and Interpreting
(Chinese and English).
Kyiv National Shevchenko University (Ukraine).
30/06/2005 Bachelor Degree in Philology (Chinese Language and Literature).
Kyiv National Shevchenko University (Ukraine).

Further Education

10/2008-07/2010 *MA Global Studies – A European Perspective*. Neighborhood Policy
Scholarship (EC).
First year (10/2008-07/2009) –University of Leipzig /Germany;
Majors: Political and Social Sciences.
Second year (10/2009-07/2010) –University of Vienna /Austria;
Majors: Global History and Cultural Studies.

Internships

03/05-31/07/2010 International Foundation *Manifesta* (Amsterdam/Netherlands).
Field: contemporary art.
01/09-28/09/2009 Center of Contemporary Art *Soviart* (Kyiv/Ukraine). Field: modern
and contemporary art.

Languages

Ukrainian, Russian, English, German, Chinese.