

EDITED BY  
ALEXANDER DUMBADZE AND SUZANNE HUDSON



CON  
TEM  
POR  
ARY  
ART

1989 TO THE PRESENT

 WILEY-BLACKWELL



C O N  
T E M  
P O R  
A R Y  
A R T

1989 TO THE PRESENT



Edited by  
ALEXANDER DUMBADZE AND SUZANNE HUDSON

C O N  
T E M  
P O R  
A R Y  
A R T

1989 TO THE PRESENT

 WILEY-BLACKWELL

A John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Publication

This edition first published 2013  
© 2013 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Wiley-Blackwell is an imprint of John Wiley & Sons, formed by the merger of Wiley's global Scientific, Technical and Medical business with Blackwell Publishing.

*Registered Office*

John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex,  
PO19 8SQ, UK

*Editorial Offices*

350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5020, USA  
9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, UK  
The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

For details of our global editorial offices, for customer services, and for information about how to apply for permission to reuse the copyright material in this book please see our website at [www.wiley.com/wiley-blackwell](http://www.wiley.com/wiley-blackwell).

The right of Alexander Dumbadze and Suzanne Hudson to be identified as the authors of the editorial material in this work has been asserted in accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Wiley also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats. Some content that appears in print may not be available in electronic books.

Designations used by companies to distinguish their products are often claimed as trademarks. All brand names and product names used in this book are trade names, service marks, trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective owners. The publisher is not associated with any product or vendor mentioned in this book. This publication is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold on the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering professional services. If professional advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

Contemporary art : 1989 to the present / edited by Alexander Dumbadze and Suzanne Hudson.  
pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-4443-3860-7 (hardback) – ISBN 978-1-4443-3866-9 (paperback)

1. Art, Modern–20th century. 2. Art, Modern–21st century. I. Dumbadze, Alexander Blair, 1973– editor of compilation.

N6490.C65665 2013

709.05'1–dc23

2012035615

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Cover design by E&P Design

Set in 10.5/13pt Minion by SPi Publisher Services, Pondicherry, India

# CONTENTS

<i>Contributors</i>	ix
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>Alexander Dumbadze and Suzanne Hudson</i>	
<b>1 THE CONTEMPORARY AND GLOBALIZATION</b>	<b>5</b>
Worlds Apart: Contemporary Art, Globalization, and the Rise of Biennials	7
<i>Tim Griffin</i>	
“Our” Contemporaneity?	17
<i>Terry Smith</i>	
The Historicity of the Contemporary is Now!	28
<i>Jean-Philippe Antoine</i>	
<b>2 ART AFTER MODERNISM AND POSTMODERNISM</b>	<b>37</b>
Elite Art in an Age of Populism	39
<i>Julian Stallabrass</i>	
“Of Adversity we Live!”	50
<i>Monica Amor</i>	
Making it Work: Artists and Contemporary Art in China	60
<i>Pauline J. Yao</i>	

<b>3</b>	<b>FORMALISM</b>	<b>70</b>
	Form Struggles	72
	<i>Jan Verwoert</i>	
	Formalism Redefined	84
	<i>Anne Ellegood</i>	
	The World in Plain View: Form in the Service of the Global	95
	<i>Joan Kee</i>	
<b>4</b>	<b>MEDIUM SPECIFICITY</b>	<b>105</b>
	The (Re)Animation of Medium Specificity in Contemporary Art	107
	<i>Sabeth Buchmann</i>	
	Medium Aspecificity/Autopoietic Form	117
	<i>Irene V. Small</i>	
	Specificity	126
	<i>Richard Shiff</i>	
<b>5</b>	<b>ART AND TECHNOLOGY</b>	<b>137</b>
	Test Sites: Fabrication	139
	<i>Michelle Kuo</i>	
	Inhabiting the Technosphere: Art and Technology Beyond	
	Technical Invention	149
	<i>Ina Blom</i>	
	<i>Conceptual Art 2.0</i>	159
	<i>David Joselit</i>	
<b>6</b>	<b>BIENNIALS</b>	<b>169</b>
	In Defense of Biennials	171
	<i>Massimiliano Gioni</i>	
	Curating in Heterogeneous Worlds	178
	<i>Geeta Kapur</i>	
	Biennial Culture and the Aesthetics of Experience	192
	<i>Caroline A. Jones</i>	
<b>7</b>	<b>PARTICIPATION</b>	<b>202</b>
	Participation	204
	<i>Liam Gillick and Maria Lind</i>	



	The Ripple Effect: “Participation” as an Expanded Field <i>Johanna Burton</i>	214
	Publicity and Complicity in Contemporary Art <i>Sofía Hernández Chong Cuy</i>	224
<b>8</b>	<b>ACTIVISM</b>	<b>232</b>
	Activism <i>Andrea Giunta</i>	234
	Knit Dissent <i>Julia Bryan-Wilson</i>	245
	Light from a Distant Star: A Meditation on Art, Agency, and Politics <i>Raqs Media Collective</i>	254
<b>9</b>	<b>AGENCY</b>	<b>265</b>
	Participation in Art: 10 Theses <i>Juliane Rebentisch</i>	267
	Fusions of Powers: Four Models of Agency in the Field of Contemporary Art, Ranked Unapologetically in Order of Preference <i>Tirdad Zolghadr</i>	277
	Life Full of Holes: Contemporary Art and Bare Life <i>T. J. Demos</i>	287
<b>10</b>	<b>THE RISE OF FUNDAMENTALISM</b>	<b>298</b>
	Monotheism à la Mode <i>Sven Lütticken</i>	300
	Freedom’s Just Another Word <i>Terri Weissman</i>	311
	On the Frontline: The Politics of Terrorism in Contemporary Pakistani Art <i>Atteqa Ali</i>	322
<b>11</b>	<b>JUDGMENT</b>	<b>331</b>
	Judgment’s Troubled Objects <i>João Ribas</i>	333

	A Producer's Journal, or Judgment A Go-Go <i>Frank Smigiel</i>	346
	After Criticism <i>Lane Relyea</i>	357
<b>12</b>	<b>MARKETS</b>	<b>367</b>
	Globalization and Commercialization of the Art Market <i>Olav Velthuis</i>	369
	Three Perspectives on the Market <i>Mihai Pop, Sylvia Kouvali, and Andrea Rosen</i>	379
	Untitled <i>Ayreen Anastas and Rene Gabri</i>	388
<b>13</b>	<b>ART SCHOOLS AND THE ACADEMY</b>	<b>406</b>
	Lifelong Learning <i>Katy Siegel</i>	408
	Art without Institutions <i>Anton Vidokle</i>	420
	Will the Academy Become a Monster? <i>Pi Li</i>	429
<b>14</b>	<b>SCHOLARSHIP</b>	<b>436</b>
	Our Literal Speed <i>Our Literal Speed</i>	438
	Globalization, Art History, and the Specter of Difference <i>Chika Okeke-Agulu</i>	447
	The Academic Condition of Contemporary Art <i>Carrie Lambert-Beatty</i>	457
	<i>Index</i>	467

# CONTRIBUTORS

**Atteqa Ali** is an art historian and writer based in Lahore. She is the officiating Head of the Communication and Cultural Studies Department at the National College of Arts. Her forthcoming book investigates the rise of Pakistani art that addresses sociopolitical concerns.

**Monica Amor** holds a PhD from the Graduate Center of the City University of New York and is Professor of Modern and Contemporary Art at the Maryland Institute College of Art. She is currently completing a book entitled *Theories of the Non-Object: The Postwar Crisis of Geometric Abstraction*.

**Ayreen Anastas** is an artist living in Brooklyn.

**Jean-Philippe Antoine** is Professor of Aesthetics and Contemporary Art Theory at Paris 8 University. His research bears on images and the social construction of memory, as well as modern definitions of art. He has recently published *La traversée du XX<sup>e</sup> siècle. Joseph Beuys, l'image et le souvenir* (2011).

**Ina Blom** is a Professor at the Institute of Philosophy, Classics, History of Art and Ideas at the University of Oslo, specializing in modernism/avant-garde art, contemporary art, and media aesthetics. She is the author of *On the Style Site: Art, Sociality, and Media Culture* (2007).

**Julia Bryan-Wilson** is Associate Professor of Modern and Contemporary Art in the Department of History of Art at the University of California, Berkeley. She is the author of *Art Workers: Radical Practice in the Vietnam War Era* (2009).

**Sabeth Buchmann** is an art historian and critic based in Berlin and Vienna. She is a Professor of the History of Modern and Postmodern Art at

the Academy of Fine Arts, Vienna. Her publications include: *Denken gegen das Denken. Produktion- Technologie-Subjektivität bei Sol LeWitt, Yvonne Rainer und Hélio Oiticica* (2007) and a forthcoming monograph on Hélio Oiticica (with M. Hinderer-Cruz).

**Johanna Burton** is an art historian and critic based in New York City. She is the Director of the Graduate Program at the Center for Curatorial Studies, Bard College.

**T. J. Demos** teaches in the Art History Department at University College London. He writes widely on modern and contemporary art, and is currently completing two books: *The Migrant Image: The Art and Politics of Documentary During Global Crisis* and *Return to the Postcolony: Spectres of Colonialism in Contemporary Art*.

**Anne Ellegood** is the Senior Curator at the Hammer Museum. Recent exhibitions include the Hammer's first biennial of Los Angeles-based artists, *Made in L.A.*, the group show *All of this and nothing*, and Hammer Projects with Shannon Ebner and Sara VanDerBeek. Ellegood served as the Curator for Hany Armanious's 2011 Australian Pavilion in the Venice Biennale.

**Rene Gabri** is an artist living in New York.

**Liam Gillick** is an artist based in London and New York. He has exhibited widely, and represented Germany for the 53rd Venice Biennale in 2009. His numerous writings, which include *Proxemics: Selected Writings 1988–2006* (2006) and a critical reader titled *Meaning Liam Gillick* (2009), function in parallel to his artwork.

**Massimiliano Gioni** is Associate Director and Director of Exhibitions at the New Museum. He is the Curator of the 55th Venice Biennale (2013). Among the many exhibitions he has either curated or co-curated are the 2010 Gwangju Biennial, the 4th Berlin Biennale, and Manifesta 5.

**Andrea Giunta** is an art historian, curator, and Professor of Latin American Art at The University of Texas at Austin, where she is Endowed Chair in Latin American Art History and Criticism and the Director of the Center for Latin American Visual Studies. She received her PhD from the University of Buenos Aires, Argentina.

**Tim Griffin** is Executive Director and Chief Curator of The Kitchen, New York. Previously he was editor-in-chief of *Artforum* from 2003 to

2010. His book of essays, *Compression*, dealing with shifts in the terms for site-specificity in contemporary art, is forthcoming.

**Sofía Hernández Chong Cuy** works with visual artists in conceptualizing meetings points—whether these take the form and space of exhibitions, events, or printed matter—for audiences to experience art unconventionally. Sofia is Curator at the Colección Patricia Phelps de Cisneros, develops projects independently, and writes regularly in [www.sideshow.org](http://www.sideshow.org).

**Caroline A. Jones** is Professor of Art History and Director of the History, Theory, Criticism Program at MIT. Editor of *Sensorium* (2006), author of *Eyesight Alone* (2005/8), *Machine in the Studio* (1996/8), and other works, her next book is titled *Desires for the World Picture: The Global Work of Art*.

**David Joselit** is Carnegie Professor in the History of Art Department at Yale University. His books include *Feedback: Television against Democracy* (2007) and *After Art* (2012).

**Geeta Kapur** is a critic and curator from Delhi. Her books include *Contemporary Indian Artists* (1978), *When Was Modernism: Essays on Contemporary Cultural Practice in India* (2000), *Ends and Means: Critical Inscriptions in Contemporary Art* (forthcoming). She co-curated “Bombay/Mumbai” for *Century City*, Tate Modern (2001). The founder-editor of the *Journal of Arts and Ideas*, she is also an advisory editor for *Third Text* and *Marg*. She has lectured and held fellowships worldwide.

**Joan Kee** is an Assistant Professor at the University of Michigan. A specialist in modern and contemporary art with interests in East and Southeast Asia, her latest book is entitled *Methods: Tansaekhwa and Contemporary Korean Art*.

**Sylvia Kouvali** lives in Istanbul, Turkey, where she runs Rodeo Gallery.

**Michelle Kuo** is the Editor in Chief of *Artforum*. She is a regular contributor to publications including *October* and *The Art Bulletin*, and most recently published the catalogue essay for the exhibition “Otto Piene: Lichtballett” at the MIT List Visual Arts Center. Michelle is also a PhD candidate at Harvard University in history of art and architecture; her dissertation concerns the organization Experiments in Art and Technology.

**Carrie Lambert-Beatty** is an art historian at Harvard University, where she received the Roslyn Abramson Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching. She is the author of *Being Watched: Yvonne Rainer and the 1960s* (2008).

**Pi Li** is a critic, curator, and gallerist based in Beijing.

**Maria Lind** is a curator and critic based in Stockholm, and currently the Director of Tensta konsthall. She previously was the Director of the Graduate Program, Center for Curatorial Studies at Bard College, Director of Iaspis in Stockholm and Kunstverein München. She received the 2009 Walter Hopps Award for Curatorial Achievement and her book, *Selected Maria Lind Writing*, was published in 2010.

**Our Literal Speed** is an ongoing media opera/textual archive based in Selma, Alabama. Since 2006, the project has been presented as a series of events in the vicinity of art and history in Europe and North America.

**Sven Lütticken** teaches art history at VU University Amsterdam. He regularly publishes on contemporary art and is the author of the books *Secret Publicity: Essays on Contemporary Art* (2006), *Idols of the Market: Modern Iconoclasm and the Fundamentalist Spectacle* (2009), and *History in Motion* (2012).

**Chika Okeke-Agulu**, a curator, critic, and art historian, is Assistant Professor in the Department of Art and Archaeology and Center for African American Studies, Princeton University. His books include *Contemporary African Art since 1980* (2009), and *Who Knows Tomorrow* (2010). He is co-editor of *Nka: Journal of Contemporary African Art*.

**Mihai Pop** is a visual artist and Coordinator of Galeria Plan B in Cluj, Romania, and Berlin. He commissioned the Romanian Pavilion at the 52nd Venice Biennale in 2007, and co-curated the *Staging the Grey* exhibition for Prague Biennale 4 in 2009. He is an initiator of the Fabrica de Pensule / The Paintbrush Factory in Cluj, Romania, a collective independent cultural center opened in 2009.

**Raqs Media Collective** was founded in 1992 by Jeebesh Bagchi, Monica Narula, and Shuddhabrata Sengupta. Based in New Delhi, Raqs remains closely involved with the Sarai program at the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies ([www.sarai.net](http://www.sarai.net)), an initiative they co-founded in 2000.

**Juliane Rebentisch** is Professor of Philosophy and Aesthetics at the University of Art and Design in Offenbach am Main, Germany. Recent publications include: *Aesthetics of Installation Art* (2012); *Kreation und Depression: Freiheit im gegenwärtigen Kapitalismus* (co-edited with Christoph Menke, 2010); and *Die Kunst der Freiheit: Zur Dialektik demokratischer Existenz* (2012).

**Lane Relyea** is Associate Professor and Chair of Art Theory and Practice at Northwestern University and editor of *Art Journal*. He has written widely on contemporary art since 1983, and his book on the effects of networks on artistic practice and its contexts is forthcoming.

**João Ribas** is Curator at the MIT List Visual Arts Center in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and was previously Curator at The Drawing Center in New York. His writing has appeared in numerous publications, and he is the recipient of four consecutive AICA Awards (2008–11) and an Emily Hall Tremaine Award (2010).

**Andrea Rosen** opened her gallery in 1990 with an inaugural exhibition of work by Felix Gonzalez-Torres. The gallery is known for discovering new artists as well as developing the career of emerging and established artists. The gallery also has an ongoing reputation for mounting significant historical exhibitions. Rosen was born in Canada and worked in numerous galleries, including Diane Brown Gallery and Daniel Newburg Gallery.

**Richard Shiff** is Effie Marie Cain Regents Chair in Art at The University of Texas at Austin, where he directs the Center for the Study of Modernism. He is the author of *Doubt* (2008) and *Between Sense and de Kooning* (2011).

**Katy Siegel** is a Professor of Art History at Hunter College, The City University of New York and contributing editor to *Artforum*. She was the Curator of *High Times, Hard Times: New York Painting, 1967–1975*, and her books include *Since '45: America and the Making of Contemporary Art* (2011) and *Abstract Expressionism* (2011).

**Irene V. Small** is Assistant Professor of Art and Archaeology, Princeton University. She has contributed to journals including *Artforum*, *Third Text*, and *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics*. Her forthcoming book, *Hélio Oiticica: Folding the Frame*, examines the emergence of a participatory art paradigm in mid-1960s Brazil.

**Frank Smigiel** is Associate Curator of Public Programs at the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, where he designs and implements live events from artists' talks and public projects to visual arts-based performance and film. His curatorial and research interests include the intersection of theatrical and live art forms, commerce by artists, and information/knowledge-based art projects. He teaches at the San Francisco Art Institute and holds a doctorate in English Literature.

**Terry Smith**, Andrew W. Mellon Professor of Contemporary Art History and Theory, Department of the History of Art and Architecture, University of Pittsburgh, and Distinguished Visiting Professor, National Institute for Experimental Arts, University of New South Wales, is the 2010 Australia Council Visual Arts Laureate, and winner of the CAA's Mather Award for Art Criticism.

**Julian Stallabrass** is a writer, curator, photographer, and lecturer. He is Professor in Art History at the Courtauld Institute of Art, and is the author of *Art Incorporated* (2004). He curated the 2008 Brighton Photo Biennial, "Memory of Fire: Images of War and the War of Images."

**Olav Velthuis** is Associate Professor in Cultural and Economic Sociology at the University of Amsterdam. He is the author of, among others, *Talking Prices: Symbolic Meanings of Prices on the Market for Contemporary Art* (2005), and has published on art markets in *Artforum*, the *Art Newspaper*, and the *Financial Times*.

**Jan Verwoert** is a critic whose writing has appeared in numerous journals, anthologies, and monographs. He teaches at the Piet Zwart Institute Rotterdam, the de Appel curatorial program, the Ha'Midrasha School of Art, Tel Aviv, and Bergen Academy of Art. He is the author of *Bas Jan Ader: In Search of the Miraculous* (2006) and *Tell Me What You Want What You Really Really Want* (2010).

**Anton Vidokle** is an artist and co-founder of *e-flux* and *time/bank*.

**Terri Weissman's** book, *The Realisms of Berenice Abbott: Documentary Photography and Political Action* (2011), examines the politics of Berenice Abbott's realist, communicatively oriented model of documentary photography. She has also co-curated (with Jessica May and Sharon Corwin) an exhibition titled *American Modern: Abbott, Evans, Bourke-White*.



**Pauline J. Yao** is an independent curator and scholar based in Beijing, where she co-founded the nonprofit art space Arrow Factory in 2008. She is the author of *In Production Mode: Contemporary Art in China* (2008), and co-edited *3 Years: Arrow Factory* (2011).

**Tirdad Zolghadr** is a writer and curator who teaches at the Center for Curatorial Studies, Bard College.



# INTRODUCTION

ALEXANDER DUMBADZE  
AND SUZANNE HUDSON

This volume comprises newly commissioned essays on contemporary art since 1989. The contemporary art world has expanded exponentially—in size and complexity—over the last two decades, precipitating a general uncertainty as to what matters and why, much less how we should look at, write about, and historicize these recent practices. Admitting from the outset the implications of this profound and often antagonistic situation, we have eschewed producing a descriptive text of our own and have instead brought together nearly fifty leading international creative, critical, and curatorial voices to examine what contemporary art is today. This book follows the principle given poetic shape in the Indian parable of the blind men and the elephant, in which a company of individuals feels a single region of the elephant's body. One might grope a leg, while another the tusk, or an ear. Each touch yields a different tactile experience, as well as a distinct vantage from which to extrapolate the contours of the whole. Precisely because of the variability of the animal's features—much less the horizon of one's perception—the resultant points of view are at once catholic and incommensurate.

The history presented in this book is necessarily partial, and the better for its aggregation of conflicting opinions, interpretations, and approaches. It goes without saying that *Contemporary Art: 1989 to the Present* is neither meant to be absolute nor prescriptive, but investigative, even speculative. It aims to generate a picture of a heterogeneous whole through the specificity

*Contemporary Art: 1989 to the Present*, First Edition. Edited by Alexander Dumbadze and Suzanne Hudson.

© 2013 John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Published 2013 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

of positions moored in disparate practices, locations, and philosophies. It is with this goal in mind that the essays in *Contemporary Art: 1989 to the Present* emphasize the virtues of partisanship in the task of understanding the recent past, and the book's success depends upon the vigor of debate it generates—debates we hope will provide the groundwork for successive histories of contemporary art.

While the essays themselves establish a discussion of the contemporary quite apart from our brief introduction of them, one basic point of structural and historiographical organization is our periodization of the contemporary from 1989. We do this for a number of reasons. The unprecedented growth of the contemporary art world coincided with the fall of the Berlin Wall and the tumultuous events surrounding the Tiananmen Square protests. The Velvet Revolution in Czechoslovakia, the Solidarity Movement in Poland, and the collapse of communism in the Soviet Union and the rest of the Eastern Bloc irrevocably modified the landscape of contemporary European Art; it also provided the economic means for local collectors to become highly influential players in the international art world. Meanwhile, the contemporary art scene in China, post-Tiananmen, evolved into an economic and cultural phenomenon independent from Western critical and economic systems of distribution, and as such represents a willful excision from, or the complete indifference to, the New York–Western Europe “hegemony” of contemporary art.

No matter the importance of such cities as New York, Berlin, or Beijing, the contemporary art world has experienced not just a multiplication of centers, but a deep constitutional adjustment regarding the nature of borders, travel, and the global economy. The increased number of biennials and triennials spread across the globe—something virtually unheard of before 1989, with the exception of stalwarts like São Paulo and Venice—made artists “peripatetic travelers” who created site-specific installations in response to the phenomena of globalization. Oft criticized for engendering a touristic, entertainment-oriented experience, these shows likewise gave rise to a kind of participatory art, taking advantage of the absence of traditional institutional structures for new, contingent presentational styles.

Such differences in exhibition practice notwithstanding, it may seem contentious to link aesthetic change to the geopolitical shifts of 1989—an argument that applies to other momentous dates, such as 1945 and 1968, which routinely arrange the writing of art history, the teaching of its classes, as well as the chronological installations of museum collections. To be sure, the events of 1989 and the years surrounding it were prepared for

by longer-term cultural, economic, and political histories, the implications of which are decisive for the comprehension of the recent past. But much art produced in the last twenty years arises, on the one hand, from artists who have grown up, been educated, and work in a context removed or critically distant from normative, Western art historical and social historical concerns. On the other hand, for those who have been educated in the Western/North Atlantic tradition—an obviously diverse body of individuals—many have at best an ambivalent relationship to the history of Western art and see themselves participating in an integrated international art system.

Despite these many transformations, the problems of power, distribution networks, conflicting senses of history, and the various contingencies surrounding both ideas of subjectivity and political agency remind us of how fraught this moment of art production and reception really is. When taken together, these complex conditions have gradually serrated the art made after 1989 from the art preceding it. Related to this, the authors assembled in these pages are, by and large, members of generations formed by the events of 1989, rather than the Vietnam War. (This latter fact has the advantage of setting aside the animating tensions between social art history and formalism that have driven much of “high” art critical writing since the 1970s, while making apparent the ways in which both approaches have been retooled, whether by means of new philosophical reference points or emergent aspects of practice.)

But to reiterate: There are numerous connections—many of which go back decades, if not longer—that caution against taking a stance of historical exceptionalism. Nevertheless the social and political alterations of the last twenty or so years have impacted how artists and commentators look at both their practice and the world, often regarding art as a source of critique as well as a tool for comprehending contemporary life under coeval conditions of holistically integrated cultures and temporalities. It is here that *Contemporary Art: 1989 to the Present* begins and leaves us, *in medias res*, which does not obviate the gesture toward understanding but renders it urgent.

### **A User’s Guide to *Contemporary Art: 1989 to the Present***

The ubiquity and variance of contemporary art since 1989 challenges art historians, curators, and critics attempting to account for works of art created and circulated in a truly, if imperfectly, global context. At the root

of this problem is how to order thematically art defined by a multiplicity of contents—art that is far from determined or accommodating to extant, particularly Western, critical categories. Indeed, the openness of post-1989 art abets both its possibility and potential vacuity, and in response, we have grouped the essays into fluid rubrics that range from theoretically oriented problems to medium-based investigations: The Contemporary and Globalization; Art After Modernism and Postmodernism; Formalism; Medium Specificity; Art and Technology; Biennials; Participation; Activism; Agency; The Rise of Fundamentalism; Judgment; Markets; Art Schools; and Scholarship.

Each section is prefaced by a brief editorial statement, which introduces the material in broad strokes. We have included three essays per section to highlight the respective range of standpoints, and while the approaches and writing techniques vary from the straightforwardly scholarly to the self-consciously casual, each text is relatively brief in length. The essays are meant for a wide audience—as befits the topic at hand. Their concision provides a forum for deft, polemical interventions. We have made the editorial decision to avoid the imposition of a house style in order to show how the essays reflect recent developments in the contemporary art world and current methodological approaches to its interpretation, whether through a case study, survey-of-literature, journalistic brief, or experimental script.

The essays also manifest critical pedagogical concerns: Authors implicitly or otherwise evaluate the distinction between primary and secondary material; balance social, historical, material, theoretical, and aesthetic issues; and come to terms with the distinctions between contemporary art history and criticism. While *Contemporary Art: 1989 to the Present* originated in the academy—one of the main impetuses for this book arose from our experiences in the classroom—it is, most importantly, also intended for artists, curators, critics, and anyone interested in a strongly argued, sustained, and disputatious inquiry into the structures and belief systems of the international contemporary art world.

# THE CONTEMPORARY AND GLOBALIZATION

In the middle of the twentieth century there was much art-world excitement regarding “internationalism”—the notion that art might reflect or impact the complex relations between distinct, politically sovereign nations. Greatly accelerated by the geopolitical events of 1989, critical attention has shifted to globalization, a difficult, even slippery term that downplays political powers, emphasizing how the deregulation of trade has largely eroded traditional nation-state boundaries. The forces of globalization—often abstracted away from the specific people, corporations, or governments that occasion its usage—its proponents believe, have promoted an effortless, even naturalized, flow of materials, goods, and services. For globalization’s detractors that “unification” levels local distinctions through processes of acculturation.

**Tim Griffin** argues in his essay “**Worlds Apart: Contemporary Art, Globalization, and the Rise of Biennials**” that globalization is fundamental for understanding how institutional frameworks now shape contemporary art. Certainly, globalization was celebrated in the early to mid-1990s in conjunction with the rise of international biennials. Many curators, critics, and artists believed in the potential of working in interstitial spaces and traveling to and among them. These optimistic attitudes changed with the turn of the millennium, when globalization became something actively to counter both in art and in writing, for reasons ranging from its flattening of difference to multinational corporations’ disregard for human sovereignty and environmental responsibility.

Of late, commentators have focused on the rise of the contemporary, a concept that sits alongside globalization. Like modernism, the contemporary suggests an aesthetic phenomenon that is necessarily global in scope, and for **Terry Smith**, as he outlines in his “**Our’ Contemporaneity?**”, this also represents a historical shift toward a cultural condition that continually reveals new worlds, new senses of being, and ultimately new ways to exist in our collective, yet particularized, time. Modernism arose in fits and starts around the world, and meant different things in different places. The contemporary assumes globalization as its foundational criteria and in a narrow sense describes what it literally means to be with the times. The contemporary speaks less about stylistic concerns (although they are implied) or ideological beliefs (they are still coming to the fore). In the conjunction of globalization and the contemporary we find two central concepts for comprehending on a macro level art production and distribution of the last twenty or so years. The question becomes just how this will be historicized. As **Jean-Philippe Antoine** suggests in his “**The Historicity of the Contemporary is Now!**” a new type of art historical practice is already under way, one which need be reciprocally informed by the work done by artists who assume the role of historian.



## Worlds Apart: Contemporary Art, Globalization, and the Rise of Biennials

*Tim Griffin*

If art is necessarily bound up with its institutions—in other words, made legible as “art” only through and within its various apparatuses of production, display, and circulation, in addition to its discourses—then nothing is so crucial to our conception of contemporary art as globalization. Yet this is only to suggest that nothing else is so implicated in art’s dense weaving (or even dissolution) into the broader cultural field today.

To explain, *globalization*, utilized as a term in recent economic and political theory, often pertains to, in the words of Fredric Jameson, “the sense of an immense enlargement of world communication, as well as of a horizon of a world market.”<sup>1</sup> Within artistic circles, the word has been used more specifically to describe an exponentially increased audience for (and financing of) contemporary art, attended by a radical proliferation of public and private museums and exhibitions throughout the world and, further, an expanded and ever-more rapid travel network and exchange of information among constituents of art on all points of the compass. (To illustrate this point simply with a hypothetical example: A work produced and debuted in São Paulo, Brazil, can be purchased in the artist’s studio by a committee of visiting trustees from a major institution in New York, where the piece is placed on view within the next month for tens of thousands of both local audiences and tourists from dozens of countries.) Precisely such circumstances, however, demand that art be seen in correspondence with the larger context of a world shaped principally by the forces and flows of global capital.<sup>2</sup> For amid a postindustrial landscape it becomes clear, as put succinctly by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri in their benchmark volume on globalism, *Empire* (2000), that “the economic, the political, and the cultural increasingly overlap and invest one another.”<sup>3</sup> Rather than imagining that art can be placed at an idealistic remove from these societal shifts, we arrive at a better grasp of art’s real contours—or better, of art’s institutions—by examining just to what degree it is steeped in those shifts. And nowhere in art is such an examination so possible or sustained—or so telling of both contemporary art’s predicament and potential, or of its waning and waxing singularity within the greater field of culture—as among biennials of the past twenty

years. In fact, in order to grasp the conditions for art-making today fully, one begins most productively with a consideration of their historical development and implications.

Arguing as much is partly to posit a crossing of two postwar trajectories: First, of art and its various models of critique; and, second, of socio-economic currents destabilizing nation-states and their ideological bases world-round. If in the 1960s, minimalist sculptors implicated the viewer's body in their work, capitalizing on a phenomenological experience of the object in space, the following decade—in the wake of such artists as Daniel Buren calling for a sustained exploration of art's "formal and cultural limits"—would see the rise of institutional critique and its efforts to disavow any sense of art's autonomy: The notion of any display space or viewer that was objective or, more precisely, independent of social matrices of class, race, gender, and sexuality (Dan Asher, Sherrie Levine, Martha Rosler, Mierle Laderman Ukeles).<sup>4</sup> By the 1980s, such engagements were extended by artists (Group Material, Hans Haacke, Christian Philipp Müller) to those social and economic terms and conditions that made any institution itself possible, with these artists' critical intention still being, to cite art historian Miwon Kwon's signal text "One Place After Another" regarding early iterations of *specificity* in art, to "decode and/or recode the institutional conventions so as to expose their hidden yet motivated operations—to reveal the ways in which institutions mold art's meaning to modulate its cultural and economic value, and to ... [make] apparent [art's] imbricated relationship to the broader socioeconomic and political processes of the day."<sup>5</sup>

Such a longstanding mission, often undertaken in the immediate context of the museum, would only have been amplified in the face of such political developments in 1989 as the fall of the Berlin Wall, the end of apartheid in South Africa, and the execution of pro-democracy demonstrators in China's Tiananmen Square. While artists in previous decades might have wanted audiences to interrogate conditions of viewership and of art's relationship with culture more generally, here were world-historical events forcing a mass reconsideration of ideology, of subjectivity and subjecthood, and of national and postcolonial identity (and even of the terms East and West, North and South)—all of which were already being eroded or challenged by widening forces of commerce and technology. In fact, if artists were, as Kwon has also noted in her essay, already being prompted by the trajectory of institutional critique to move outside the conventional realm of art—relocating their practices in the discursive framework of any site they chose, and steeping their art-making in research and, moreover,

in other disciplines, from anthropology to archaeology and so on—such endeavors would naturally gravitate toward the suddenly recalibrated coordinates of contemporary society. As curator Okwui Enwezor aptly put it in a brief text written in 2007, the world-historical events of 1989 “spurred a critical appraisal of the conditions of artistic production and of the systems by which such production was legitimated and admitted into the broader field of cultural production,” resulting in a “shift in curatorial language from one whose reference systems belonged to an early twentieth-century modernity to one more attuned to the tendencies of the twenty-first century.”<sup>6</sup> The very ground under the institution of art had shifted; and if the museum was, as an initial object of postwar artistic critique, nevertheless linked to the idea of the modern nation-state, artists and curators alike would now seek alternative discourses and frameworks for their projects.

Numerous biennials provide ample, concrete evidence of such efforts being prompted by such a changing postwar landscape. For instance, the inaugural Johannesburg Biennial, curated by Lorna Ferguson, opened in 1995, just a year after South Africa’s first multiracial elections, in an effort to establish the country as part of a larger global community (a second iteration, curated by Enwezor, was titled “Trade Routes” and explicitly revolved around the theme of globalization). The Gwangju Biennale was created the same year, against the backdrop of South Korea’s first freely-elected government after a decades-long military dictatorship; titled “Beyond the Borders,” its first exhibition aimed to present work reflecting the dissolution of longstanding arbiters of identity, from political ideology to nationality. Further to the West, Manifesta—a self-described roving “European Biennial of Contemporary Art”—began in 1996, taking the fall of the Berlin Wall as a cue for reconsidering a new Europe (in terms of political ideology, economic structures, and novel communication technology) both in its own right and in relationship to the world at large. And, looking back to more than a decade before Manifesta’s creation, we find a precedent for such a multinational scope in the Havana Biennial: Created specifically to highlight artists of the Third World on the global stage (though later iterations of this exhibition would include Asian artists, effectively expanding its purview more generally to non-Western artists) this large-scale exhibition took region, as opposed to country, as its organizing principle.

If all these exhibitions were intended at their respective inceptions to create a stage for art within which audiences could discern a kind of destabilizing of cultural perspective—a redrawing of the societal map, as it were,

that was Copernican in its altering of the terms for center and periphery, and subsequently for object and context—it is still more provocative that most historians and curators contemplating the biennial phenomenon of the past twenty years cite the 1989 Centre Georges Pompidou exhibition *Magiciens de la Terre* as a singular precedent for such investigations. Curated by Jean-Hubert Martin, this exhibition included work from the global “margins” not only to counter museums’—and, more specifically, the Paris Biennial’s—privileging of work produced in Europe and the United States, but also to put into question the very Western ideation of art. (Notably, the Paris Biennial was created in 1959 by André Malraux.) As Martin would say at the time in an interview with art historian Benjamin H. D. Buchloh, “[T]he questions of center and periphery are also related to issues of authorship and oeuvre..., especially since the artist’s role and the object’s function are defined [elsewhere] in an entirely different manner from our European way of thinking.”<sup>7</sup> In turn, the exhibition would feature not only Western artworks by such artists as Nancy Spero and Cildo Meireles but also objects playing unique traditional roles within their specific societies, including a Tibetan Mandela and a Navajo sand painting, among other pieces. While such displays would necessarily ask audiences to view art in the West through the prism of ethnography—effectively denaturalizing art’s place in Western society, prompting an awareness of its stakes in specific societal structures and belief systems, as well as of what Martin would call “the relativity of culture”—they also courted a very great risk.<sup>8</sup> For in presenting installations specially made on the occasion by these various artists—one should note that to say “artists” is not quite accurate here, given the curator’s desire to problematize conventional ideas of art by deploying the anthropological terms of cult and ritual, as evidenced even by the use of “magicians” in his title—the exhibition re-inscribed Western tropes of authorship despite itself and, as a result, of authenticity and originality. The latter aspect, with its troubling historical associations with primitivism and, more specifically, constructions of an “other,” would undermine the exhibition’s supposed mission to subvert any privileged Eurocentric vantage on cultural production throughout the world.

Far from being a closed chapter of curatorial history, *Magiciens de la Terre* therefore has a continuing legacy in exhibition practices today, partly since so many curators have in its wake sought corrective approaches to the problematic of center and periphery, and partly since the core dilemma of that exhibition—of bringing together different cultures only at the peril of re-inscribing neocolonial perspectives—persist even now. Regarding

the former, it is worthwhile to consider the increasing prominence of Martinique-born, postcolonial poet and theoretician Édouard Glissant, particularly in terms of his emphases placed on the recognition of sustaining difference among cultures that are nevertheless being drawn into ever-closer relations. As he would write in 1990:

What we call globalization, which is uniformity from below, the reign of the multinationals, standardization, the unchecked ultra-liberalism of world markets, in my view, is the downside of a prodigious reality, that I call globality. Globality is the unprecedented adventure we are all given to live in a world which, for the first time, in a real and immediate, shattering way, conceives of itself as both multiple and single, and inextricable.<sup>9</sup>

Such a notion of being both “multiple and single” would, in Glissant’s own writing, be developed into a “poetics of relatedness,” whereby “each one must face the density (opacity) of the other. The more the other resists in his thickness or fluidity (without being confined to this), the more expressive his reality, and the more fruitful the interrelating.”<sup>10</sup>

In curatorial practice, then, many large-scale international exhibitions have been conceived in formats designed to create and maintain the quality of opacity, while moving beyond traditional display formats. For instance, Molly Nesbit, Hans-Ulrich Obrist, and Rirkrit Tiravanija’s *Utopia Station*, which debuted as part of the 2003 Venice Biennale, was organized around Glissant’s idea of the “archipelago”—consisting of so many interlinked yet isolated presentations of the project at different points on the globe, unfolding not only in space but also in time.<sup>11</sup> With numerous iterations of the collaborative exhibition happening over the course of many years, few, if any, individuals would ever encounter the project in its entirety. Similarly, Enwezor’s Documenta 11 of 2002 would embrace Glissant’s understanding of *creolité*—a term first used to describe the heterogeneity of the Antilles, given historical interfaces there of European colonialists, indigenous Caribbeans, African ex-slaves, as well as indentured servants from China and East India—while composing a project featuring numerous seminars and conferences at various locations throughout the world in addition to an exhibition in Kassel, Germany, where Documenta takes place every five years.<sup>12</sup> Audiences would be bound not to have seen every aspect of the exhibition and, more important, every conference city—whether Lagos or Mumbai—would be taken as a location with unique, specific concerns and cultures even while they were necessarily imbricated in global discourse

and the forces of globalization more generally. Any artwork placed on view was put forward in the context of this broader discursive landscape and larger thematic.

Such impulses, of course, are bound to create a fair amount of frustration among audiences—particularly as questions of access and accessibility arise. In fact, if, in a 2003 roundtable devoted to considerations of large-scale international exhibitions, artist Yinka Shonibare would note that globalization had created “a fantastic opportunity for visibility” for non-Western artists seeking international recognition, many others have levied criticisms that the conditions of visibility in exhibitions taking up globalization as a theme are subpar at best.<sup>13</sup> Put another way, the impulse toward kinds of opacity in these exhibitions is taken to bespeak privilege—since the formulation of these ideas require a kind of overview only available to the curators themselves—or, perhaps more problematic, obfuscation. In this regard it is worthwhile to consider a reflection from the same roundtable by Francesco Bonami, who, following his 2003 Venice Biennale—for which he invited a number of other curators to organize shows with visions diverging from his own—would note *New York Times* critic Michael Kimmelman’s expressed desire for a smaller show consisting of a “dozen or even a few dozen” artists. Taking exception to this wish, which had been put forward in a review of his Biennale, Bonami argues:

[H]e is dreaming about a museum show—which isn’t what Biennales and Documentas are about. People insist on looking at Documentas and Venice as unified territories, which they are not. Similarly, the concept of globalization is often used to define the world as a unified territory, which it is not. We experience fragmentation in the world, and that’s what these big-scale events should reflect.<sup>14</sup>

Hence, the curator says, his exhibition was inspired in part by architect Rem Koolhaas’s notion of *bigness*, in which a “building is not a building but something else, with a plurality of functions. Similarly, an exhibition, when taken to a certain scale, is no longer an exhibition but a plurality of visions.”<sup>15</sup> A certain cacophony (or even incoherence) is, in other words, necessary if art is to be reflective of its larger cultural context. To seek any streamlined presentation whose organizing principles would be overarching and all-encompassing would be not only to commit an act of bad faith—since objects would be subject to a singular vision, instead of being allowed to