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Abstract

What role do private foundations play in a global contemporary art world? Not-for-profit art foundations presenting site-specific temporary art installations have become established institutions in their own right. This thesis traces the development of these foundations from the 1970s, placing their role within the context of the evolution of contemporary art institutions. My research focuses on Kaldor Public Art Projects as one of the earliest exponents of this form of patronage and support for contemporary art. The thesis examines the history and impact of Kaldor Public Art Projects, from Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s Wrapped Coast (1969), to Thomas Demand’s The Dailies (2012). It explains the motivations behind collector John Kaldor’s early invitations to leading international contemporary artists to travel to Australia to present temporary art projects. The thesis traces the subsequent evolution of the Projects. The thesis argues that consistent with trends in a globalising contemporary art world, Kaldor Public Art Projects became increasingly professionalised, formed embedded relationships with public art museums and was part of the rise of international contemporary art events such as biennales.
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INTRODUCTION

This thesis examines the role of the private foundation presenting temporary art projects by contemporary international artists. What role did private foundations play in the development of a form of artwork that became central to the very notion of contemporary art from the 1990s onwards: installation? The thesis focuses on one of the oldest of these foundations, Kaldor Public Art Projects (KPAP)\(^1\) in order to address this question. An Australian not-for-profit art foundation, it was created in 1969 through the presentation of Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s *Wrapped Coast – One Million Square Feet, Little Bay, Sydney, Australia* (1969).\(^2\) This thesis presents the first critical history of this foundation focusing on the projects it presented between 1969-2012, placing it within a global context, and assessing its role and impact locally and internationally.

This topic is important as it sits at the intersection of three key issues in recent research: the emergence of global – or international – contemporary art; the rise of installation art; and the changing role of patronage and foundations.

SURVEY OF GLOBALIZATION AND CONTEMPORARY ART

In 1989, French curator Jean-Hubert Martin organized the exhibition *Magiciens de la Terre*, presented at the Centre Pompidou in Paris.\(^3\) Including contemporary works by artists from Africa, Asia, North America, and Europe, Martin displayed art by artists from the ‘West’ alongside the same number of artists from the ‘non-West’ in an exhibition that aimed to exhibit and install art and artifacts in a new, non-hierarchical, aesthetically driven way. The landmark exhibition was amongst the most controversial of its time.\(^4\) Heralded as ‘the first truly

---

1 Between 1969-2012, Kaldor Public Art Projects changed its name. It began as John Kaldor Art Projects (JKAP), changed to Kaldor Art Projects (KAP), and finally became known as Kaldor Public Art Projects (KPAP). The shift in title and acronym throughout this thesis (JKAP, KAP and KPAP) charts the titular evolution of the foundation at the time of each Art Project.
2 The work will henceforth be referred to as *Wrapped Coast* (1969).
3 Martin was director of the Musée National d’art modern, Paris.
international exhibition of world-wide contemporary art’, the exhibition has been noted as the first global art event. It was seen as a sign of the increasing globalization of contemporary art, particularly within the trend to analyse contemporary art history by considering the history of exhibitions themselves. 

Over the following twenty years, dramatic changes occurred in the creation, circulation and consumption of contemporary art. It mirrored wider developments in the globalized economy with the emergence of increasingly international trade and supply chains and information networks. A globalized contemporary art world was similarly promoted by developments in technology and communications such as the world-wide-web, which fostered global reach and connectedness. Artists, curators, art professionals, collectors and a wider public could follow and be a part of international developments and exhibitions that, in the past, were inaccessible due to distance or lack of contacts across the globe. Cheaper travel and increased mobility also encouraged transnational, cosmopolitan career paths. From the 1990s, the discussion of a ‘global art world’ became widespread through journals, critical writing, and international exhibition reviews. While some found the term problematic, its popular adoption reflected the impact of globalization on the entire art system, and its significance for the discipline of art history.

Mapping Contemporary Art and Culture, 2011, p. 156; while the importance of the exhibition as a precedent was noted in MONA, Theatre of the World, (ex. cat), Museum of Old and New Art, Hobart, Tasmania, 2012.


7 Thomas Friedman’s The World is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century, Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 2005, defines ten ‘flatteners’ that leveled the global playing field: the collapse of the Berlin Wall (11 September 1989); Netscape; Workflow software; Uploading; Outsourcing; Offshoring; Supply-Chainning; Informing (Google and other search engines are prime examples); ‘the Steroids’ (wireless, voice over internet and file sharing); and personal digital devices.


Charlotte Bydler’s PhD thesis and subsequent book, *The Global Art World inc*, mapped the transformations of the institutional, economic and social structures of an internationalized, urban, art world.\(^{10}\) Hans Belting and Paul Weibel’s publications under the Global Art and the Museum (GAM) series included essays by arts professionals, curators, artists and critics from around the globe that critically examined the effects of globalization, mass media, and new technologies on contemporary visual art.\(^{11}\) Belting and Buddensieg’s 2009 *The Global Art World* focused on how the challenges of globalization affected art institutions, analyzing the museum as a site of contest.\(^{12}\) *Global Studies: Mapping Contemporary Art and Culture*, 2011, the third book in the GAM series, provided a further set of case studies of globalized art museums, biennials, and art markets, and their complex political, economic and social frame.\(^{13}\)

Global versus local is a subject that has long engaged Australian artists, art historians and academics. In the 1970s, essays by Terry Smith and Ian Burn, members of *Art and Language*, showed their concern about the power of New York, about Australia’s dependency, and about the problems of translating cultures.\(^{14}\) Terry Smith’s *Artforum* essay of 1974 ‘The Provincialism Problem’ positioned the argument within a political rather than aesthetic context.\(^{15}\) Commissioned by a New York magazine, though written by an Australian critic and academic, Smith argued that the problem applied both to American artistic communities beyond the artistic centre of New York as well as to artists living in more remote parts of the world, like Australia.

The international phenomenon of Postmodernity also played a role in promoting global perspectives. The cross-cultural, international image scavenging adopted by artists identified with this style enabled the simultaneous breaking up (and down) of the idea of boundaries.\(^{16}\)


\(^{11}\) Global Art and the Museum (GAM), as a project of SKM, Center for Art and Media in Karlsruhe, directed by artist, curator and theorist Peter Weibel, and curated by art historian Hans Belting.


\(^{16}\) For a discussion of Imants Tiller’s use of appropriation, see below p. 189.
Postmodernist critique, Postcolonial theory and cultural identity were key themes within critical writing on contemporary art from the 1980s. In Australia, art magazines including *Art & Text*, *Tension*, *Pataphysics* and later *World Art* discussed these local developments within a broader, international frame. In the 1990s, as the label ‘global art’ gained currency, the term ‘international art’ acquired connotations that encompassed the concerns of post-colonial theory. *Documenta*, in Kassel, Germany, the most important international exhibition of its kind, reflected these shifts, as part of the globalization of the contemporary art world. More recently, Australian-born, Oxford-based academic Anthony Gardner’s essay, ‘Whither the Postcolonial’ in *Global Studies* (2011), reasserted postcolonial analysis, while acknowledging that the term encompassed a range of responses to specific local conditions and histories. Gardner adopted the term ‘transcultural’ to reflect how ideas of origin and location took on a different meaning, as artists born in one country lived in another and worked in others again – through residency programs and participation in international biennales. As Nikos Papastergiadis noted, although globalization was increasingly identified as a threat, the desire by artists to stage open conversations between the local and the global emerged as a core aim. The local took on new currency in this global frame. Postcolonial, or cosmopolitanist discourse offered one approach to the discussion of these wider trends in contemporary art. Terry Smith’s *What is Contemporary Art*? (2009) and *Contemporary Art: World Currents* (2011) offered a new art historical approach to

17 For a discussion of *Art & Text*, see below, p. 190. For an introduction to the Melbourne-based visual art, design and music magazine, *Tension*, see the interview between creators Terence Hogan and Ashley Crawford, ‘Tension’, *Meanjin*, Vol. 69, Issue 4, Summer 2010, p. 43-44, though detailed research on the role and significance of *Tension, World Art* and *Pataphysics* is yet to be undertaken. For a local audience, their significance was reflected by their inclusion in the inclusion of Max Delany’s inaugural collection show as recently appointed senior curator, NGV, *Mix Tape 1980s: Appropriation, Subculture, Critical Style*, Ian Potter Centre: NGV A, National Gallery of Victoria, April 2013.


notions of the contemporary and contemporaneity. The biennale exhibition format played a significant role in Smith’s analysis as he drew on extensive travel and first-hand experience engaging with the production and dissemination of contemporary art.

The rise of the biennale exhibition model became a significant marker of the globalization of contemporary art. Extensive writings on the growth of the biennale viewed that phenomenon as one of the major developments in contemporary art since the late 1980s. The globalized biennale circuit affected exhibition formats, the art world economy and the roles of the artist and curator. These large-scale international exhibitions, sometimes referred to as ‘mega-exhibitions’ or ‘biennales’ (though not all took place every two years), differed from typical group shows in art museums, art centres or kunsthalle through their temporality and spectacularity, and in their dispersion over multiple public spaces and institutional sites. In 2000, sociologist and cultural theorist Nikos Papastergiadis noted that artists on this circuit were not only among the most mobile members of society, ‘they are often the outriders of the transformations between the local

---


23 The number of artists, writers, curators, art historians and critics addressing notions of the contemporary and contemporaneity is vast. See for example Smith, What is Contemporary Art?, 2009; What is Contemporary Art?, e-flux journal and Sternberg Press, 2010, with texts by Zdenka Badovinac, Hu Fang, Hal Foster, Boris Groys, Jörg Heiser, Carol Yinghua Lu, Cuauhtémoc Medina, Hans Ulrich Obrist, Raqs Media Collective, Dieter Roelstraete, Martha Rosler, and Jan Verwoert.


and the global. They offered the possibility of links between local art communities and a global contemporary art world, though many did not fulfill this brief.

Many of the early, and most notable examples of biennales, had their origins in contexts of profound political and cultural change, as Elena Filipovic noted in 2005. Documenta emerged at a time of German postwar reconstruction (1955); the Gwangju Biennial with the democratization of South Korea (1995); the short-lived Johannesburg Biennale at the end of South African apartheid (1995); and Manifesta, the European Biennial of Contemporary Art, with the fall of the Berlin Wall (1996). Filipovic reflected that many had used the particularity of their historic, cultural, and geographic situation to define an institutional focus, attempting to represent a local region, host city, or nation, within the context of an international panorama of contemporary art. Nigerian-born Okwui Enwezor’s documenta 11 of 2002 marked a significant shift in the role and potential of the biennale format. It was widely understood to be one of the defining ‘global’ art exhibitions of its time, grappling with its very own contradictions as a globalist enterprise.

The roles of institutional and independent curators evolved alongside the globalization of contemporary art. The increasingly nomadic curators based in international cultural capitals travelled the world to a network of international biennale exhibitions as an established aspect of a global art world. The professionalization of the role of the curator, through university courses and the development of a critical discourse around the redefined term, also responded to the globalization of contemporary art. By the early 2000s, ‘New institutionalism’ had become a


28 Documenta 11 extended beyond the exhibitions traditional one-hundred-day format. It comprised five ‘platforms’ realised on four continents between March 2001 and September 2002. The first four were symposiums held in Vienna and Berlin, New Delhi, St Lucia (West Indies) and Lagos. They engaged distinct communities around themes designed to explore the contemporary in art, politics and society. The exhibition in Kassel was the final ‘platform’ for these ideas, in which Enwezor took up topics that included democracy, truth and reconciliation, creolisation, and the fate of four African cities. See Rex Butler’s interview with Okwui Enwezor: Rex Butler, ‘Curating the World’, *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Art*, Vol 9, No ½, 2008/2008, pp. 14-21.

29 There is extensive material on the shift in the curatorial role in relation to contemporary art. See Reesa Grenberg, Bruce W. Ferguson and Sandy Nairne, *Thinking About Exhibitions*, Routledge, Oxon, U.K., 1996, particularly Part IV, for a series of early essays on the shifting role of the curator, predominantly in institutions; Mika Hannula (ed.), *Stopping the Process*, Contemporary views on art and exhibitions, Nordic Institute for Contemporary Art, Gunnebo Kirjapaísio Oy, Jyväskylä, 1998; Jan Verwoert, *This is Not an exhibition*, on the Practical Ties and Symbolic Differences between the Agency of the Art Institution and the Work of
well-established term. In part driven by a desire to eschew market commodification, the ‘new institution’ and its curatorial exponents placed equal emphasis on the exhibition alongside other related activities that all formed part of the artistic and curatorial frame, such as journals, blogs, and symposia. Curators also often presented exhibitions and projects outside of the traditional art museum modernist ‘white cube’. However, even these curatorial positions ‘institutionalised’. Alex Farquharson, writing in Frieze in 2006, noted that the concept of ‘new institutionalism’ subsequently shifted as a generation of independent curators who had developed an exhibition history outside institutions became directors of centres of contemporary art.

The role of the curator became an increasingly prominent position. As early as 1998, Michael Brenson noted in an article in Art Journal that the ‘curator’s moment’ had arrived. Often no longer employed by the museum, the new breed of independent curator at large, or ‘meta-artist’


Online resources include ONCURATING.org, an independent international web-based journal focussing on questions around curatorial practice and theory supported by the Postgraduate Program in Curating, Institute for Cultural Studies in the Arts (ICS), Zurch University of the Arts, URL: http://www.on-curating.org/; the online and published journal ART LIS: a Contemporary Art Journal, issue 59, Fall 2008 which was subtitled ‘Death of the Curator’ and focused on curatorial issues. It included essays by Jens Hoffmann on the role of the artist as curator/curator as artist; the legacy of curators Harald Szeemann and Walter Hopp; and Nato Thompson’s ‘Curator as Producer’, http://www.artlies.org/article.php?id=1659&issue=59&s=1, accessed May 28, 2012. In February 2012, Gertrude Contemporary also hosted Kate Fowle, Executive Director, Independent Curators International as part of their international residency program. See Kate Fowle, 'New Strategies for mobile institutions and the paracuratorial', Lecture, Ian Potter Museum of Art, University of Melbourne, Tuesday 21 February 2012; and Fowle, ‘Reflective Curating: Generative Practices Today’, Artpace, Sydney, 23 February 2012, in which she looked at the move from the international biennale that boomed as an exhibition form in the 1990s, and has now been superseded by new models for curators, artist and institutions to collaborate. See Artpace website, http://www.artpace.org.au/content/public/lectures/23/pdf/Artpace_2012_Intl_Curator_Series.pdf, accessed June 12, 2012.

30 See below p. 20.
(the term John Miller coined to reflect the shifting role in 1992), was generated in large part by the rise of the biennale as the dominant format of a global exhibition business. \[34\] Key curators of the 1990s included Charles Esche, Maria Lind, Nicolas Bourriaud and Jérôme Sans. As Jens Hoffmann noted, their exhibitions offered an alternative to the thematised exhibitions that had first been developed by Harald Szeemann (1933-2005), and later by his protégé, Hans-Ulrich Obrist. \[35\] Instead, the late 1990s supported the idea of curatorial ‘authorship’, in which curators became makers or auteurs. \[36\] The role of ‘curator’ had moved way beyond traditional meanings of the term as a person who undertook research and cared for a collection of objects in their keeping. It had also superseded the role later developed by Harald Szeemann in the early 1970s, \[37\] the curator increasingly acting as an ‘initiator and author of project-based presentations at various institutions’, or beyond. \[38\] Curating began to be discussed as a form of ‘practice’, and Art Curation Masters courses proliferated alongside the graduate practice-based Masters and PhD courses offered to artists by art schools. \[39\] Locally, the University of Melbourne’s Masters in Art Curatorship course was established in 1990 and was one of the first in the field, as Kate Fowle, Executive Director Independent Curators International (ICI), New York, noted in 2012. \[40\]

---


\[37\] For a discussion of Szeemann’s curatorial approach, and his desire to move away from all traditional museological attempts to classify and order cultural material as in the past, see Szennm section below, p. 151.

\[38\] See below p. 151. Alex Coles suggested that this model had its antecedents in the role that curator Lawrence Alloway played in the UK’s the ‘Independent Group’, a group of artists, critics, architects and designers who used the Institute of Contemporary Art (ICA) as their base in the 1950s. See Alex Coles, ‘Curating: Then and Now’, Art Monthly, No. 275, April 2004, pp. 1-4.


Literature on the subject to date has largely focused on courses in the northern hemisphere. As Nicola Trezzi noted in an article in *Flash Art* in 2010, if the 2000s were to be remembered for the rise of the art fair, the preceding decade of the 1990s should be remembered as the decade of the biennale, and as such, ‘the decade of curating.’ Curating had become an art in its own right, as curators acted as artists, and shows functioned like complex works. In response, artists increasingly adopted (and subverted) this increasingly powerful role.

As part of a globalized contemporary art world, an international group of high-profile collectors of contemporary art also became increasingly visible. While they had similar motivations for collecting as in the past, they forged much closer working relationships with art institutions – from the public art museum, to the international biennale. High profile contemporary collectors and their collections became part of a global network of artists, curators, writers, art museum directors, and other collectors with similar interests. Their increasingly visible role was reflected in their prominence in the equivalent of newspaper ‘society pages’, such as the reviews and updates from global art world events featured in *Artforum*’s ‘Scene & Herd’. The private collector’s acquisition of key installation works of art museum quality and scale by signature artists within the globalized world denoted a collector’s expertise, insider knowledge and

---


43 Maurizio Cattelan responded to the proliferation of biennales and foundations through a number of key projects. In 1992 Cattelan established the Oblomov Foundation, inviting patrons to donate money to endow a fellowship for a young artist, on the condition that they did not show work for one year. The donors’ names were engraved on a glass plaque that Cattelan affixed (without permission) to the façade of Milan’s L’Accademia di belle arti di Brera. No-one accepted the fellowship, and in 1993 Cattelan used the money to finance his move to New York. In the same year, he sublet his space in the Venice Biennale to an advertising agency, who erected a billboard advertising perfume. In 2000 Cattelan created the fictitious 6th Caribbean Biennial (2000), inviting artists to travel to the exotic location, document and publicise the event, though no exhibition took place. See Nancy Spector, *Maurizio Cattelan: All*, (ex. cat.), Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York, 2011.


44 See discussion below p. 25.
networks. Private funds, unfettered by art museum bureaucracy, and an ability to make a decision fast gave private collectors an edge. Private foundations became a vehicle for acquiring and presenting these forms of contemporary art.

Some drew links between the rise of neoliberalism as a political philosophy, and the heightened role of private collectors and foundations relative to public institutions in the funding and exhibition of contemporary art. The key elements of neoliberal philosophy were free international trade (facilitated by reduced tariffs and restrictions on direct foreign investment), deregulated markets (particularly financial markets) and the privatization of government activities such as banking, transport and utilities. The explosion of private foundations was part of this trend. With its roots in the reformulation of classical economic liberalism after the Great Depression and Second World War, neoliberalism acquired negative overtones when used to describe the economic shifts in the contemporary art world. Neoliberalism was widely adopted as a term by artists, curators, art historians and critics in reference to developments in the contemporary art world from the 1990s. The growth of private foundations carrying out roles that elsewhere may have been part of the province of public art institutions could be seen as consistent with the neoliberal trend towards privatization of previously public functions; while the international reach of these foundations also merited comparison with the neoliberal push to deregulate multi-national corporations operating across national borders. Julian Stallabrass went so far as to argue that contemporary art acquired a ‘core function as a propagandist of neo-liberal values’, as corporate and state power used the institutions and conventions of contemporary art to calibrate art’s social functions to the needs of the new world order.


46 See discussion below p. 27.


Political philosophy – let alone political proselythising – was probably not an explicit consideration for many contemporary art collectors or foundations. In the 1980s and 1990s, foundations supporting new forms of contemporary art that might otherwise have been publically funded (assuming that there was public funding for these kinds of projects, and institutional spaces in which to show them) had some factors in common with the privatization of other government functions. In contrast with the archetypal neoliberal privatization of previously public activity, however, foundations sometimes funded activities that were new at the time though they may subsequently have become part of the core activities of public institutions. Foundations were able to support and fund projects that, without such support, might not have taken place in that form. Private foundations had the potential to increase leverage, and contribute valuable funds and/or support. The initiative of private foundations offered a means to circumvent obstacles such as the bureaucratic, and non-guaranteed processes of government support.

THE RISE OF INSTALLATION ART

This globalization of contemporary art mirrored economic globalization. It was embraced or actively rejected by critical theory. It was manifested in the rise of biennales and the emergence of groups of international artists with a global currency, ‘nomadic’ curators, and collectors of contemporary art. Installation works, often large in scale, often ephemeral, often constructed for a specific site beyond the conventional art gallery white cube, were both prominent and widespread in contemporary art by the early 1990s.\(^50\) Claire Bishop has traced the emergence of such works from early 20\(^{th}\) century antecedents such as Kurt Schwitters’ *Merzbau* (c. 1932); through the ‘happenings’ and ‘environments’ of the late 1950s and 1960s, and the installation works of artists such Allan Kaprow and Claes Oldenburg; to their proliferation in the 1990s.\(^51\)

By the 1990s, such artists’ projects were widespread as part of biennales: both within institutional programs and exhibitions, and as site-specific, stand-alone projects, often in out of the way and unexpected locations. They were frequently ambitious, large-scale, cinematic and spectacular. They were often socially engaged, participatory, and experiential. They were regularly site-


specific. As temporary works, their enduring impact depended on becoming part of a wider cultural memory.

Bishop’s 2005 primer, *Installation Art*, published by Tate Publishing, signaled the widespread acceptance of these forms of art into the canon of contemporary art. Three years later, Boris Groys could argue that installation was the ‘leading art form’ of contemporary art even if, as Groys suggested, installation was frequently denied the status of a specific art form because it incorporated a range of media, in which the space itself became a material part of the work.

The rise of installation art was a timely development. Institutions were often engaging contemporary art audiences that were larger and more diverse than ever before. The ambitious and spectacular nature of many installations, both within and outside the institutional frame, offered a new form of engagement with an artform that sat equally well within and beyond an institutional context. Audience participation naturally became a key element of these immersive installations. The temporal aspect of these works, their relationship to site, and their demand of a physical participation by the audience that implicitly required the viewer to reconsider artistic production and presentation of contemporary art has been widely discussed. The art of installation, Groys suggested, was presented with the intention of reordering memories, proposing new criteria for telling stories, and differentiating between past and future. This form of contemporary art was able to privatize the public space of the exhibition. The critical writing of Groys and Bishop offered new approaches to understanding installation art, and by definition, more current meanings of public art.

---


56 Groys suggested that the enclosed space of the installation can transform into ‘a platform for public discussion, democratic practice, communication, networking, education’, and more. Groys, ‘Politics of Installation’, *e-flux journal*, 2009, p. 4.

57 Tom Eccles, in his essay in *Plop, Recent Projects of the Public Art Fund*, Merrell Publishers, London and New York, 2004, and Mel Gooding, in his introductory essay for *Public Art Space, a decade of Public Art Commissions Agency, 1987-1997*, both reflected on the problematic nature of the term ‘public art’. Gooding suggested that it probably arose because “public art” was seen as object art, and so commissioners and artists alike (unconsciously) regarded public spaces as an extension of museum space, seeking
Social engagement

The participatory aspect of these immersive installations – gained by first-hand experience – was a pivotal element of audience engagement. Irit Rogoff defined participation as a form of ‘complicit encounter’ between artist and audience.58 She described the complicity as working on a number of different levels: the collusion with artist and institution, creating the context or situation to enable a work; the collusion with tropes and narrative structure, and modes of representation and language; and the collusion with the site and location.59

French art critic and curator Nicolas Bourriaud discussed this engagement with audiences and publics, coining the term ‘relational aesthetics’ in his catalogue essay accompanying his 1996 exhibition *Traffic*, presented at the CAPC Musee d’art contemporain de Bordeaux. He further developed his theme in his influential book, *Esthétique relationnelle (Relational Aesthetics)*, a series of essays first published in French in 1998 and translated into English in 2002.60 Bourriaud used the term to describe collaborative and socially engaged art of the 1990s that aimed to reveal the perceived and hidden structures of power.61 Art that encouraged social interaction among its participants and viewers offered a tangible aesthetic alternative to some of the effects of globalization, such as increased social fragmentation, isolation, and increasing dependence on new technology. It offered a form of art that did not appear to be market led. Artists including Vanessa Beecroft, Philippe Parreno, Rikrit Tiravanija, Pierre Huyghe, Liam Gillick, Carsten Holler and Dominique Gonzales-Foerster were all prominently included in Bourriaud’s list.62 These artists and others developed a process-based and socially engaged art that offered a form of counter-spectacle, a solution to the atomization of communities as Claire Bishop noted in a sympathetic settings for work that was primarily within the established discourses of modernism and postmodernism. See Gooding, *Public Art Space*, Merrell Holberton, London, 1998.


62 Tiravanija, Parreno, Gillick, Holler, Gonzalez-Foerster and Huyghe were all included in Bourriaud’s exhibition *Traffic* (1996).
2007.\textsuperscript{53} Relationality became a common factor, as the work of these artists increasingly featured in large-scale temporary exhibitions and international biennales.

For Bourriaud, the role of the curator, and the institution, had also changed. Bourriaud argued that processes of engagement and intervention needed interlocutors, thus the role of the curator or commissioner as mediator became vital, as was the role of the institution to initiate these debates. In his role as co-Director of the Palais de Tokyo in Paris, Bourriaud proposed that the institution was ‘to be a sort of interdisciplinary \textit{kunstverein} – more laboratory than museum’, presenting art that was both exploratory and participatory.\textsuperscript{64} Aspects of many of the projects also took place beyond the gallery walls. Claire Bishop agreed, noting that this new approach to the institution recontextualised the ‘white cube’ model for displaying contemporary art, instead offering a studio or experimental ‘laboratory’ site.\textsuperscript{65} For the Palais de Tokyo and the Baltic Centre for Contemporary Art, Gateshead, laboratory-forms of exhibition-making became a signature curatorial style. Its most notable curatorial exponents included Bourriaud, Maria Lind, Hans Ulrich-Obrist, and Hou Hanru. However, Bishop argued, that project-based works in progress and artists-in-residence ‘began to dovetail with an “experience economy”’, replacing commodifiable goods with scripted and staged personal experiences and events.\textsuperscript{66} The laboratory style exhibition became equally marketable as spaces of leisure and entertainment. Many of the same artists discussed by Bourriaud also fell within Bishop’s critical writings on installation art.

Hal Foster’s 1996 essay ‘The Artist as Ethnographer’ also became a canonical text for discussing social engagement. In it, he proposed that artists could be self-reflexive ethnographers whose work highlighted cultural and representational practices, and explored the very problems involved in raising such issues.\textsuperscript{67} He added a note of caution in relation to the evolving nature of the museum, reflecting that ‘the institution may overshadow the work that it otherwise highlights: it


\textsuperscript{64} Bennett Simpson, ‘Public Relations: Bennett Simpson talks with Nicolas Bourriaud’, \textit{Artforum}, April 2011, p. 48.


becomes the spectacle, it collects the cultural capital, and the director-curator becomes the star.\textsuperscript{68} Further developing Foster’s ideas, Anthony Downey questioned what was meant by social or collaborative artworks, who the publics were, and what were the ethical implications of engaging others in works of art of this kind.\textsuperscript{69} Artists themselves often preferred the term ‘critically engaged’.\textsuperscript{70}

From 2004, Claire Bishop, Liam Gillick, Grant Kester and others continued to argue the parameters of the term.\textsuperscript{71} Bishop’s essay ‘Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics’, \textit{October} (2004), and Liam Gillick’s responses reflected the heated nature that the debate could elicit between artist and academic/critic.\textsuperscript{72} In 2004, Grant Kester offered another perspective in his book \textit{Conversation Pieces. Community and Communication in Modern art.}\textsuperscript{73} Eschewing the art of artists he described as ‘biennale-circuit stalwarts’ he focused on more overtly activist, but less visible groups.\textsuperscript{74} Kester suggested that different forms of engagement were defined by their ability to break down conventional distinctions between artist, artwork and audience, while engagement required the viewer to ‘speak back’ to the artist in certain ways, and in turn, the reply became part of the work itself. \textit{Participation} (2006), a book edited by Bishop, and part of a series of publications by the Whitechapel Gallery and MIT Press, offered a canonical compendium of socially-engaged


\textsuperscript{70} Artist Patrick Pound, Board member of West Space, noted the shift in terminology depended on institution: art institutions and biennales tended to refer to ‘socially engaged’ art; whereas the dominant rhetoric of Artist Run Spaces (ARIs) was ‘critically engaged’. ‘If social engagement implied widescale participation by many publics through projects that are externally focused, apparently political and relevant beyond the art world, ‘critical engagement’ implied a small, highly engaged, possibly self-referential audience of experts and makers. Conversation with Patrick Pound, Melbourne, December 4, 2012.


\textsuperscript{74} In his ‘Response to Claire Bishop’, \textit{Artforum}, 2006, Kester used the term ‘biennale-circuit stalwarts’ in relation to Rirkrit Tiravanija, Thomas Hirschhorn and Santiago Sierra, in contrast to groups such as Ala Plastica, Park Fiction and Platform. See Bishop, ‘The Social Turn’, \textit{Artforum}, 2006, and Kester, ‘Response to Claire Bishop “Another Turn”’, \textit{Artforum}, May 2006.
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Theoretical texts, artists’ writings, and critical and curatorial reflections on the theme.\textsuperscript{75} The debate, however, continued. Grant Kester’s book \textit{The One and the Many, Contemporary Collaborative art in a Global Context} (2011) and Bishop’s \textit{Artificial Hells, Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship} (2012), ensured that these topics remained central to wider discussions of contemporary art.\textsuperscript{76} In \textit{One and the Many: Contemporary Collaborative Art in a Global Context} (2011), Kester argued that the quality and depth of local engagement should be paramount, criticizing the ‘EU art’ often presented by art foundations or biennales as lacking true engagement.\textsuperscript{77} Bishop, in contrast, argued that aesthetic considerations remain vital even to the political success of such art.\textsuperscript{78} Whatever viewpoint was adopted, social engagement had clearly become a mainstream doctrine inside and beyond the white cube.

\textbf{Site-specificity}

Social engagement was often embodied in works presented outside gallery walls, which in turn were often responding specifically to a particular site. Artists working in this way were also able to reveal local buildings and sites in locations that were easy to overlook or to bypass. Site-specificity implied a degree of engagement with context, environment and local history that often differed from the history of modernist public art that preceded it. The term suggested empathy with locale, and a desire to uncover or reveal a range of social and cultural relations that might otherwise not have been apparent.\textsuperscript{79}

Miwon Kwon’s scholarly research, first published in 1997, mapped out the expanding notions of site-specificity in art practices over the last forty years: both within and beyond the institution.\textsuperscript{80} Her subsequent book, \textit{One place after another: site-specific art and locational identity} (2002), became the

\textsuperscript{75} See Claire Bishop (ed.), \textit{Participation}, Whitechapel, London and The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2006. Included are a selection of historic theoretical frameworks through which to consider participation; artist’s writings, reflecting a range of approaches to the documentation and analysis of projects that are often elusive and ephemeral; and a selection of recent curatorial and critical writings from the 1990s and beyond.


\textsuperscript{77} Kester, \textit{The One and the Many}, 2011.

\textsuperscript{78} Bishop, \textit{Artificial Hells}, 2012.


definitive text on the subject. Tracing the genealogy of site-specificity through the 1970s and 1980s, Kwon suggested that as artists and curators became increasingly informed by a broader range of disciplines – which included anthropology, sociology, literary criticism, psychology, natural and cultural histories, architecture and urbanism, political theory and philosophy – ‘so our understanding of site has shifted from a fixed, physical location to somewhere or something constituted through social, economic, cultural and political processes.’ Kwon proposed that institutional interest in this form of site-specific practice created demand for an increasing number of artists who adopted a nomadic form of working, producing works in various cities throughout the cosmopolitan art world. Jane Rendell built on Kwon’s work in this area, developing a framework to discuss the inter-relationship of site, architecture and art, while others approached it from the position of the artist and curator. It led, as Charlotte Bydler articulated in 2004, to a highly visible and mobile group of international artists and curators, often working from the cultural capitals of New York or Europe, who travelled the world and presented art and exhibitions in a range of increasingly exotic locations around the globe. The biennale model offered an ideal opportunity for this kind of work.

In 2005, artists Tacita Dean and Jeremy Millar’s Place, published by Thames & Hudson, offered a virtually curated exhibition explaining the idea of site specificity, ironically presented in book form. Works were divided into eight ‘rooms’, under the titles of Urban, Nature, Fantastic, Myth/History, Politics/Control, Territories, Itinerancy, Heterotopias and Non-places, and included projects such as Jeremy Deller’s The Battle of Orgreave (2001), which had been commissioned by the not-for-profit art organization Artangel. Reflecting on each of the themes and chosen works, the publication was less a critical text than a curated exhibition in book form conceived by two artists. There were notable omissions, including the immersive installations

82 Kwon, One Place After Another, 2002, pp. 3-4.
83 Kwon, One place after another, 2002, p. 46.
87 Tacita Dean has presented a number of curated projects and writings as part of her art. See Dean, An Aside, An exhibition selected by Tacita Dean, (ex. cat.). A National Touring Exhibition organized by the Hayward Gallery in collaboration with Camden Arts Centre, London, for Arts Council England, Hayward Gallery Publishing, London, 2005.
of Mike Nelson, but the book did not attempt to be comprehensive or encyclopedic. It illustrated, instead, the diverse forms of installation art, and demonstrated how many works of the previous decade had responded to place and location.

The emerging importance of site-specific art that was often socially engaged was reinforced by the publication of *Situation*, edited by Claire Doherty in 2009, and published as part of the Whitechapel and MIT Press series, Documents of Contemporary Art. This series of volumes focused on specific subjects that reflected key trends in international contemporary art. As with Bishop’s earlier *Participation* (2006) in the same series, *Situation* collected texts by artists, writers, curators and critics offering a theoretical and artistic frame for the role and function of site and location. It too underscored the dominant role that discussions around site-specificity had come to play in contemporary art. Temporary installations remained a dominant form. Hal Foster added a note of caution about site-specificity in his 2011 *The Art-Architecture Complex*, observing that the indiscriminate use in questionable contexts, had made the term itself become arbitrary.

**Cultural memory**

In part, the success of temporary installation art depended on capturing viewers’ imaginations. Often large-scale, and made for sites that were not gallery spaces, much installation art was ephemeral. If a site-specific work was re-installed elsewhere, then by definition it provided a significantly different experience. The site-specific and temporary nature of these works meant that first-hand experience was increasingly important, and this was progressively reflected in art historical and critical writing.

In her essay in the *Off Limits: 40 Artangel Projects* publication of 2002, surveying forty years of installation art and including key works commissioned by Artangel, Bishop explored the significance of first-hand experiences. She explained how they embedded themselves in wider cultural memory. She wrote exclusively about works that she had personally experienced,

---


89 ‘In architecture no less than in art, the putative extrapolation of a scheme from its site has become a familiar operation; first embraced as a way to avoid the arbitrary, it has become arbitrary in its own way.’ Foster, *Art-Architecture*, 2011, p. 82.

discussing them within a critical frame. These works not only invited a form of activated spectatorship, but also ‘decentred’ the viewer. Unfamiliar locations, truly site-specific works, and destination art that required a form of ‘pilgrimage’ to find the work in often difficult to access locations, all acted to create a heightened sense of anticipation and experience. Bishop called this experience ‘quasi-cinematic’, and noted that the carefully staged and premeditated element of these installations ensured that they were perhaps best described as the ‘experience of experience’. Thus, itinerant and nomadic artists were creating temporary and site-specific art that often no longer existed in any physical form after the period of the exhibition, instead becoming part of collective cultural myths and memories.

Ephemerality also encouraged the artists, curators and institutions to write their own histories. In the absence of objects, art was mediated through professional voices. Often, their histories became primary sources: as a series of documentary images, texts commissioned to support the work, and extensive websites that further extended the reach of projects. Rarely was the historical significance of a work not mediated in some way by its makers. Subsequent writers, artists, historians, or cultural theorists had to rely on secondary texts: newspaper editorials, journal and magazine articles, and interviews with those involved or who experienced the event or artwork. While these were valuable historic documents, they could never replace the physical experience of a work at first-hand. Often this physical absence did not lessen the perceived impact of the original ephemeral art. An object or a person in absentia can take on added magnitude, as we see with those who die young. For projects no longer present, their reputation was mythologized, growing in size, stature, and significance. A project’s very absence aided and abetted its continued significance. The very ephemerality of installation art sometimes contributed to its success in capturing viewers’ imaginations. In the increasingly vast array of off-site installations and temporary projects presented as part of the Venice Biennale, personally experiencing certain ‘must-see’ works denoted insider status in the contemporary art world.

---

91 For a discussion of notions of the decentered viewer, implying a lack of a unified subject founded in Lacan and Mouffe’s Theory of Subjectivity, see Bishop, ‘Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics’, October, 2004, p. 66.

New Institutionalism

New institutionalism emerged from a desire to more actively collaborate with artists, and involve the viewer through a range of activities and events that extended beyond the traditional notion of the gallery space.93 The term had its antecedents in art produced by artists including Marcel Broodthaers and Daniel Buren in Europe, and Michael Asher and Hans Haacke in the US in the 1960s, though it was not defined as such at the time. It grew out of ‘Institutional Critique’, first coined as a term by artists including Andrea Fraser and Fred Wilson, and critics including Benjamin Buchloh in the 1980s.94 John Welchman’s Institutional Critique and after (2006) was a largely essay-based collection on the subject by artists, curators, art historians and critics drawn from the proceedings of a Southern California Consortium of Art Schools conference held in May 2005 at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art.95 In his introduction, John Welchman described the evolution of Institutional Critique from its origins encompassing art museums and galleries, to the inclusion of organisations and activities beyond the gallery space, new curatorial practices, and the art that emerged during the 1990s onwards. More recently, the term has been used to address a wide range of issues such as site-specificity, globalization, and the relation of visual culture to urban and metropolitan environments.96 The shift in terminology from Institutional Critique to New Institutionalism in the early 2000s differentiated these new contemporary art practices and locations from those of the past. The New Institutionalism reflected a desire to create a new experimental and multi-functional approach to curating in which the ‘active’ institutional space evolved again.97

As Charles Esche noted in 2001, the art centre or public space became ‘a space in society for experimentation, questioning and discovery – an active space that became part community-

93 See above p. 7.
94 Andrea Fraser used the term ‘institutional critique’ in a 1985 article on Louise Lawler, ‘In and out of Place’, in Art in America, June 1985, p. 124.
centre, part-laboratory, and part-academy. Artists responded to these opportunities of scale, presenting immersive installations that used the opportunities of site, scale and space created by the rise of unconventional contemporary art spaces, which often put historic buildings to radically new uses. In the 1980s and 1990s, exhibition spaces proliferated in buildings that had once been factories, warehouses, or even part of 19th century transport systems. These spaces lent themselves to the presentation of large-scale, immersive installations.

Among this new generation of art spaces, Glasgow’s Tramway, a venue for contemporary visual and performing art that had been a 19th century tram shed, opened as a centre for contemporary visual and performing art in the late 1980s. Its visual arts program came to prominence in the following decade under the direction of Charles Esche (Visual Arts Director 1993-97). Commissioning and presenting new works by Scottish and international artists, it became one of the more dynamic contemporary visual and performing arts venues in Europe, presenting the work of artists including Christine Borland and Douglas Gordon. Gordon’s 24 Hour Psycho (1993) was commissioned by Tramway, for which he went on to win the Turner Prize in 1996.

Berlin’s Hamburger Bahnhof reopened in November 1996 as "Museum für Gegenwart" (Museum for Contemporary Art), in a building that had been erected in the mid-19th century as one of the first terminal stations of the railway system. Its impressive architecture, with neoclassical façade, grand industrial halls and vast interior spaces, was on a scale beyond most conventional art galleries.

In Great Britain, London’s Tate Modern opened in May 2000 in the former Bankside Power Station. Tate Modern’s Unilever Series commenced that year with a commission by Louise Bourgeois, whose oversized spider and grand spiral staircase inhabited the massive Turbine

---


100 For the significance of this work in Gordon’s subsequent career, see Laura Cumming, ‘It’s awfully light for an elephant …’, *The Guardian*, Sunday 19 November 2006, accessed online, [http://www.guardian.co.uk/artanddesign/2006/nov/19/art](http://www.guardian.co.uk/artanddesign/2006/nov/19/art), October 13, 2012.

The rise of installation art

Hall. In the north of England, Gateshead’s Baltic Centre for Contemporary Art opened in a disused flour-mill on the banks of the River Tyne. The appointment of the Swede Sune Nordgren as its founding director signaled the international ambitions of a new organization in a city that had not previously been on the global contemporary art map. It also marked the transmigratory nature not only of biennale curators, but also of institutional directors.

The Palais de Tokyo, Paris, offered a dedicated space for contemporary art, and was opened at in 2002 under the co-directorship of Nicolas Bourriaud and Jérôme Sans in a building originally constructed for the International Exhibition of Art and Technology in 1937. New purpose-built art spaces were also commissioned during this period, such as Kiasma, Helsinki’s Museum of Contemporary Art, which opened in 1998. It too, rapidly became known for an exhibition program of cutting-edge contemporary art.

A parallel development was the creation of deliberately temporary venues alongside permanent contemporary art museums and galleries. For example, in 2000 the Serpentine Gallery, London, instigated a series of temporary pavilions, designed by leading international architects and artists. Rather than create spaces in which to show art, these temporary spaces were used to hold a range of other activities. More significantly, their status as part of a public institutional program acted as an extension of the notion of contemporary art. Hal Foster, in *The Art-Architecture Complex* (2011) noted the ‘experience economy’ of art-architecture projects of this kind, and drew attention to the economic cost of creating building-sized artworks, and artistically conceived buildings.

---


104 The temporary pavilion program began in 2000 with a commission by Zaha Hadid. Other architects who designed pavilions presented on the Serpentine Gallery’s lawns in Kensington Gardens, in front of the historic tea house building turned gallery, included Daniel Libeskind (2001), Oscar Niemeyer (2003), Rem Koolhaas with Cecil Balmond and Arup (2007), Olafur Eliasson, Cecil Balmond and Kjetil Thorsen (2007), Frank Gehry (2008); and Ai Weiwei and Herzog & de Meuron (2012). In October 2012, Sylvia Lavin suggested pavilion programs originated with P.S.1’s ‘Rooms’ series of projects initiated by Alana Heiss in June 1976, now MoMA’s Young Architects Program. She argued that the form had now reached a state of exhaustion, reflected by the 2012 Serpentine Pavilion conceived by Ai Weiwei and Herzog & de Meuron, in which they chose to entomb half of their structure below ground, and excavate the foundations of all previous Serpentine pavilions. She also discussed Thomas Demand’s *The Dailies* (2012), as a form of art pavement, fusing art and architecture. For the first P.S.1 ‘Rooms’ project, see cover and issue of *Artforum*, October 1976; for a discussion of the contemporary pavilion, see Sylvia Lavin, ‘Vanishing Point, the contemporary pavilion’, *Artforum*, Vol. 51, Issue 2, October 2012, pp. 212-219.

More strategically, these new spaces depended on a mix of large-scale, spectacular, immersive installations that would attract visitors, even if they also needed corporate and philanthropic support to stage them. Projects such as these often emerged from a partnership between corporate industry partners, public funding, and private patronage.

Symbiotic evolution of commissioners and presenters

Large-scale, immersive installations were institutionally and financially attractive for these new spaces, foundations and biennales. They offered an often impressive means of filling the new large-scale gallery spaces. They avoided freight, the artist was usually on hand, and even if the work became part of a collection after the exhibition, the transport and storage were usually the artist’s concern. Local crews could construct the work. A rapport often developed between the imported artist and workers, who were often local artists and students. The scale, the cost, and the temporary nature of these large-scale installations created natural synergies. Usually lacking permanent exhibition spaces themselves, biennales needed the impact of a certain number of immersive installations to fill vast spaces and to differentiate one biennale from those of other years. Within the context of biennales, installations were one form of a rapidly evolving contemporary art landscape. Within art museums and kunsthalles, these immersive works responded to the dramatically scaled venues now available.

Beyond the formal institutional space, some not-for profit art foundations presented temporary installations and projects either within biennales as collateral events, or as stand-alone projects beyond a gallery frame. Fondazione Nicola Trussardi and Thyssen Bornemisza Contemporary (TB21) participated in or presented notable projects in this way. Other not-for-profit organisations, such as Artangel, Public Art Fund and Creative Time, located themselves within particular geographic locations and cities, refining their role, working methodology and artistic focus over time. Certain works became highly visible, were regularly critically acclaimed and

---

106 In an essay discussing the corporatization of museums, Andrea Fraser noted that Bruce Ferguson’s keynote address at the 2000 Banff Curatorial Summit discussed the increasingly large-scale and spectacular forms favoured by museums, which depended on huge investments from dealers, collectors, and even corporations, such as the Tate’s Unilever Series. See Andrea Fraser, ‘A museum is not a business. It is run in an businesseslike fashion.’, in Nina Mommann (ed.), Art and its Institutions, current conflicts, critique and collaborations, Black Dog Publishing, London, 2006, p. 89; first published in Melanie Townsend (ed.), Beyond the Box: Diverging Curatorial Practices, Banff Centre Press, Banff, 2003.

107 See below discussion of Thyssen Bornemisza Contemporary 21 commission of Janet Cardiff A Murder of Crows (2008), as part of the Biennale of Sydney, 2008; and Trussardi Foundation’s participation in the Venice Biennale.
discussed, and even became touchstones for specific art historic moments. These included yBa
generation artists Rachel Whiteread and Michael Landy, whose projects *House* (1993) and *Break
Down* (2001) respectively were both commissioned by a new generation Artangel, UK. Claire
Doherty and Paul O’Neill suggested that the significance of temporal projects such as these lay in
the durational approach adopted for curating public art, or art in the public space.\(^{108}\) For the
commissioning agency, the durational aspect of the cumulative series of projects ‘in place across
time’ was more significant than the duration of any single project. However, ‘despite the fact that
the value of the commissioned events and projects lies in their ability to cohere cumulatively, and
therefore demand some kind of recognition, their potency for gathering temporary constituencies
lies precisely in their ability to surprise and unsettle’.\(^ {109}\) Regardless of the cumulative nature of
curated series of projects, certain works would continue to play a more vital role. The durational,
or cumulative, role of such foundations and organisations in responding to, or leading,
developments in contemporary art has not previously been analysed. Nor has earlier scholarship
analysed their relationship to public institutions. The present study aims to fill that gap.

**SURVEY OF FOUNDATIONS AND PATRONAGE**

Why do private foundations of this sort matter, and where do they sit within the broader frame
of a globalized contemporary art world? Is this form of private patronage part of a wider social
good, or, initiated and directed by private individuals, are they another manifestation of neoliberal
economic trends? Can they have a lasting impact on a developing local cultural landscape, and
how do their activities and ambitions affect the strategic direction of cultural policy of the visual
arts? How do these foundations’ activities engage with broader contemporary art trends? These
are some of the vital questions that this thesis addresses.

\(^ {108}\) Doherty and O’Neill define durational approaches to public art as involving a process of being together for a period of time
with some common objectives, to constitute a new mode of relational, conversational and participatory practice. While many of
the projects commissioned by not-for-profit foundations are not strictly durational in this sense, the idea that they have a
durational curatorial dimension is useful. See Claire Doherty and Paul O’Neill (eds.), *Locating the Producers: Durational Approaches to

\(^ {109}\) Doherty and O’Neill (eds.), *Locating the Producers*, 2011, p. 11.
Collecting

Extensive literature exists on the historic role of patrons, patronage and collecting art since the Renaissance and earlier. The motivations for patrons and collectors of contemporary art from the late 1960s to the present day forms part of this long, and well documented tradition. Three essential motivations can be identified: social status; furthering collateral business interests; and pursuing aesthetic interests. Muensterberger has noted that collecting contributes to a collector’s sense of identity and functions as a source of self-definition. It can also be seen as a means of ordering one’s thoughts through things. Collecting can be perceived as increasing self-worth and social advancement as the collection implies education, cultivation and refinement. The collection of art can be seen as the quintessential ‘positional good’, where its value is a result of the social position it confers. Baekeland has emphasized that collecting can be an extension of a person’s business, enabling them to connect to new networks of people, and to differentiate themselves. In this case, collectors usually rely on experts to suggest artists, and identify potential


works of art.\textsuperscript{115} Baekeland also perceived that collecting involves some form of creative impulse that satisfies an aesthetic need that may not be able to be articulated in a business context.\textsuperscript{116} Whatever the potential motivation, a collection goes further to filling these aims if its items are relatively rare and uncollected by others. Large-scale temporary installations and immersive art – a biennale form of art as it became known – often differed from art made by the same artists and sold through commercial gallery shows. Scale and cost ensured that this form of biennale art remained limited in supply and conferred a unique status.

Art dealers care about the motives of collectors. In part, because the collectors may well affect the future biography of the works they acquire. As Olav Velthuis noted, art dealers make the distinction between collectors who buy for the ‘right’ reasons, and those who buy for the ‘wrong’.\textsuperscript{117} Those who buy for the right reasons, he suggested, are motivated by a love of art: they think about art as an intellectual pursuit, discuss the work, want to meet the artist, follow the gallery in its artistic choices, and have an ongoing interest in the artist’s career. Importantly, they are willing to buy work that is difficult to commodify, such as installations, or performance. In the United States, collectors who have acquired art for the ‘right’ reasons often subsequently donate part of their collection to museums, or – though less common – fund a museum of their own. These gestures offer credibility, or legitimacy to the artists, the collector, the gallery, and works of art. The museum also confers status. And from an economic perspective, the artwork can never again – unless deaccessioned – be considered as a commodity, although with ongoing recognition of the donor, it could remain part of an economy of symbolic goods.\textsuperscript{118}

Becoming a collector offers other social advantages. In 1988, American art critic and poet Carter Ratcliff interviewed the noted American West Coast dealer Irving Blum for a feature article in


\textsuperscript{118} French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu proposed a taxonomy of the economy of symbolic goods that consisted of two different types of hierarchies: ‘large-scale’ production directed at catering to the preexisting demands of a larger audience; and ‘small-scale production meant for an audience mainly consisting of fellow artists, experts, critics, and a limited number of insiders. He also discussed the opposition between the commercial and non-commercial, traditional and avant-garde, or between bourgeois and intellectual art. See Pierre Bourdieu, \textit{The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature}, Polity Press, Cambridge, 1993.
Art in America focusing on Art and Money. Blum pointed to the social advantages to be gained from becoming a collector. A collector, Blum observed, became part of a network of lively people – from artists, curators, writers, and other collectors. ‘One constantly receives requests for visits from people interested in one’s collection. When a collector travels, he plugs into the art network, wherever he goes … It’s a fascinating and highly civilized kind of existence. Art can become the reason for living one’s life.’ The social advantages afforded by the collection of a specific form of art were not only a social milieu shared with like-minded people, but the immediate creation of a far-reaching network (including dealers, art museum directors and curators, and fellow collectors), within which the collector had a clearly identified place.

Gift-giving foundations

Private collecting is often bound up with philanthropy. While there is extensive scholarly literature surrounding gift-giving foundations in the United States, United Kingdom and European contexts, little has been written about ‘operational’ foundations, on which this thesis focuses. Both gift-giving and operational foundations share similarities, and must be considered within the context of wider twenty-first century philanthropic debate. In 2001, in American Foundations: An Investigative History, Mark Dowie suggested that organized philanthropy was on the verge of an evolutionary shift, which would transform America’s nearly 50,000 foundations from covert arbiters of knowledge and culture to overt mediators of public policy and aggressive creators of a new orthodoxy. Should we, he asked, place so much power at the disposal of nondemocratic institutions? The rise of this new generation of philanthropic giving was addressed by Helmut Anheier and Diana Leat, whose 2006 publication, Creative Philanthropy,


noted that some of the most innovative funding was coming from trusts and foundations.\textsuperscript{124} They suggested that this was because foundations can work outside government agendas, can engage with imaginative, knowledgeable and enthusiastic staff and trustees, and they can take risks that governments avoid. However, Anheier and Leat’s work focused largely on grant-making foundations rather than those that run their own programs, and those focusing on the visual art were not extensively addressed.\textsuperscript{125}

In March 2013, American academic Rob Reich expounded on the role of the modern charitable foundation in a lead article in the \textit{Boston Review}, ‘What Are Foundations For?’\textsuperscript{126} Reich noted that the last decade of the twentieth century witnessed the creation of an unprecedented number of both large and small foundations. If Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockerfeller were the epitome of early twentieth century philanthropy in America, Bill Gates and Warren Buffett became the best-known early twenty-first century global philanthropic brands. Reich posed a familiar question that is yet to be widely debated: What is the role of private foundations in society, and do they always work for the public good?

In exploring the role of charitable foundations, Reich argued they were well placed to fund public goods that were under-produced, or not produced at all by either the marketplace or state.\textsuperscript{127} Unlike politicians elected under a democratic system, foundations were free to fund minority, experimental, or controversial public goods that were not favoured by majorities. However, Reich presented a counter view: like Judge Richard Posner, with whose observations he opened the article, Reich noted that they were subject to a number of disquieting trends. They lacked marketplace accountability and transparency; competed neither in capital markets nor in product markets; resulted in a loss of funds that would otherwise be tax revenue; and were not subject to political controls.\textsuperscript{128} While we applaud the initiatives of a wealthy few, we need to assess how successfully they function, and if it is in the best interests of a wider public good. The

\textsuperscript{124} Not-for-profit, or charitable foundations are often given different titles or nomenclatures in different countries. For a discussion of terms see Anheier, \& Leat, \textit{Creative Philanthropy}, 2006.


\textsuperscript{127} Reich, ‘What are Foundations For?’, \textit{Boston Review}, 2013. The article was drawn from academic research Reich has been leading at the Center of Philanthropy and Civil Society, Stanford University.

\textsuperscript{128} Reich, ‘What are Foundations For?’, \textit{Boston Review}, 2013.
considerable private assets of the modern charitable foundation – and its creator – Reich suggested, give it considerable public power.

What impact did the explosion of charitable foundations have on the visual arts? Even within the literature on gift-giving foundations, references to the visual arts, and in particular to contemporary art, are scant. Paul Glinkowski’s *Good Foundations* (2007) offered a useful analysis on the role of trusts and foundations in supporting the artist in the United Kingdom in the 21st century. It included essays by Marjorie Allthorpe-Guyton, Arts Council of England (1993-2006), and Timothy Llewellyn, Director, Henry Moore Foundation (1995-2007). Again, the publication focused on gift-giving foundations.129

In Australia, writing about philanthropy for the visual arts in the 2000s was focused mainly on gift-giving support and was published as reports. Rupert Myer wrote and spoke extensively from a policy perspective in his role as chair of the 2002 *Report of the Contemporary Visual Arts and Craft Inquiry (The Myer Report)*, and as an advocate for philanthropy and the visual arts in his role with the family-run Myer Foundation.130 Reflecting a keen understanding of the challenges faced by the arts and cultural sector in Australia, one of the major findings of the Myer Inquiry was that as a sector, contemporary visual arts ‘was used to, but nonetheless increasingly frustrated by, doing more with less.’131 In 2005, in her foreword to the Commonwealth Report, *Philanthropy, Development and Fundraising in arts/culture and sport: scoping the international environment*, Associate Professor Jennifer Radbourne noted that:

> Philanthropy has never played a great role in the development of the artist in Australia. There has been a natural dependence on government because of two factors: strong role of government in ongoing programs of support, and the lack of skill of many arts organisations generally in how to seek and sustain donors.132

---


132 Australian Government, Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts, *Philanthropy, development and fundraising in arts/culture and sport: scoping the international environment*, prepared by the Centre of Philanthropy and Nonprofit Studies, Queensland University of Technology (QUT), 2005, p. 1.
As part of the Sherman Contemporary Art Foundation’s inaugural forum on philanthropy and contemporary art in 2007, Myer drew on historical precedents of giving to the visual arts, and discussed legal and taxation implications for developing this area. The subsequent publication edited by Terry Smith titled *Contemporary Art + Philanthropy* (2007) included policy, curatorial and museological, art historical, and institutional perspectives on foundations that focus on contemporary art. The forum and publication were the initiative of a not-for-profit foundation, reflecting its desire to better understand the potentially pivotal role that philanthropy could play in the support and development of contemporary art.

**Collecting foundations**

More recently, foundations created by collectors to acquire and present contemporary art have begun to attract popular and critical attention. As early as 1992, in an article in *Art in America*, Eleanor Heartney noted the rise in private foundations in Los Angeles. Almost all were created to acquire contemporary art, much of which was presented in permanent private galleries or public art museums. As many of these West Coast American foundations were initiated in the 1980s, Heartney suggested that one explanation for their proliferation could be explained by the political climate at that time. She proposed that they could variously be seen as a manifestation of a conservative Reganite ideal (which was not exclusively publically spirited), or more altruistically, as a reflection of the L.A. entrepreneurial spirit. All required vast financial endowments, and were not for the average collector. In each case, the founding patron retained

---


135 Heartney’s article features the Weisman Foundation; the Hammer Mseum; the Lannon Foundation; the Broad Foundation; and the Peter Norton Family Collection. Heartney, ‘The New Private Patronage’, *Art in America*, 1992.

a high degree of control over the foundation and their gifts, until the foundation passed to the second generation.

While private art institutions ranged from various forms of the contemporary house museum, to destination art experiences, they were all ultimately variations on the ‘bricks and mortar’ philanthropy that is a well-established, researched and documented model of private collecting.137 In Australia, notable recent examples include the creation of the private Museum of Old and New Art (MONA) by David Walsh in 2011; Lyon Housemuseum, Melbourne, developed by Corbett and Yueji Lyon in the early 2000s, opening in September 2009; and The White Rabbit Collection, founded by Kerr and Judith Neilson in the late 1990s and based in a permanent factory space in a former Rolls-Royce showroom near Sydney’s Central Station.138

Two recent examples of the not-for-profit foundation operating from a permanent gallery space in Australia include the Sherman Contemporary Art Foundation (SCAF), in Sydney, and Detached, in Hobart, Tasmania. SCAF was initiated by Dr Gene Sherman, previously Director of Sherman Galleries, a Sydney commercial gallery. The Foundation became operational in 2008. It focused on contemporary art from the Asia-Pacific region. SCAF’s first project was a new work by Ai Weiwei in the recently refurbished Sherman Galleries space in Paddington, coinciding with an exhibition curated by Dr Charles Merewether, *Ai Weiwei: Under Construction* (2008), at the Campbelltown Arts Centre.139 SCAF subsequently presented a series of temporary projects, usually in its permanent gallery space at Five Ways in Paddington.

Detached was initiated by Penny Clive and also opened to the public in 2008.140 It was a privately funded, not-for-profit organization that presented a series of changing exhibitions inside a restored shell of an historic church within the arts precinct of Hobart. Detached’s first project


was an exhibition by Mike Parr, *The Tilted Stage* (2008), curated by Anthony Bond, Assistant Director and Head Curator, International Art, Art Gallery of New South Wales (AGNSW). A collaboration between the Detached Cultural Foundation and the Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery (TMAG), the exhibition presented performance, drawing, printmaking, film and photography across both venues, and was accompanied by an exhibition catalogue. Since 2008, Detached has presented eight new commissions and exhibitions by Australian and international contemporary artists. The gallery does not open regularly. Its scale and infrequency of programming, meant that it was not a key player in a developing field. While SCAF and Detached offer useful contrasts in an Australian context, permanent gallery spaces resulted in a different role and focus to that of Kaldor Public Art Projects.

**Foundations and temporary art projects**

There is a significant dearth of scholarly writing on operational not-for-profit foundations presenting temporary contemporary art projects both in Australia and globally. The literature documenting the history and projects of key not-for-profit foundations and organisations has largely been commissioned by the not-for-profit foundations themselves. While these publications visually document the unfolding history of each organization, they largely offer a non-critical, partisan view. Since 2000, Artangel, Public Art Fund, Creative Time, Fondazione Nicola Trussardi and Kaldor Public Art Projects have all self-published lavish catalogues documenting their projects with essays and interviews with their creators. Thyssen-Bornemisza Art Contemporary (T-BA 21), while offering publications on specific projects and a substantial catalogue of its contemporary collection, has not yet produced a compendium of its Art Pavilions and major immersive commissions. As with other art foundations, there is extensive existing documentation of KPAP’s projects. While scholars and critics have considered the specific

---


142 During the opening weekend of MONA’s much anticipated exhibition *Theatre of the World* (2012) curated by international curator Jean Hubert Martin, which was programmed to coincide with the opening of the Sydney Biennale in the hope of attracting international visitors, Detached was not open.


projects presented by not-for-profit foundations and organisations discretely, to date, no research has focused on foundations presenting temporary site-specific projects in order to understand their role within a broader contemporary art history.

As has been stated, this thesis aims to begin to fill this gap. It provides an international overview of the history of foundations presenting temporary projects and site-specific installations. The thesis then critically appraises in more detail the history and significance of the art projects presented by Kaldor Public Art Projects within a rapidly changing global art world.

SURVEY OF WRITING ON KALDOR PUBLIC ART PROJECTS

In 1969, John Kaldor presented what was to be the first John Kaldor Art Project. Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s Wrapped Coast – One Million Square Feet, Little Bay, Sydney, Australia (1968-1989) was the first site-specific, temporary art project that can be located inside the emerging trajectory of contemporary art presented in Australia by an individual. Indeed, Kaldor Public Art Projects was one of the first operational foundations in the world to present temporary projects by contemporary artists. While it has been canonized within the history of contemporary art within Australia, a detailed scholarly analysis of KPAP’s role and history is overdue. Its evolution and longevity as part of a global art world makes it an important case study for understanding the changing role of not-for-profit operational foundations in supporting site-specific temporary installations.

Existing literature

The existing literature offers useful descriptions of the projects, with extensive images of the works alongside other related material. Exhibition brochures, artists’ books, or small exhibition catalogues conceived by the artist present primary source material conceived by the artist, such as Gilbert & George’s publications (1973), and Szeemann’s exhibition catalogue, with its hand-written notebook-style (1972). Published by KPAP, publications formed part of the Art Projects, with the exception of projects by Miralda (1973) and by Charlotte Moorman and Nam June Paik (1976). Individual projects presented by John Kaldor have been the focus of

---

145 The work will henceforth be referred to as Wrapped Coast (1969).

Survey of Writing on Kaldor Public Art Projects

newspaper reviews and magazine articles since Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s first John Kaldor Art Project in 1969. Some, such as Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s *Wrapped Coast* (1969), and Gilbert & George’s *Singing Sculpture* (1973) have also been the subject of scholarly research. Projects and images were collated and presented as part of an extensive website that further disseminated information and documentary images of each of the projects since 1969. More extensive exhibition catalogues accompanied exhibitions that contextualized the Art Projects, with works drawn from John Kaldor’s personal collection presented at the Museum of Contemporary Art, Sydney (1995) (MCA) and Art Gallery of South Australia (2003) (AGSA). In 2009, KPAP published an extensive catalogue raisonné to accompany the Art Gallery of New South Wales (AGNSW) exhibition marking forty years of projects.

Critic, curator and noted art historian, Daniel Thomas wrote extensively on the early projects, covering these events in his capacity as critic for local newspapers and weekly magazines. As curator at AGNSW from 1958-1977, Thomas wrote articles about Kaldor, his collection, and his specific projects in *Art & Australia*. Thomas also edited the exhibition catalogue of JKAP’s 1984 *An Australian Accent*. His essay for the publication was significant in locating the project within an international frame, and addressing some of the wider debates with which contemporary Australian artists were engaged. Thomas’s 2009 essay, part of the KPAP publication, *Forty Years: Kaldor Public Art Projects* (2009), was tellingly titled ‘Reminiscing’. Its tone was anecdotal rather than scholarly. Thomas’s role as a scholar, critic and curator enabled him to offer an objective perspective on the significance of the Art Projects, and Kaldor’s role, in a changing Australian cultural context. However, his active involvement in many of the early projects, and advocacy at the time meant that these were not impartial records. Later, Tony Bond, as Associate Director, Curatorial, AGNSW, also wrote extensively on Kaldor’s early role

---

147 For a discussion of Christo and Jeanne-Claude and Gilbert & George, see for example, Charles Green, *The Third Hand: collaborations in art from conceptualism to postmodernism*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 2001.

148 See Thomas in Bibliography.


150 John Kaldor Art Projects, as it was then known.
as a collector and initiator of projects. Bond was closely involved with the generous Kaldor gift to the Gallery, and development of the John Kaldor Family Gallery at AGNSW.

Nicholas Baume also wrote extensively on the history of KPAP projects and John Kaldor’s personal contemporary art collection to that point. Leading up to and coinciding with AGNSW’s exhibition *Chri*sto (1990) that Baume curated in his capacity as curator of John Kaldor’s collection, Baume published articles in *Art & Australia*, *Look* (AGNSW’s Gallery Society magazine), and the *Sydney Morning Herald*. Baume edited the AGNSW’s exhibition catalogue *Chri*sto (1990) that accompanied the exhibition. AGNSW Senior Curator, Tony Bond, and Daniel Thomas also wrote essays for the *Chri*sto catalogue. Tony Bond placed Christo’s wrapped objects and projects within an art historical frame, while Daniel Thomas focused on Christo’s first Australian project, *Wrapped Coast* (1969), which he had experienced at first hand.

Baume’s exhibition, *From Christo and Jeanne-Claude to Jeff Koons: John Kaldor Art Projects & Collection* at the MCA (1995), presented the history of the Art Projects in relation to Kaldor’s personal collection. Baume was curator at the MCA. His essay, titled ‘John Kaldor: Public Patron/Private Collector’, offered the first contextualization of the Art Projects in relation to the Kaldor’s growing interest in and acquisition of conceptual, Minimal and post-sculptural art from Europe and America, though it marked the two activities as separate. Baume’s essay offered a scholarly, and informed at first-hand, art historical approach to a subject with which he had been personally engaged. He discussed the development of a personal collection, the Art Projects as a form of ‘sporadic patronage’, and located these activities within a broader local and international art historical and social frame. Photographs of key artworks and Art Projects, ephemera and other related material also made the catalogue a valuable source. The exhibition coincided with Jeff

---


Koons’ *Puppy*(1995), an Art Project, presented on the forecourt of the MCA. Three years later, a much smaller exhibition catalogue edited by Baume accompanied the MCA Sol LeWitt exhibition and Art Project, *Sol LeWitt: wall pieces* (1998). It included an essay by Baume that located LeWitt’s MCA show within the trajectory of Minimal and Conceptual art, and placed the Art project within the context of his earlier Australian Art Project presented by John Kaldor in 1977. However, it did not offer new insights such as those contained in his 1995 essay.

Much of Baume’s writing on KPAP focused on the significance of Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s *Wrapped Coast*(1969), and subsequent projects were discussed in the light of this first groundbreaking project. Baume’s interview with Kaldor as part of the 2009 *40 Years* publication was titled ‘The Artist as Model’. Baume provided an account of some of the key projects, presenting them alongside Kaldor’s developing collection of contemporary art, and reflected on the possible influences of KPAP on the changing art world. Most significantly, the interview’s title suggested that the role of the artist had always been Kaldor’s inspiration and example, reflected by the close relationships Kaldor had developed with key artists, such as Christo and Jeanne-Claude, and Jeff Koons. In an informal, personal manner, Baume’s interview covered many of the points about which Kaldor often spoke.

An earlier 2003 exhibition catalogue had already emphasized the relationship between Kaldor’s public Art Projects and his personal collection. It also indicated the relationship between public art institutions and the Art Projects. Adam Free’s essay ‘Collection as Biography’, in the exhibition catalogue *Journey To Now, John Kaldor Art Projects and Collection* (2003) that accompanied the self-titled exhibition at the Art Gallery of South Australia (Adelaide) reaffirmed the strong link between Kaldor’s collecting activities and the Art Projects. Again, however, this was not an impartial view, nor did it attempt to critically evaluate the impact of the projects, or their relationship to wider developments in contemporary art either in Australia or overseas.

Sophie Forbat’s 2009 publication for KPAP, *40 Years Kaldor Public Art Projects*, offered a catalogue raisonné of projects between 1969-2009, with extensive documentary images and a selection of

---


other primary material. Alongside Thomas and Baume’s essay and interview, it also included essays by AGNSW Assistant Director (curatorial), Anthony Bond, and international curator and artistic director of Documenta 13 (2012), Carolyn Christov-Bakargiev. In 2011, AGNSW’s publication produced to accompany the opening of the John Kaldor Family Collection at the Art Gallery of New South Wales lavishly documented the collection with both artists’ profiles and catalogue essays, including essays by celebrated novelist David Malouf, London-based art historian David Jaffe, MoMA curator Klaus Biesenbach, Anthony Bond, and an interview between John Kaldor and AGNSW curator Wayne Tunnicliffe.

While useful curatorial research and writing has been undertaken, there has been much mythologising about the significance of KPAP Art Projects within a developing Australian cultural landscape. There remains no scholarly history of the development of KPAP locating it within a broader frame of international philanthropy, contemporary collecting, and the evolving nature of contemporary art.

**Contribution of this thesis to the literature**

My research offers a very different perspective on the cultural, artistic and institutional history of Kaldor Public Art Projects. For the first time, I analyse KPAP within a wider cultural context, both at a local and international level. KPAP played a significant role in presenting some pivotal international works. Thus I have chosen to draw on the experience of the artworks themselves, images of the projects, and other primary material relating to exhibitions and projects that may exist, locating this within an art historical, critical and theoretical, and social and political frame.

My research draws on primary material in the form of exhibitions, art projects, writings, and other published documents. I was fortunate to be able to work extensively on the Kaldor Archive in 2007, consult archives for Artangel in London, Public Art Fund and Creative Time in New York, and the Fondazione Nicola Trussardi in Milan. The research was informed by numerous informal discussions, interviews and conversations with artists, curators, academics.

---

159 See for example Gilbert & George, screenprint for *Underneath the arches*, 1971; NGV opening invitation and newspaper advertisement; the leaflet *A guide to singing sculpture by George & Gilbert the human sculptors*, Art for All, London 1973, Forbat (ed.), *40 Years*, 2009, p. 90.

and critics and collectors of contemporary art who have been directly involved in, or influenced by the areas of my research. Early discussions with John Kaldor about the projects and their impact were useful. However, interviews were not the primary mode of research. Kaldor has given numerous public interviews and lectures about the history of the Art Projects and these are readily available online. Many of those who were involved with Kaldor Public Art Projects over the years have also written and spoken extensively on the subject, as shown in the literature review above. These first-person accounts repeat stories and anecdotes and perpetuate cultural myths. Further interviews were unlikely to add new insights to the existing record. Instead, my approach aims to provide a more distanced view of the artistic and cultural importance of the Art Projects by analyzing the influence of the local and international context on the projects and the influence of the projects on both local and international contemporary art.

My research on Kaldor Public Art Projects is framed within a broader question: what role do private art foundations play within a local and global contemporary art world? It locates Kaldor's background, professional training and mentors, determining their influence on Kaldor's Art Projects. Although there is a research literature on the history of emigré Australians, this has largely focused on the role of artists and architects rather than philanthropists.\(^\text{161}\) This thesis locates Kaldor within that history, assessing the influential role that emigrés played as philanthropists and business people within a developing cultural landscape. I then discuss the evolution of JKAP, presenting a critical analysis of its twenty-five projects that were presented over a forty-three year period until 2012. I examine how the evolution of Australian institutions and Australian culture was affected by globalization and thus how the development of international philanthropic models, institutions, and the development of contemporary art, influenced JKAP's activities. This explains why certain projects were selected, and the extent of their artistic and cultural impact.

This thesis also explains the relationship between Kaldor and a number of major Australian public art institutions, including the AGNSW and the NGV. It explains how and why JKAP

---

evolved as an organization and developed into a professionalised institution, paralleling, in sheer elout, state art museums.

The thesis argues that, as Australian institutions matured and commerce and contemporary art became more global (and similar international foundations proliferated), KPAP was forced to alter the nature of its projects and its institutional structure to maintain its relevance. A full understanding of artistic developments, in addition to an analysis of the artwork, requires historical, psychological, political and institutional context. This is provided in the following chapters.

Chapter Outline

Chapter One describes the global development of institutions that supported many of the most important site-specific temporary art works since the late 1960s. It summarises the history of key not-for-profit foundations involved, the growing involvement of biennales in installation art, and how increasingly major works resulted from their cooperation as foundations presented installation works within a biennale or curated program.

Chapter Two describes and assesses Kaldor’s motivations for creating a private foundation through which he invited leading international contemporary artists to Australia to present site-specific temporary art projects. It investigates what led him to do so: his upbringing, his mentors, the influences on his collecting interests, the Alcorso-Sekers Travelling Scholarship, and parallel developments internationally.

Chapter Three describes the first John Kaldor Art Project (JKAP) Art Project with Christo and Jeanne-Claude in 1969. It investigates its evolution, its impact both in Australia and internationally, and its influence on the future shape of JKAP.

Chapter Four looks at the early projects from 1971 to 1977. It examines how JKAP evolved through these early projects. It argues that their declining influence can be attributed to the development of other Australian arts institutions, such as public art galleries and the Sydney Biennale. It also chronicles how changes in the international contemporary art landscape affected KPAP.

Chapter Five relates the hiatus in JKAP’s history between 1978 and 1994, during which only two projects were presented. It investigates the relative paucity of projects, and why the curatorial models used were not subsequently repeated.
Chapter Six analyses the revival of JKAP between 1995 to 2003. It explains what drove renewed interest in the Art Projects. It investigates how Kaldor’s private collection became publicly paired with the Art Projects.

Chapter Seven addresses the institutionalization of Kaldor Art Projects (KAP) between 2004 to 2012, with the appointment of a management board, international Curatorial Advisory Group, and professional staff. It contends that as the projects became more frequent, certain projects became more conscious of responsiveness to site, and reflected a greater influence of the activities of similar international not-for-profit foundations.

Chapter Eight analyses the overarching trajectory of Kaldor Public Art Projects (KPAP). It summarises the influences on Kaldor's choice of projects, their impact locally and internationally, and how these changed over time. It argues that the projects have consistently been involved with public institutions in Australia, and that these have played a part in the mythologizing of Kaldor’s role within the official narrative of Australian contemporary art.

This detailed analysis of KPAP within a local and global context forms the basis for future exploration of the role of foundations in contemporary international art, particularly their role in the development of site-specific installation art.
Vanessa Beecroft, I’B40 (1999)
Museum of Contemporary Art, Sydney
Photo: Giacco Bertoli
Forbat (ed), 40 Years, 2009, p. 190.
CHAPTER ONE: GLOBAL DEVELOPMENTS

The activities of Kaldor Public Art Projects should be understood in a global context. Not-for-profit organisations and private foundations became more prominent in the contemporary art world, both at an institutional level, and within the wider frame of biennale and temporary art projects. This chapter outlines how, from the 1970s onwards, a number of foundations around the Western world became progressively involved in commissioning and facilitating site-specific temporary installations and projects. Biennales and other art events also promoted such work. From the 1990s, the two trends came together as foundations were increasingly involved in commissioning large-scale site-specific art works as part of biennales and other major art exhibitions. Whether the relationship between artform and organization was causal, responsive or symbiotic, will be explored in this analysis.

FOUNDATIONS AND CONTEMPORARY ART

Early US foundations

The development of not-for-profit foundations and organisations from the 1990s had its antecedents in the establishment of early foundations founded to support contemporary art. A number of non-commercial models evolved in the 1960s to support artists making art then described as ‘post-sculptural’ or Land and Environmental Art.1 Dwan Gallery, a commercial gallery with spaces in Los Angeles, California and later New York, had been actively involved in showing work that encompassed Abstract Expressionism, Nouveaux Réalisme, Minimalism and Land art between 1959 – 1971 in both New York and Los Angeles.2 This art was often unsalable, and required the presence and active involvement of the artist for each realization. American critic and curator Barbara Rose wrote of the non-commercial support for contemporary art and artists of this kind in an article published in Art in America in 1967.3 Rose noted that, at other American institutions, new models for the participation of artists were being


3 Barbara Rose, ‘Shall we have a Renaissance?’, Art in America, New York, March – April, 1967, p. 35.
formed, such as the UCS initiative at Long Beach, California, in 1966. Eight sculptors were paid a stipend, and given materials and technical assistance in return for the works made during this time.4 The economic boom years of the 1960s in the US saw art being purchased at record rates. It bred a new generation of collectors, with new forms of patronage emerging to support the developing forms of art.5 As art and culture attracted a wider audience, other forms of sponsorship and support for contemporary art were actively considered. 6 More experimental artforms were attractive to corporate patrons, representing the innovation these companies hoped to reflect.7 In Europe, the sponsorship of Szeemann’s *When Attitudes Become Form* (1969) by US tobacco corporation Philip Morris indicated a progressive turn to arts patronage.8 More recently, art historian Anna Chave has re-assessed the influence of private patrons on the development of Minimal and post-Minimal American art, contending that they exercised a ‘decisive sway over the course of that art.’9

The best known of these foundations was the Dia Art Foundation, which at various times occupied sites in Chelsea, Manhattan, and Dia: Beacon, in upstate New York. Dia championed a generation of American Minimalist artists from the movement’s inception. In 1974, Heiner Friedrich and his wife, Philippa Pellizzi (née de Menil), with Helen Winkler, founded the Dia Art Foundation in New York.10 Heiress to the Schlumberger oil fortune, Philippa de Menil11 had
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4 Rose, ‘Shall we have a Renaissance?,’ *Art in America*, 1967, p. 35.
9 For a discussion of the spiritualised view of Minimalism and the influence of Count Giuseppe Panza di Biumo and the founders of the Dia Art Foundation, Heiner Friedrich and Philippa Pellizzi (nee de Menil), see Anna Chave, ‘Revaluing Minimalism: Patronage, Aura, and Place,’ *Art Bulletin* 90, No. 3, September 2008, pp. 466-86.
10 Helen Winkler had worked for the Menils and Kimmelman noted that she became Dia’s link with many artists. Winkler and her husband oversaw the construction of De Maria’s *Lightning Field* (1977), New Mexico. For a discussion of the development of key East coast Minimalist works, see Chave, ‘Revaluing Minimalism’, *Art Bulletin*, 2008.
been profoundly influenced by the example of her parents, Dominique and John de Menil. They were collectors, philanthropists, and well-known for commissioning the Rothko Chapel designed by Philip Johnson,12 and founders of the Menil Collection in Houston. Philippa’s parents offered a philanthropic model, first that of bricks and mortar, through the creation of their private museum, and second the support of scholarship through collecting and the endowment of university positions.13 Heiner Friedrich had previously run commercial galleries in Munich and Cologne before opening a branch in a second floor-loft space in Soho, New York City in 1973. It was a large, open space that was well suited to the presentation of work by Donald Judd, Walter de Maria, Andy Warhol, and Blinky Palermo, many of whom he had shown in his German galleries.14 His business partner until 1966, Franz Dahelm, noted that ‘He saw himself as their patron. He thought artists were the pinnacle of society and art was a system to build a new world.’15

Heiner Friedrich and Philippa de Menil wanted to find a way to actively support a contemporary generation of American artists, many of whom were exploring site-specific works beyond the traditional gallery space. Dia’s first annual report of 1995 noted that the foundation’s aim was to ‘plan, realize and maintain public projects which cannot be easily produced, financed or owned by individual collectors because of their cost and magnitude.’16 Philippa de Menil noted in 1996, ‘Heiner had such a different approach. It wasn’t collecting’.17

At the height of the early 1980s, Bob Colacello noted:

Dia was supporting almost a dozen Minimal and conceptual artists, including such towering figures as Donald Judd, Dan Flavin, and John Chamberlain, with stipends,
studios, assistants, and archivists for the individual museums it planned to build for each of them.\textsuperscript{18}

The resulting site-specific artworks include Walter de Maria’s \textit{The Lightning Field} (1977), a mile-wide long-term installation in Western New Mexico; Walter de Maria’s \textit{The New York Earth Room} (1977), in Wooster Street, New York City,\textsuperscript{19} and works associated with Judd’s museum at Marfa, Texas.\textsuperscript{20} All were part of Dia Art Foundation’s collection, and this was later supplemented by long-term installations and exhibitions presented at Dia: Beacon.\textsuperscript{21} The approach of the Dia Art Foundation reflected a broader desire to find new philanthropic ways to support contemporary art both in America and overseas. It was focused on the artist, and on the new Minimal art emerging in America at that time. Talking about the beginning of their foundation, Friedrich noted ‘We wanted to focus it all on the artists. And not on the institution.’\textsuperscript{22}

Dia Art Foundation’s support of such projects, within Bishop’s definition of installation art, was mirrored by the evolution of organisations such as Artangel in London, and Creative Time and Public Art Fund in New York City. They, too, were responding to the changing nature and needs of contemporary art.

\textbf{Artangel}

Artangel was a privately funded charitable trust founded by Roger Took in 1985 and based in London.\textsuperscript{23} Known as the Artangel Trust, part of its role was to support artists working outside the confines of conventional art practice.\textsuperscript{24} The Artangel projects undertaken between 1985-1991


\textsuperscript{19} Robert Smithson’s \textit{Spiral Jetty} (1970), on the Great Salt Lake, Utah, was acquired by the Dia Art Foundation as a gift from the Estate of the artist in 1999.

\textsuperscript{20} See below p.89.

\textsuperscript{21} Dia: Chelsea is located on West 22\textsuperscript{nd} Street, in the heart of New York’s gallery district, and now hosts temporary installations, artist lectures and readings. Dia: Beacon presents the Dia Art Foundation’s collection from the 1960s to the present day, as well as special exhibitions, new commissions, and public and education programs. A new gallery space on west 22\textsuperscript{nd} Street is due to open in 2016.


were described by Lingwood as ‘first generation Artangel projects’. Emerging during the broader social and political context of the Thatcher years, artists often responded to political issues, from gender politics to Conservativist Party rule. Billboards, posters, ephemeral sculpture, projections and publications were all part of the projects presented during this period. Projects appeared in various locations ranging from officially sanctioned, to commercial, and guerilla sites. They included Krzysztof Wodiczko’s City Projections (1985), a series of projections onto buildings and iconic monuments such as Nelson’s Column, Trafalgar Square, in Central London; Andy Goldsworthy’s On Hampstead Heath (1986), a series of sculptural works made from materials he found in the environment of the Heath; Lawrence Weiner’s Paradigms for Daily Use (1986), in which he produced two special works that were bill-postered throughout Central London, examples of which read ‘We are ships at sea not ducks on ponds’; Barbara Kruger’s billboard We don’t need another hero (1987); and Jenny Holzer’s Messages (1988-98), a series of terse one-liners and aphorisms presented on the Spectacacolor Board in Piccadilly Circus. Each was public art seeking a strong social and political engagement. Artists often worked closely with the community groups to whom the works spoke. New York’s Public Art Fund showed many of the same artists during this period, reflecting parallel ambitions.

In 1991, James Lingwood and Michael Morris became Co-Directors and Artangel became professionalized, their co-directorship marking a radical shift in focus and ambition. Lingwood and Morris both came from professional arts backgrounds: they had worked together at London’s Institute of Contemporary Art (ICA), Lingwood as a curator, and Morris running the performing arts program. Lingwood had also previously curated projects that questioned notions of ‘public art’. TSWA 3D presented nine simultaneous temporary commissions of new work at public sites in Britain, as well as two gallery-based projects. The initiative was co-

26 Artangel projects prior to Morris and Lingwood taking over were described in an article in Vogue as having tended to focus on billboard and fly-poster projects that gave a visual expression to urban social themes’. See Rachel Campbell-Johnston, ‘Art Angel Delight’, Vogue, December 2002, p. 109.
organised by Johnathan Harvey, Arts Consultant for Television South West; Tony Foster, Visual Arts Officer for South West Arts at the time of inception; and Lingwood.31 Centrally organised, and supported by funding from public and private sources, works were presented in a range of urban and rural sites. Speaking about the TSWA 3D project in 1988, when curator at the ICA, Lingwood noted that their intention for the project was to subvert the perception of public art as an ‘apologetic and anemic’ practice; to question site-specificity and the relationship of the work of art to its context; and to challenge notions of audience for art beyond the gallery space, given that there was more than one public and each was actively engaged with creating the work’s meaning. The significance of the project for shifting the perceptions of what public art could be was reflected in articles and reviews of the project in British and international journals, including London’s Arts Review, Domus, Flash Art International, and Art in America.32 John Carlisle, Curator of Artangel in 1988, commented that Lingwood’s TSWA 3D project had set a precedent for public art.33 While not politically contentious, the projects questioned conventional ideas of art practice and presentation.

By 1991, Morris and Lingwood also felt that not only had art institutions lost sight of the fact that their purpose was to engage with artists for the benefit of audiences, but also that the Co-directors could create a place that was ‘really driven by artists’.34 Reflecting the shifts in contemporary art occurring at that time, their temporary projects became increasingly ambitious, often large-scale and immersive. They were sites for engagement and experience, spectatorship and the spectacular. Artangel’s renewed vision was reflected by a shift in organizational status, from the privately funded charitable trust to a not-for-profit organization. The trust began to work much more closely with artists to define and realize projects, creating significantly more complex installations in sites that most suited the work of art. Artangel emphasised the opportunity they offered to artists, as a means of realizing their often unarticulated dream work;


34 Van Noord, Off Limits, 2002, p. 10. Artangel was described as a not-for-profit organisation from 1991.
the resources they generated to achieve often difficult and ambitious projects, and the participatory experience that the art offered to a widening audience. This extended well beyond the art world, and it differentiated the 1990s Artangel vision from its first phase of art projects and exhibitions.

Two years later in 1993, Artangel presented Rachel Whiteread’s House (1993), a concrete cast of the interior spaces of an East London row house. Intended as a temporary intervention, it generated such an intense response – both positive and negative – that the work became the focus of a national media debate. As a sculpture, it attracted interest both for its detail and as a whole. It was impossible to view the work as independent of its physical and cultural context. The project became synonymous with Artangel, and epitomized a method of risk-taking, collaboration with artists, and determined advocacy in the face of controversy. More importantly, the work was critically and artistically acclaimed for having extended notions of public, traditionally seen not only as a discreet object, but bearing little relation to its location or site. This approach was continued in Artangel’s next projects, which included Ilya & Emilia Kabakov’s The Palace of Projects (1998), a large immersive built structure first presented at The Roundhouse, Chalk Farm, London; Janet Cardiff’s The Missing Voice (Case Study B) (1999), a forty-minute audio walk through Spitalfields and Whitechapel in London’s East End; Michael Landy’s Break Down (2001); Jeremy Deller’s The Battle of Orgreave (2001), a partial re-enactment for film of the miners’ strike of 1984-85 in a field near Orgreave, South Yorkshire; and many other visible and less visible projects. Artists not normally associated with public art commissions or projects became keen to present work in such contexts. Public art – or site-responsive art as it became known by the early 1990s – was now a well-established force in contemporary art.

Artangel’s next suite of projects reflected the directors’ understanding that the organisation’s ambitions needed to continue to evolve, in keeping with those of its chosen artists. In 2007, Artangel presented its first international artwork, Roni Horn’s Library of Water, or ‘Vatnasafn’, as it is known in Icelandic. It was located in the remote sleepy fishing village of Stykkishólmur on

---


the west coast of Iceland, several hours drive from the capital, Reykjavík. The project continued to develop themes that Horn had long explored: language and material, water and weather, reflections and illumination, and the ever-changing nature of identity. It was located in a country with which Horn had long-term associations: she had first visited Iceland as an art student in the 1970s and had been returning to Iceland from New York ever since to spend part of the year making art in a region that she described as ‘an open-air studio of unlimited scale and newness’.

Horn’s library sits on a rocky crag, perched above the town’s harbor. Twenty-four glass columns were placed irregularly within the glass-fronted circular room overlooking the town. Each contained water from glaciers gathered around Iceland, which refracted and reflected the changing weather and the surrounding town on a lichen-green rubber floor embedded with words used to describe weather and atmospheric conditions. Chess sets were set up permanently in the gallery space. The Library of Water was also used for community gatherings, as a studio for writers, and as a library for the oral archive of weather reports gathered from people who live around the town.

If the project reflected the newest form of art-led cultural tourism then, for most people, its geographic location meant that it would only ever be experienced online or through publications made by Horn and Artangel. When the library opened in 2007, Lingwood noted, ‘There’s a lot of number-chasing going on in the art world now. Visitor numbers are used as the measure of success. But I think value lies elsewhere.’ The library was also presented through a strong web presence, as arresting images attempted to capture the work. Clever web-design placed the artwork at the centre of the world: New York is only 4197 km away, while Artangel in London is

---

40 Noted both in the website and publications on the subject.
a mere 1948 km. A project far removed from metropolitan centres of the art world, first-
hand experience became only one of the ways to engage with a site-specific work of this kind.
For Artangel, the project in Iceland offered the not-for-profit organization the chance to present
a work beyond the geographic confines of London, England. Their desire for global reach reflected the ambitions of a number of other not-for-profit organisations and private
foundations, as they became increasingly visible in the contemporary art world, both at an
institutional level, and within the wider frame of biennale and temporary art projects. Indeed, the
artworks that the foundations fostered became central to understandings of contemporary art.

As with later foundations, Artangel was active in promoting its own history. This emphasized
the impact of its own activities on both contemporary art and philanthropy. Arguably, the
visibility of these publications, and Artangel’s growing profile had shifted its role by 2000 from
that of organizational and philanthropic supporter of commissioned works to a new form of
institution, albeit without gallery walls. Artangel was working within the contemporary art
world, rather than in parallel. Artangel published widely, with many of its more notable projects
captured in monographic catalogues and books published after the event. Contextual essays
presented alongside images documented the temporary works. Artangel published an overview
of its projects, Off Limits, 40 Artangel Projects in 2002, which included an essay by author Marina
Warner, a conversation between the co-Directors and artist Michael Craig-Martin, and an essay
by critic and academic Claire Bishop. In an attempt to curate Artangel’s projects into an overall
set of themes, projects were grouped around the themes of Motion, Past, Navigation, Pulse, and
Time. A chronology outlined projects from Artangel’s inception in 1985. However, the focus
was on projects from 1991 to 2002. The publication located Artangel firmly within a broader
contemporary art debate. In it, Lingwood suggested that the British model of patronage was in
part responsible for the development of an entrepreneurial culture, with Artangel a prime
example. He defined UK patterns of patronage as ‘stuck between two different models’: the
American model of private patronage funded by tax breaks and a particular tradition of

44 See Alex Farquharson, ‘Bureaux de Change’, frieze, 2006; Nina Möntmann (ed.), Art and Its Institutions: Current Conflicts, Critique,
45 See for example Lingwood, House, 1995; Matthew Barney, Cremaster 4 (1995), Artangel in association with Barbara Gladstone
Gallery, New York, and Fondation Cartier, Paris; Gabriel Orozco, Empty Club (1998), Artangel; Michael Landy, Break Down (2001),
philanthropy; and a continental-European model of consistent patronage sourced from a centralized state.\textsuperscript{46}

**Public Art Fund**

New York’s Public Art Fund (PAF) became, in the 1990s, New York’s leading presenter of artists’ projects, new commissions, and exhibitions in public spaces.\textsuperscript{47} PAF worked with emerging and established artists to produce a range of contemporary projects located beyond museums and galleries.

Created by Doris C. Freedman in 1977, PAF consolidated two organisations: City Walls, founded in 1969, and the Public Arts Council, founded in 1971.\textsuperscript{48} The combined not-for-profit organization aimed to ‘bring artists’ ideas to the forefront while establishing contemporary art as a vital component of New York City’s unique urban landscape’.\textsuperscript{49} The focus on urban renewal through culturally led programs coincided with other initiatives involving Doris C. Freedman, such as New York City’s Percent for Art Program, which was introduced in 1982 after a decade of lobbying.\textsuperscript{50} The organisation’s early activities ranged from artworks commissioned by PAF, projects administered by PAF (which worked as an agency for others), and an active advocacy role for public art through education and public program events.\textsuperscript{51} Early PAF activities shared

\begin{footnotes}
\item[51] Such as the Cooper-Hewitt Sculpture Symposium, *Community Sculpture*, July 28, 1971, in which PAF participated. Public Art Fund Archive, Series 1, Subseries A, Box 10, Folder 10, Fales Library and Special Collections; or a symposium held on Sat October 20, 1984, coinciding with the exhibition *Land Marks* held at the Edith C. Blum Art Institute, Bard College Center, September-October 1984, co-sponsored by the Edith C. Blum Art Institute and PAF. Public Art Fund, Series III, Subseries C, Box 17, Folder 12, Fales Library and Special Collections.
\end{footnotes}
Global Developments

similarities with the first generation of Artangel projects: they tended to be more experimental and socially and politically engaged, and often presented the work of the same artists.52

PAF commissions during the 1980s included Jenny Holzer’s *Aphorisms* (1982), and Barbara Kruger’s *Messages to the Public* (1983), displayed on the electric Spectacolor signboard in Times Square, presaging projects in London auspiced by Artangel including Kruger in 1987, and Holzer in 1988-89.53 All offered new forms of public art. The role of public art, the significance of site-specificity, and who ultimately had jurisdiction over permanent works was widely debated in New York and America, following the removal of Richard Serra’s *Tilted Arc* (1981) from the public plaza of the Jacob K. Javits Federal Building in Lower Manhattan.54 While issues of site-specificity were pertinent to many PAF projects, because they were temporary they were not debated in the same acrimonious way. PAF activities did not always appear on public streets. Kruger’s *Group Material Inserts* (1988) offered another form of public art. Broadly questioning the role of culture and its audience, the work was a printed supplement of artists’ works and images inserted in *The New York Times* on Sunday May 22, 1988. In the same year, Kruger’s billboard *Untitled (We don’t need another hero)* (1988) was one of many billboard projects PAF presented during this period.55

The 1990s was a decade characterized by a renewed focus on the artist, and the importance of the experience of the work for PAF. Again, paralleling developments at Artangel from the early 1990s onwards, the New York-based not-for-profit organization worked more closely with artists in conceiving and realizing each project. PAF became more of a producer than a manager, as the organization developed a curatorial model that saw artists directly selected to make projects by the Director, rather than chosen by a panel or open selection process. Tom Eccles, Director and Curator of Public Art Fund from 1996-2005, noted in an essay in 2004 that the example of

---

52 See above p. 47.
Whiteread’s *House* commissioned and presented by Artangel in 1993 radically changed the way the PAF conceived its relationship with artists.\(^{56}\)

This refocused approach led to PAF inviting Whiteread to make a work in New York. Rather than beginning with a site and a budget, the invitation allowed the artist an extended period of investigation in which to develop a proposal.\(^{57}\) A partnership was created in which PAF as the commissioning organization took an active role in the conception, fabrication, installation and final presentation.\(^{58}\) The ultimate result was Rachel Whiteread’s *Water Tower* (1998), a clear resin cast of a water tower, which offered a semi-translucent rendering of the original water towers that still punctuated the SoHo skyline. It was presented five years after her London project.\(^{59}\) High on the city horizon, the cast was readily overlooked by an unknowing public, and even those in search. Its location and materials ensured it remained an enigmatic work, though it captured a disappearing historical element that made New York’s skyline unique. For those who chanced upon it, the lack of highly visible signage or specific art context meant that for viewers its status as art was not necessarily obvious.

Other PAF projects commissioned during the 1990s reflected broader developments in contemporary art, as illustrated by works featured in the 2004 publication *PLOP, Recent Projects of the Public Art Fund*.\(^{60}\) Accompanying contextual essays by Eccles, Dan Cameron, curator of the New Museum, and art historian Katy Siegel reinforced this shift. In contrast to the thematic approach to projects presented in Artangel’s *Off Limits* (2002), *Plop* presented artists’ projects in alphabetical order. Within the context of the commissioned essays, images of the projects provided a compelling argument for the evolving notion of public art.

Like Artangel, the artistic evolution of PAF mirrored an organizational evolution beyond the vision of its original instigator and advocate. It too evolved into a non-profit arts organization that became in itself a form of alternative institution, supported by government funds and by

---


\(^{59}\) Eccles noted that the project took three years to develop. See Eccles, *Plop*, 2004, p. 14.

contributions from individuals, foundations and corporations.\textsuperscript{61} The appointment of Nicholas Baume as Director and Chief Curator of PAF in September 2009 marked the next stage in the institution’s evolution. Baume articulated a desire to present a range of variously scaled projects within the unique context of New York.\textsuperscript{62} Working with emerging and established contemporary artists on site-specific projects, Baume and his staff are continuing to explore ideas of public art and contemporaneity, within history and artistic legacy of the PAF.

**Creative Time**

Creative Time was active in New York City from the early 1970s.\textsuperscript{63} It was formed in 1973 by Susan Henshaw, Anita Contini and Karin Bacon, at a time when Manhattan was verging on bankruptcy, the urban landscape was deteriorating, and the city was suffering social and political unrest.\textsuperscript{64} As Director since 1994, Anne Pasternak noted the three women believed that ‘artists could reanimate life in Lower New York’, taking over vacant shop fronts in the financial Wall Street area.\textsuperscript{65} Anita O’Neill, Director of Creative Time in 1974 described early projects at the time as a means of introducing the artist into the corporate work place, revealing the artistic process, and giving workers something to do in their lunchtimes.\textsuperscript{66} There were a number of other alternative arts spaces and organisations that developed at this time in New York, such as The Kitchen, an artist-run space founded in 1971, that incorporated as a non-profit two years later, with the aim of providing a place for the presentation of experimental video and performance art and experimental music and film.\textsuperscript{67} As with other artist initiated projects, Creative Time had a clear social and political agenda. It redefined notions of public art, taking an

\textsuperscript{61} See for example the list of donors, sponsors and government and non-supporters for any recent project.

\textsuperscript{62} Conversation with Nicholas Baume, New York, Monday January 17, 2011.

\textsuperscript{63} For a discussion of the role of PAF and Creative Time, see Knight, *Public Art*, 2008, p. 138-140.


\textsuperscript{65} Marshall Heyman, ‘This Woman is Changing the Way we see Art,’ *Wall Street Journal (WSJ)* Magazine, Friday January 27, 2012.


early interest in relationships to site, context and audience participation, in what later came to be known as socially engaged art.68

For *Art on the Beach* (1978-1985), Creative Time commissioned a series of large-scale, experimental public sculptures and performances featuring over one hundred and eighty artists, against the backdrop of the Hudson River and the skyline of Lower Manhattan.69 More recently, Creative Time presented a series of solo artist projects alongside curated events. Mike Nelson’s *A Psychic Vacuum* (2007) transformed the disused interior of the Essex Street Market in NYC’s Lower East Side, into a type of parallel universe.70 Like many of Nelson’s previous projects, the immersive installation responded to the building’s history, the surrounding landscape and cultural references, and was created with salvaged materials that the artist had gathered over an extended installation period.71 For Nelson, the project built on an increasingly international history of site-specific projects shown as part of international biennales, and immersive installations in gallery spaces in the UK, Europe, and even Australia.72 For Creative Time, the project continued its history of encouraging discussion about neighborhoods on the verge of change and the production of site-specific work. Other recent projects included *It is what it is: Conversations about Iraq* (2009), a mobile project by Jeremy Deller intended to stimulate unmediated dialogue about the history, present circumstances and the future of Iraq, commissioned in collaboration with the New Museum;73 and Stephen Vitiello’s site-specific sound work, *A Bell for Every Minute, Manhattan* (2010), presented in collaboration with friends of the High Line and the New York City Department of Parks & Recreation.74


73 The project was curated by Nato Thompson and Laura Hopman. It was first shown at the New Museum, where a variety of people with first-hand experiences of Iraq engaged in conversation with visitors. In March 2009, the project took the road in a specially outfitted road vehicle, conducting conversations in more than ten locations across the US. See Creative Time website for details, [http://creativetime.org/projects/it-is-what-it-is-conversations-about-iraq/](http://creativetime.org/projects/it-is-what-it-is-conversations-about-iraq/), accessed October 7, 2012.

74 See p. 267.
Creative Time’s social and political engagement also took the form of Public Summits. On September 23, 2011, Creative Time held its third ‘Summit: Living as Form’, in which over thirty curators, artists and thinkers addressed a range of subjects that directly engaged with the ‘pressing issues affecting our world.’ The Summit was held in conjunction with the exhibition, *Living as Form*, curated by Nato Thompson, Chief Curator, Creative Time. The exhibition featured over one hundred artists and projects, twenty-five curators and nine new commissions presented at the Historic Essex Street Market. It aimed to highlight twenty years of socially engaged art. The exhibition and Summit coincided with the socially and politically motivated activism of the Occupy Wall Street movement, and so summit participants’ decision to forego talk during one session and actively join the movement reflected Creative Time’s political and socially engaged history and Thompson’s desire to be actively involved. Creative Time’s acknowledged role as a commissioner of more experimental public art reaffirmed socially engaged art as a burgeoning trend in the development of contemporary art.

Creative Time’s publication, *Creative Time: The Book*, published in 2007, documented each of the projects presented over a thirty-three year history. The book was divided into sections entitled New York City, People, Power, Experiment and Surprise. Each section featured a contextual essay, such as Linda Yablonsky’s ‘New York: A Personal Site Map’, followed by projects around each theme. The focus of the book reflected an institution that portrayed itself as firmly embedded within the city and the people who supported it.

Like Artangel and Public Art Fund, Creative Time worked without a permanent gallery, though many of their projects were organised in collaboration with other public organisations. They too evolved from a small informal operation to a professionalised arts organization, with a clearly defined role and position within the wider contemporary art world.

---


PEER

PEER began in 1997 as the not-for-profit Pier Trust. Its small project-space in Shoreditch Town Hall in London’s East End became known as PEER in 1999. The Pier Trust was set up by Alex Sainsbury, heir to one of the largest fortunes in Britain derived from the UK supermarket giant, Sainsbury’s. His family had a tradition of patronage and support for the arts. Alex’s father, Timothy, famously funded the £50m Sainsbury Wing at the National Gallery. Alex Sainsbury chose to pursue a more active form of patronage by championing contemporary art.

Between 1998-2001 PEER dynamically commissioned and supported the presentation of a range of site-specific installations in and around the East End of London. Its focus on the presentation of projects largely in this part of the city offered another form of cultural activity in a part of London that was increasingly identified as an incubator for an exciting range of contemporary art spaces encouraging emerging practice, artists’ studios, and artist-run-initiatives.

For the Trust’s first project, Political Homeopathy (1998), unattributed images by Drew Milne, Gilian Breeze and Richard Wentworth appeared for three consecutive weeks in the pages of The Spectator. The following month, they again appeared in another right-wing British newspaper, The New Statesman. The project acknowledged a history of early Artangel and PAF projects of socially and politically engaged art, and public projects that took different forms. In 1999, Martin Creed produced four new works for PEER. His large neon text work, Work No. 203, Everything is going to be alright (1999), was installed under the portico of a listed building, The Portico, in Clapton, East London. Three of Creed’s recorded songs commissioned by PEER were also ...


81 The same work was subsequently installed in Times Square by Public Art Fund in 2000; and in 2006 by the Fondazione Nicola Trussardi, on the façade of the Palazzo dell’Arenario di Piazza del Duomo, as part of their project, I Like Things, May-June 2006. It became the signature image of his exhibition in Milan: see p.63. See also Louisa Buck, ‘Martin Creed’, Artforum, New York, Vol. XXXVIII, No. 6, February 2000, pp. 110-111.
published on CD: *Work No 207, I like things* (1999), *Work no. 208, Nothing is something* (1999), and *Work No. 209, I can’t move* (1999). Ceal Floyer’s exhibition for PEER, *Massive Reduction* (2001), a playful form of pared-back minimalism or essential every-day aesthetics, was the last show to be presented in the Shoreditch Town Hall space in April 2001. After 2001, PEER moved to Hoxton Street, Shoreditch, also in the East End. 82

Trustees took an active role in the choice of artists and organization of projects: a number of the projects were initiated by PEER trustees during this early period. Other projects, such as Martin Creed’s large neon installation, were presented through the collaboration of PEER members with local councils, government agencies, and other private grant giving trusts and foundations. 83 The foundation was not only driving an artistic agenda, but the increasingly ambitious projects required consortia of support from various sources.

PEER’s most ambitious project was Mike Nelson’s *The Deliverance and The Patience* at the 2001 Venice Biennale, discussed further below. 84 Nelson’s installation at the 2001 Venice Biennale was the first and only project PEER presented outside the British capital. Quite possibly, the logistics and costs of staging a project of this scale and ambition in Venice were experiences that they chose not to repeat. Moreover, the increasing number of collateral events of this kind at the Venice Biennale made their endeavour no longer distinctive.

Alex Sainsbury subsequently opened Raven Row Gallery, a not-for-profit art space on the edges of the City of London, which, he said, differed from the more traditional commercial contemporary art gallery. He described Raven Row as a ‘charitable company funded by me’, in which he was totally engaged in running. 85 By 2012, PEER had also professionalised, appointing a director, general manager, and advisory boards, in line with the typical evolution of such

82 PEER, 97-99 Hoxton Street, Shoreditch, London N1 6QL.
83 *Political Homeopathy*, 1998 was initiated by Andrew Brighton, a trustee of Peer; while Creed’s *Work No. 203, Everything is going to be alright*, 1999 was initiated and curated by Ingrid Swenson in partnership with The Hackney Historic Buildings Trust, while the CD was a commission of PEER. See Peer website, http://www.peeruk.org/projects/creed/martin-creed.html, accessed October 11, 2012.
84 See p. 83.
foundations. PEER described itself in 2012 as ‘an independent organization that commissions imaginative and ambitious arts projects by local, national and international artists in the heart of east London’.

By 2012, however, the local and wider global contemporary art landscape in which PEER was presenting projects had radically changed. A number of other not-for-profit foundations had also been launched, with a sustained international focus and strong biennale presence.

**Fondazione Nicola Trussardi**

One of these foundations was the Fondazione Nicola Trussardi, originally established by Nicola Trussardi in 1997. Its first incarnation supported a permanent gallery space in the flagship building of the Trussardi Group’s fashion headquarters in Milan. Group exhibitions there reflected the eclectic tastes of a keen collector and advocate of art, fashion and culture, with a healthy dose of theatre, style and spectacle. Opera-singer Luciano Pavarotti described Nicola as ‘one of the best ambassadors of “Made in Italy” in the world.’ American director Robert Altman’s film *Prêt-à-Porter* (1994) captured Trussardi’s vision, with the Italian fashion entrepreneur making a cameo appearance, playing himself.

The Foundation shifted dramatically when Beatrice Trussardi, Nicola’s daughter, became president in 1999. Unlike her father, Beatrice Trussardi did not see herself as a ‘collector’ of modern and contemporary art, as many now understand the term. She did away with the permanent gallery space, and appointed young Italian curator and New York editor of the Milan-

---

86 Ingrid Swenson was Director, and there was also a General Manager position, a Board of Trustees and an Advisory Group. PEER website, [http://www.peeruk.org/about-peer.html](http://www.peeruk.org/about-peer.html), accessed September 12, 2012.


90 Trussardi emphasized this in an interview with Cecilia Alemani, curator and writer (and partner of Massimiliano Gioni). She was alluding to the ‘super collectors’ such as Charles Saatchi, Francois Pinault, and Eli Broad, who took a highly visible role in the contemporary art market. Trussardi offered an alternative to this model, and spoke instead of the projects that the Trussardi foundation had presented. See Andrea Bellini, with Cecilia Alemani, Lillian Davies (eds), *Collecting Contemporary Art*, Printed by MUMESCI, spa. HAPAX series, 2008, pp. 87-90.
based *Flash Art International*, Massimiliano Gioni, as Artistic Director in 2001. Gioni was only twenty-nine, but he was already making a name for himself in Europe and New York. His appointment by Trussardi reflected her first-hand knowledge of a local and global contemporary art world, having completed a liberal arts education and further study in New York, as well as internship positions in New York art museums. Their respective backgrounds presaged a strong American/European focus of projects presented from 2001 onwards. Gioni’s appointment signalled Trussardi’s desire to present contemporary art projects that reflected the manifold forms of contemporary art, and the role art and culture could and should play as part of a vibrant society.

Trussardi and Gioni also appointed an advisory board for the Foundation, comprised of high profile, well-connected, international contemporary art curators, critics and writers. The board included: Laura Hoptman, Curator, Department of Painting and Sculpture, MoMA, New York; Hans Ulrich Obrist, Director of International Projects and Co-director of Exhibitions, Serpentine Gallery, London, UK; Jerry Saltz, critic, New York Magazine, New York; and Philippe Vergne, Director Dia Art Foundation, New York. Trussardi’s ambition to create a Milan-based global brand fusing luxury fashion, design, and contemporary art was a conscious manifestation of Richard Florida’s creatively led economy. It would be consistent with Florida’s thesis to hope that the creation of high profile international events, such as Fondazione Nicola Trussardi’s contemporary art projects, would attract creative workers in related fields with higher economic productivity.

Between 2003-2010, the Trussardi Foundation presented thirteen site-specific, temporary projects by contemporary artists in a diverse range of locations and buildings throughout Milan.

---


94 In 2003, Trussardi noted that contemporary art, in particular, ‘allows us to see reality in a different way, and enables a sort of literary key for living and interpreting the past, the present and the future.’ *‘Io credo che l’arte contemporanea ci permetta di vedere la realtà in modo diverso e costituisce una sorta di chiave di letteratura per vivere e interpretare il passato, il presente e il futuro.’ In *Viaggio*, n.a., *In Viaggio*, Ottobre 2003, p. 47.


The project-curated approach with no permanent gallery space was a deliberate break both with the Trussardi Foundation’s past as well as the practice of other prominent contemporary art foundations in Milan of the time. Beatrice Trussardi and Massimiliano Gioni described the functioning of the Foundation as a ‘nomadic museum’. 97 Their first project, an installation of Michael Elmgreen & Ingar Dragsæt’s _Short Cut_ (2003), presented a car and its caravan erupting from the patterned tile floor of the Galleria Vittorio Emanuele, under the central dome. The work co-opted the symbol of Italy’s economic revival, the ubiquitous Italian everyman’s car, a white Fiat Uno. The site – the centre of Milanese retailing – added cultural and political context to the contemporary work of art, and announced the Foundation’s strategy of urban disruption and discovery.

In February-March 2004, the Foundation presented _I Nuovi Mostri (Life is Beautiful)_. Works by sixteen young Italian artists were produced as posters that were affixed in public advertising spaces throughout Milan. Trussardi described the project as ‘a peaceful invasion’ of the city. 98 The Milan project was also accompanied by a free tabloid-form publication, which included all the images of the posters alongside an introductory text exploring stereotypes, and a dictionary of Italian clichés. The project acknowledged a history of the poster as a form of protest, in ironic contradiction to the Milan fashion capital’s strong tradition of advertising and highly stylized art photography of the fashion world. Trussardi’s project enabled it to build links with a younger generation of Italian artists. It created opportunities for Gioni to work with his artistic contemporaries. It also ensured that when the Foundation presented projects with internationally recognized contemporary artists, these would resonate with and be supported by the local artistic community.

Most Trussardi Foundation projects featured work by leading contemporary artists whose art also appeared prominently in major international exhibitions and biennales. They ranged from site-specific projects, to curated exhibitions in unique spaces in Milan that featured new and existing work as sculpture, installation, video, film, and performance. Maurizio Cattelan

---


exhibited *Untitled* (2004), an installation of three children hanging by their necks from an ancient oak in the centre of Piazza XXIV Maggio. John Bock’s film *Meechfieber* (2004) was showcased in Milan’s Sala Reale (Royal Room), part of a series of video installations that revealed Milan’s Stazione Centrale (central train station) in a new light. Urs Fischer’s *House of Bread* inhabited the church of the Istituto dei Ciechi, part of a larger project, *Jet Set Lady* (2005); while Martin Creed’s neon sign *Everything is going to be all right* (2006) (first commissioned by PEER in 1999) illuminated the façade of the Palazzo dell’Argerio flanking Milan’s central Duomo, as part of the exhibition *I Like Things* (2006) at the same institution. Paul McCarthy’s exhibition *Pig Island* (2010) featured immersive video installations, sculpture, and a dramatically-scaled installation that had never previously been shown. It was presented in Palazzo Citterio’s subterranean gallery spaces, part of the Pinacoteca di Brera’s unfinished 1980s Grande Brera extension designed by British architect James Stirling, which had languished forgotten and closed to the public for over twenty years.

Each project engaged with the sites and histories of Milan, offering a context for the projects and installations that would remain unique. Gioni and others characterized Milan as lacking a contemporary art space, or *kunsthalle*, and saw the Fondazione Nicola Trussardi’s projects and exhibitions as a roaming contemporary art program that addressed this need. Gioni contrasted Turin’s range of internationally recognized public and private contemporary art spaces with the city of Milan, where contemporary art had been presented primarily by commercial galleries and art spaces. In fact, Milan did have some other not-for-profit spaces and other galleries run by

---

99 See p. 58.

100 Palazzo Citterio was purchased by the Italian State in 1972 as an extension to the nearby Pinacoteca di Brera, to show temporary exhibitions, cultural events and education programs. The project was halted by legal disputes, and in 2012 remains unfinished. See Luisa Arrigoni, *Pinacoteca di Brera: guida ufficiale*, Touring club italiano, Soprintendenza per beni artistici e storici, Milano, 1998, p. 14.


private foundations focused on contemporary art, although none were committed to presenting high profile international contemporary art on the scale that Trussardi subsequently developed. Government funded spaces included the Villa Reale, which presented a mainly historic permanent collection, though little of Milan’s historic early 20th century artists and art was ever on display. They nearby Padiglione Arte Contemporanea (PAC), showed a range of temporary exhibitions and contemporary art. However, Gioni noted it was ‘an institution that remains in perennial indecision that affects its programming and funding.’ Other spaces include Careof, launched in 1987 and located in Fabbrica del Vapore since 2002, a not-for-profit organization presenting a range of temporary exhibitions by emerging Italian artists with some younger international artists, and housing an archive of artists’ materials and work. Its role in the landscape of Milan is not dissimilar to other contemporary art spaces marketed as ‘laboratories’, with a studio and residency program, created to support emerging contemporary art and ideas. Via farini was established in 1991 as a temporary project space, again supporting emerging Italian contemporary artists, and an artist-in-residence program from 2008. Hangar Bicocca, a permanent gallery space and art centre opened in 2004 in the massive 15,000 sq metres converted spaces of the Ansaldo-Breda industrial plant, but had not established a significant program of international curated projects at the time of Gioni and Cerizza’s _Frieze_ article.

Fondazione Nicola Trussardi’s presence extended beyond the city of Milan. In September 2004, at the invitation of the City of Venice, the Fondazione Nicola Trussardi bill-postered thousands of posters around the streets of Venice from their _I Nuovi Mostri_ project, previously presented in Milan earlier that year. The project coincided with the inauguration of the Venice Biennale’s 9th International Architecture Exhibition. For the second _Frieze_ Art Fair in London in 2004, the Fondazione was invited to make an ‘Incursion’ as part of the _Frieze_ Foundation’s curated

---

106 In Australia, the most notable example is Melbourne’s Gertrude Contemporary, an exhibition space and studio and residency program that opened in 1985, and changed its name from 200 Gertrude Street to Gertrude Contemporary in 2010. Curators Roberta Tenconi and Chiara Agnello undertook a curatorial residency at Gertrude Contemporary, as part of an exchange between the cities of Milan and Melbourne. Tenconi was subsequently appointed as curator for the Fondazione Nicola Trussardi, having previously worked with Gioni on the Berlin Biennial; while Agnello continued in her role as Artistic Director of Careof.
program of Artists’ Projects and Commissions. Gioni organized an off-site project, *I’ll Be Your Mirror* (2004), in which artists Monica Bonvicini, Mircea Cantor, Martin Creed, Jeremy Deller, Trisha Donnelly, Michael Elmgreen & Ingar Dragset, Gabriel Kuri, Adam McEwen, Richard Prince, and David Shrigley left messages for those guests of the London hotel, City Inn Westminster, who had registered as art fair visitors. Messages appeared in the hotel rooms while guests were out, scrawled in lipstick on the bathroom mirrors, or left as a note on the bed. Martin Creed left a simple X, to mark his spot, while Adam McEwen wrote new instructions to the opening film scene of Elizabeth Taylor’s *Butterfield 8* (1960), instructing guests to ‘1. Get out. 2. Leave the money. 3. Don’t call.’ *I’ll Be Your Mirror* (2004) offered a nomadic approach to contemporary projects that the Trussardi Foundation had developed throughout the city of Milan. For Frieze Art Fair and Frieze Foundation, the curated projects demonstrated the successful partnering of public and private interests, and their desire to build credibility and add intellectual ‘curatorial weight’ to a global commercial art enterprise. For the Fondazione Nicola Trussardi, it revealed Gioni’s networks within the global contemporary art world. Their inclusion in the Frieze Art Fair as one of only two outside organisations acknowledged the role that the Trussardi Foundation had started to play within a broader contemporary art landscape.

In 2009, the Trussardi Foundation was involved in two critically acclaimed projects within the Venice Biennale: Roberto Cuoghi’s *Mei Gui* and *The Collectors*, a curated exhibition by Michael Elmgreen and Ingar Dragset. Both were important in the development of installation art that acknowledged place, context and history, and in the development of the relationship between foundations and biennales to produce such art, as discussed below. At the same time, the Trussardi Foundation presented a further major project in Milan with British born, Berlin based,
artist Tacita Dean, *Still Life* (2009). This was staged in the Palazzo Dugnani, a historic palazzo replete with ceiling frescos by Gianbattista Tiepolo in the heart of Milan, which had been closed to the public for many years. Notwithstanding the challenges of the site, such as dust and light and not being able to affix anything to the heritage walls, the experience offered a unique context and location for an exhibition made up solely of Dean’s 16mm film projections, many of which were already well-known through international exhibitions. Also included were two new pieces filmed at Giorgio Morandi’s studio in Bologna and produced for the occasion by the Fondazione Nicola Trussardi. The new work was developed through extended access to Morandi’s studio, which would not have been possible without Trussardi’s involvement, given the complex bureaucratic process of Italian governments. The installation of Dean’s new and existing films in a historic building resulted in an experience different from that of an art museum exhibition.

The timing of the project allowed internationally based curators, collectors and artists to visit the nearby northern Italian city while in Italy for the Venice Biennale.

International interest in the Fondazione Trussardi projects was reflected by their profile in international art journals and magazines including *Flash Art* and *Artforum*. This profile was boosted by Gioni’s complementary roles as Artistic Director of the Fondazione Trussardi, curatorial and directorial roles at the New Museum, New York, and positions as Artistic Director of a number of notable international biennales.

---


114 Conversation with Tacita Dean, Melbourne, June 23, 2009. In 2001, an exhibition of Dean’s 16mm films was presented as part of the Melbourne Festival Visual Arts Program, curated by Juliana Engberg, project managed by Rebecca Coates. The program presented seven solo international artist projects in Melbourne, and a curated exhibition *Humid*, at Australian Centre for Contemporary Art (ACCA), Dallas Brooks Drive.

115 Filmed in black and white, Dean’s *Still Life* (2009) focussed on the meticulous markings and measurements found on the paper Morandi placed underneath his objects. *Day for Night* (2009) dealt with the objects themselves. Unable to touch or move anything, Dean chose to film them singly, making random groupings, in contrast to Morandi’s studied and mathematically rigorous compositions.

116 Conversation with Tacita Dean, Melbourne, June 23, 2009. Trussardi’s exhibition and commissioned work, Morandi, coincided with another exhibition of Tacita Dean’s films and other works, at Melbourne’s Australian Centre for Contemporary Art. Tacita Dean, 6 June – 2 August, 2009, Australian Centre for Contemporary Art, Melbourne. This exhibition featured Dean’s films, including a number shown as part of the Trussardi exhibition, alongside prints and other works on paper. It was one of a long series of institutionally based survey shows of the artist’s work in Europe and the UK.


Mirroring the practice of other foundations, the Trussardi Foundation contributed significantly to writing its own history, either through book or exhibition form. The Foundation presented 8½, an exhibition at Stazione Leopolda, Florence, as part of the celebrations for the 100th anniversary of the Trussardi Group. It brought together the work of many of the artists who had made projects with Trussardi over the preceding eight and a half years, and showcased it in a city beyond Milan. The Foundation’s 368 page 2010 hard-backed publication, *What Good is the Moon?*, provided an encyclopedic text with installation images for each of the projects, and other related activities, presented in alphabetical order. A foreword by Hans Ulrich Obrist entitled ‘Avere fame di Vento’ (To be Hungry for Wind), in homage to the same-named artwork of 1988-89 by Alighiero Boetti, described the urban strategy of the Foundation of rejecting a fixed institutional location and instead focusing on the city of Milan itself as both stage and material. Obrist described the city of Milan as a ‘magnificent ready-made’, which was revealed through the presentation of projects and exhibitions in unusual and often overlooked places and locations. Obrist suggested that the Foundation was creating a form of ‘dynamic memory’, acknowledging the work done in this area by Israel Rosenfield. Its projects offered a means to revisit and revise a collective sense of self and a renewed understanding of location. Their contemporaneity, Obrist contended, was consistent with Giorgio Agamben’s definition of the term: people who belong to their own time are those who do not coincide perfectly with it;

---


122 Obrist’s use of ‘readymade’ in this context was a somewhat loose adaptation of the art-historical term, which came to refer to a found object, elevated to the status of an art object. Duchamp’s ‘readymade’ has been extensively discussed from numerous philosophical, political, and ideological positions. See for example Thierry de Duve, *Kant after Duchamp*, October Books, MIT Press, London and Cambridge, Mass., 1996, Second edition 1999.

whereas the truly contemporary person is able to perceive obscurity, and is not blinded by the lights of his or her time or century.  

Beatrice Trussardi and Massimiliano Gioni’s interview in *What Good is the Moon?* outlined their aims and objectives for the foundation under their leadership. They hoped to redefine notions of public art, through the creation of powerful images, firmly embedded within the history and context of Milan; and they wanted to offer a new model of philanthropic support for artists through an organization that was informal and responsive, and at the same time could partner with local agencies and some of the major art museums and institutions around the world. Through their choice of artists, working methodology, and siting of art, the Trussardi Foundation reflected the professionalization of a private, alternative institutionalised model.

**Prada Foundation**

The Prada Foundation was also based in Milan. It was created in 1993 by Miuccia Prada and her husband Patrizio Bertelli, head of the Milanese luxury travel goods and fashion house, Prada. In 1995 Prada and Bertelli appointed international curator Germano Celant as its Artistic Director. As Senior Curator of Contemporary Art at the Guggenheim Museum, New York since 1989, Celant brought international connections and a curatorial reputation founded on his association with the Italian *arte povera* movement of the 1950s and ’60s. As sole Artistic Director and curatorial voice, Celant was as visibly associated with the Prada foundation as the creators and owners themselves.

Satellite projects and installations were not the Prada Foundation’s primary focus. Prada and Bertelli had acquired a substantial private collection of contemporary art. From 1993, the Prada Foundation operated a permanent gallery space in via Spartaco, Milan, and aimed to present two

---


126 The first exhibition space was located in a renovated industrial building, where the Prada fashion offices were located, at via Spartaco, no. 8, Milan. The Foundation was known as PradaMilanoArte. Prada Foundation, [http://www.fondazioneprada.org/en/intro.html](http://www.fondazioneprada.org/en/intro.html), accessed May 24, 2011.

gallery exhibitions per year. Exhibitions were closely associated with works and artists featured in their private collection. The Office of Metropolitan Architecture (OAM), led by Rem Koolhaas, was commissioned to create new spaces for the Foundation’s activities in via Fogazzaro, 36, an early 20th century industrial site in the south of Milan, which opened in April 2011. In June 2011, the Prada Foundation opened a new, permanent exhibition space in Venice, the Ca’ Corner della Regina, a historic palazzo on the Grand Canal. The permanent gallery was located in one of Venice’s many historic buildings in a visible location, its purpose to present works and exhibitions drawn from the Prada Collection. The model built on other examples of private contemporary collections presented in historic public spaces in Venice and elsewhere. Permanent gallery spaces and temporary projects and installations presented alongside an international biennale enabled the Prada Foundation to develop a substantial international presence.

In 1995, the Prada Foundation presented two off-site projects in association with other art institutions. The Prada Foundation began actively supporting site-specific installations through its involvement in a number of high profile projects presented as collateral events at the Venice Biennale. As discussed below, it presented an exhibition of two works by Francesco Vezzoli in 2005, and Thomas Demand’s Processo Grattesco in 2007. These were high profile, celebrity studded events. The Venice projects enabled the Foundation to further support and showcase new opportunities for artists well represented in the Prada collection.


131 External projects included Mark di Suvero, External Project, XLVI Biennale di Venezia, June 1995, which featured three large outdoor sculptures presented near the Giardini site; and Angelo Savelli, External Project, Centre of Contemporary Arts ‘Luigi Pecci’, Prato, June 1995.

132 See p. 84.
In 2010, Prada commissioned and presented *First Spring* (2010), a film by acclaimed Chinese artist Yang Fudong for Prada Spring/Summer 2010 collection. The work went viral through the popular video site Youtube. Fudong’s considerable reputation had developed through participation in international biennales and institutional exhibitions. Represented by the influential Marian Goodman Gallery in New York, Fudong’s first instalment of a five-part work entitled *Seven Intellectuals in Bamboo Forest* (2003) was exhibited at the Venice Biennale in 2003, while all five parts were included in the Venice Biennale in 2007, to critical acclaim. His work has also featured in *documenta 11* (2002), the Shanghai Biennale (2002), and Brisbane’s Asia Pacific Triennial (2006).

The Prada Foundation’s desire to showcase innovative and challenging projects reflected Prada and Bertelli’s approach to luxury fashion labels developed under the Prada Group’s name. Architecture, cinema and culture were part of the Prada Group’s brand and core values, with contemporary art playing an integral and influential role. Rem Koolhaas and OAM designed experimental, theatrically performative spaces for Prada retail outlets, opening the Prada Epicenter New York in 2001 in downtown SoHo, in the midst of an economic downturn and just after September 11. In 2003, Prada opened a second Prada Epicenter in Tokyo’s fashionable Aoyama district designed by Herzog and de Meuron, a six-storey futuristic glass bubble-paned building. Koolhaas designed two further Prada stores: the Prada Epicenter, Los Angeles, in 2004; and the Prada Transformer, a rotating multi-use pavilion, in Seoul in 2009. OAM’s designs for the new gallery and office spaces in Milan extended their vision for the Prada Group’s redefinition of commercial and artistic fusion. Contemporary art projects and exhibitions extended the Foundation’s collecting interests of sculpture, installation and architecture. The creation of permanent exhibition spaces to present exhibitions drawn from a collection did not differentiate the Prada Foundation from other contemporary international collectors and foundations. Its temporary projects offered a new forum in a biennale context for artists already well established in their collection. It is arguable, however, whether all large-scale immersive projects presented by Prada enabled the artist to present something that they chose to

---


repeat, as in the case of Thomas Demand’s *Processo Grottesco* (2007).\(^{135}\) None-the-less, Prada’s model offered a singular approach to the overall fusion of cutting edge architecture, fashion and contemporary art.

The Prada Foundation provides an interesting contrast with the Trussardi Foundation. Both foundations are based in Milan, were created by the leader of a luxury fashion house, were prominent in a global contemporary art world, were led by high profile curators, and contributed to the presentation of large-scale immersive installations and exhibitions in the biennale context. They extended the role of luxury fashion, in which art, architecture and cinema play an integral part. Prada’s Venetian art museum built on the notion of the ‘house museum’, conceived for the display of a private collection of art, while its first Milan gallery offered a space for the presentation of their contemporary collection and projects. The Fondazione Nicola Trussardi’s artistic activities, on the other hand, were more closely aligned with the tradition of the *kunsthalle*, albeit in a series of changing Milanese venues. The Trussardi Foundation presented projects that offered unique experiences in the unique buildings and locations of Milan. They commissioned new works, borrowed key works from the artist’s collection, and were also able to attract loans from major public and private collections. Given the historic preponderance of private collections in Milan, the Trussardi Foundation made site-specific temporary projects the focus of its activities.\(^{136}\)

**Thyssen Bornemisza Art Contemporary (T-B A21)**

Thyssen-Bornemisza Art Contemporary (T-B A21), a private foundation based in Vienna, Austria, was created in 2002 by Francesca von Habsburg, a fourth-generation collector and philanthropist of contemporary art. Although it became a prominent player in the creation of temporary site-specific installations, through its Art Projects series, the Foundation was originally created to aid the commissioning and collection of contemporary art. Von Habsburg noted in an interview in *Flash Art* in 2010 that she had created the Foundation as ‘it was the only way that

\(^{135}\) It is arguable whether Thomas Demand’s creation of an oversized model or immersive environment, *Processo Grottesco* (2007) offered a significantly new development in his art. The installation enabled Demand to work with shifts in scale, and reveal the sculptural process behind his photographs. This, however, was an aspect that he had always ensured remained hidden. While the large photographs made from this installation were seductively grand, it was possible to view them as illustrative of the experience of viewing itself. See Thomas Demand section below, p. 283.

serious artists would part with their better works.¹³⁷ Von Habsburg had seen Janet Cardiff’s work *The Forty-Part Motet* (2001) at P.S.1 in New York.¹³⁸ When she approached Cardiff to acquire the work, the artist refused to sell it to an individual, although she was prepared to sell the major work to a foundation.¹³⁹ For an artist of Cardiff’s reputation, such a significant piece was better positioned in an art museum collection rather than by a private collector, as the former offered an institutional endorsement and art historical context. T-B A21 was formed, and its first project was an exhibition *Walking thru* (2004) by Janet Cardiff. T-B A21 subsequently commissioned and acquired further works and projects from Janet Cardiff, developing a long working relationship.¹⁴⁰

T-B A21 subsequently commissioned a series of ‘Art Pavilion’ projects that presented stand-alone multi-disciplinary installations by both established and emerging artists and architects in a series of unique locations and contexts in Europe and beyond. The Art Pavilions were a further manifestation of Thyssen-Bornemisza’s collecting interests. The format enabled the Foundation to offer contemporary artists with international reputations and busy schedules a commission that had equivalent scale and standing to a commission from an art museum. The Foundation’s ability to organize a unique site, and to allow the artist to create a work specifically related to this context, ensured that the experience would be unique. As part of this Art Pavilion series, in 2005 T-B A21 commissioned Olafur Eliasson and David Adjaye’s Art Pavilion *Your black Horizon* (2005). It was first presented on Isola San Lazzaro degli Armeni, as a collateral event to the 51st Venice Biennale.¹⁴¹ In a windowless pavilion, a thin horizontal line of light, directed through a narrow gap at eye level, offered visitors a constantly changing colour spectrum calibrated to reflect the specific light conditions of Venice. Accurate readings had been taken from sunrise to


¹⁴¹ Eva Ehersberger and Daniela Zyman (eds.), *Your black Horizon*, (ex. cat.), Thyssen-Bornemisza Art Contemporary, Vienna, 2007. The work was subsequently presented twice more on the island of Lopud, Croatia.
sunset to study the light and intensity of the Mediterranean laguna. Between 2005-2012, T-B A21 presented five Art Pavilions, two further with David Adjaye, and two others in conjunction with the Venice International Architecture Biennale that occurred in alternate years to the contemporary art program. None received the level of critical acclaim of T-B A21’s 2005 project with Olafur Eliasson and David Adjaye.

In a panel discussion convened by Thyssen-Bornemisza to accompany the 2005 project with Eliasson and Adjaye in Venice, Hans Ulrich Obrist noted that the T-B A21 model presented another form, or new institution, of support for artists and artists’ projects. He noted other novel models, such as those offered by Guang-Yi in China, who collected installations by other Chinese artists that did not fit readily into buildings because they were either too big or complicated. Instead, he constructed buildings specifically to show these works. Obrist suggested that new institutions to support the commissioning of contemporary art would continue to evolve.

The collection, touring exhibitions, the development of archives, and a small permanent exhibition space remained important parts of T-B A21. It maintained a small permanent exhibition space in Vienna, in the building where Francesca von Habsburg also had an apartment, to show some of the smaller works from the collection. Archives were developed and maintained through curatorial projects developed with artists working with the foundation on new commissions. The Foundation also presented touring exhibitions from the collection at other art institutions. By 2009, the Foundation maintained a permanent exhibition space in Vienna, and a staff of ten. In 2012, they moved to new permanent galleries at Augarten,


143 The scale of the galleries meant that only smaller works from the collection could be shown. John Bock’s immersive installation, *Antonin Artaud und die Pest* (Antonin Artaud and the Plague) (2005), incorporating everyday objects and furniture presented in unexpected configurations, and video footage of Bock’s live performance, was installed as a semi-permanent display in the building’s roof space, under the eaves.

144 Conversation with Daniela Zyman, Vienna, Wednesday September 16, 2009. The archives were unavailable for consultation, as they had been packed in preparation for T-B A21’s move to new premises.


Vienna, inaugurating the space with an exhibition *Reprototypes, Triangulations and Road Test*, of works from the collection by British artist Simon Starling and Danish artists’ group SUPERFLEX. Nevertheless, the Art Pavilion projects were a core program for the Foundation, arguably because they differentiated the Foundation from other private collectors with gallery spaces and gave them an international presence.

**Other recent foundations**

Other new foundations further redefined their roles and the context within which they would operate. Not-for-profit foundations and organizations commissioning, producing and presenting ambitious art projects by emerging and established contemporary artists proliferated in the early 2000s, including the New York-based Art Production Fund founded in 2000 by curators Yvonne Force Villareal and Doreen Remen; the Pasadena, California-based West of Rome (WoR), launched by Emi Fontana in 2005, and working in the Los Angeles bay area; and LAND (Los Angeles Nomadic Division), founded in 2009 by curator Shamin M. Momin, former contemporary curator at the Whitney Museum of American Art, and Christine Y. Kim, Associate curator of Contemporary Art at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (LACMA), also presenting contemporary art projects in Los Angeles and beyond. Each of these organisations functioned without a permanent exhibition space, enabling it to select sites and locations specific to each of the art projects. All collaborated with more established art institutions and community organisations, enabling their temporary projects to reach a broader public. Like Artangel, Public
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Art Fund and Creative Time, they were not named after the individual, or individuals who founded the organisation. Each was initiated by an art professional who was strongly embedded within a local and global contemporary art world.

Other not-for-profit foundations such as SKOR, the Foundation for Art and Public Domain, formally recognized the fact that temporary site-specific projects and installations were changing the definition of public art and its role.\textsuperscript{149} Created in 1999, SKOR was a Dutch art institution that advised, developed and created art projects in relation to public spaces. Its projects and research reflected an ongoing interest in the way in which art projects in public spaces could reflect socio-political changes and new developments in contemporary art, urban design and landscape architecture.

Situations, a pilot art commissioning program within the University of the West of England in 2002, offered a further organization model.\textsuperscript{150} It looked to Artangel, Locus + (an artist led collective in the North of England) and Creative Time for inspiration on ways to make and engage with art in the public realm.\textsuperscript{151} Through artist commissions, lectures, seminars, research and publications developed over the ensuing decade, Situations contributed to the redefinition of public art and its presentation both in the U.K. and beyond.

Other curatorial initiatives reflected these trends. Led by the Litmus Research Initiative at Massey University, Wellington, and Claire Doherty, Director of Situations, \textit{One Day Sculpture} was produced in partnership with art institutions and curators across New Zealand. A time-based series of artist commissions, \textit{One Day Sculpture} took place over the course of a year (from June 2008 to June 2009), as a form of time-based curation, and offered tangible examples of the evolution in critical thinking and practice of public sculpture, temporality, performance, and


\textsuperscript{150} Situations website, \url{http://www.situations.org.uk/}, accessed September 27, 2012. After a partnership of ten years with the University of the West of England, Situations was re-launched as a new independent arts organization in the autumn of 2012.

curating art in the public realm.\textsuperscript{152} The selected artists were familiar names on an international biennale and exhibition circuit, their projects were artistically as well as philosophically and theoretically driven. The subsequent publication, \textit{One Day Sculpture} (2009), included texts by Jane Rendell, Terry Smith, Mick Wilson, Amelia Jones and Daniel Palmer on a range of related topics.\textsuperscript{153}

Small rural towns in New Zealand were not the only ones to present site-specific installations and socially engaged art. In February 2012, IASKA (International Art Spaces Kellerberrin Australia) launched its inaugural Biennial event, \textit{Spaced: art out of place}.\textsuperscript{154} After a highly successful residency program had been established in the wheat-belt town of Kellerberrin, the decision to launch \textit{Spaced} positioned it as yet another biennale format in an overpopulated landscape. Heralded as ‘an international event of socially engaged art’, the Biennial offered artists opportunities to stay in often remote parts of Western Australia, and develop community-based projects that responded to location, history and site. The attempt to reflect these community and site-responsive works in an exhibition format was not entirely successful.\textsuperscript{155} The most compelling works in this exhibition context were conceptually and aesthetically strong, though almost all bore little relation to the site-specific project or installation that preceded them.\textsuperscript{156} For a State politically focused on wheat-belt agriculture despite the reality of a booming mining and urbanist economy,\textsuperscript{157} the biennial exhibition offered government stakeholders a tried and tangible outcome for cultural projects that many would otherwise never see.

As I will show, KPAP started presenting temporary site-specific and publically engaged works before many of these other not-for-profit foundations and organisations evolved, including Artangel, PAF, and Creative Time. However, as I will argue, KPAP’s projects presented from

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{153} David Cross and Claire Doherty (eds.) \textit{One Day Sculpture}, Kerber Verlag, Bielefeld, Germany, 2009.
\item\textsuperscript{154} The Biennial had evolved from what had previously been a successful and ambitious residency program presenting seventy-two site-specific projects in and around the small rural community of the West Australian wheatbelt town of Kellerberrin from 1998 onwards.
\item\textsuperscript{156} See p. 16.
\item\textsuperscript{157} See John Daley and Annette Lancy, \textit{Investing in Regions: making a difference}, Grattan Institute, Melbourne, 2011, p. 47.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
the mid-1990s were influenced both by the projects and choice of artists presented by these international organisations, as well as their curatorial approach and organizational structure.

**BIENNALES**

New forms of installation art were fostered by the rise of the biennale, alongside foundations. As projects became more ambitious, they often demanded greater budgets. It was a form of art-making that lent itself to the explosion of large international exhibitions during the same period.\(^{158}\) However, the relationship between the development of installation art and its means of support was not simply causal or simply responsive.\(^{159}\) The relationships between artistic developments such as installation art, and the evolution of new institutional models through which it was fostered and presented were often complex and symbiotic.

The 1997 Münster Skulptur Projekte embodied this shift.\(^{160}\) A high-profile exhibition, international in scope, Münster Skulptur Projekte had occurred every ten years since its inception by Kasper König in 1977. König, curator of the first Projekte, later noted that he had been interested in examining the change in attitudes towards public art over time, and the relation to social changes.\(^{161}\) He wanted to focus on process rather than product; question ideas of public art for those who used the space; ask whether the role of the patron was still tenable in a changing context; and question whether there were still symbols that could be used to create collectivity.\(^{162}\) Twenty years later, these questions were still valid. In 1997, Münster Skulptur Projekte filled the German town with a range of permanent and temporary projects that continued to engage with process rather than product, site-specificity, audience, and socially-

---

158 See p.5. Installation art was also presented in a range of other art spaces, including ARI’s, and dealer galleries. However, the relative scale of most of these spaces ensured that they were usually not of the scale or spectacular nature of installation art in biennales.

159 Installation proliferated beyond the art museum, biennale and private foundation models of support.

160 The full-stop between Skulptur and Projekte was to differentiate it from the previous iterations of the project in 1977 and ‘87, and to indicate a new curatorial shift. For a discussion of the 1997 Münster Skulptur Projekte and social engagement, see Maria Lind, ‘Returning on Bikes: Notes on Social Practice’, in Nato Thompson (ed.), *Living as Form*, 2012.

161 König noted that in post-WW2 West Germany, many cities had erected public sculptures as a way of expressing commitment to democracy and freedom. In later years, these sculptures were seen very differently. Women’s Audio Archive, WAA.033, ‘Art Beyond Gallery: James Lingwood, Jan Hoet, Kasper, König’, ICA, London, February 20, 1988.

engaged art.\textsuperscript{163} Michael Asher’s \textit{Installation Münster (Caravan)} (1977) appeared once again, as it had in each of the Projektes, becoming a lens for a model of urban redevelopment, as photographs captured the changes to sites, and disappearance of certain original locations over twenty years.\textsuperscript{164} As in 1977, each week the caravan was parked at a different spot around the city during the show. While information about its location was available from the central museum site, nothing indicated that the caravan was art or that it had any connection to the exhibition at the central site. More obviously interventionist, Hans Haacke’s \textit{Standort Merry-go Round (Location Merry-go-round)} (1997), was a children’s roundabout complete with music and lights, surrounded by planks of wood and crowned by barbed wire. Placed next to a 1909 war memorial dedicated to the three Prussian wars between 1864 and 1871, its cultural and historic overtones could not be missed. In contrast, Douglas Gordon’s video installation \textit{Between Darkness and Light (after William Blake)} (1997) was presented in an underground pedestrian walkway, the action of the two films somehow mirroring the passing of foot and street traffic above and below ground. The 1997 Projekte marked a shift in which a new generation of artists addressed urban spaces and landscapes in a more exploratory, and participatory way. The town itself functioned as a public space for a range of artistic media, rather than as the site for a series of installations or public sculptures presented in isolation.

The third in a trinity of international exhibitions in Europe that year, Münster Skulptur. Projekte’s focus on installations and art responsive to site offered a real alternative to the 47\textsuperscript{th} Venice Biennale and \textit{documenta X} held in Kassel in the same summer of 1997.\textsuperscript{165} The Biennale was notable for video installations including Pipilotti Rist’s \textit{Anahita’s swinging} (1997), and works by Sam Taylor Woods and Mariko Mori. Marina Abramović’s performance and installation \textit{Balkan Baroque} (1997) was a compelling politically charged alternative.\textsuperscript{166} But in general, the biennale context offered little interplay between installation and site. Instead, it offered a large audience a series of contemporary projects and curated exhibitions in fairly conventional exhibition formats.


\textsuperscript{165} The 1997 47\textsuperscript{th} Biennale di Venezia, curated by Germano Celant; \textit{documenta 10}, curated by Catherine David; Münster Skulptur Projekte curated by Kasper König, Klaus Bussmann, and Florian Matzner.

\textsuperscript{166} Abramović had been invited to present work in the former Yugoslavian pavilion. However, when the invitation was withdrawn under pressure from the Montenegrin government, Celant invited her to show as part of his curated exhibition instead.
Catherine David’s *documenta X* (1997) was a monumental exhibition, the first *documenta* curated by a woman, and it was accompanied by one hundred days of talks, lectures, performances, and related events, entitled ‘100 days – 100 guests’. In contrast to these two mega-exhibitions in established biennale venues, Skulptur. Projekte offered new ways of thinking about exhibitions in the expanded field. Its artistic diversity marked an obvious shift in the nature of contemporary art beyond the gallery walls. Skulptur. Projekte captured a renewed attention to social practice and the immersive experience, alongside the spectacular and the site specific.

The Venice Biennale caught up with these changes with Szeemann’s curated exhibition for the 1999 Venice Biennale. First initiated in 1895, the Venice Biennale was the world’s oldest biennale. Unlike many later biennale forms, in addition to a curated exhibition component, it featured a series of national pavilion exhibitions, as well as ‘peripheral’ events beyond its official scope. An inveterate biennale curator, Szeemann had co-organised the 1980 Venice Biennale with Achile Bonito Oliva, in which they introduced the Aperto section for the first time, to showcase younger artists and emerging art in the Magazzini del Sale in Dosoduro. In 1999, Szeemann’s *dAPERTutto*, the 48th edition of the Venice Biennale, introduced more artists from countries beyond the Western hegemony, such as Asia and Eastern Europe, and used the newly restored exhibition spaces of the Arsenale for the first time. Large-scale immersive installations that actively engaged the viewer were a feature of Szeemann’s curated exhibition, such as the sound, video and atmospheric experiences included, such as Chen Zhen’s *Drumming Room* (1999), Thomas Hirschorn’s *World-Airport* (1999), Doug Aitken’s eight-projection installation *electric earth* (1999) – for which he won the International Prize, Olafur Eliasson, and New York-based Iranian Shirin Neshat’s compelling two-screen video *Turbulent* (1998). For all, the spectator was central to these experiential works of art. The massive exhibition halls of the Arsenale, that had once been Venice’s industrial warehouses, required art-making on a grand scale, with video and installation proliferating.

---


However, Szeemann’s curated exhibition for the 2001 Venice Biennale, *The Plateau of Mankind*, did not attract the same critical response.\(^{170}\) Whereas the 1999 Biennale was notable for installations within the exhibition space, 2001 was remembered for projects beyond the frame of the curated exhibition. In an article entitled ‘Groans of Venice’ in the September 2001 issue of *Artforum*, Daniel Birnbaum and others discussed the failings of Szeemann’s *The Plateau of Mankind*, which in their view suffered from too much video and durational cinematic work.\(^{171}\)

But critics, curators and reviewers in 2001 all noted the strength of the national pavilions and certain collateral events. Mark Wallinger represented Great Britain with a series of ironic Biblical installations and witty trompe l’œil hoardings that doubled as the façade of the Pavilion itself; Pierre Huyghe represented France; Robert Gober the USA; Luc Tymans re-introduced painting that was at once contemporary and political in the Belgian Pavilion; Ernesto Neto presented an olfactory experience with *Blue Cave* (2001) in the Brazilian pavilion; while in the Australian pavilion, Lyndal Jones presented a video elegy to the city of Venice.\(^{172}\) Janet Cardiff and George Bures Miller’s *The Paradise Institute* (2001), in the Canadian pavilion, created an immersive experience that incorporated cinema, sculpture and sound, layering spoken fictions and cinematic film noire to create a work in which it was difficult to distinguish fact over fantasy. Gregor Schneider’s *Totes Haus ur* (Dead house ur) (2001) in the German Pavilion had queues of critics, curators, collectors and celebrity guests lined down the central avenue of the Giardini for the four days of the *vernissage* preview, and for which he was awarded the Golden Lion.\(^{173}\)

Works extended beyond the traditional confines of the Biennale, and the city itself. Maurizio Cattelan presented *Hollywood* (2001) as an off-site work, the first supported by a Venice Biennale. It was located in Sicily, in the hills surrounding Palermo, above the southern city’s municipal rubbish dump. Cattelan’s equally dramatically-scaled Hollywood sign was a replica of the original

---


\(^{173}\) Three years later, with the support of Artangel, Schneider presented a further extension of this work in London, *Die Familie Schneider* (2004). It was another immersive, psychologically charged house experience that built on the reputation of the work presented first in Reydt, Germany, and more publically, at the 2001 Venice Biennale.
that famously sits atop the hills above Sunset Boulevard in Los Angeles. Its context and reading, however, were very different in this setting. Lynne Cooke, curator of Dia Art Foundation, New York since 1991, described a jet-load of art world insiders – critics, collectors and curators – who were flown down south for the day, to see the work, have a drink, take a stroll, and take photos of Cattelan’s re-appropriation of the iconic sign. It was, as Cooke noted, ‘an event amongst events’. Projects such as these had become the convergence point for curator, critic, collector, and expecting public alike. As Lynne Cooke noted in her review of the 2001 Biennale, the proliferation of biennales and triennales reflected the exponential growth and globalisation of the art world, and was breeding a generation of ‘biennale’ artists whose mode of practice was primarily supported by this new industry of exhibition events.

The influence of the biennale exhibition and the rise of a form of installation art also extended to the commercial realm. In 2003, Polly Staple commissioned a program of Artists’ Projects for the 2003 inaugural Frieze Art Fair. It explored the idea of ‘sited’ projects that could engage politically, socially and economically with the commercial contemporary context of the art fair. It included works such as Paola Pivi’s Untitled (slope) (2003), a giant grass slope presented in the Frieze tent, that was both a giant monumental sculpture, and a performance that required the participation of art fair attendees. The curated program functioned in the same way as a mini-biennale within the confines of a commercial art fair enterprise. In 2004, Staple invited artists to address the notion of circulation as a means of communication that could achieve access for all. Resisting the notion of the spectacular, exemplified by Pivi’s project of 2003, projects in 2004 included publications, such as Aleksandra Mir’s fictitious biography of a collector’s daughter; Adam Chodzko’s nocturnal map of the fair; Roman Ondák’s queues; and live radio broadcasts.

Academic Olav Velthuis argued that the impact of these important international mega-exhibitions, or biennales, and their relationship to the contemporary art market could not be

176 Staple was presented as one of a new, young breed of curators who epitomized the shift in curatorial practice. Staple noted that she brought an ‘academic art historian’s brain, but also a fine art training so I can see a project from both points of view.’ Liz Hoggard, Lisa O’Kelly and Carl Wilkinson, ‘Best in Show’, Observer, Sunday 9 October 2005, http://www.guardian.co.uk/artanddesign/2005/oct/09/art1, accessed December 1, 2012.
overlooked.\textsuperscript{179} Arguably, he said in a lead article ‘The Venice Effect’, in the \textit{Art Newspaper} in June 2011, the relationship (though a taboo topic) of commerce and culture at one of the world’s most famous exhibitions of contemporary art went hand-in-hand. In 1895, when the Venice Biennale was founded, it was established as a new market for contemporary art.\textsuperscript{180} Sales were an intrinsic part of the biennale until 1968, when the protests of students and intellectuals led to the decision to revoke sales. Since then, officially, a ban on sales has remained. Dealers and collectors, however, use the \textit{vernissage} period in which to view and acquire art. Curators and commissioners have steadfastly repeated that exhibitions are framed as a ‘locus for experiment rather than commerce’, elaborating on the fundamental difference between the institution and the art fair.\textsuperscript{181} Velthuis also noted that as curators attempted to demonstrate their independence from the market, they focused more extensively on work that is hard to sell. The Venice Biennale’s \textit{Utopia Station} (2003) epitomized this point.\textsuperscript{182} Thus, he suggested, we have seen the rise of installations and videos in biennales around the globe.\textsuperscript{183} ‘Non-commodities have slowly crowded out the commodities at the biennale.’ This has not, however, separated the biennale from the market: the representation of artists by commercial galleries who have a biennale practice ‘produces symbolic capital for these dealers’, Velthuis suggested. And as a generation of collectors emerged with the means and the desire to acquire this type of art, traditional non-commodity did not prove an obstacle. As the biennale and art fair has positioned contemporary art as a social and cultural experience, the increasingly elite aspects – such as the acquisition of non-commodity art – reflects and reproduces the well-established status hierarchies of the contemporary art world.

\begin{flushright}

\textsuperscript{180} Velthuis, ‘The Venice Effect’, 2011, p. 21. The ‘Venice Effect’ that Velthuis referred to is the impact that being curated into the Venice biennale could have on an artist’s career. For emerging artists, the effect could be huge, however for big name artists with established reputations and impressive sales, the effect was far less.

\textsuperscript{181} Velthuis, ‘The Venice Effect’, 2011, p. 22.


\textsuperscript{183} Velthuis, ‘The Venice Effect’, 2011, p. 23.
\end{flushright}
BIENNALES AND ART FOUNDATIONS

The 2001 Venice Biennale contained a work that brought together biennale and foundations for the first time in support of large-scale installation. This model would subsequently prove important to the development of large-scale signature installations at biennales. As a satellite project to the 2001 Venice Biennale, the London-based not-for-profit foundation PEER presented Mike Nelson’s *The Deliverance and The Patience* (2001). The maze-like installation was created in the Ex Birreria (a large disused brewery building), on Venice’s other island, the Giudecca. Alluding to the 17th century settlement of the new colony of Virginia, slave trade, and piracy, Nelson’s title was a reference to the ill-fated voyage from Bermuda to Virginia of two galleon ships, *The Deliverance* and *The Patience*.\(^{184}\) Built over two months, Nelson’s work filled an empty 26,000 square feet space with sixteen rooms, a mezzanine, and 190 running feet of corridor.\(^{185}\) Though it borrowed from Nelson’s *Coral Reef* (2000) project in style and form, shown at Matt’s Gallery, London during the previous year, this was a far more ambitious undertaking. No amount of recounting or photography could adequately capture the work’s sound, smell and the experience of the unique location. A series of wooden doors opened to reveal a range of squalid, abandoned spaces: an empty sweatshop, a workshop, a travel agent’s dingy office, and a gambling den. Cigarette butts suggested recent occupation, though the biker’s bar, and other spaces remained sinisterly uninhabited. While the work was similar in form to Schneider’s *Totes Haus Ur* (2001) in the German Pavilion, Nelson’s installation was notable for its quietly menacing theatrics and its position away from the crowd.\(^{186}\) The work was widely reviewed both in articles and newspapers at the time, and in subsequent scholarly research.\(^{187}\) Its status as an independent project presented by a private foundation marked a further shift in global biennales, and the institutional development of installation art. For PEER, Nelson’s project marked a culmination in a series of site-specific, temporary projects presented in and around the East End of London, as we have seen, often presented in collaboration with local councils, and other trusts and


foundations. For Nelson, it was the first of his large-scale, immersive, site-specific projects presented within a biennale context.

PEER’s private initiative at the 2001 Venice Biennale revealed the changing role of private, public and state institutions in an increasingly globalized art world. As this chapter has shown, it was part of a wider trend of contemporary art privately supported by a younger generation of philanthropists, whose motivations were not necessarily driven by personal collecting interests.

Indeed, this emerging form of installation art and large-site specific projects presented new challenges for the average private collector. Martin Gayford, writing in *The Telegraph* in 2001 noted that, notwithstanding Nelson’s newfound celebrity status as the possible next Emin or Hirst (Nelson was shortlisted for the Tate Britain’s prestigious Turner Prize in 2001), his work eschewed commodification. At that time, Nelson had only sold two works. But with the exception of newspaper commentary about the artist or the work itself, there was no critical writing about this new model of philanthropic support for contemporary art, or how it fitted within the existing network of collectors, curators and art institutions that made up the increasingly globalized contemporary art world.

Nelson’s installation was one of the first of a series of notable satellite projects at the Venice Biennale presented over the next ten years by private not-for-profit foundations. As a collateral event to the 51st Venice Biennale in 2005, the Prada Foundation presented an exhibition of Francesco Vezzoli curated by Germano Celant, at the Fondazione Cini, Isola di San Giorgio Maggiore, Venice, entitled *Trilogia della Morte* (Trilogy of Death) (2005). Taking its inspiration from the Italian director Pier Paolo Pasolini, the exhibition featured two works, the first being *Comizi di Non Amore* (Non-love meetings) (2004), a reconstruction of an old-fashioned movie

---

188 See above p. 58.

189 *Conversation with Mike Nelson, London, July 5, 2010.*

190 In 2001, Nelson was shortlisted with Richard Billingham, Isaac Julien and Martin Creed. Creed won the Prize with his work *Work No. 227 The Lights Going On and Off* (2000). Nelson was shortlisted a second time for the Turner Prize in 2007, along with Nathan Coley, Sarina Bhimji, and winner Mark Wallinger. Wallinger was awarded the prize for his installation *State Britain* (2007), a recreation of Brian Haw’s five-year anti-war display in Parliament Square, London, made in response to British involvement in the Iraq war.


theatre projecting a film inspired by television reality shows that featured female icons Catherine Deneuve, Marianne Faithfull, Antonella Lualdi, Jeanne Moreau and Ela Weber. The second, *Le 120 sedute di Sodoma* (The 120 Seats of Sodom) (2004), was an installation of 120 Argyle chairs with embroidered seats designed by Charles Rennie Mackintosh in 1904, arranged facing the tapestry *La Fine di Canterbury* (2004), a Gobelins traditional handwoven wool tapestry featuring erotic scenes taken from other films by the artist. In 2007, Vezzoli was one of two artists chosen to represent Italy in the newly reappointed Italian Pavilion at the Tese delle Vergini in the Arsenale. Celant’s exhibition and project for the Prada Foundation by Francesco Vezzoli in 2005 not only raised the profile of the artist on a global art stage, but also acted as a form of public and private endorsement of the artist’s worth.

In 2005, Thyssen Bornemisza Art Contemporary’s project with Olafur Eliasson and David Adjaye’s Art Pavilion, *Your Black Horizon* (2005) was presented as a collateral event as part of the Venice Biennale. In 2007, the Prada Foundation exhibited a further commission and exhibition at the Fondazione Cini, Thomas Demand’s *Processo Grottesco* (2007), in which the artist created a life-size model. It was an inversion of Demand’s photographic process, in which the model of the found image from which the photographs were taken was discarded and remained an invisible part of the process. Photographers, too, were entranced by the possibilities of the spectacular. In 2008, T-B A21 commissioned Janet Cardiff and George Bures Miller’s *The Murder of Crows* (2008) as part of Carolyn Christov-Bakargiev’s Sydney Biennale in that year. It was another example of a foundation participating in the biennale context. It was one of the memorable works of that year’s biennale, as the ambient sounds of seagulls and lapping water under the pier intermingled with the soundscapes created by Cardiff and Bures Miller. A retrospective text by Christov-Bakargiev on *The Murder of Crows* (2008) was included in *Thyssen-

---


194 Italian Pavilion Press Release, 2007. For the 2007 newly appointed Italian Pavilion at the Tese delle Vergini in the Arsenale, new works were presented by arte povera artist Giuseppe Penone (Garessio, Cuneo, 1947), and Francesco Vezzoli (Brescia, 1971). Vezzoli’s video installation *Democrazy* (2007) featured Hollywood actress Sharon Stone and French philosopher Bernard-Henri Lévy. It was inspired by the forthcoming 2008 US presidential elections, and conceived the venue of the Venice Biennale as the forum for a confrontation between the two hypothetical candidates for one of the most important offices of the world. Curator of the Italian Pavilion, Ida Gianelli, then Director of the Castello di Rivoli, stated of her choice of artists ‘Although these two artists belong to different generations and despite the difference between their languages, they are both contemporary art protagonists and express the deepness and richness of contemporaneity’.

195 See p. 72.

196 For a discussion of Demand’s process, see Demand section, p. 283.

197 See below p. 244.
For Daniel Birnbaum’s 53rd Venice Biennale in 2009, the Fondazione Nicola Trussardi supported two projects, as well as exhibiting Tacita Dean’s project, Still Life in Milan, to coincide with the Venice Biennale.\textsuperscript{198} Roberto Cuoghi’s sound work, Mei Gui, was installed as part of Birnbaum’s curated exhibition Making Worlds, in the little known garden courtyard by Carlo Scarpa off the Palazzo delle Esposizioni (formerly the Padiglione Italia) within the Giardini. The work received a Special Mention in the Biennale awards.\textsuperscript{200} The Trussardi Foundation’s involvement marked their ongoing support for an artist with whom they had previously worked.\textsuperscript{201}

Trussardi was also involved in a second project as part of the 2009 Biennale. Described as an Incursion, Trussardi produced the catalogue for Michael Elmgreen & Ingar Dragset’s curated exhibition, The Collectors, presented in the Danish and Nordic Pavilions.\textsuperscript{202} The Foundation had previously worked with Elmgreen & Dragset with its first project in Milan in 2003.\textsuperscript{203} Elmgreen & Dragset’s contribution to the 53rd Biennale was the ‘must see’ event of that year, awarded a Special Mention in the Venice Biennale awards, and the subject of numerous art magazine reviews and articles.\textsuperscript{204} The artists turned the Alvar Alto designed Modernist Nordic pavilion, and its adjoining Danish pavilion, into the home of an imaginary collector. Works by twenty-four invited contemporary artists were presented within the setting of an imagined private home.


\textsuperscript{199} See p. 66.


\textsuperscript{202} The catalogue was conceived as an artist’s multiple: a play on the promotional bags produced to be gifted or sold to visitors by many of the country’s pavilions. It contained a variety of offerings: limited editions, books, posters, postcards, and even a salami – ‘an irreverent contribution from Maurizio Cattelan’. See Gioni, What good is the Moon?, 2010, p. 360.

\textsuperscript{203} See above p. 62.

As a lifelike dead collector floated face down in his outside pool, actual naked male youths lounged in conversation pits surrounded by modernist design icons.

Elmgreen & Dragset’s 2009 Nordic and Danish pavilions self-referentially characterised significant developments in the art world over the preceding decade. In a subversively playful manner, the artists highlighted the wider public’s renewed love affair with the cool Modernist lines of Danish architecture and design. Within the context of the Venice Biennale, their creation of a fictitious contemporary collector’s home acknowledged the role and status of the contemporary collector within a globalised market. It coincided with a spate of books that popularised the workings of the contemporary art world, the role of the market and the identity of wealthy collectors within it. The exhibition also marked the apotheosis of the curator through the international biennale exhibition.

The Fondazione Nicola Trussardi’s involvement in two critically acclaimed projects within the biennale context marked the increasingly public role of private foundations within the context of the contemporary art world. They built on previously existing relationships developed between artists and foundations, presented publically within the biennale framework. Foundations were no longer merely the mechanism to fund the work. Collaboration of this kind circumvented the institutional system of support for artists’ projects, which was often lengthy and bureaucratic (and did not necessarily guarantee results). Through the biennale vehicle, if the curator or artistic director was interested in an artist’s work, foundations that had previously worked with the artist could become directly involved in commissioning often large, ambitious projects. Sometimes, one of an edition went into the collection of the foundation, as in the case of Cardiff and Bures Miller’s The Murder of Crows (2008). As a result of their international status, such artists usually

205 See above p.9, p. 30.
207 See above p. 6
208 For example, in Australia, artists can apply for government funding from state funding bodies, such as Arts Victoria, or Commonwealth agencies, such as the Australia Council. Applications can be made twice a year, and require lengthy applications and acquittal reports, if successful. Private foundations do not require this sort of administration.
wanted to focus on art museum quality and scaled works. To give a work a similar cachet as an
exhibition in an art museum, the private collector or foundation needed to present the work in a
recognised context, such as a biennale.

ART FOUNDATIONS AND DESTINATION ART

What might be the cutting edge for foundations and contemporary art in the next two decades?
One possibility is the further influence of foundations in promoting contemporary art in remote
locations that is in part cultural tourism, part culturally led economic renewal, part cultural well
being, and in part the next phase of marketing exclusive experience and collecting. Unlike the
focus of this thesis, such work is not necessarily temporary or site-responsive, though particular
artworks may originally have been conceived as such. Projects may well present the work of
significant local contemporary artists who do not have a high international profile, alongside
works by contemporary ‘big names’. The confidence to do both reflects in some degree the
power of private collectors to acquire, and install, increasingly complex and ambitious
installations and large-scale projects, and make curatorial decisions, which were once the domain
of the public art institution or funding body.

Early manifestations

Early manifestations of destination art were already visible by 1990. Robert Smithson’s *Spiral Jetty*
(1970), Dia Art Foundation’s sponsorship of Walter de Maria’s *The Lightning Field* (1977), Donald
Judd’s Marfa project, and Ian Hamilton Finlay’s sculpture and garden, Little Sparta, outside
Edinburgh, were early precursors of this form of art.\textsuperscript{209} They were, however, largely single artist
projects. More recent endeavours like the Benesse Art Foundation’s Art Site Naoshima; the
Instituto Inhotim, in Brazil; and on a ‘smaller’ scale, MONA in Tasmania and the Gibbs Farm in
New Zealand, have all radically redefined the meaning of this term in scale and breadth of art.\textsuperscript{210}

\textsuperscript{209} The garden was first established in 1966 by Finlay and his wife Sue Finlay, and was named Little Sparta in 1983.

\textsuperscript{210} New Zealand entrepreneur Alan Gibb created a 1000-acre sculpture park, The Farm, on New Zealand’s Kaipara Harbour,
approximately one hour from Auckland, which includes major commissions by international artists Andy Goldsworthy, Anish
Kapoor, Bill Culbert, Daniel Buren, Sol LeWitt and Tony Oursler. Like Kaldor, Gibb began collecting minimal and abstract art,
but purchased the farm in 1991 to create unique site-specific commissions. See Rob Garrett, ‘Alan Gibbs Farm’, *Art
World* AUS/NZ Edition Issue 9, June-July 2009, pp54-65; also published in *Art World* UK/Int’l Edition Issue 12, August-
September 2009, pp124-129.
Supported by Dia Art Foundation, Donald Judd’s Marfa project, known as The Chinati Foundation, opened a contemporary art museum in Marfa, Texas, in 1986 as an independent, non-profit, publically funded institution. Based upon the ideas of its founder, Donald Judd, Marfa was originally conceived by the artist as a vehicle to exhibit the work of Donald Judd, John Chamberlain, and Dan Flavin in a series of former army barracks that Judd had acquired. It offered a new form of museum as artwork. Colacello noted that the body of works Judd created in Marfa, Texas, employed $5 million of Dia Foundation’s money. The collection was expanded to include works by other artists, including Carl Andre, Roni Horn, Ilya Kabakov, Claes Oldenburg and Coosje van Bruggen, Richard Long and John Wesley, alongside works by the original artists. Furthermore, an artist in residency program enabled contemporary artists from around the world to develop work in this unique location.

**Benesse Art Foundation**

Benesse Holdings, a series of private foundations created to develop Art Site Naoshima in Japan’s southern Seto Inland Sea focused on the contemporary art development of an isolated area. The undertaking developed a range of long-term projects and art experiences that opened in 1992, and continued to evolve. Benesse Park was developed by Soichiro Fukutake, a Japanese businessman with global interests, on a site first purchased by his father in 1955. It included a series of buildings designed by internationally acclaimed Japanese architect, Tadao Ando, which included the Benesse House Museum (1992), a hotel and museum complex, and three further accommodation buildings, Oval (1995), Park (2006) and Beach (2006). Ando designed two further museums in the Park, the Chichu Art Museum, and Lee Ufan Museum. Permanent installations and art works were installed in and around the museums and buildings. Yayoi Kusama’s gigantic *Pumpkin* (1994-2005), sitting at the end of a jetty against a backdrop of sea and nearby islands, became an iconic corporate image for the Benesse Art Site project.

---

211 See Marianne Stockebrand, *Marfa*, Chinati Foundation, Texas in association with Yale University Press, Newhaven, 2010. The Judd Foundation and the Chinati Foundation are two distinct organisations, though they both manage aspects of Judd’s legacy.

212 Colacello, *Vanity Fair*, 1996.

213 Founded in 1955 as Fukutake Publishing Co., Benesse Holdings was largely the vision of Soichiro Fukutake, though it built on the company created by his father, Tetsuhiko Fukutake started in the postwar years in Japan. See introduction by Nobuko Fukutake, in Naoshima Fukutake Art Museum Foundation (ed), *The Chichu Art Museum, Tadao Ando Builds for Walter De Maria, James Turrell, and Claude Monet*, Hatje Cantz, 2005, p. 79.
While the collection did not demonstrate any radical departures from many private collections of contemporary art, other installations and art projects did.²¹⁴ The juxtaposition of an installation of the late Nymphéas water-lily paintings of Claude Monet, displayed in the cathedral-like space designed by Ando and Yuji Ajimoto, with its white marble-tessellated floored gallery lit with ambient natural light, did more than simply reflect the Japanese nation’s enduring regard for French Impressionism.²¹⁵ Shown alongside the Minimal sculpture of Walter de Maria and immersive light and atmospheric installation by James Turrell, the combination of context, architecture and art offered visitors a unique experience.²¹⁶ It drew on a tradition of fusing art and architecture, including Matisse’s chapel in Vence, the de Menil Rothko Chapel in Huston, Texas, and Judd’s installations of his own work, and that of his contemporaries, at Marfa, Texas.

A series of eight Art House Projects were presented between 1998-2009 in the nearby district of Honmura, Naoshima. Each project was a solo artist commission, and was installed in a local disused or abandoned building in the once busy fishing village, now emptied by the economically driven exodus of the younger generation to large cities combined with an aging population. Each project evolved through extensive consultation with local residents and communities, and the building, and even aspects of the work’s fabrication, used traditional techniques and Japanese artisans. With the exception of James Turrell’s Minamidera (1999), a light work in a specially designed vernacular black timber clad building, all Art House Projects presented work by Japanese artists, including Tatsuo Miyajima, Rei Naito, Hiroshi Sugimoto, Hiroshi Senju, Yoshihiro Suda, and Shinro Ohtake.²¹⁷

²¹⁴ The collection included works by Dan Graham, Bruce Nauman, Yukinori Yanagi, George Rickey, David Hockney, Jackson Pollock, Jasper Johns, Cy Twombly, Alexander Calder, Frank Stella, Jean Michel Basquiat, and Donald Judd. See Yuji Akimoto and Kumiko Ehara (eds.), Remain in Naoshima, Benesse Corporation Corporate Communications Office, Okayama, 2000.

²¹⁵ Claude Monet, Water Lilies (1914-17); Water Lilies, Reflections of Weeping Willows (1916-19), Water-Lily Pond (ca. 1915-26), Water Lilies (1914-17), on loan from Asahi Breweries, Japan. Recent examples of Japanese exhibitions focusing on French Impressionism include Impressionist and Post-Impressionist Masterpieces from the National Gallery of Art, National Art Centre, Tokyo (2011); Do you like Impressionism, Bridgestone Museum of Art, Tokyo (2010); Manet and Modern Paris, Mitsubishi Ichigokan Museum, Tokyo (2010).


²¹⁷ Tatsuo Miyajima, Kadoya (1998); James Turrell, Minamidera (1999); Rei Naito, Kinza (2001); Hiroshi Sugimoto, Go’s Shrine (2002); Hiroshi Senju, Ishibashi (2006); Yoshihiro Suda, Gokaiishi (2006); Shinro Ohtake, Haisha (2006) and Naoshima Bath I (love heart) Yu (2009).
Temporary and permanent art projects and installations on the nearby islands of Teshima and Inujima extended the idea of temporary and permanent site-specific art. A number of the works were first installed as part of the first Art Setouchi 2010, a festival of site-specific temporary artworks by Japanese and international artists located on many of the islands of the Seto Inland Sea. The Festival reflected a further aspect of the Foundation, its international ambitions revealed through the adoption of a triennial exhibition model, rather than festival, for its second iteration in 2013.

The Foundation’s many publications disseminated information and images about the remote, and visually beautiful projects, buildings and location. Titles included *Remain in Naoshima* (2000), *Naoshima, Nature, Art, Architecture* (2010), and *INSULAR INSIGHT, Where Art and Architecture Conspire with Nature, Naoshima, Teshima, Inujima* (2011). They featured a range of essays by local and international academics and scholars, such as Miwon Kwon’s text in *Naoshima, Nature, Art, Architecture*, published by Hatje Kantz. The Foundation also maintained an international profile through its endowment of the Benesse Prize, awarded to an artist at the Venice Biennale. A series of symposia, the ‘Naoshima Meetings’, held since the founding of the Naoshima Contemporary Art Museum in 1992, enabled leading contemporary curators, writers and critics to experience the site, and reflect on the role and place of the Benesse Art Site within a globalised contemporary art world. The panelists of the 2000 ‘Naoshima Meeting V’ included Hans-Ulrich Obrist, Jérôme Sans, and Dan Cameron, who had each been members of the jury that chose the...

---


221 The Prize was established on the occasion of the *TransCulture* exhibition organized in 1995 under the patronage of the 46th Venice Biennale. Artists were chosen from the Biennale exhibitions and projects.
winner of the Benesse Prize at the 1999 Venice Biennale.\textsuperscript{222} With its strong focus on the social and political context of the projects, and relationship to landscape and site, Art Site Naoshima revealed how a private foundation could enable its creator to develop projects rooted in their local context, while engaging with a broader cultural and artistic frame. Though not articulated as such, it was philosophically aligned with cultural well-being approaches.\textsuperscript{223}

\textbf{Instituto Inhotim}

Another significant example of these private initiatives was the Instituto Inhotim, created by mining billionaire Bernardo Paz in Minas Gerais, in a remote part of southeast Brazil. Paz began building pavilions in grounds of the extensive botanic garden in which to show works of art in the late 1990s, and in 2006 it opened to the public.\textsuperscript{224} A complex of permanent pavilions, art installations, and exhibitions drawn from the permanent collection of contemporary art were set within the 240 hectare complex of exotic gardens. The art park project united Paz’s dual passions for contemporary art and botanical gardens in one location. Over 30,000 people visited in 2011.\textsuperscript{225} While one hundred people a day may not be much for a city-based art institution, in a remote part of Brazil, the number is noteworthy. The project was in part cultural tourism, and in part the further institutionalization of the activities of a not-for-profit foundation. In an article for \textit{Frieze} magazine in 2011, Dan Fox asked whether this represented a new kind of institutional model.\textsuperscript{226} A recognition of the role of such institutions in the contemporary art landscape was reflected by the Independent Curators International (ICI)’s choice of Instituto Inhotim as the venue for its Curatorial Intensive held in April 2012.\textsuperscript{227} Scholarly research into new developments in Asia, India, and China is yet to be developed.


\textsuperscript{227} See ICI website, \url{http://curatorsintl.org/intensive/instituto_inhotim}, accessed September 27, 2012.
CONCLUSION

This review of foundations and not-for-profit organisations argues that one aspect of international contemporary art for the two decades from 1990-2012 was the rise of the ‘nomadic artist’, the internationally mobile contemporary artist presenting projects across the globe. These artists presented a form of biennale art that was temporary, often large-scale, and sometimes responded to its specific location, history and site. Maurizio Cattelan and Jens Hoffmann’s notorious fictitious Caribbean Biennial of 1999 not only drew attention to the proliferation of the biennale form in established and increasingly exotic locations, but the generation of nomadic contemporary artists whose art was made in response to this format. Foundations were crucial in supporting and often co-producing this work. The allure of site-specific temporary installations was the unreplicable experience of the first-hand viewing of a work made specifically for its site. The exhibition context was also important, as was the fact that the work no longer existed in that form after the event. Ironically, as these works proliferated, supported by public institutions, biennales and foundations, the exclusivity of the experience in this context waned, perhaps heralding the rise of foundation support for Destination Art.

Foundations promoting site-specific, ephemeral installations and temporary art projects shared a variety of motives, models and outcomes. Some organisations, such as Creative Time, chose to work with artists whose practice often incorporated social and participatory forms of art. Others such as Trussardi saw their commissions as, in part, a mechanism for revealing or revitalizing their city. Others, particularly Artangel, simply saw installation art and temporary immersive projects as the most visible cutting edge of contemporary art, in which they wanted to be involved. The latter motive explains the attraction for foundations closely associated with significant collections of contemporary art such as the Prada Foundation or Thyssen Bornimisza Art Contemporary. The kudos and networks available as a result of their involvement with high profile installations, often in association with biennales, also did no harm to their access to collecting high-quality and significant art.

228 See Bydler, Global Art, 2004, for a discussion of this term.

229 See p. 66.
Although some foundations, such as PEER, Artangel and PAF began as organisations primarily driven by their founders, almost all ultimately became more professional, adopting a model of leadership by a high profile curator, backed by a curatorial team and often accompanied by an equally high profile advisory board. Lingwood at Artangel, Eccles and Baume at PAF, Gioni at Trussardi and Celant at Prada were all curators with high profiles in public institutions before they began working with foundations. All, interestingly, are men, though a significant number of women had initiated the foundations.

These foundations operated within, and effectively worked to expand and promote, a global contemporary art world. As this study has shown, despite their location in several different cities, there was substantial overlap between the artists they commissioned, their curatorial advisors, and the biennale exhibitions that they supported.

As this analysis shows, from the 1990s, the development of large-scale immersive installations coincided with the institutional and artistic evolution of not-for-profit foundations. The relationship between the rise of installation art and foundations is symbiotic. New foundations were often created to respond to the recent trends in contemporary art, particularly the renewed focus on site-specificity and on large-scale temporary installations, which sometimes offered a form of artistic social engagement for the viewer. These art forms were frequently presented within the context of globally focused biennales. Foundations were often embedded within, and worked alongside, the established institutional frames of art institutions, biennales, and commercial art fairs. The role of private foundations and not-for-profit organisations within this global contemporary art world should be seen as a new form of patronage that, alongside new institutional support, actively facilitated the development of installation art.

To date, little critical work has assessed the foundations and organisations identified in this chapter, or their role and impact as part of both local and global contemporary art worlds. The remainder of this thesis analyses one such foundation—Kaldor Public Art Projects—in detail.
CHAPTER TWO: THE ORIGINS OF JOHN KALDOR ART PROJECTS

KALDOR’S EDUCATION AND TRAINING

John Kaldor’s early history as an expatriate and immigrant shaped his subsequent philanthropic and collecting decisions. Born in Budapest, Hungary, in 1936, a city ravaged by widespread destruction during World War II and subsequent communist rule by the Soviets, Kaldor fled the country with his parents and younger brother in 1948.1 The family’s arrival in Paris, and Kaldor’s experience of visiting great museums and galleries in the city have been well documented by Baume and Thomas.2 Kaldor noted their impression on him as a twelve-year-old. In retrospect he viewed the experience as one of the great forms of art education available worldwide.3 It gave him an early appreciation of art, the value of art museums and galleries as history writers and teaching tools, and the significance of individuals through donations and bequests.

On arrival in Sydney, Australia, Kaldor was sent to a private, Catholic boy’s school.4 One of his contemporaries was the future art critic and famed Australian expatriate, Robert Hughes, but it does not appear this early association with one of Australia’s globally acknowledged writers played any role.5 Kaldor studied painting on weekends while still at school, tutored by fellow Hungarian expatriate, the painter Desiderius Orban.6 The link strengthened ties with others in the Hungarian expatriate community, whilst continuing to develop Kaldor’s interest in making art. Orban’s style of painting was neither avant-garde, nor radical. His Landscape (1952), later purchased by the Art Gallery of New South Wales, owed much to the cubist paintings of Paul Cezanne. It could also be compared to the landscape paintings of other Australian artists with extensive European experience, such as John Passmore, who taught at the Julian Ashton School

---

5 Baume, From Christo and Jeanne-Claude, 1995, p. 10.
6 Baume, From Christo and Jeanne-Claude, 1995, p. 10.
Kaldor's education and training

and the National Art School, and was much admired by young Sydney artists in the 1950s; and Godfrey Miller, a teacher at the East Sydney Technical College from the 1940s, whose figurative, landscape and still-life paintings revealed Miller’s pursuit of a radical distillation of form, developed through small lattice-like divisions and a restricted colour palette. Kaldor's early art classes solidified his interest in art and art-making, which he largely developed painting still-lives.

On completing senior school, Kaldor was sent back to England and Switzerland to undertake training in preparation for entering his parents’ textile business. In England, Kaldor studied under Sir Nicholas Sekers, a pioneer of the British fashion textiles industry after World War II. He was Kaldor's godfather and a business partner of his parents. Neither Thomas nor Baume refer to a specific school or location where his training occurred. Kaldor’s studies took the form of a professional internship or work placement with Sekers. Sekers had left Hungary earlier than Kaldor’s family, arriving in Britain in 1937. He had trained in textile technology in Krefeld, Germany, and had experience of textile manufacture in the family silk mills in Budapest. After setting up in Britain, he sold his designs to leading French couture houses including Christian Dior (whose firm used them for the first time in 1947), Pierre Cardin and Givenchy. Sekers was a highly successful Hungarian émigré whose professional career reflected a passion for art and design, which enabled him to develop an increasingly public philanthropic role offering support for many aspects of the arts. As a philanthropist, Sekers was a valuable role model, though Kaldor subsequently focused his philanthropy on visual art. Sekers’ approach was more heterogeneous, and stretched to theatre, opera, music, and art. He set up the Rosehill Arts Trust and built the intimate Rosehill theatre in the garden of his large house. He was a trustee of Glyndebourne, chairman of the London Philharmonic Orchestra, a member of Council of the Shakespeare Theatre Trust and of the Royal Opera House, Covent Garden.

---

7 John Passmore (1904 Sydney – 1984. Europe, England 1933-51, 1960-61); Godfrey Miller (1893 – 1964). See for example works of a similar date, Passmore’s *The argument* (1953), and Miller’s *Building and trees* (1951-53), both in the collection of the AGNSW. The three works were included in an exhibition Australian Contemporary Painting (1955) that toured to State galleries.


In Europe in 1955 at the age of nineteen, Kaldor embarked on his training for the family textile and fabric-making business. He studied colour and design with Bauhaus designer and teacher, Professor Johannes Itten at the Textile College of Zürich in Switzerland.\(^{12}\) The experience of studying with Itten gave Kaldor first-hand contact with the Bauhaus modernist principles that had influenced Sekers’ approach to both art and design, and had also begun to alter distant Sydney, Australia.\(^{13}\) Kaldor’s study with Itten at a technical school, in place of university study in art history and aesthetics, reflected his desire to understand theory through practice, and his wish to be involved with creators and artists rather than with academia, scholarship or theoretical research. The experience wove together his personal interest in art-making and design, within his professional training in the textile and fabric-making industry. This integration of art and commerce marked the subsequent creation and support of John Kaldor Art Projects.

Kaldor’s Eastern European roots, his experience as an émigré coming to a new and comparatively unsophisticated country, and his early training in Europe within the intersection of art and commerce influenced the development of his personal art collection and Art Projects. It played a significant role in his decision to focus on bringing international artists to Australia to present works of art.

Kaldor shared his European background, education and philanthropic role models with other educated European immigrants who, like Kaldor, were ‘New Australians’.\(^{14}\) But, as Baume noted, Kaldor’s formal and informal European art education set him apart from many others in Australia.\(^{15}\) Kaldor’s childhood in Hungary, the months spent visiting art collections in Paris, and his first-hand familiarity with the work of advanced, avant-garde European artists and the involvement of philanthropists in high culture, were experiences that many Australians would only have then been aware of through books.

\(^{12}\) Daniel Thomas (ed.), *An Australian Accent*, John Kaldor Art Project 7, P.S. 1 New York, Published by John Kaldor, Sydney 1984, p. 13; Baume, ‘The Artist as Model’ in Forbat, *40 Years*, 2009, p. 45. Swiss born Johannes Itten (b. 11 November 1999 – d. 27 May 1967) taught at the Bauhaus school from 1919 to 1922 under the directorship of Walter Gropius. A painter, designer, teacher, writer and theorist, Itten developed his universal doctrine of design during this time, which he taught as the Bauhaus preliminary course in the Weimar. From 1943 – 1969 he became Director of the Textilfachschule in Zürich, with which he affiliated his work as Director of the Kunstgewerbeschule 1938 – 1954 (school of art and textile design).


\(^{14}\) For a discussion of the role of emigres in the development of an Australian cultural landscape, see Butler, *The Europeans*, 1997.

\(^{15}\) Baume, ‘The Artist as Model’ in Forbat, *40 Years*, 2009, p. 45.
Kaldor’s international awareness was combined with an innate understanding of the role that art acquisition and philanthropy can play in the development of a sense of place and identity. In his essay for *An Australian Accent* (1984), Thomas noted that Kaldor was ‘the pioneer, the first to realize that the new 1960s global village existed in terms of transport and could be operated for Australia’s benefit.’

While Australian artists had often spent extended periods living, studying and working in Great Britain and Europe, Kaldor reversed this trend by inviting artists and curators to make the opposite journey to Australia. Individual travel, though expensive, was still cheaper than freighting exhibitions or artworks to Australia. The reversed trajectory could potentially benefit a wider audience: it not only introduced international artists to an Australian context and community of artists and supporters of contemporary art, but no doubt it was hoped that invited artists would be international ambassadors after their Australian sojourn, courtesy of John Kaldor.

**KALDOR’S EARLY RELATIONSHIPS AND MENTORS**

In Kaldor’s adopted city, Sydney, other émigré architects and designers including Harry Seidler, influenced Kaldor’s interest in modernist design and art as well as contemporary art. Born in Hungary, Seidler had studied in the United States with Bauhaus exponents Walter Gropius and Marcel Breuer. He arrived in Australia in 1948. As Whitehouse has noted, Seidler’s efforts to change the face of Australian architecture included lectures on Bauhaus theory, and a NSW Contemporary Art Society exhibition of Josef Albers’ *Basic Design Forms* in 1951, which both found a receptive audience in Sydney’s expanding European population and the increasing number of modernist designers. His designs for his mother’s house at Turramurra, the Rose Seidler House (1948-50), had an enormous impact on contemporary art and design. Seidler’s

---


20 Seidler’s first, and best-known, residential house was commissioned by his mother, the Rose Seidler House at Turramurra (1948) on Sydney’s North Shore. Glass walled, elevated and cubiform with a flat roof, the house was revolutionary, and introduced the Bauhaus principles of Gropius and Breuer into Australia for the first time. Seidler’s public buildings were similarly
radical architectural forms presented a new form of modernist architecture. As part of the strong expatriate Hungarian community in Sydney, Kaldor was necessarily aware of Seidler’s influence as an architect and champion of this new school of art and design. It may well have contributed to Kaldor’s decision to travel to Britain at the end of his secondary schooling to study with Itten in Zürich in 1955.

Later during Kaldor’s first Art Project with Christo and Jeanne-Claude in 1969, Seidler was to be a staunch public supporter. He advocated Kaldor’s initiative and the work itself in a film that ABC Television made to commemorate the event. Seidler was to say on that film that for the last twenty years Australia had lagged behind developments overseas. Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s project not only closed the gap, but also heralded a change in the country’s attitudes. Those who criticized it, Seidler said, reflected a parochial vision.

The Seidlers and Kaldor had more than a passing relationship. Apart from Harry Seidler’s advocacy of new forms of art, Penelope Seidler was actively involved in the organization of the Wrapped Coast (1969) project. When Kaldor travelled for work to New York during August and September 1969, Penelope Seidler was left in charge of the project in Sydney. She received detailed letters from Kaldor while he met regularly with Christo and Jeanne-Claude. Penelope Seidler recalled in 2009 that, ‘Harry and I were both enthusiastic about the concept … I recall getting badges manufactured which all the assistants wore while working on the rocks.’ As so often happens with the women supporting prominent men, Penelope Seidler’s role remained part of the oral, rather than written history of Kaldor’s first project, and her importance, until recently, unacknowledged.

innovative: Australia Square (1961-1967) was one of the first modern international-styled office towers in Australia. It established new principles in design and construction through its distinctive circular form and the creation of a large public open space at ground level. At the time it was built, it was the world’s tallest light-weight concrete building. Public areas included Le Corbusier tapestries, and Calder sculpture, commissioned as part of the original building. Australian Institute for Architects biography, Harry Seidler, http://www.architecture.com.au/i-cms?page=6364, accessed August 7, 2011. For Seidler’s significance in the development of Australian architecture, see Peter Blake, Architecture for the new world. The architecture of Harry Seidler, Sydney, Horwitz, New York and Wittenhorn, Stuttgart, Karl Kraemer, 1973; and Frampton and Drew, Four Decades of Architecture, 1992.


23 KPAP Archive; also noted in Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 64.

24 Seidler in conversation with Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 64.

25 It was arguably for this reason that Jeanne-Claude was only retrospectively acknowledged as a collaborator with Christo.
Kaldor's early relationships and mentors

Kaldor's professional experience in the textile industry brought him into contact with other ‘New Australians’, whose support for artists and example as patrons clearly influenced him. On his return to Australia in 1957, Kaldor began his first job as a designer at Silk and Textile Printers Ltd., Hobart, under the guidance of the well-known textile entrepreneur and arts patron, Claudio Alcorso.26 Alcorso had emigrated to Sydney from Rome in 1938, escaping Fascist Italy, to make a new life for his family. He gradually expanded their business interests.27 They established Silk and Textile Printers in Rushcutter’s Bay, Sydney. After internment in 1940 following the outbreak of the Second World War, he transferred his company and factory to Derwent Park, Tasmania in 1947.28 As a keen supporter of the arts, Alcorso was involved in setting up and supporting fledgling Australian arts organisations such as the Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust and the Australian Ballet. He also directly supported Australian artists through commissions for designs created by his company. His eclectic support of the arts followed a well-established philanthropic model, whereas Kaldor’s philanthropy was to be more intensely and narrowly focused.

Alcorso’s commissioning of designs for his textile business from a younger generation of Australian visual artists was a model that Kaldor later adopted in his own business. Coinciding with the shift of Alcorso’s business from Sydney to Tasmania, Alcorso organized an exhibition of ‘Modernage’ fabrics commissioned and fabricated by his company, and shown at Melbourne’s Australia Hotel. Opened on 1 September 1947, the society event was launched by British composer and conductor, and celebrity Eugene Goossens, who had recently emigrated to Australia.29 The event was glamorous enough to feature in the major local newspaper, *The Sydney...*
The Origins of John Kaldor Art Projects

Morning Herald, in a society feature article that married design with Australia’s latest fashion. The exhibition featured designs by thirty-six ‘well-known Australian artists’ and was accompanied by a publication, *A New Approach to Textile Design*. Its cover imagery incorporated modernist principles of design and text and it featured essays by some of the country’s leading art history academics and gallery directors. These included Professor Joseph Burke, the inaugural Herald Professor of Fine Arts at the University of Melbourne, Mr Hal Missingham, Director of the National Art Gallery (AGNSW), Sydney, and Ure Smith, President of the Society of Artists, Sydney. Colour, as well as black and white images of the artists’ designs and printed fabrics were accompanied by designer-artists’ statements about the commission.

The featured artists, all of who had designed textiles for the occasion, included William Dobell, Russell Drysdale, Donald Friend, Margaret Preston, Hal Missingham, Justin O’Brien, and James Gleeson. Ten of the artists were women, although their designs were no more domestic or ‘feminine’ than any other, and all featured a strong use of line. Several designs were derived from landscape and natural motifs, such as Russell Drysdale’s *Tree Forms* (1947), made from drawings taken from a sketchbook and arranged informally across the fabric. Justin O’Brien’s *The Three Kings* (1946–47) was the only religiously inspired design, based on a stylized Biblical theme and featuring a palette of musky pinks, oranges and yellow. Other subjects were influenced by


31 Ure Smith, [with a foreword by Claudio Alcorso], *A New approach to textile designing / by a group of Australian artists*, (ex.cat.), Ure Smith production, Sydney, 1947.

32 Smith, *A New approach to textile designing*, 1947. Burke was appointed the Herald Chair of Fine Arts in 1946 in Australia’s first Department of Art History at an Australian university. The position was instigated by Daryl Lindsay, Director of the National Gallery of Victoria, Sir Keith Murdoch, editor of the *Herald & Weekly Times* and patron of the arts, who funded the position, with support from John Medley, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Melbourne.


34 For a discussion on the range and focus of topics, see McPhee, ‘Sanctuaries’ in Butler, *The Europeans*, 1997.

Surrealism; Aboriginal motifs and mythological patterns. The more abstract patterns were based on Cubistic or scientifically derived motifs.

As the *Sydney Morning Herald* article noted, the commission was based on a similar initiative of the Czech textile manufacturer Zika Ascher. Together with his wife Lida, he had founded the Ascher studio in London after having escaped Nazi Europe in the early 1940s. Ascher contemporaneously with Alcorso in Australia in the 1940s and 1950s, the London based House of Ascher commissioned successful British and international Modernist artists to create a highly successful scarf series, which became known as the Ascher squares. As Straub noted, the Ascher squares reflected a ‘yearning for optimism and a new start for life and for fashion’ following the Second World War. British artists who designed fabrics for him included Henry Moore, Cecil Beaton, and Graham Sutherland, whilst the international artists commissioned included Pablo Picasso, Henri Matisse, Andre Derain, Alexander Calder and the American based Salvador Dali. Moore’s design for the square was *Family Group* (1947), a repeating pattern of clusters of people against a black background. The theme reflected the strength of the family unit in wartime England, in a style reminiscent of his wartime bunker series. In May 1945, James Laver, the ‘dandified historian of dress, playwright and Keeper of the Department of Prints and Drawings’ (as he was described by a similarly flamboyant Roy Strong, Director of the Victoria & Albert Museum in his foreword to the exhibition catalogue for the 1987 Ascher exhibition at the V & A), opened the Ascher Collection at the Dorchester Hotel in London.

---


The following year, fifty of the Ascher fabrics were shown in an exhibition at the Victoria & Albert Museum, London, entitled *Britain Can Make It* (1946). The Squares were also widely shown internationally, including New York and other cities in America, Motevideo, Sydney and Cape Town. Squares were acquired for museum and art gallery collections, including the National Gallery of Victoria’s acquisition of Henry Moore’s *Family Group* (1947) in 1948. As well as promoting British art and textiles with newfound optimism, the designs also highlighted Ascher’s place as a leading producer of innovative, international fabric designs. A collaboration between contemporary fine art and fashion, and art and industry, the designs were supposed to create a broader appeal for their art, through mass production and popular consumption.

Alcorso noted that the designs by Australian artists reflected not only ‘a new approach to textile designing’, but also a ‘desire to introduce creative thought and beauty into the everyday things of life’. In this, Alcorso’s ambitions were in keeping with principles of international modernist design, and industry’s use of these principles to develop opportunities for living artists. The exhibition reflected a desire to champion modern design principles, and the whole initiative showed Australia’s increasing prosperity, which went with the growth of corporate and commercial patronage. Whilst the project and exhibition offered Australian artists a rare opportunity to develop their art through commercial avenues, ‘it was not sufficiently popular to continue the experiment’, as McPhee noted. Claudio Alcorso remembered that ‘The post war enthusiasms quickly faded away, [and] in order to survive we returned to … a diet of boiled potatoes’.

Alcorso was ahead of his times in post war Australia. But in Britain, this was clearly not the case. The example of Ascher was taken up by Sekers in London in 1959. His interests in art and design came together in 1959 in an exhibition in which he asked artists including Cecil Beaton, Oliver Messel and Graham Sutherland to create paintings and drawings for fabric designs.

---

company now recognised the need for new showrooms to reflect the times as well as the changes in fabric designs, and in 1964 it moved to glittering new glass showrooms in Sloane Square, the centre of Swinging London and the Kings Road. Kaldor was to imitate his mentors, commissioning designs for fabrics by Australian artists and developing glamorous new showrooms for John Kaldor Fabrics in 1973.

On his return to Sydney in 1960, Kaldor joined Sekers Silk, the Australian arm of Sir Nicholas Sekers’ business. This franchise was owned and run by John Kaldor’s parents Andrew and Vera Kaldor. In 1962 John Kaldor commissioned artists, much in the manner of Claudio Alcorso’s 1959 Modernage exhibition. In 1965, Sekers Silks and several other companies, including Alcorso’s, merged to form Universal Textiles of Australia. In the following year Kaldor became Marketing Manager of the new organization. In this position, he initiated the Alcorso Sekers Scholarship, to be discussed below.

KALDOR’S EARLY COLLECTING

Alongside a growing awareness of the role that contemporary artists could play in promoting commercial interests, Kaldor began his personal collection in 1954. Kaldor often described his collection and the Art Projects as separate activities, reflecting the private and public aspects of his interest in contemporary art. Nevertheless, it can be argued that the motives for Kaldor’s own art collecting played a significant role in the direction and development of the Public Art Projects.

Kaldor’s early collecting did not reflect his subsequent focus solely on contemporary international art. According to Thomas, the twenty year old Kaldor was also collecting classical

---


51 Kaldor commissioned Australian artist Mike Kitching in Surrey Hills, Sydney in 1973. For its launch, he invited Antoni Miralda to create a coloured feast of coloured breads. See Baume, *From Christo and Jeanne-Claude*, 1995, p. 23. Miralda also presented a coloured bread project at the AGNSW from 21 September – 4 October 1973. This was not originally considered by Kaldor as one of his Art Projects. For Forbat, 40 Years, the project was reassigned Art Project status. See p. 168.


54 Discussed further below p. 298.
and Egyptian antiquities and medieval objects. His early purchases reflected his aspirations towards connoisseurship. Thomas suggested that Kaldor favoured these areas of collecting ‘less as objects than for their connection with history and past civilization.’ However, his broad focus on objects that signified a European history and its civilization did not differentiate Kaldor from many other European and American collectors in either subject-matter or motivation.

Kaldor’s appreciation of art was based on a strong personal aesthetic response to the object rather than scholarship or research. In 2009 Kaldor stated that ‘we talk about contemporary art, but I love art of all periods, whether it’s Egyptian, Byzantine, Renaissance, baroque, impressionist or modern. To me, periods don’t really matter; there is great art and bad art, and what you call it is very arbitrary.’ This was the rationale for Kaldor’s early collecting decisions, which included antiquities and historical art in contrast to the contemporary focus of subsequent collecting and projects. In later years, conversations with artists with whom he had built up a friendship – Jeff Koons, for instance – enabled him to see the relationships between earlier periods and contemporary art.

Like many collectors, Kaldor started collecting contemporary art early in life. This became his focus. Kaldor’s collecting of contemporary art rapidly took him beyond tradition. In a 2009 interview, Kaldor noted that art ‘should reflect what is going on today and point the way to the future.’ Kaldor’s first art purchase was a semi-abstract painting bought for £10 in London in

56 See p. 25.
60 Baume, ‘The Artist as Model’ in Forbat, *40 Years*, 2009, p. 47.
62 Kaldor noted that Koons enabled him to develop a love of the Baroque through his own interest in this area explored through his work. Moore, ‘The Quiet Pioneer’, *Apollo*, 2011.
1954. Baume did not note the artist’s name, title of the work, or any further description. The fact is significant for two points: Kaldor was aged eighteen, and the acquisition of the work heralded his interest in avant-garde forms of modern art. The material value of the work was also significant for the collector: in subsequent histories Kaldor referred to its cost, but neither the name of the artist nor the work’s title. Kaldor’s focus on the financial value of the work, still remembered some forty years later, presaged his deployment of art as a positional good in years to come.65

On his return to Australia in 1957, Kaldor focused briefly on the work of his Australian contemporaries. He began collecting paintings by Sydney artists, including works by James Gleeson, Michael Kitching, Colin Lanceley, John Olsen, Ivan Van Wieringen and Dick Watkins.66 Whilst Gleeson’s work had featured in Modernage’s textile designs from 1947, other artists were of a younger generation. Acquisition, however, did not actively involve Kaldor with the artists. Based on the Ascher (1942 and 1955), Alcorso (1947) and Sekers (1959) projects, Kaldor commissioned furnishing fabrics by leading Australian painters and sculptors for the launch of a new furnishing division of his parents’ company in 1962. Titled ‘Artists’ Originals’, the commissions featured John Coburn, Russell Drysdale, Donald Friend, James Gleeson, Clement Meadmore and John Olsen. These results were subsequently exhibited in 1963 in Sydney and Melbourne.67 In Melbourne, they were shown at John Reed’s Museum of Modern Art and Design of Australia.68 Kaldor’s ‘Originals’ enabled Kaldor to work directly with a younger generation of Australian artists, following a well-established tradition of commercial patronage.

Kaldor’s attention was refocused on international contemporary art by an article in Time on Pop Art in May 1963.69 The article impressed Kaldor. He saw an ‘extraordinary nature’ in reproductions of works by Jasper Johns, Roy Lichtenstein, Claes Oldenburg, Robert

---

64 Baume, From Christo and Jeanne-Claude, 1995, p. 10.
65 For a definition of ‘positional goods’ see above p. 25.
67 Baume, From Christo and Jeanne-Claude, 1995, p. 10. Artists whose work was included in the range were Judy Cassab, John Cohorn, Russell Drysdale, Cedric Flower, Donald Friend, James Gleeson, Elaine Haxon, Clement Meadmore, John Olsen and Ian Van Wieringen. The work was exhibited at the Dominion Art Galleries in Castlereagh Street, Sydney.
68 Baume, From Christo and Jeanne-Claude, 1995, p. 10.
Rauschenberg, Andy Warhol and Tom Wesselmann.  

For Kaldor, Pop Art was not only ‘revolutionary’, but embodied the ‘energy and creativity of the new world’ – which could easily encompass Australia. Baume notes that this article marked an important moment in the development of Kaldor’s taste. It shifted his interest decisively from the local to the international. The sensational tone played a part: ‘Pop-Art: Cult of the Commonplace’, was resoundingly dismissive. Whether positive or negative in tone about the newer developments in American art, the art writer wielded increasing power. Francis O’Connor’s 1972 *Artforum* article ‘Notes on Patronage: the 1960s’, observed that patronage divided into three separate activities: promotion, acquisition and subvention, in order of importance, and that the art writer - whether critic, curator, or art historian – had become the principal tastemaker and canoniser of art and artists of the 1960s. He argued that those who acquired art, such as collectors, dealers and museums, depended on the art writer’s judgments to certify their investments.

The development of Kaldor’s interest in American artists of the 1960s, beginning with his acquisition of Pop Art, appeared to be part of a well-established international trend. By 1963, a key group of American Pop artists were already well established, and Pop Art had attracted a considerable following. Pop Art collector, architect Philip Johnson was quoted in the same *Time* article saying that it was ‘the most important art movement in the world today’. If a collector wanted to be associated with the latest developments in international contemporary art, than this was it. Whilst the work of these artists may have been revelatory for Kaldor, altering the focus of his collecting interests, they were already much collected by American museums and private collectors. The art world of that time, made up of galleries, collectors and those interested and involved in related aspects of the arts, may have been smaller. However, key artists and artistic trends were still able to capture a popular imagination, as they continue to do today.

---


76 Iconic works, such as Damien Hirst’s formaldehyde embalmed shark, *The Physical Impossibility of Death in the Mind of Someone Living* (1991), reflect the ability of certain works to attract critical and popular interest. The work featured on the cover of Terry Smith’s book *What is Contemporary Art* (2009). It was also used by BBC News online and Bloomberg Businessweek Markets & Finance online, accompanying articles about Hirst’s 2012 retrospective at the Tate Modern and marketability in 2012 – or not –
popular American magazines such as *Time*, American Pop Art was not only the latest thing in the development of contemporary art, demonstrated by the interest of galleries and private collectors, but it had also attracted the interest of a wider public, even if opinion reflected the usual hostility towards new forms of art, as did Sieberling’s article for *Life* magazine in 1964.77

A number of gallerists and advisors played a key role in this early phase of Kaldor's collecting, particularly Romanian-born collector and gallerist Ileana Sonnabend.78 Sonnabend and her husband Leo Castelli opened their first gallery in New York in 1957, discovering the work of the emerging generation of American artists that included Jasper Johns and Robert Rauschenberg. Returning to Paris, she opened Galerie Sonnabend in 1962 with her second husband, Michael Sonnabend, with an exhibition of work by Jasper Johns.79 Later exhibitions showcased the same young generation of American artists as championed by Leo Castelli Gallery in New York, alongside emerging European work.80


80 The Galerie Sonnabend exhibited the work of American artists and young Italian artists including Mario Schifano (1963) and Michelangelo Pistoletto (1964), Mario Merz and Giovanni Anselmo (1969) and Jannis Kounellis (1972). In 1970 Ileana Sonnabend opened a gallery in New York, moving in 1971 to the SoHo district, together with the Castelli Gallery, opening her SoHo gallery with a now-celebrated performance by Gilbert & George. Sonnabend was known for the 'international' focus of her gallery, presenting new art from both the European and the New York scene: Minimalism, Arte Povera, Conceptual Art, Transavanguardia, Neo-Expressionism, Neo-Geo. See Gallery Sonnabend website, Sonnabend Gallery, http://www.sonnabendgallery.com/index.php?v=exhibition&id=13&press=1 , accessed August 8, 2011. Sonnabend's role as a gallerist and collector of late 20th century contemporary art was celebrated in an exhibition presented at the Peggy Guggenheim Collection, Venice, *Ileana Sonnabend*. An Italian Portrait*, May 29 to October 2, 2011, coinciding with the opening of the 54th Venice Bienalle, 2011.

than the significance of the work.\textsuperscript{82} He saw the acquisition as his ‘first real purchase of contemporary international art’, reflected by his later gift of the work to his wife Naomi Milgrom Kaldor.\textsuperscript{83} It was the first of a number of acquisitions of American Pop Art.\textsuperscript{84} Kaldor credited his meeting with Sonnabend in Paris at that date as shifting his focus towards more cutting edge art. Sophy Burnham, writing in 1973, noted that the introduction of sophisticated marketing techniques by dealers such as Leo Castelli and others had helped to create ‘the vogue for Pop Art’.\textsuperscript{85}

The relationship between art dealer and collector was also significant as part of a complex network of art markets for the more experimental forms of contemporary art. Economic sociologist Olav Velthuis has written extensively on the development of the contemporary art markets, and the relationship between collectors and dealers in network terms.\textsuperscript{86} While market exchange is invariably embedded in social networks, in \textit{Talking Prices: Symbolic Meanings of Prices on the Market for Contemporary Art} (2007) Velthuis outlined a further approach: the consideration of markets as cultural constellations. He proposed that, like other forms of social interaction, market exchange is highly ritualized, involving a wider variety of symbols that transfer rich meanings between people who exchange goods with each other.\textsuperscript{87} People participating in these exchanges are connected through ties of different sorts, involving complex social processes. As a result, intimate, long-term relationships between artists, collectors, and their intermediaries develop. Art and commerce is kept distinct, through dealers’ advice on the acquisition of the ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ work.\textsuperscript{88} Dealers also have a vested interest in managing the biography of key works, by ensuring that they are positioned with suitable collectors to prevent them coming into

\textsuperscript{82} Kaldor noted that works ranged from $150 to $250 US, though he only had $50 to spend. Tunnicliffe, \textit{John Kaldor Family Collection}, 2011, p. 19. Noted by J.K., Woolwich, Sydney, June 22, 2008.

\textsuperscript{83} Also featured on the frontice page of Tunnicliffe’s interview with Kaldor, Tunnicliffe, \textit{John Kaldor Family Collection}, 2011, p. 19.


\textsuperscript{87} Velthuis, \textit{Talking Prices}, 2007, p. 3. For a discussion of the social fabric of the market, see chapter 2.

\textsuperscript{88} Velthuis, \textit{Talking Prices}, 2007, p. 5.
contact with money again too soon through circulation on the secondary market. Curators and artists also played an important role. The curator gained increasing prominence with notable collectors of contemporary art, often replacing the dealer as a source for advice. As the role of the intermediaries such as gallerists decreased, the role of artists also evolved. As Isabelle Graw reflected in 2012, artists in turn became more a kind of “critic-curator-consultant-gallerist”.\(^{89}\) They had to work as sophisticated participants in a complex art world. The relationships that Kaldor developed with key dealers, critics, curators and artists over time forms part of what Velthuis defined as the social networks and cultural constellations of the contemporary art world and market.

Other acquisitions reflected Sonnabend’s continued influence on Kaldor’s developing taste. As Velthuis noted, ‘pre-existing social ties with the dealer are critical in order to purchase an artwork.’\(^{90}\) His new interest in European conceptual art was reflected by his acquisition of work by Dutch artist Jan Dibbets, while Robert Rauschenberg’s *Dylaby* (1962), purchased from Sonnabend in 1966, bookended his developing collection.\(^{91}\) Its significance, and that of Galerie Ileana Sonnabend, was underscored when an installation photograph of Rauschenberg’s *Dylaby* (1962) in Sonnabend Gallery’s February 1963 exhibition was included in Baume’s review of Kaldor’s collection and projects published in 1995.\(^{92}\)

*Dylaby* (1962) was first shown as part of the exhibition *Dynamic Labyrinth* at Amsterdam’s Stedelijk Museum in 1962, for which Director Willem Sandberg had invited six artists to take over seven rooms and create ‘environments’.\(^{93}\) Kaldor had neither seen the installations at the Stedelijk, nor the subsequent exhibition at Sonnabend’s Paris gallery in 1963 in which *Dylaby* (1962) was also included.\(^{94}\) However, Rauschenberg’s significant exhibition history, and Sonnabend’s close involvement with his Stedelijk show certified the reputation of this relatively unknown artist for Kaldor. The history of Kaldor’s purchase of the work would become part of the mythologizing

---


\(^{92}\) Baume, *From Christo and Jeanne-Claude*, 1995, p. 11.

\(^{93}\) Baume, *From Christo and Jeanne-Claude*, 1995, p. 11. Sonnabend assisted Rauschenberg with the installation of the work.

of the early development of his collection. The work’s association with a major international gallery, with a history of presenting avant-garde and experimental work, enabled Kaldor to begin an international collection with works that had international clout. Kaldor noted the social openness of the art world in the early 1960s, likening it to ‘a small but non-exclusive club as anybody who wanted to could join in.’

Kaldor also admitted that low cost was a motivation for collecting American Pop Art rather than Australian artists at that time. In 2009, Kaldor recalled that artists such as Robert Rauschenberg, Jasper Johns, Andy Warhol and Roy Lichtenstein were only beginning to gain attention in 1963. This made their works relatively affordable. However, by 1962, Lichtenstein’s paintings had already been included in a number of key articles and art museum exhibitions. Max Kozloff’s article in that year, “‘Pop’ Culture, Metaphysical Disgust, and the New Vulgarians’ in *Art International*, might have been profoundly unsympathetic to the emergent art movement, but it linked the artists together as a cohesive group. Gene R. Swenson’s article in *ARTnews* in September of the same year called Pop Art ‘impudent’, ‘single-minded’, and so ‘obvious as to be unexpected’. Even populist articles followed, such as *Life* magazine’s feature on Pop Art in June 1962. Lichtenstein’s paintings began to appear in art museum exhibitions. In 1962, his *Head (Red and Yellow)* (1962) was acquired by the Albright-Knox Art Gallery (Buffalo). The following year, the Guggenheim Museum, New York, presented *Six Painters and the Object*, an exhibition featuring works by Dine, Johns, Lichtenstein, Rauschenberg, Rosenquist and Warhol, which travelled throughout the US.

---


In 1995, Kaldor remembered that the Lichtenstein painting of 1962 cost US $50, whilst the work of a recognized Australian artist would have been priced at least double. He was later to acknowledge that the work was less expensive than others in the Paris exhibition, which ranged between $150 and $250. If Kaldor’s memory about prices in the French exhibition was correct, then the French exhibition reflected very good value for money, priced significantly below American exhibitions of the time. Records from the Leo Castelli Gallery show that in 1962, prices ranged between US $350 to $1200 for Lichtenstein’s first show at the New York Gallery, and featured signature paintings such as The Kiss (1962), Engagement Ring (1961), and Turkey (1961). All works were sold prior to the exhibition. Prices for Lichtenstein’s second solo exhibition with Leo Castelli Gallery in September 1963 ranged from US$1,200 to $3,500, whilst his exhibition in 1964 of larger oil on canvas works made in that year ranged from US$12,000 to $15,000. Kaldor’s anecdote about the low price of the work reflected not only its relative scale, date, and importance, but also the fact that Sonnabend may well have priced the works significantly lower for a European market. Kaldor remembers her saying to him that since he appeared honest, she was willing for him to take a larger work and pay the balance later. While Kaldor purchased the smaller, and less significant work, her trust was repaid by Kaldor’s respect for Sonnabend’s advice, and ongoing support for the artists her gallery represented through the acquisition of works of art.

A personal relationship with the artist also appeared to have played a significant role in other early acquisitions by Kaldor. In 1964, Kaldor acquired a number of works by Scottish sculptor Eduardo Paolozzi during a visit to the artist’s studio in London. They had been made during the artist’s earlier residency in Paris.


103 Tunnicliffe, John Kaldor Family Collection, 2011, p. 19.

104 The Kiss (1962), oil on canvas, 80 x 68 inches, priced at $1200 and sold for $1000; Engagement Ring (1961), oil on canvas, 67 ¾ x 79 ½ inches, priced at $1200; Turkey (1961), oil on canvas, priced at US$350, sold $300. Leo Castelli Archive, Price list for Roy Lichtenstein, February 10 – March 3, 1962.


Daniel Thomas’s feature on Kaldor’s collection for *Art and Australia* in 1971. The transitional, lumpen cast-bronze *Figure* (1958) showed the impact of Surrealism and Paris-based contemporaries Brancusi and Giacometti, as well as the *l’art brut* sculptures of Jean Dubuffet. By contrast, *Paris Bird* (1948-9), with its incorporation of machine parts and found objects, presaged Paolozzi’s later participation in the development of Pop Art in Britain.

Purchasing work directly from the artist enabled Kaldor to develop a closer, and often more personal, engagement than if the contact were mediated by a gallerist. In some cases, direct negotiations may also have financial advantages for the collector. Establishment of personal contact was characteristic of Kaldor’s subsequent relationships with artists, and one that he particularly valued. The acquisition of these sculptures marked the awakening of Kaldor’s interest in artforms beyond painting. From this point on, sculpture – and increasingly post-sculptural practice, drawings, installations, assemblages, photographs, conceptual works and artists’ books – became the focus of his collecting.

Thomas has suggested that it was at this point Kaldor became ‘less an art collector than an art patron’. He was alluding to the different relationships that collectors and art patrons have with artists. Art patrons have a closer relationship with the artists whose work they often commission, whereas collectors usually acquire works of art from galleries or auction houses, and may never encounter the artists whose work they acquire. Kaldor’s collecting in the mid-1960s was now more international, and more focused on sculpture, installation, and assemblages, rather than painting. This differentiated him from other collectors in Australia. However, Kaldor’s developing relationship with the galleries directly involved with Pop Art was not markedly different from other international collectors at that time. Naifeh noted that the number of collectors who spent more than US $10,000 annually on vanguard art rose to about 200 by

---


Collectors were not solely based in New York. They also came from smaller American cities such as Detroit, Houston and Atlanta. European collectors, predominantly from Italy and Germany, began to outbid Americans in the market for contemporary art. The number of modest collectors also rose, and by 1973, there were approximately 50,000 collectors of vanguard art from around the globe.

On the other hand, Kaldor had been more closely associated with artists both through his commissioning of the Kaldor ‘Originals’ fabric designs, and his visit to Paolozzi’s studio. The close association put him in a smaller category of highly engaged collectors of contemporary art. He clearly valued direct personal relationships with artists. His next acquisition followed an introduction to an artist that began a relationship that would continue for decades.

**THE ALCORSO SEKERS SCULPTURE PRIZE**

The threads of Kaldor’s early association with contemporary artists producing fabric commissions, and his increasingly international collection, came together in the creation of the Alcorso Sekers Sculpture Prize. Kaldor acknowledged the financial and philanthropic examples of his two mentors, Sekers and Alcorso, by naming a fledgling sculpture prize after them. In 1966, as Marketing Manager of Universal Textiles, Kaldor convinced the company to start the Alcorso-Sekers Travelling Scholarship for young Australian sculptors, a prize that supported travel and professional development for an Australian artist overseas. State Gallery directors were to select the entrants, and a $2,000 travel grant was to be awarded to the winner. An exhibition of work by the entrants was to be shown in alternate years in Sydney and Melbourne state galleries. Modelled loosely on the existing Helena Rubenstein Scholarship for oil painting, the Alcorso-Sekers Scholarship was created specifically to support sculpture since Kaldor believed there was no equivalent prize for that medium. For state galleries, involvement with

---

prizes of this nature enabled them to present an exhibition of contemporary work by Australian artists for whom they might not have otherwise had the exhibition budget. Support by companies such as Helena Rubenstein or Universal Textiles enabled state galleries to receive much-needed funds. For Kaldor, it enabled him to develop useful contacts with key public galleries in Sydney and Melbourne.

The international focus of the Alcorso-Sekers scholarship – which saw an Australian artist dispatched overseas – reflected Kaldor’s early European roots and a belief that the most interesting work was being produced overseas. It reflected Kaldor’s resolutely international focus that he developed in both business and art.

A proliferation of prizes, and an increased discord about the nature of these awards, may also have prompted Kaldor to propose a different model for the 1969 Alcorso-Sekers model.\textsuperscript{118} The medium of sculpture was gaining greater attention. In 1966, the same year that the Alcorso-Sekers scholarship was inaugurated, the Transfield Prize was altered. Created by fellow immigrant, Italian-born Franco Belgiorno-Nettis, the Transfield Prize had long been the richest art prize in Australia.\textsuperscript{119} Within a year, the number of prizes specifically for sculpture had doubled, and the Alcorso-Sekers Travelling Scholarship was one amongst many.\textsuperscript{120} At the same time, there was growing criticism from curators and critics about the selection processes and criteria of prizes.\textsuperscript{121} James Gleeson noted on ABC Radio that rather than rewarding the artist, prizes such as these were ‘commissioning’ works, and shaping the nature of the work produced.\textsuperscript{122}

\textsuperscript{118} For a discussion of other art prizes, the Mildura Sculpture Triennial and their context, see Sanders, \textit{The Mildura Sculpture Triennales}, 2009, pp. 128 – 230.


\textsuperscript{120} See Scarlett, ‘Australian Sculpture Prizes’, \textit{Sculpture}, 2004 for a discussion of the history of sculpture prizes in Australia. Apart from the shift in the Transfield Prize, the Flotta Lauro Shipping Company set up a travelling prize for sculpture and painting in 1967. The Comalco Invitation Award for Sculpture in Aluminium was launched on 23 September, 1968, and lasted from 1968 to 1971. The Helena Rubenstein Prize encouraged international travel. The Mildura Sculpture Prize was held in 1961, 1964 and 1967. Its aim was to focus on contemporary Australian sculpture. It subsequently became the Mildura Sculpture Triennial. See Sanders, \textit{The Mildura Sculpture Triennales}, 2009, chapters 2 and 3.

\textsuperscript{121} Some of these issues were addressed by Elwyn Lynn, ‘Art prizes in Australia’, \textit{Art & Australia}, Vol. 6, No. 4, March 1969, pp. 314–18; and Sanders, \textit{The Mildura Sculpture Triennales}, 2009, particularly chapter 3 which traced the relationship of early sculpture prizes to the development of the Mildura Sculpture Triennial.

These concerns prompted Kaldor in 1968 to suggest the Alcorso Sekers Scholarship be amended to bring an international artist to Australia rather than sending an Australian artist overseas.\textsuperscript{123} Kaldor proposed an international artist ‘who represent[ed] important trends in contemporary art practice and to help realize major projects of their work.’\textsuperscript{124} His recommendation differentiated his ‘prize’ from the others and more importantly, it would introduce emerging trends to Australian artists and the wider local audience. The shift also meant that identifying ‘important trends’ in contemporary international art would be Kaldor’s personal responsibility, as would the selection of the artists to visit Australia.

In his essay for \textit{An Australian Accent} (1984) Thomas noted that Kaldor was ‘the pioneer, the first to realize that the new 1960s global village existed in terms of transport and could be operated for Australia’s benefit.’\textsuperscript{125} An international awareness, combined with an understanding of the role that acquisitions and philanthropy could play resulted in Kaldor’s focus on bringing contemporary artists to Australia.

Under the amended Alcorso Sekers scheme, in 1969 Kaldor invited New York-based artists Christo Javacheff and his partner Jeanne-Claude de Guillebon to Australia: Christo would perhaps give a couple of lectures in each of the cities [Sydney and Melbourne] and arrange an exhibition.\textsuperscript{126} Christo in turn proposed giving ‘open meetings’ (as his English was not good), but said his real interest lay in the realization of his project \textit{Packed Coast}.\textsuperscript{127} Christo had already made his first drawings for a wrapped coastline in 1967, initially planned for California as \textit{Packed Coast}.\textsuperscript{128} Both Christo and Kaldor immediately envisaged the project as a major artistic

\textsuperscript{123} Baume, ‘The Artist as Model’ in Forbat, \textit{40 Years}, 2009, p. 44.


\textsuperscript{125} Thomas, \textit{An Australian Accent}, 1984, p. 13.


\textsuperscript{127} Christo letter to John Kaldor, New York, 7 March 1969. Baume, \textit{From Christo and Jeanne-Claude}, 1995, p. 14. \textit{Wrapped Coast} was originally credited solely to Christo but in the 1970s the environmental works were retrospectively credited to both Christo and Jeanne-Claude. See Charles Green, The Third Hand: collaborations in art from conceptualism to postmodern, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 2001, p. 128. Letters from Christo to John Kaldor regarding the 1969 Australian project were in fact all written by Jeanne-Claude, reflecting their close working relationship. See letters reprinted in Baume, \textit{From Christo and Jeanne-Claude}, 1995, p. 78.

\textsuperscript{128} Baume noted that Christo’s first project to make direct use of landscape forms was his unrealized \textit{Packed Hills – Project for Wrapping 30 Hectares Area} (1968), which he hoped to undertake in the United States. Later in the same year he made his first studies for what was then called \textit{Packed Coast – Somewhere on the West Coast of the USA, between Los Angeles and San Francisco} (1968), though he was unable to obtain permission for the work. In his letter to Kaldor in early 1969, he wrote ‘… what I am really
achievement. Kaldor’s shift from the private collection of Pop art to a highly public engagement with a lesser widely known ephemeral form of artmaking offered him the chance to engage with an artform that was able to attract widespread interest, controversy, images and debate. The work would attain world-wide coverage and ‘underwrite the image of Sydney as one of the most progressive cities of the world.’

Whilst Kaldor was clearly interested in the new forms of art-making Christo was exploring, he was also interested in Christo’s personal history. Like Kaldor, Christo saw his art as emerging from his own biography. Christo grew up in Bulgaria under a communist regime, the son of Marxist intellectuals. Kaldor and Christo shared the early experience of repressive Eastern European political regimes and social unrest that contributed to the Kaldor family’s decision to emigrate and to Christo’s to defect. Like the Kaldor family, Christo had fled to Paris. Like Kaldor, Christo’s experience of Paris was pivotal. So too was Christo’s subsequent decision to settle in New York in 1964, though his experience of American Pop Art in the 1960s was a far cry from Sydney’s in the 1940s. Kaldor was attracted to Christo because they shared a similar history, tenacity and determination, and a desire to challenge perceived expectations of modernist art.

However, a site for Packed Coast was difficult to procure, and following adverse publicity about the project and mounting financial concerns, the Alcorso-Sekers company eventually withdrew its support. John Kaldor, by then Managing Director of Universal Textiles, decided to continue without their support. Strangely, no-one appears to have made the link between the Alcorso-Sekers’ line of business – fabrics – and Christo’s extensive use of a woven fabric to wrap the

interested in is the realization of my projects, most of all “Packed Coast”. Christo letter to John Kaldor, 7 March, 1969. See Nicholas Baume (ed.) Christo (ex. cat.), Art Gallery of New South Wales, Sydney, 1990, p. 37. For a history of these early projects, see also David Bourdon, Christo, Harry N. Abrams Publishers, New York, 1972.


130 Referred to by Thomas in Baume, Christo, 1990, p. 28.

131 See Bourdon, Christo, 1972 for biographical details. Thomas noted that Christo’s parents were Marxist intellectuals, and the family owned numerous books on Russian avant-garde art and theatre. These disappeared from the Javacheff family home when Bulgaria was occupied by Hitler’s German soldiers, prior to it becoming a communist republic in 1944. Thomas in Baume, Christo, 1990, p. 29. Following the First World War, Hungary also suffered from political, social and economic upheaval, which no doubt contributed to many Hungarians, including the Kaldors decision to emigrate.

132 The Reverend Roger Bush railed against the project on Radio 2GB, implying that the products of the company, or companies that sponsor this project should be boycotted. Baume, From Christo and Jeanne-Claude, 1995, p. 16.
A foundation, named John Kaldor Art Projects, was created in 1969. It retained this name until 2004. By naming the foundation John Kaldor Art Projects, the organisation’s activities were inextricably linked to the identity of its creator. The two activities - private art collecting and the presentation of public art projects - were intertwined.

The transformation of the Alcorso-Sekers Scholarship into an internationally focused event that took place in Australia was mirrored by the evolution of another major art prize, the Transfield Prize. It was awarded for the last time in 1971 and then transformed into the first Biennale of Sydney in 1973 with the support of the Belgiorno-Nettis family. The Biennale presaged a new model of exhibition in Sydney and Australia: it was designed to be a showcase for international contemporary art.

INTERNATIONAL PARALLELS

Other models of support for the kind of post-sculptural, environmental work that Christo and Jeanne-Claude produced were evolving elsewhere. US philanthropists such as Heiner Friedrich and Philippa de Menil were actively supporting a contemporary generation of American artists, many of whom were producing large-scale site-specific installations. In their desire to work directly with artists, Friedrich and de Menil’s aspirations accorded with Kaldor’s. Kaldor was visiting the US regularly for business, at which time he acquired works of art by international artists. He was also reading about contemporary art, exhibitions and new means of support in popular magazines such as Life, and The New York Times. Fred Sandback, one of the artists supported by Friedrich, noted in 1981 that ‘This was a new paradigm for patronage, and I myself am ungodly lucky to have had such support and freedom in my life.’

133 The sponsorship would have seemed a better ‘fit’ than the sponsorship of Harald Szeemann’s Live in your Head exhibition by cigarette company Philip Morris. See below p. 151.


136 See above p. 3.

137 See above p. 43.

Thus, Kaldor’s model of philanthropic support and involvement in the artistic process coincided with a more widespread desire to find new ways of supporting artistic practice. Rose’s 1967 *Art in America* article addressed some of the issues associated with arts funding and patronage and what would be most useful for artists’ individual needs. Drawing on interviews with American sculptors, including Donald Judd, Dan Flavin, Sol LeWitt, John McCracken, Roy Lichtenstein and Robert Morris, she argued the need for new forms of philanthropy better able to respond to the requirements of artists and a more avant-garde art. Boards of private foundations and museums, she noted, often reflected conservative taste, whilst art dealers often took on the role of ‘de facto patrons financing the production of work’, as Dwan Gallery had done. She observed that artists’ only needs were ‘money, materials, places to store and exhibit their work.’ Kaldor’s Art Projects appeared to offer the artist just that: a place in which to show their work, and the means and resources with which to do so.

**CONCLUSION**

For Christo’s project in 1969, Kaldor’s philanthropic initiative developed out of a pre-existing model of philanthropic support for the visual arts in the form of a travelling scholarship and art prize. Its evolution into a series of Art Projects chosen and initiated by one individual was born of Kaldor’s interest in international contemporary art. He had developed this first through collecting, and now his desire to present it in a uniquely Australian context. The model adopted by Kaldor for Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s visit to Australia fused the models being explored overseas to support site-specific art together with an international artist touring program. Where international touring exhibitions and curatorial formats brought the art and permanent collections from overseas to Australia, Kaldor now brought the artist. Baume credited Kaldor as being the first private patron in Australia, ‘possibly even the world’, to realize it was ‘becoming more simple to transport people than work’. Though part of an international trend to find new models to support contemporary art, Kaldor’s initiative was the first by an Australian individual, free of direct commercial interests, to support contemporary art in this way.

---


141 See above p. 16.

Christo and Jeanne-Claude, *Wrapped Coast – One Million Square Feet, Little Bay, Sydney, Australia* (1968-69)
Photo: Harry Shunk
Forbat (ed), *40 Years, Kaldor Public Art Projects*, 2009, p. 35.

MEETING CHRISTO

Kaldor’s early collecting provided the entrée in 1968 that led to his first art project with Christo and Jeanne-Claude in 1969. By 1968, Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s work had received significant attention internationally, and their site-specific installations and Christo’s exhibitions had been the focus of numerous magazine and art journal articles in Europe and America.1 Two years earlier in 1966, Christo had presented a solo museum exhibition at the Stedelijk van Abbemuseum, Eindhoven; and in the same year Christo and Jeanne-Claude made their second air package (42,390 Cubic Feet Package) shown in conjunction with an exhibition held at the Walker Art Center, Minneapolis, Minnesota.2 In 1968, Christo and Jeanne-Claude exhibited at the Museum of Modern Art, New York, and in the summer of that year they presented wrapped buildings as part of the Two Worlds Festival in Spoleto, Italy.3

In the same year, the artists completed their first fully wrapped building, Wrapped Kunsthalle, Bern (1967-68). Curated by Museum Director Harald Szeemann, Wrapped Kunsthalle, Bern (1967-68) formed part of an exhibition featuring an international group show of environmental works by twelve artists, presented to mark the fiftieth anniversary of the Kunsthalle in Bern.4 Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s work shrouded the Kunsthalle with 2,430 square metres of reinforced polyethylene, left over from the discarded first skin of the Kassel Air Package and secured with three kilometres of nylon rope.5 Visitors could enter the gallery through a small slit at the main entrance. It took six days to wrap with the help of eleven construction workers and the assistance of the local fire brigade. The building was unwrapped after one week, as insurance companies refused to underwrite the building whilst wrapped. Once inside the exhibition, Andy

---

1 Christo’s work had been featured in Art International, Domus and Art and Artists, whilst exhibition catalogues had been produced for exhibitions of Christo’s work held at the Stedelijk van Abbemuseum, 1966; the Institute of Contemporary Art, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 1968; Lucy Lippard’s Pop Art, 1966; and Bourdon, Christo, 1972, p. 55.
2 Bourdon, Christo, 1972, p. 55.
5 Bourdon, Christo, 1971.
Warhol's *Brillo Boxes* (1964) created a ‘monstrous advertising display’, and in another room Warhol created environments of sprayed and stenciled walls in blue, pink, salmon, purple and green, interspersed with ‘electric chairs turned into happenings, heads of Marilyn Monroe and cows.’6 Other rooms were treated in a similarly immersive manner, with one covered with silver wallpaper, and mirrors covering the floor.7 The exhibition was significant not only for Christo and Jeanne-Claude, as the first large-scale wrapping project they created, but also because it proved a pivotal exhibition for Harald Szeemann, who was later to be invited by Kaldor to Australia as the second John Kaldor Art Project in 1971.

Kaldor had seen Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s *5,600 Cubic Meter Package* (1967-68) illustrated in an art magazine about *documenta IV* in 1968.8 As projects such as these were increasingly covered in magazines and newspapers such as *Time*, *Life* and the *New York Times*, a new generation of collectors and those interested in more progressive art forms was developing.9 Whilst the artists presented their largest ever store-front, *Corridor – Store Front* (1968) as part of the exhibition, their inflatable sculpture floating above the Karlswiese, Auépark, attracted greater media and public attention.10 At eighty-five metres in height, the column of air-filled synthetic fabric was the most ambitious work to date.11

For Kaldor and the artists, the context of *5,600 Cubic Meter Package* (1967-68) was important.12 The work was part of *documenta IV*, the highly significant international exhibition held in Kassel, Germany. This had been initiated in 1955 by Arnold Bode as a means of reestablishing a connection between an impoverished Germany and current developments in the international art

---

9 Steven W Naifeh noted that articles in *Time*, *Life* or the *New York Times* were more useful in attracting new collectors than an article in an art journal such as *Artforum*, as most collectors of ‘vanguard art lived outside the art world, and did not read such abstruse journals.’ See Naifeh, *Culture Making*, 1976, p. 96.
world.\textsuperscript{13} \textit{documenta IV} was a deliberate contrast to its precursors: eschewing the retrospective model, the exhibition concentrated on current art activity from the 1960s. Installation, sculpture, Colour Field painting, Minimal art and Pop Art were included, with American art playing a significant role.\textsuperscript{14} Within a large-scale international art exhibition, the context and prominence of Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s work ensured that their inflatable sculptures and large-scale wrappings received an international exposure that solo exhibition projects were unable to provide. Widespread coverage in the international press ensured that Kaldor would have been aware of this.

\textit{5,600 Cubic Meter Package} (1967-68) became the model for Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s subsequent projects. It was funded by the artists through the sale of Christo’s original drawings, collages and early works from the 1950s and ’60s. This aspect was attractive to museums lacking a large exhibition budget, and no doubt featured in Kaldor’s subsequent discussions. As with later works, Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s \textit{5,600 Cubic Meter Package} required a team of people for its realization and installation.\textsuperscript{15} This means of production became synonymous with Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s large-scale wrappings. The artists maintained that it initiated a form of cultural consciousness-raising through the engagement of paid and voluntary workers.\textsuperscript{16} For some young students involved in the later \textit{Wrapped Coast} (1968-9) projects, the experience certainly proved pivotal.\textsuperscript{17}

In 1968 when visiting New York, Kaldor endeavored to meet Christo and Jeanne-Claude. Gallerist Leo Castelli made the introduction, even though Christo had no gallery representation and sold his work directly from his studio.\textsuperscript{18} In a phone conversation with Jeanne-Claude to arrange the meeting, Kaldor introduced himself as a young collector from Australia.\textsuperscript{19} Kaldor met the artists, purchased \textit{Package} (1967), and later invited them to ‘come to Australia, do an

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{13} \textit{documenta IV}, Kassel, Germany. Artistic Director Arnold Bode. 27 June – 6 October 1968. \textit{documenta} website, \url{http://www.documenta.de}, accessed August 24, 2011.
  \item \textsuperscript{14} The exhibition included Americans Carl Andre, Kim Dine, Dan Flavin, Donald Judd, Ellsworth Kelly, Sol LeWitt, Roy Lichtenstein, Walter de Maria, Bruce Nauman, Robert Rauschenberg, Ad Reinhardt, and more. See \textit{documenta} website for a full list of artists and focus on art forms, \url{http://www.documenta.de}.
  \item \textsuperscript{15} Christo and Jeanne Claude website, \url{http://www.christojeanneclaude.net/ajoar_cubieimeter.shtml}, accessed August 24, 2011.
  \item \textsuperscript{16} Christo and Jeanne Claude website, \url{http://www.christojeanneclaude.net/ajoar_cubieimeter.shtml}, accessed August 24, 2011.
  \item \textsuperscript{17} See above p. 83.
  \item \textsuperscript{18} Baume, \textit{From Christo and Jeanne-Claude}, 1995, p. 14.
  \item \textsuperscript{19} Baume, ‘The Artist as Model’, in Forbat, \textit{40 Years}, 2009, p. 43.
\end{itemize}
Meeting Christo

In June 1969, the same year that the project with Christo and Jeanne-Claude was to take place, Package (1967) was included in an exhibition of international art from Australian collections organized by Chandler Coventry and shown at Sydney’s Central Street Gallery. A commercial gallery, Central Street was known as one of the more significant avant-garde venues in Sydney at the time. Its adherence to the formalist tenets of Greenbergian Colour Field and Hard Edge painting reflected the Gallery’s aspirations to be part of an international rather than Antipodean set of values. The 1969 exhibition that included Christo’s Package not only drew the attention of Australian collectors to these artistic developments, but also contributed funds to the proposed Australian project through the sale of works. Kaldor’s meeting with the artists in New York demonstrated the advantage of a private collector with independent means over public institutions, which frequently struggled with limited funds for purchase of works, lengthy acquisition processes, and the risk of potential public outcry at new forms of art.

The inclusion of Christo’s Package was a foretaste of Wrapped Coast, which was presented some four months after the exhibition at Central Street Gallery. Artist and critic James Gleeson, in a review of the exhibition in The Sun, 18 June 1969, wrote that interest in Christo’s work from the Kaldor collection lay not only in its new material form, but also because it came ‘as a prelude to his ambitious plan to wrap up almost a mile of coastline at Little Beach (sic).’

---

20 Baume, ‘The Artist as Model’, in Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 43. The invitation formed part of the Alcorso-Sekers Travelling Scholarship. Package (1967) was gifted to the ANGSW as part of the John Kaldor Family Collection in 2011.


Wrapped Coast remains to this day one of Kaldor Public Art Projects’ (KPAP) most significant projects, both artistically and in its impact on the local and international art scene.²⁵ It played a major role in the development of John Kaldor Art Projects, and the positioning of JKAP as a major influence on the development of contemporary art in Australia. Later, the 40 Year retrospective of KPAP at the AGNSW in 2009, and reviews of the accompanying exhibition both portrayed Wrapped Coast (1969) as pivotal in the evolution of John Kaldor Art Projects and Australian art history.²⁶ Comments such as those made by Edmund Capon, Director of the AGNSW, in his foreword to the KPAP publication 40 Years also reinforced this position. Capon sweepingly noted that though he was not much given to the notion of ‘defining moments’, ‘if there was ever such a moment in the story of modern and contemporary art in Australia it was surely the very first Kaldor project: Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s Wrapped Coast.’²⁷ For John Kaldor, Wrapped Coast introduced him to a new way of working with artists. It was also a means to bring leading international art and artists to Australia in a manner that was not being done by others. It differentiated his art collecting and support for contemporary art activities from most other important collectors worldwide.

AUSTRALIAN CONTEXT

What was the context for the first John Kaldor Art Project in 1969? Thomas claimed in his catalogue essay for An Australian Accent (1984) that until 1969, ‘art exhibitions visiting Australia were rare’.²⁸ Similarly, Baume noted in his survey of Kaldor Art Projects in 1995 that when Kaldor presented his first John Kaldor Art Project, the Power Bequest was yet to be realized, the Biennale of Sydney had not begun, the National Gallery of Australia was still thirteen years from opening, and Federal funding for the arts was limited.²⁹ Bond’s article marking the 40th anniversary of the Art Projects was similarly disparaging about the contemporary art landscape.

²⁵ See below p. 303. Name changes from John Kaldor Art Projects (JKAP) to Kaldor Public Art Projects (KPAP) denote the not-for-profit foundation’s title at the time of the project referred to.
²⁷ Capon, 40 Years, 2009, p. 18.
on offer in Australia in 1969.\textsuperscript{30} In reflecting on the context for his first Art Project, Kaldor also noted that there were almost no other initiatives for this sort of internationally focused project in Australia at that time. As Bond and Kaldor’s words echoed each other, Kaldor also remembered that ‘there was no Biennale of Sydney, no Museum of Contemporary Art. …. What people knew about contemporary art came from magazines’.\textsuperscript{31} Furthermore, letters and telegrams were the main forms of international communication. Interactions therefore occurred at a slower pace.

However, these memories did not acknowledge the significant contemporary art activities of the time. Contemporary Art Societies in Sydney and Melbourne, and the associated support of individuals such as John and Sunday Reed in Melbourne, had brought international artists and ideas to the attention of Australian artists during the preceding decades, as is now well documented and researched.\textsuperscript{32}

By 1969, a number of pivotal international exhibitions had travelled to Australia, significantly influencing a younger generation of artists alongside a wider public. International touring exhibitions were an established part of cultural activity across the globe. American and French Abstract Expressionism had been presented in the 1950 and 1952 Venice Biennales, whilst popular magazines such as \textit{Life} elevated Jackson Pollock to a celebrity status.\textsuperscript{33} An exhibition of American art was presented in Paris in 1955 at the Musée Nationale de l’Art Moderne.\textsuperscript{34} The British Council organized a range of different exhibitions of English contemporary art in Europe post WWII.\textsuperscript{35} A form of cultural propaganda, travelling exhibitions, and international art and trade fairs, were employed as part of a strategic campaign to promote international stature and political ideals in the emerging Cold War. As E.A. Spaeth wrote in 1951 in a paper for the annual convention of the American Federation of Artists, America was a mature nation with a

\textsuperscript{30} ‘At the time there was no Biennale of Sydney, no Australia Council for the Arts, no museum with a contemporary curator - although Daniel Thomas at the Art Gallery of New South Wales (AGNSW) clearly had a deep personal commitment to new art - and there were no publicly funded contemporary art spaces. In this impoverished art scene …’; see Bond, ‘A nice well-done child’, \textit{Art \& Australia}, 2009.

\textsuperscript{31} Young, ‘The Great Commissioner’, \textit{Art \& Asia Pacific}, 2009, p. 76.


\textsuperscript{33} \textit{Life}, August 8, 1948.

\textsuperscript{34} Exhibition included work by Stuart Davis, Arshile Gorky, Morris Graves, Edward Hopper, John Kane, John Marin, Jackson Pollock and Ben Shahn; and sculptures by Alexander Calder, Theodor Roszak and David Smith.

democratic and free culture that epitomized all that was good about capitalism, and it was time for America to follow Britain and France and use contemporary art exhibitions as ‘propaganda’; as a means for spreading knowledge about the American way of life.36

Consistent with this, travelling exhibitions arranged by nations were an established feature of the Australian exhibition landscape. In 1953, an exhibition of French Painting Today was arranged between the French and Australian Governments.37 A historical survey of French modernism, it included extensive coverage of young artists whose work had to that time only been accessible to Australians through overseas travel or art reviews in the few international publications.38 Between January – September 1953, it toured to Hobart, Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide and Perth. Bernard Smith, academic, critic and author of Place, Taste and Tradition: a study of Australian art since 1788,39 observed in an article for Meanjin that the French exhibition presented an excellent survey of recent painting, and offered Australians the opportunity to participate in an international discourse and to judge for themselves the relative merits of the new developments of figuration and abstraction.40

Exhibitions of American art also toured to Australia.41 Contemporary US Prints was sent to Australia in 1958 as part of the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA), New York’s International Program of American Art, and the ideas surrounding the new American abstraction were explored in publications such as NSW Broadsheet, edited by artist and critic Elwyn Lynn.42 In 1967, nearly ten years later, and as part of this ‘soft power’ approach,43 Two Decades of American

---

39 Published Ure Smith, Sydney, 1945.
42 The exhibition featured forty prints by thirty-two artists from MOMA, and was shown at the Contemporary Art Society (CAS), in Melbourne in February 1958. For details of the influence of these publications as disseminators of the ideas of American Abstraction and early minimalist theory, see Whitehouse, The Contemporary Art Society of NSW, 1999, p. 130; Barker and Green, ‘The Watershed’, Art Journal, 2011.
Painting was sent to Australia as part of the MoMA International Program of American Art. The touring exhibition included works by Willem de Kooning, Ashile Gorky, Jackson Pollock, Franz Kline, Roy Lichenstein, Andy Warhol, Barnett Newman, Mark Rothko, Ad Reinhardt, Josef Albers and Frank Stella, presenting American Hard Edged abstraction and Colour Field painting.

The touring show was the last exhibition presented at the 19th century spaces of the NGV at Swanston Street, installed in the classically proportioned galleries that usually held the permanent collection. As Barker and Green have noted, it was an exhibition organized and largely paid for by Australians. In Melbourne, NGV exhibition officer, John Stringer, was actively involved, after having been temporarily based at MoMA in 1966 on a work placement, while in Sydney a young curator Daniel Thomas played an equally central role. When reflecting on the intentions and significance of the exhibition, Stringer noted: ‘Isolated and often hanging alone, paintings were presented with a reverence and authority appropriate to masterpieces – it was a challenge to local taste that invited critical response, and the public responded with unprecedented passion in the pages of the dailies.’ Daniel Thomas, in his dual role as critic for the Sydney Morning Herald, wrote a complimentary review entitled ‘Australia’s most important exhibition’. The works were abstract, often monumental in scale, contemporary, and included some of the leading American artists at that time. The exhibition hang was spacious, affording the paintings the same

---


46 Barker and Green, ‘The watershed’, *Art Journal*, 2011, p. 65. For a discussion of the role of members of the International Council in enabling and financially supporting international exhibitions of this kind, see p. 295.


48 John Stringer, ‘Cultivating the field’, in Green, Charles and Smith, Jason, *Fieldwork*, (ex. cat.), National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne, 2002, p. 18. This exhibition was noted as a key moment in the development of the NGV in its 150th anniversary publication. See also Phip Murray, *The NGV Story, A Celebration of 150 Years*, National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne, 2011, p. 98.

veneration as the Old Masters. Ad Reinhardt’s paintings in the exhibition were of particular significance for a younger generation of Australian artists. Represented by three of his black paintings, all marked by a cruciform shape painted in close black tones on a five-foot square canvas, the works impressed both Robert Hunter and John Nixon.50 The exhibition was important not only for the institution, but also a wider Australian artistic audience. Prior to 1973, there was no overarching Commonwealth Arts body. The Australian Council for the Arts had been established in 1968, with responsibility for some professional training schools, national touring companies, and special projects. However, this and other bodies were seen as ad hoc, with insufficient involvement from artists, and poor administrative processes.51 Touring exhibitions of this kind were the major showcase of leading international developments for a local Australian audience, notwithstanding their overtly nationalistic agenda and Euro-American focus.

The impact of this international exhibition has been widely documented.52 Thomas described it as the first truly ‘blockbuster’ show, whilst Stringer reflected in 2002 that the exhibition had been a ‘significant catalyst’ for the opening exhibition *The Field* (1968) at the new NGV building in St Kilda Road.53 The importance of the exhibition for a local audience was reflected by the acquisition of works from the exhibition. The NGV acquired two works: a small yellow abstract painting by Josef Albers’s *Homage to the square: Autumn echo* (1966), and second-generation Abstract Expressionist Helen Frankenthaler’s *Cape (Provincetown)* (1964).54 Neither acquisition was a radical choice. The AGNSW also acquired works from the exhibition: Albers’ *Homage to the square* (1966), another yellow painting from his extensive series; and Morris Louis’s large and imposing abstract painting *Ayin* (1958) (Thomas would later hang this work alongside a Kaldor art project by Miralda in 1973).55 Though a large number of the works were available for sale,
interest from private collectors was almost non-existent.  However, architect Harry Seidler also purchased a work from Albers’ *Homage to the square: impartial* (1966), which, unlike the similar NGV and AGNSW yellow works from the series, featured luminous pink-grey paint on masonite.

Key international exhibitions, however, did not always receive the widespread and public interest that they should have merited. A major touring exhibition of avant-garde works by Marcel Duchamp organized by the Arts Council of Britain travelled extensively throughout Australia in 1967-8. Bond noted that that the retrospective presented yet another example of posthumous work. Melbourne sculptor Peter Cripps, who was a young student at the time, acknowledged the exhibition’s pivotal role in the development of his conceptual, post-sculptural practice. However Thomas, then curator of the AGNSW, remembered that the exhibition was ‘barely noticed’ by a wider public.

Influenced by *Two Decades of American Painters*, in August 1968 Melbourne curators Brian Finemore and John Stringer presented their own interpretation of developments in international art-making with an exhibition of Australian art entitled *The Field*. The first show at the newly opened National Gallery of Victoria on St Kilda Road, the exhibition subsequently travelled to the Art Gallery of New South Wales. The curators aimed to look at the influence of American Colour Field painting and Hard-edged abstraction on Australian artists. With artists including Robert Hunter, who at twenty-one, was the youngest artist in the exhibition, Robert Rooney, Trevor Vickers, Mel Ramsden and Ian Burn, Stringer noted that all of the artists chosen had

---

‘dedicated themselves to radical forms of abstraction.’63 Presented in Roy Grounds’ exhibition spaces, with their resoundingly modernist modular forms of installation and display, and lined for the occasion by Stringer in silver foil, *The Field* was an enormous public and critical success.64 The decision to open the NGV’s new building with a contemporary exhibition of Australian art exploring and responding to international Abstraction and Colour Field painting reflected the NGV’s desire to be part of a current contemporary art debate. However, by the late 1960s, the focus of *The Field* reflected only one aspect of new forms of art. Presented two years prior to the publication of Sydney academic and feminist Germaine Greer’s *The Female Eunuch* (1970), the exhibition’s inclusion of only two women, alongside thirty-eight male artists, did not reflect its times. While a key exhibition in the development of a specifically Australian cultural landscape, the exhibition’s backward view meant that even for many of the artists included in the show, the moment had already passed.

In November 1968, Robert Hunter travelled overseas. He stayed with James Doolin in Los Angeles, followed by six months in New York staying with Mel Ramsden and Ian Burn.65 All had shown with him in *The Field* (1968) earlier that year. In New York, Hunter was impressed by Sol LeWitt’s art, whose work he noted as having a particular resonance with his own.66 Hunter’s travels reflected the increasing trend among a younger generation of Australian artists to spend extended periods travelling and living overseas, strengthening valuable contacts with artists and galleries, and enabling them to immerse themselves in the most recent contemporary art. The significance of *The Field* for this younger generation of Australian artists was in part its role as catalyst. Kaldor built on this awareness of contemporary international art with the presentation of *Wrapped Coast* (1969) the following year.


64 See Green, in Smith and Green, *fieldwork*, 2002, p. 12, for a discussion on the impact and legacy of *The Field*. See also essays by Lindsay, ‘left field, fieldwork in context’, and Stringer, ‘Cultivating the field’, in Smith and Green, *fieldwork*, 2002, pp. 8 – 11.


66 Dodge noted that Hunter would have seen LeWitt’s ‘cage-like structures based on cubic modules and constructed of wood and metal, either painted white or covered in white baked enamel, the earliest of which were made in 1965.’ Although three-dimensional, they were conceived as two-dimensional. Dodge in Duncan, Robert Hunter, 1987, p. 23.
In Sydney, the J.J.W. Power Bequest, formally accepted and announced by the University of Sydney in 1962, had also increased access to international contemporary art and theory. John Power’s bequest to the University of Sydney was at the time the largest gift for contemporary art in Australia, and the largest gift to the arts in Australia save for the NGV’s Felton Bequest. An artist, author, surgeon, medical scientist, businessman and benefactor, John Power (1881–1943) bequested works of art and $2 million to the University of Sydney for the establishment of the Power Institute of Fine Arts. The Power Bequest aimed to ‘make available to the people of Australia the latest ideas and theories in the plastic arts by means of lectures and teaching and by the purchase of the most recent contemporary art of the world.’

The Bequest was instrumental in enabling the development of art history as a discipline, which in turn played a pivotal role in the development of contemporary art in Australia. Whilst Baume noted that when John Kaldor became active as a patron in Australia in 1969 ‘the full potential of the Power Bequest had yet to be realised’, it had already begun to play an important role. In 1967, eminent art historian and author Bernard Smith was appointed founding Power Professor of Contemporary Art, and Director of the Power Institute at the University of Sydney, where he remained until 1977. The significance of his role in the development of contemporary art in Australia has been widely noted. The second art history department created in Australia, its courses were structured around an established chronology of Western painting, sculpture and architecture. Alongside these activities, the Institute ran a nationwide programme of annual public lectures, and it was through this initiative that celebrity New York critic and theorist Clement Greenberg visited Australia and launched the Power Lectures in Contemporary Art in 1968 with a lecture entitled ‘Avant-Garde Attitudes’. A Research Library for contemporary art

---

67 Power died in 1943, however the Bequest was not acquired until 1961, on the death of Power’s wife on 6 October 1961. She also bequeathed most of his paintings to the University. For a detailed account of the history of the Power Bequest, see Museum of Contemporary Art, John Power, Artist and Benefactor, essays by Donna Lee Brien and Virginia Spate, Museum of Contemporary Art, Sydney, 1991; and Bernice Murphy, Museum of Contemporary Art: Vision and Context, Museum of Contemporary Art, Sydney, 1993. For a discussion of the role of Bernice Murphy and Leon Paroissien as first co-curators of the Power Collection in 1984, and their role in Sydney’s Museum of Contemporary Art’s (MCA) collection, see Dinar, Dysart, ‘Preparing the ground: On the founding of Sydney’s Museum of Contemporary Art’, Art & Australia, Vol. 47, Issue 4, 2010, pp. 586.


71 See, for example, Heather Barker and Charles Green, ‘Bernard Smith, cold warrior’, Thesis 11, No. 82 (1), 2005, pp, 38 – 53.

was created. In the department’s inaugural year, a Power Studio for Australian artists was endowed at the Cité International des Arts in Paris. The Power Gallery appointed Gordon Thomson (1967) and artist Elwyn Lynn (1969) as its first curators: their role was to develop an international contemporary art collection that would be exhibited extensively in Sydney and elsewhere. The collection was later transferred to the Museum of Contemporary Art building at its Circular Quay location in 1989. Each of these activities had a major impact on the developing cultural life of Sydney.

Despite the comments of Thomas, Bond, Baume and Kaldor himself, Australia was not bereft of international contemporary art in 1969. There had been many opportunities to see contemporary international work first-hand rather than just in magazines. Nevertheless, the first John Kaldor Art Project had a significant impact on contemporary artists, the Australian public imagination, the subsequent careers of artists and arts professionals, and the evolution of KPAP.

**WRAPPED COAST IMPACT**

*Wrapped Coast – One Million Square Feet, Little Bay, Sydney, Australia (1968-9)* dramatically caught the public’s imagination, and exploited the peculiarly collaborative aspect of Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s art.\(^7^4\) It was captured on film, generated countless editorial columns, was the subject of newspaper cartoons, and was championed and pilloried alike.

With most of Sydney’s coastline government-owned, Kaldor’s approaches to the New South Wales Premier and Minister for Lands had been refused on the grounds that the project would ‘not be appropriate use of Crown land’.\(^7^5\) Dr Jack Clancy, Chief executive officer of The Prince Henry Hospital, then a quarantine hospital for tropical diseases, agreed to the Little Bay site’s use, on the condition that a small fee would be paid to the hospital and insurance would be covered.\(^7^6\) The London art magazine *Studio International* described the event:

---

\(^7^3\) See above p. 29.

\(^7^4\) *Wrapped Coast*, 28 October – 14 December 1969, Little Bay; *Drawings and Collages*, 22 October – 8 November, Central Street Gallery; *Wool Works*, 1 – 30 November, National Gallery of Victoria. An exhibition of Christo’s drawings and collages was also held at Central Street Gallery, Sydney. From the mid 1990s all environmental projects created since 1961 have been retrospectively recognized as collaborations between Christo and Jeanne-Claude. Christo is sole creator of the drawings, collages and wrapped objects. See Green, *The Third Hand*, 1999 for a discussion of the collaborative aspect of their work.

\(^7^5\) Tom Lewis (New South Wales Minister for Lands) to Peter Coleman, Sydney 28 April, 1969, Baume, *From Christo and Jeanne-Claude*, 1995, p. 15.

\(^7^6\) Baume, *From Christo and Jeanne-Claude* 1995, p. 15. Letters from Kaldor to Clancy.
Christo’s latest package, 1,000,000 sq.ft. of the Australian coastline at Little Bay, near Sydney covering a frontage of approximately one mile, was realized for the period 1 to 28 November. Using a polypropylene fabric, 35 miles of rope, two-way radios and an estimated 17,000 man-hours, and despite southerly gales and pyromaniac hooligans, Christo wrapped up rocks to a height of 84 feet. Sponsors were the Aspen Centre of Contemporary Art, Colorado, and Christo himself.77

Though incorrectly acknowledging the sponsors as the Aspen Centre of Contemporary Art, Colorado, the news piece was accompanied by an image of the work.

ABC local film footage of the wrapping and subsequent opening on 28 October captured the sense of excitement about the work. Images showed some of the many participants on the project: the local garbage workers from the nearby dump; nurses swimming, sunbathing, and watching the work’s progress; and constantly shifting numbers of local students who acted as paid and voluntary labour for the wrap. Though shot in black and white, the billowing white fabric and orange rope were in sharp relief against the mass of the Antipodean sky and ocean.

The workforce totalled 120 people daily, and included a site engineer, technical coordinator, fifteen professional rock-climbers, eleven students and one hundred labourers, who spent four weeks climbing, wrapping and sewing.78 CAS Broadsheet called for volunteers to assist with the installation at Little Bay, and Christo was invited to lecture to students and staff at the Power Institute at the University of Sydney.79 Many of the students from the University and the East Sydney Technical College were architecture students, introduced to the project by their University of Sydney lecturer, Marr Grounds.80

The project had a significant impact on students, even if some of them were not enrolled in art school per se. Thomas noted the importance of departments other than art in a report in 1969, suggesting that there was little ‘intellectual stimulus to be had in art schools … and technical


78 Baume, Christo, 1990, p. 38. Also noted in Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 60. Christo frequently drew attention to the fact that not only were works funded by the sale of artists’ models and drawings, but those involved should also be paid.


aspects can be learnt at part time courses.⁸¹ Students involved in *Wrapped Coast* (1969) included architecture student Imants Tillers and self-taught artist Ian Milliss. Tillers noted that the experience not only introduced him to a new perspective on art, but also convinced him to become an artist.⁸² "My conception of what an artist could be had been quite a limited one, you know, prior to the sort of encounter with Christo and his work. So I think I was quite inspired by that aspect."⁸³

In a collective event that involved bureaucrats, technicians, students and artists, the project challenged popular notions of the artist and art itself.⁸⁴ J.A.C. Dunn, writing in the *Sydney Morning Herald* commented, 'From some aspects, wrap-up looks like construction of a commune.'⁸⁵ The impact of the experiential and collaborative nature of the work influenced other organisations in Australia. Tom McCullough, curator-director of the Mildura Art Centre, travelled to Sydney to see and photograph *Wrapped Coast* (1969).⁸⁶ The work's participatory and performative nature, its site-specificity, and the experiential nature of the work were all to be explored in later Mildura Sculpture events from 1970.

Locally, the project presented a new form of post-sculptural art as well as bringing internationally acclaimed artists to Australia to make new work.⁸⁷ Thomas underlined the significance at the time: ‘This year, for the first time ever, foreign artists of stature will have actually worked in Australia.’⁸⁸ Not only was the artwork present, but local artists gained first-hand access to the artists.

---


⁸² Tillers quoted in Burt Churnow, Christo and Jeanne-Claude: a biography, St Martin's Press, New York, 2002, p. 192. See also Baume, Christo, 1999, p. 27; and Forbus, 40 Years, 2009, p. 66. This is now well mythologised. See above p. 135.


⁸⁴ There is extensive literature on the work, and the involvement of diverse members of Sydney’s community. See for example Bourdon, Christo, 1972; Baume, From Christo and Jeanne-Claude, 1995; Australian Broadcasting Commission Arts Online (ABC), film footage, written and directed by Brian Adams, Wrapped Coast – Christo/Kaldor Collaboration, 1969, drawn from the ABC archive, http://www.abc.net.au/arts/stories/s3108455.htm, accessed August 7, 2011.


In 1969, America’s cultural and political influence dominated world news. Television broadcast Neil Armstrong as the first man to walk on the moon, the Woodstock three-day music festival held in the US became a cultural touchstone for a generation, while protest marches continued in the US and Australia against conscription and an unwinnable war. Amidst all this, Wrapped Coast (1969) made Australia a brief focus of international attention, attracting widespread local and international interest. New York art critic David Bourdon, dressed in an outrageously flamboyant apple-green suit, even covered the project for Life magazine.

The project certainly captured the public’s imagination. No doubt fuelled by the controversy and media interest, thousands of people gathered for the opening, paying a 20 cent donation to experience the large wrap. Writing for Melbourne’s Herald evening newspaper, Alan McCulloch reported ‘Every taxi-driver knows the way to Little Bay and the roads from the city are packed with tourists’. 250,000 people visited Wrapped Coast. As Green noted, ‘the work of art was a part of “real life” – an obstacle, a tourist attraction – rather than an art gallery experience.’ This aspect was key: visitors experienced the work beyond the white cube of the gallery frame, so that the work was not mediated by expectations of context. With the surrounding ambient sounds of seagulls, sun and surf, the experience could not have been further from the gallery world.

The response to the work would not have been complete without controversy. Bourdon noted that much of the adverse criticism addressed the work’s impact on the environment. This was the first wrapping by the artists of a natural environment rather than a man-made object. The project was the subject of cartoons in the local papers, whilst the Reverend Roger Bush
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89 See Bourdon, *Christo*, 1972, for example.
90 Thomas in Forbat, *40 Years*, 2009, p. 37.
94 On the social engagement of installation art, see above p. 58.
95 Baume, *Christo*, 1990, p. 37. Whilst Smith’s ‘The provincialism problem’, *Artforum* essay of 1974 was not directly mentioned, the reference to ‘a sparsely populated island continent’ implied a form of provincialism.
deplored the project in the ABC’s television and radio broadcasts about the event.  Not all artists supported the project either, with critic Alan McCulloch noting in the January edition of *Art International* that Melbourne-based social realist painter Albert Tucker ‘accepted the role as defender of the national innocence from attacks by “the paranoiac out-riders of the extremist international fashions”’.  

The impact of Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s temporary environmental work of art was profound and has become inscribed as a key moment in Australia’s cultural history.  Whilst the comments of Thomas, Baume, and others involved in the projects and auspicing institutions could be seen as self-reinforcing, its cultural, historic and artistic significance is clear from the work’s broader critical frame.  For critic and academic Donald Brook, Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s *Wrapped Coast* (1969) was powerful because it raised ‘either explicitly or by implication nearly every question that ought to matter to us about art now.’  In 1984, reflecting on the impact of *Wrapped Coast* (1969), Thomas described the work as having ‘conspicuously raised questions about the nature of art while being so undeniably, indeed glamorously, a work of art.’  

For Australian artists, Thomas argued, the work was directly linked to the emergence of Conceptual art in Sydney at the same time.

The durational aspects of the work were important to its success.  Christo reflected on the experience of the local audience: ‘People would take time to walk from one side of the project to the other.  For me, that element of time is the most significant and influential part of the project.’  The durational aspects of the work included not only the length of time that visitors spent experiencing the work, but also the work’s own temporality: the long gestation of the project; the four weeks it actually took to realize the work; its finite period of existence after which the site was returned to its original state; and the work’s continuing legacy in people’s memories.  This legacy was framed both through the interviews and commentary that surrounded
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98 See Baume, *From Christo to Jeanne-Claude*, 1995, p. 16.
103 Anthony Bond began his essay for the 1990 Christo and Jean-Claude exhibition and project at the AGNSW with a reference to Thomas’ reflections on the work’s impact for an Australian audience.  See Baume, *Christo*, 1990.
the work, and through its photographic documentation. The work’s very impermanence was a key element of its continued identity.\footnote{On this feature of installation art, see above p. 18.} The artwork eschewed commodification, and introduced a new form of post-object work. Its very ephemerality could only be captured in the models, photographs, films, books and publications that are now all that remains of one of the earliest site-specific environmental sculptures.

As their first large-scale wrapping, \textit{Wrapped Coast} (1969) was instrumental to the subsequent development of Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s work. It enabled them to move beyond the museum and the object into the landscape itself. In retrospect, \textit{Wrapped Coast} (1969) had more impact than any other KPAP project on the evolution of its artists’ practice and on the evolution of site-specific ephemeral works internationally. \textit{Wrapped Coast} (1969) played a key role in subsequent exhibition catalogues, essays and monographs on Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s work.\footnote{See for example Bourdon, \textit{Christo}, 1972; Thomas \textit{An Australian Accent}, 1984.} Catalogue essays and monographs regularly cite Christo’s early wrapping of ‘things’ – furniture, motorbikes, traffic signs and cars – as having established Christo’s reputation.\footnote{See for example Dieter Ronte, \textit{Christo and Jeanne-Claude – The Würth Museum Collection}, Wurth collection, Philip Wilson Publishers, London, 2004, p. 28.} The wrapping of buildings, such as \textit{Wrapped Kunsthalle} (1968), bridges and even the inflatables extended this part of Christo’s art. \textit{Wrapped Coast} (1969) went further, taking the artists beyond the art gallery or museum, so that the site and location were an important aspect of the work itself. It was memorable both for the logistical challenges of the work and its relation to site.

The work was the first site-specific intervention by the artists. In the United States it was followed by \textit{Valley Curtain} (1970-1972); \textit{Ocean Front, Newport, Rhode Island} (1974); \textit{Running Fence, Sonoma and Marin Counties, California} (1972-76); \textit{Wrapped Walkways}, Jacob Loose Park, Kansas City, Missouri, (1977-78); \textit{Surrounded Islands, Biscayne Bay, Greater Miami, Florida} (1980-83); and \textit{The Gates, Central Park, New York City} (1979-2005).\footnote{For details and images see Christo and Jeanne-Claude website, \url{http://www.christojeanneclaude.net/major_islands.shtml}, accessed February 22, 2012.} In Europe it was followed by \textit{Wrapped Roman Wall}, via Veneto, Rome (1974); \textit{Wrapped Reichstag, project for Der Deutsche Reichstag – West Berlin} (1971-1995); and \textit{The Pont Neuf Wrapped}, Paris (1975-85).
Writing just three years after the work was created, Bourdon noted the wider significance of *Wrapped Coast* (1969) for a developing form of artistic practice. He linked the work to the development of ‘a recent trend in sculpture, a sprawling kind of landscape art that uses Mother Earth as its medium, variously described as “earth art”, “earthworks”, and “land art”’. He placed Christo’s work alongside those of American artists working in this area, including Walter de Maria and Michael Heizer, and suggested that Italian conceptualist Piero Manzoni had arguably created the most comprehensive earthwork, *Socle du Monde* (*Base of the World*) (1961), a sculptural cube whose inverted title enabled the work to be interpreted as supporting the whole earth – ‘the largest found object yet’. Present at the wrapping, Bourdon maintained that *Wrapped Coast* (1969) was Christo’s ‘most spectacular “package”’. ‘At the very least’, he added ‘the wrapped coast was one of the most extraordinary images and memorable art spectacles of the 1960s.’

Subsequent writing on Land art recognized the importance of *Wrapped Coast* (1969) as a seminal work. The historical positioning of the work was reflected by Jeffrey Kastener’s survey book *Land and Environmental Art* (1998, updated in 2010), which featured a picture of *Wrapped Coast* (1969) on its cover. More recent academic research presented in the form of the first historic survey exhibition of Land art, *Ends of the Earth, Land Art to 1974* (2012) presented by MOCA LA and Haus der Kunst, Munich, located the project as one of many other significant ephemeral works of its kind. Accompanied by an extensive hard-back catalogue, curators Philipp Kaiser and Miwon Kwon challenged many of the Land Art myths that had evolved. In contrast to the
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110 Bourdon, *Christo*, 1972, p. 44.
111 Bourdon, *Christo*, 1972, p. 46.
112 Bourdon, *Christo*, 1972, p. 46.

traditional histories of the art movement presented to date, the cover featured a black and white photograph of LA conceptual artist, Edward Ruscha from *Royal Road Test* (1967), an apparently random action that took place on the side of U.S Highway 91, south of Las Vegas in the California desert.\textsuperscript{116} *Wrapped Coast* was reproduced as a full-page illustration, along with other notable works, and was noted as the largest single artwork ever made.\textsuperscript{117} However, the work’s contribution did not outweigh many other significant works of its kind presented by artists from Europe and Great Britain, Iceland, Israel, Japan, and the United States. These were often less-known, as they took place in remote locations in various parts of the world and were not captured by the seductive photographic images of Harry Shunk.

*Wrapped Coast* (1969) had a substantial impact on the evolution of the work of Christo and Jeanne-Claude, and of environmental sculpture internationally. It also affected thinking about philanthropy for contemporary art, as Bourdon noted in his essay on Christo in 1972.\textsuperscript{118} The financial aspect of such an ambitious project was clearly an important issue. Under the terms of textile company Alcorso-Sekers’ Travelling Scholarship for Sculpture, airfares and accommodation were covered.\textsuperscript{119} Christo maintained that he paid for all costs incurred for each of his wrapped works, including *Wrapped Coast*.\textsuperscript{120} Funds were raised through the sale of collages, drawings and other original works of art, in a model of fund-raising for large-scale projects that Christo and Jeanne-Claude continued in subsequent projects. As Baume noted in 1990, as the sole financier of each project, through corporations set up for that purpose, Christo and Jeanne-Claude were able to maintain complete artistic control of their projects.\textsuperscript{121} Nevertheless, Thomas’ framing of the work for his essay commissioned for JKAP’s *An Australian Accent* (1984) reinforced the philanthropic legacy fifteen years later. His comments were written primarily for an American audience who, by that time, would have been aware of a number of Christo and


\textsuperscript{117} *Wrapped Coast* was discussed as the ‘first work in the series of Kaldor Public Art Projects initiated by Australian collector John Kaldor’: see Kaiser and Kwon, *Ends of the Earth*, 2012, p. 29, p. 193.

\textsuperscript{118} Bourdon, *Christo*, 1972, p. 52.


\textsuperscript{120} See Christo and Jeanne-Claude website, ‘Who Pays for the artwork?’, https://www.christojeanneclaude.net/faq, accessed May 12, 2012. The also state that ‘they do not accept donated labor (volunteer help).’ For this first environmental wrap, volunteer help was accepted.

\textsuperscript{121} Baume, *Christo*, 1990, p. 38.
Jean-Claude’s other ‘gentle disturbances’ that had taken place in American locations. Thomas explained Kaldor’s role as pivotal in the realization of Wrapped Coast (1969), presaging a new form of philanthropic support. As Christo’s art cut across ‘many styles and concerns of art’, it raised issues about both the social responsibility of the artist and the changing role of patronage. Wrapped Coast (1969) placed Kaldor within these debates, and its example enabled him to form John Kaldor Art Projects as a means of further developing these activities.

WOOL WORKS

A further element of Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s 1969 project was a sculptural wrap for the National Gallery of Victoria. After completing Wrapped Coast (1969), Christo and Jeanne-Claude travelled to Melbourne in November 1969 to create Wool Works, an installation of wrappings in two parts. The work was conceived to be presented in the Murdoch Court, an open-air space that adjoined the temporary exhibition galleries. However, when the open bales proved unsuitable for this exterior site, NGV curator John Stringer successfully negotiated the installation of the open bales in the NGV’s temporary galleries, in sight of a larger wrapped stack in Murdoch Court. Within Grounds’ bluestone and timber clad interior spaces, and still retaining the temporary galleries’ silver foil-clad walls installed for The Field exhibition in 1968, 75 bales of wool were presented in two long rows along the floor. On the ground floor, in the Murdoch Court’s bluestone clad interior courtyard space, a further two truckloads of wool bales were stacked and wrapped in dark tarpaulins. The materials and trussed form were reminiscent of wool transported by freight trucks across the country. Alongside the wrapped bales was a further stack, from whose partly opened hessian bales cascaded woolen filling: the odour of lanolin was redolent of shearing sheds, peppercorn trees, and the Australian rural myth. In its use of natural materials, the work related to an earlier Christo wrapping, Wrapped Hay (1968), that Christo had made for the Institute of Contemporary Art, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. Christo’s choice of material could not help but evoke reflections on a country
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Installation view, home of John Kaldor
Photo: Kerry Dundas
Forbat (ed), *40 Years*, 2009, p. 43.

Installation view, National Gallery Victoria
Photo: Harry Shunk
that had developed through Australian rural labor and an economy that had prospered on the sheep’s back. This was reinforced by the work’s proximity to the Gallery’s famous colonial painting, Tom Roberts’ *Shearing the rams* (1890).127

As neither *Wrapped Coast* nor the Sydney exhibition of Christo’s work was associated with a public art institution, Christo’s Melbourne project was an opportunity for a public gallery to present work by the charismatic international contemporary artist at the very moment he was gaining widespread international recognition. The institutional context placed Christo’s work within the art historical trajectory of the country’s most significant historic collection.128 The NGV’s new Australian Modernist building in St Kilda Road, and the recent success of *The Field* (1968) made it an ideal Melbourne location for Kaldor’s project.

However, *Wool works* did not have anything like the cultural, historic or artistic significance of *Wrapped Coast* (1969). Alan McCulloch, writing in *Art International* in 1970, noted that ‘wrapped walls and wool bales were in effect routine exercise[s] and after the epic of the wrapped coast they appeared very much as anti-climax.’129 As Saunders has also noted, the work appeared both ‘miniaturised and emasculated’ inside the gallery building.130 With the memory of *Wrapped Coast* still fresh in people’s minds through extensive media and television coverage, Christo’s NGV work appeared in marked contrast to the major environmental and ephemeral installation. The impact on local arts and students could also not be compared to *Wrapped Coast*. The artists enlisted by Stringer to help with the Melbourne installation included John Davis, Les Kossatz, Peter Clarke, Clifford Last, Ti Parks, William Ferguson, Peter Corlett, Clive Murray-White, and Jock Clutterbuck.131 Students were suggested by Alun Leach-Jones, whose work had been included in *The Field* in 1968, and included Roger Butler and Simon Klose amongst others, who had also assisted with the Little Bay project.132 However, participating in the NGV wrap gave neither the extended contact with the artist, or the experience of working beyond the gallery
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127 Daniel Thomas also pointed out the relationship of Christo’s work to the Roberts’ painting. Noted in Forbat, *40 Years*, 2009.
128 The Felton Bequest had significant impact on the development of the NGV’s collection, and its position at that point as one of the major art institutions in Australia. See J. Poynter, *Mr Felton’s Bequests*, The Meigunyah Press, An imprint of MUP, Melbourne, 2003.
132 Lindsay, ‘Christo and Jeanne-Claude’, *Art Journal*, 2011, p. 119.
space. Where *Wrapped Coast* transformed the work and the public experience of it into an event in itself, experienced over time and in relation to context and place, the Melbourne installation did not.

Though Christo’s preparatory drawings for *Wool works* (1969) were submitted for purchase by the NGV in December 1969, endorsed not only by the Director Eric Westbrook and the Acquisitions Sub-committee, the work was declined.\(^{133}\) Whilst there was a single black and white photographic image of *Wool Works* (1969) in the NGA collection, gifted by Thomas in 1980,\(^{134}\) the NGV did not acquire works or documentary material from the show until 2010-11.\(^{135}\) Lindsay’s article in the NGV’s *Art Journal* (2011) was written to coincide with the Gallery’s acquisition of Christo’s drawing *Project for Keith Murdoch Court, National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne* (1969).\(^{136}\) The pencil, wax crayon, charcoal and collage of cotton, string, staples and cut photographs on paper was shown alongside thirteen drawings by the artist and three other preparatory drawings for *Wool Works*. The 2010-2011 Annual Report of the NGV described *Wool Works* (1969) as ‘the seminal event in 1969, bringing to the city the most recent international practice in terms of installation art,’\(^{137}\) although the failure to acquire any contemporaneous record of the ephemeral event suggests it was not seen as being so by some in the institution at the time. Instead, the Gallery Trustees of the time saw these works as preparatory works, which were not part of the NGV’s exhibitions policy to include installations and ‘happenings’ such as *Wool Works* (1969), thus ‘reflecting current developments in contemporary art.’\(^{138}\) Nevertheless, for Kaldor, the Melbourne project built awareness of Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s work with a wider Australian audience, extending the cultural reach of *Wrapped Coast* (1969) beyond its geographic location in Sydney.
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133 Lindsay, ‘Christo and Jeanne-Claude’, *Art Journal*, 2011, p. 119.


IMPACT OF JKAP AND KALDOR

The significance of *Wrapped Coast* (1969) for the project’s instigator and project manager, John Kaldor, has been well documented, and has become a part of the artwork’s history. Kaldor often stated that the experience as project coordinator of the complex and logistically demanding project inspired him to start up his own company. As the first project to be presented as part of John Kaldor Art Projects, it shaped the direction of many of the subsequent JKAP events.

What was Kaldor’s role in the initiation of the Art Projects? Kaldor himself, rather humbly, saw his role in *Wrapped Coast* (1969) as the ‘project co-ordinator’. Kaldor did not at the time see his position as a curator. No doubt this has to do with the evolving nature of the contemporary curator, and what became inherent in the term itself. By the mid-2000s, the role of the curator-producer was a well-established model for working with contemporary artists both in and beyond the institution. Some organisations, however, still consciously chose to refer to their staff fulfilling this hybrid role as Producers. The changing nature of the role of the curator, from traditional collection curators to curator-producers, was in keeping with the evolving nature of contemporary art.

In 2011, Claire Doherty suggested that by 2006, the curator-producer emerged as the linchpin in negotiations between artist and place. She proposed that the qualities that differentiated a curator-producer from the traditional museum curator was their active involvement in the production of the artwork; their consideration of the need to work from an informed, embedded position; and the responsibility to account for considerable expenditure of public funds on artworks that must be locally relevant but also internationally significant. She also noted that they needed to avoid the ‘pseudo-ethnographic’ commissioning process outlined in Miwon Kwon’s *One Place After Another: Site-Specific Art and Locating Identity* (2002), while at the same time seeking
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142 At this stage there was no discussion of the role of ‘Curator’, which was first adopted in 1984 to describe Kaldor’s role for *An Australian Accent*.

143 See introduction, p. 20. Artangel refers to their curatorial staff as Producers. In 2001, curatorial roles for the Visual Arts Program of the Melbourne International Arts Festival were referred to as Project Managers.

144 Doherty and O’Neill (eds.), *Locating the Producers*, 2011, p. 3.
to enable the creation of a ‘truly remarkable work or project that would resonate beyond the specifics of a given location’.\textsuperscript{145}

Balancing the need for the spectacular and memorable with these other practical and philosophical constraints was no easy task. As private initiator of this new work, Kaldor was not technically responsible for the expenditure of public funds. He was, however, responsible for the use of public land, and the weight of financial responsibility for the project lay with Kaldor and the artists. Though ‘project co-ordinator’ did not necessarily imply any curatorial participation, his activities as co-ordinator and manager of the logistics of a complex and ambitious project, and desire to engage a local and international audience with the final result, means that his role for this first project should be considered as a curator-producer as that role has now evolved. In 2009, in an interview with Nicholas Baume, Kaldor noted the similarity of his role to that of a curator, in its contemporary form.\textsuperscript{146} Subsequent models of Art Projects that presented internationally acclaimed works by well-established international artists, meant that Kaldor’s role would continue to evolve from curator-producer to an artistic directorial role.

Whether as patron or curator-producer, as with \textit{Wrapped Coast} (1969), the Art Projects enabled Kaldor to play an active role in the development of projects. Charles Green noted that Kaldor was both a facilitator for the realization of projects, and a collaborator working directly with the artists.\textsuperscript{147} This role enabled Kaldor to be actively engaged with the artists whose work he also collected. Kaldor noted that he did not commission works, but rather facilitated or enabled.\textsuperscript{148} In Baume’s interview with Kaldor in the 2009 publication celebrating 40 years of Kaldor Public Art Projects, he asked Kaldor whether in his mind ‘a patron, a philanthropist, and a curator is really the artist’?\textsuperscript{149} Baume’s analogy alluded to the belief that artists have their own vision, often in the face of resistance and rejection, and suggested that Kaldor’s dedication to projects shared similar determination. However, Kaldor emphatically rejected Baume’s suggestion. ‘I never considered myself an artist – closer, maybe, to a curator’, he stated.\textsuperscript{150} Kaldor’s use of the term

\textsuperscript{145} Doherty and O’Neill (eds.), \textit{Locating the Producers}, 2011, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{146} See Kaldor’s interview with Baume in Forbat, \textit{40 Years}, 2009, p. 45.
\textsuperscript{147} Green, ‘Disappearance and Photography’, \textit{Afterimage}, 1999.
\textsuperscript{148} Conversation with John Kaldor, Thursday August 14, 2008. Kaldor noted he did not commission works, rather facilitated or enabled their presentation.
\textsuperscript{149} Baume in Forbat, \textit{40 Years}, 2009, p. 45.
\textsuperscript{150} Baume in Forbat, \textit{40 Years}, 2009, p. 45.
‘curator’, picking up its connotations in 2009, acknowledged a shift in meaning implied by the term that began with Szeemann’s role as ‘independent curator’ of documenta 5 in 1972, and developed to encompass a curator as the initiator and collaborator of projects. Kaldor’s use of the term connoted his involvement as a collaborator and enabler, rather than the more traditional scholar-curator role, whilst acknowledging the professionalization of the curator within a now global contemporary art world.

Kaldor also saw himself as a ‘collector’ with an interest in supporting new forms of contemporary art. In acquiring artworks for his own private collection, Kaldor took on the role of passionate connoisseur, a role reflected by other collectors of contemporary art at that time. In 1984 in his catalogue preface to An Australian Accent, Kaldor stated, ‘I am neither a professional curator nor a critic; I am an individual with a great interest in contemporary art. I believe that collecting art is a private and somewhat passive role’. Ironically, Kaldor was expressly credited as the ‘curator’ of An Australian Accent, although its format was very different from any other JKAP project. However, the nature of the Art Projects inherently involved Kaldor working with artists more closely than a conventional collector. Christo commented in 1988:

Even though he is a collector of things, John became involved with art that was beyond the collectable dimension. With us, Gilbert & George, Charlotte Moorman and Nam June Paik, the important thing was not that there would be some permanent object, but that there was another dimension that needed to be experienced.

Kaldor’s close involvement in artistic developments through the evolution of the temporary Art Projects placed him in a different position to many other collectors of contemporary art at that time. In Australia, Wrapped Coast (1969) was new: both in collecting the non-collectable, and in the presentation of such work. Conceptual, performative, and large-scale installation based artworks increasingly forced collectors to rethink considerations of scale and space. By creating John Kaldor Art Projects to host the presentation of work of this nature, works that might once...

151 See below p.154.
152 See above p. 6
have been perceived as ‘beyond the collectable’ were now pivotal to the philanthropic endeavor. What differentiated Kaldor from other collectors was his initiation of a series of Public Art Projects.

Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s *Wrapped Coast* (1969) had a significant impact on the subsequent development of John Kaldor Art Projects. The couple introduced him to Harald Szeemann, Gilbert & George, Miralda, and Charlotte Moorman and Nam June-Paik, who made the four projects that followed *Wrapped Coast* (1969).156 Their influence was also indirect: Szeemann’s European exhibition *Live in Your Head: When attitudes become form* (1969) included work by Sol LeWitt and Richard Long, who made JKAP projects 6 and 7 in 1972. Kaldor’s friendship with Christo and Jeanne-Claude had developed because he was able to visit exhibitions and artists while overseas for business. Continued acquisition of their work, and the work of others, enabled him to make contact with other artists, curators and gallerists. The personal endorsement of Christo and Jeanne-Claude gave Kaldor confidence in the artistic merit and importance of artists selected to participate in subsequent Art Projects.

**CONCLUSION**

The first JKAP was pivotal to the future success of the enterprise. Christo’s *Wrapped Coast* (1969) had an enormous impact on contemporary art in Australia. Although Australia had not in fact been bereft of direct exposure to international contemporary art, as demonstrated by the presentation of international touring exhibitions *French Art Today* (1953), *Contemporary US Prints* (1958), *Two Decades of American Painting* (1967) and *Marcel Duchamp* (1967-8), *Wrapped Coast* (1969) was the first time that a significant international artist had worked in Australia and produced a work with international impact that was pivotal in the development of the artists’ oeuvre.

The collaborative nature of the work affected many young Australian artists, and the work gained a public profile in Australia unmatched in that generation.

The experience was also foundational for JKAP, and for Kaldor himself. Kaldor now developed his own private fabric business, Universal Textiles, and alongside that, the organization JKAP. It
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created a model for Kaldor to work directly with artists, which he found very attractive. It offered the flexibility of an event-based institution, often working with, or alongside established art museums. It was neither as costly as the presentation of a temporary exhibition, that required a venue and curatorial research, and was neither time and resource heavy as the other well-established form of private support, the establishment of the private ‘bricks and mortar’ art museum. The model also differentiated Kaldor from other Australian collectors of contemporary international art. The project provided Kaldor with an entrée to other important figures in international contemporary art. This was important to identifying and procuring subsequent art projects.
Harald Szeemann, *I want to leave a nice well-done child here* (1971)
Installation view, National Gallery of Victoria
Forbat (ed), *40 Years*, 2009, p. 77.
CHAPTER FOUR: KALDOR'S EARLY PROJECTS (1971-1977)

JKAP’s following five projects between 1971 and 1977 included Harald Szeemann – an international curator – and a number of international contemporary artists. Kaldor continued the model of inviting an international contemporary artist to Australia to exhibit, and make work.

There were many performances, though not always considered as such by the artists, such as Gilbert & George. However, all of the works had either been previously presented elsewhere, or were part of a series presented elsewhere. Consequently, they did not have the same international impact as *Wrapped Coast* (1969).

HARALD SZEEMANN

The second JKAP was the visit of international curator, Harald Szeemann, to Australia in 1971. He made a series of studio visits from which he curated two exhibitions of Australian art. By 1971, Szeemann was already an important international curator, emerging as the most influential curator of his generation. Szeemann was an intensely European curator. He was charismatic, theatrical, and travelled at the speed of light. Appointed at the age of twenty-eight to what was then a provincial institution without a permanent collection, Szeemann had adopted an ‘improvisational, working style’. His 1969 exhibition, *Live in Your Head: When attitudes become form* (1969) had a profound impact and it continues to be discussed today. Teresa Gleadowe, in her introduction to the history of the exhibition publication, *Exhibiting the New Art*, noted that *Live in Your Head* (1969) achieved an almost mythical status, as the first major exhibition to bring together international developments in post-Minimalism, Arte Povera, Land art and Conceptual art, and to juxtapose art emerging in the US with contemporaneous developments in Western
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1 On the appropriate definition of Gilbert & George’s work, see below p. 164.


Europe.\footnote{For a detailed analysis of the exhibition, artists included, and its significance, see Barker, 'When Attitudes become form', \textit{Flash Art}, 2010.} She added that the exhibition was increasingly regarded as the cornerstone for an understanding of contemporary exhibition making, illustrating the curator’s transformation from scholarly art historian to artists’ co-worker, engaged with the conception, production, presentation and dissemination of art of his or her own time.\footnote{Teresa Gleadowe in Rattemeyer, \textit{Exhibiting the New Art}, 2010, p. 9.}

The subtitle of Szeemann’s groundbreaking exhibition \textit{Live in Your Head: When attitudes become form} (1969), ‘Works, concepts, processes, situations, information’, marked an important methodological shift in exhibition practice. As artists ‘took over the institution’, they presented a range of works that existed in and beyond the gallery space: Lawrence Weiner removed three square feet of wall space, whilst Richard Long left the institutional framework and went on a three-day hike in the Swiss mountains.

\textit{Live in Your Head} also introduced a new model of financial support for exhibitions and institutions. Museum director, curator and critic Daniel Birnbaum noted in his article on Szeemann’s legacy in \textit{Artforum International} in 2005, that according to Szeemann, the exhibition came about only because ‘people from Philip Morris and the PR firm Ruder & Finn came to Bern and asked me if I would like to do a show of my own. They offered me money and total freedom.’\footnote{Birnbaum, ‘Szeemann’, \textit{Artforum International}, 2005.} John A. Murphy, the company’s European president, asserted in the exhibition catalogue that his company experimented with ‘new methods and materials’ in a way fully comparable to the Conceptual artists in the exhibition.\footnote{Szeemann, \textit{Live in your head: when attitudes become form} (1969), (ex. cat.), Independent Curators International website, \url{http://ubumexico.centro.org.mx/text/Szemann-Harald_Live-In-Your-Head_When-Attitudes-Become-Form_1969.pdf}, accessed April 11, 2012.} The opening of the exhibition was preceded by a press campaign, also coordinated by Ruder & Finn. Press releases were sent to specific publications, which included \textit{Artforum, Le Figaro, International Herald Tribune, Time Magazine, Der Spiegel, Business Week, and The New York Times}.\footnote{See Claudia Di Leece, ‘Avant-garde Marketing: ‘When Attitudes Become Form’ and Philip Morris’s Sponsorship’ in Rattemeyer, \textit{Exhibiting the New Art}, 2010, p. 226.} Exposure to the exhibition in more than one country was important to the sponsors, and sponsorship of the exhibition was
conditional on it travelling. Ambitions for the exhibition, from both the curator and the sponsors, were international.

The prominence of the exhibition in the catalogue raisonné of all of Szeemann’s exhibitions from 1957-2005 attested to its key role in Szeemann’s own mind. That exhibition had introduced a European audience to a new form of exhibition-making, expanding the notion of art, profiling an emerging generation of European and American artists, and highlighting new developments in post-sculptural avant-garde practice. As Bezzola and Kurzmeyer noted, Szeemann’s exhibition-making ‘endeavoured to reflect the experimental, gestural attributes of the works in their presentation by allowing the artists to actually provide the work at the exhibition. Artist Lawrence Weiner reflected on the significance of the exhibition for artists in an interview in 1994:

Everybody that was in the Attitudes show knew all about the work of everybody else in the Attitudes show. They wouldn’t have known them personally, but they knew all the work … Most artists on both sides of the Atlantic knew what was being done. European artists had been coming to New York and U.S. artists went over there.

For artists, the exhibition appeared to bring all of these ideas together in the one place and moment. It also reflected Szeemann’s insistence on the presence of the artist, turning the gallery into the studio and enabling artists to see at first-hand the works by their contemporaries, many of them made in situ. The values of transporting artists to make work locally had already been recognized by Kaldor with Wrapped Coast (1969).

The controversial nature of the new curating model, however, spilled into the public reception of Live in your Head. The exhibition was not favourably received by the Kunsthalle board, the local government, or the local press, where it attracted headlines including ‘When Platitudes Become Form’, ‘Sabotage in the Art Temple’, ‘Is Art Finally Dead?’ and ‘Stupidity…’ By the end of

1969, Szeemann had resigned to become the first of a new breed of independent curators.\footnote{Kate Fowle noted that Szeemann is now generally acknowledged as the first ‘independent’ curator. See Fowle, ‘Who cares?’ in Rand et al., Cautionary Tales, 2007, p. 29.} He was soon appointed curator for the 1972 \textit{documenta V} exhibition in Kassel, West Germany.

Eschewing traditional museum curator’s work classifying and displaying art based on scholarship and research, Szeemann presented a series of exhibitions that could not easily be categorized. \textit{Documenta V}, titled ‘Questioning Reality – Pictorial Worlds Today’, was shown immediately after Szeemann’s Australian project. Using an encyclopedic format, Szeemann broke down hierarchical conventions in exhibition practice. Extending Arnold Bode’s idea of \textit{documenta} as a ‘100-day museum’ first presented in 1955, Szeemann supplemented this with 100 days of events.\footnote{For a history of \textit{documenta}, see Roger Buergel, ‘The origins of Documenta’, in Michael Glasmeier and Karen Stengel (eds.), \textit{Archive in Motion}, Germany, 2005, pp. 173-79.} He described himself as an \textit{ausstellungsmacher}, or ‘exhibition maker’,\footnote{Birnbaum, ‘When attitude becomes form’, \textit{Artforum International}, 2005.} rather than a curator, in a linguistic shift that placed his role firmly alongside the artists with whom he worked. The collaborative nature of exhibition maker working with artists was one that would have resonated with Kaldor’s own role as ‘project co-ordinator’ working with Christo and Jeanne-Claude.\footnote{See above for a discussion on the changing nature of the curator-producer.}

Szeemann explained his position on exhibition-making and developments in European art in an interview published in \textit{The Australian} prior to the Australian exhibition opening in 1971:

\begin{quote}
In Europe now, the art world is divided into two parts. One wants art works that are autonomous and explain themselves. The other is for making more complex exhibitions, and putting art works in a state bigger than autonomous works … I’m interested in the art of concept, change, permanence, environments and attitudes rather than objects’.
\end{quote}

His attitude reflected a curatorial direction that gave precedence to the display of conceptual art, performance and sculpture of a more ephemeral nature.\footnote{\textit{The Australian}, 15 April, 1971. Quoted in Baume, \textit{From Christo and Jeanne-Claude}, 1995, p. 25.}  

\footnote{Szeemann continued to reflect these interests in subsequent exhibitions, such as his contributions to the 1980 and 1999 Venice Biennales: see above p. 79.}
Kaldor’s decision to invite a curator rather than an artist reflected Szeemann’s status as an avant-garde exhibition-maker. His reputation was on a par with that of artists.21 Kaldor initially invited Szeemann to visit Australia, and whilst in Australia to make a work – in this case an exhibition. This international curator-led project was the first of its kind in Australia. It presaged later developments in biennale curating, in which visiting artistic directors adopted an almost artistic role in the conception and realization of their chosen theme. Kaldor was unafraid of the controversy that Szeemann might generate. In interviews with the local press, Kaldor had previously dealt with his detractors.22 Indeed, criticism from Alcorso-Sekers about Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s project had already seen Kaldor taking on the project himself. In an interview in The Australian newspaper about the Szeemann project, Kaldor stated: ‘Sure I know I’ll be ridiculed for this but I don’t care.’23

Instead, Kaldor wanted Szeemann’s Art Project to have a long-standing influence in Australia, with the additional hope that it might lead Szeemann to present Australian artists’ work in his exhibitions overseas.24 Ironically, Szeemann’s major export was an international touring exhibition documenting Wrapped Coast (1969) for European and American audiences.25 Christo and Jeanne-Claude had first worked with Szeemann in 1968 when he was Director of the Kunsthalle, Bern. He included them as part of his exhibition 12 environments? 50 Years, for which they made their first major wrapped building, Wrapped Kunsthalle, Bern (1967-68).26 The 1970 European tour of documentation of Wrapped Coast (1969) enabled Szeemann to once again work with the artists, and present their first large-scale environmental wrap to a European audience.27

Szeemann’s travelling exhibition of the Australian project firmly located Kaldor’s place within the artists’ international oeuvre.

---


23 Kaldor quoted in Janet Hawley, ‘Sea of hands acclaims Mr Kaldor’, The Australian, 30 April 1971, p. 3.


25 See Christo and Jeanne-Claude exhibition biography, Bourdon, Christo, 1972.

26 See above p. 121.

27 Baume, From Christo and Jeanne-Claude, 1995, p. 25.
Szeemann was questioned about his knowledge of Australian art prior to arriving in Australia in a Sydney television interview on the project.\textsuperscript{28} He noted that though he was aware of an older generation of Australian artists, including Nolan – who was based in England – of the younger generation he knew very little, apart from some information gleaned from a single article in \textit{Art International}.\textsuperscript{29} Kaldor’s invitation came at a relatively quiet moment between Szeemann’s resigning his institutional position at the Berne Kunsthalle and his next big project, \textit{documenta V}. Kaldor offered him the opportunity to travel and see more radical forms of contemporary art in a country of which he knew little.

Szeemann described the scope of his Australian trip as follows:

‘ (a) to gather general information on the Australian art scene;
(b) to make a very subjective choice of works by artists met during this stay.

The result is a non-representational survey about recent tendencies in Australian art.’\textsuperscript{30}

Szeemann’s visit enabled Kaldor to present this new form of exhibition-making to Australians whilst at the same time presenting the work of Australian artists to a curator with an international reach who was preparing for \textit{documenta V}. Kaldor invited Szeemann to visit Australia and curate an exhibition for Sydney and Melbourne. Szeemann’s intensive two-week visit between 14 and 27 April 1971, during which he visited museums, galleries, and seventy artists’ studios in Sydney, Adelaide and Melbourne, resulted in an exhibition entitled \textit{I want to leave a nice well-done child here} (1971).\textsuperscript{31} Travelling at high speed, wearing a safari jacket, dark glasses and occasionally a bear-fur hat, his visit was accompanied by photographers and an ABC film crew. This lent the visit the tone of a celebrity event rather than a serious art world endeavour.

The Sydney exhibition featured the work of twenty-two young artists, with a focus on ‘open-form construction, deriving from either sculpture or wall-hangings.’\textsuperscript{32} Much of the work was installation, or sculptural, but a couple of paintings were included. Aleks Danko showed a slide

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{28} Noted in Szeemann, Bezzola and Kurzmeyer, \textit{Szeemann}, 2007, p. 304, though no specific details are given of the television interview. Brian Adams, who had directed and scripted the ABC TV film of Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s \textit{Wrapped Coast} (1969), was part of the travelling support team, documenting the event with still camera and film.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Quoted in Szeemann, Bezzola and Kurzmeyer, \textit{Szeemann} 2007, p. 304.
\item \textsuperscript{31} Szeemann, \textit{I want to leave a nice well-done child here}, 29 April – 13 May, Bonython Gallery, Sydney; 4 June – 4 July, National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne. Itinerary for visit, KPAP Archive. Also noted in Forbat, \textit{40 Years}, 2009, p. 81 – 83.
\item \textsuperscript{32} Terry Smith, ‘Szeemann: exhibition maker’, \textit{Sunday Australian}, 9 May 1971, p. 17.
\end{itemize}
projection. Peter Kennedy recorded the sound of a willow tree blowing in the wind and played its original sound back to visitors. Durational works were included by Tim Johnson and Neil Evans. As part of his contribution to the exhibition, Mike Parr produced an exhibition invitation in the form of a questionnaire that asked the visitor whether the show was a) material, b) immaterial, or c) neither.\(^{33}\) Another Parr work, *Shadow piece* (1971) presented a series of intersecting strings arranged across the length of the wall, which cast shadows and changed with light and time. An exhibition catalogue documented the visit, including itinerary and notes for the exhibition by Szeemann, as well as a hand-written list of works.\(^{34}\)

New works were added for the Melbourne NGV show: Mike Brown contributed a large mixed-media installation. Of the twenty-two artists originally chosen, only one was a woman.\(^{35}\) Whilst Ian Burn’s conceptual work had been included in *The Field* in 1968, this was the largest exhibition including conceptual art that had yet been staged in an Australian museum. After a fourteen day whirlwind visit, that included lectures, the bestowal of art prizes, and numerous parties and dinners, Szeemann returned to Zurich, two days before the Sydney exhibition opened.

*I want to leave a nice well-done child here* (1971)\(^{36}\) appeared first at Sydney’s Bonython Gallery in Paddington. Its purpose-built commercial gallery spaces, interior courtyard, and focus on leading international and Australian artists lent itself to a challenging exhibition of this kind.\(^{37}\) Terry Smith, reviewing the exhibition for *The Australian*, noted that the ‘chic nature of Bonython Gallery itself defeats some of the work.’\(^{38}\) The choice of a commercial gallery as a venue for Szeemann’s Sydney exhibition was unusual. It might be attributed to a number of factors. Kaldor would have come into contact with Bonython and his gallery activities through his own early collecting of Australian art and commissioning of designs by Australian artists for his fabric-making activities. Other alternative spaces may have offered possible sites, such as the small

---

\(^{33}\) Mike Parr, opening invitation, KPAP Archive. Reprinted in Forbat, *40 Years*, 2009, p. 76.

\(^{34}\) The exhibition included work by John Armstrong, Tony Bishop, Robert Boynes, Gunter Christmann, Tony Coleing, Aleks Danko, Margaret Dodd, Neil Evans, Ross Grounds, Dale Hickey, Tim Johnson, Peter Kennedy, Warren Knight, Nigel Lendon, Ian Milliss, Ti Parks, Mike Parr, Guy Stuart, Alec Tzannes, and a collaborative work by William Pigdeon, Brett Whiteley and Tony Woods. Mike Brown’s work was added for Melbourne.

\(^{35}\) Margaret Dodd.


\(^{37}\) The Director was Kym Bonython, whose commercial gallery in Paddington, Sydney opened 1967, closed 1976, specialised in contemporary Australian and international art.

\(^{38}\) Smith, ‘Szeemann’, *Sunday Australian*, 1971. Smith referred to Mike Parr’s *String-shadow piece* and his *Invitation* as having suffered from its context.
alternative Sydney gallery Inhibodress conceived by artist Mike Parr as a venue for ‘new art’, and intended as a space for the most experimental art possible. But its tiny size, lack of funds and minimal gallery administration made the space unsuitable for Kaldor’s project with Szeemann. It is conceivable that, as in Melbourne, Kaldor might have preferred a state art museum for the Sydney exhibition. Thomas, the curator of contemporary art at the AGNSW, had been highly supportive of Kaldor’s first Art Project. However the AGNSW’s contemporary gallery spaces were closed for refurbishment, and there was no talk of showing the work anywhere else in the AGNSW. The Melbourne exhibition was staged at the NGV, implicitly providing an institutional imprimatur.

Subsequent documentary photography of the project largely focused on images of the exhibition at the NGV rather than the Bonython Gallery installation. In part, this may be attributed to the fact that the exhibition spaces of Roy Ground’s new St Kilda Road Gallery lent themselves better to the avant-garde and conceptual nature of the work presented, when compared with the smaller spaces of Bonython Gallery. Equally, the authority of an institutional setting further endorsed the experimental nature of many of the works.

At the exhibition opening at Bonython Gallery, on 29 April 1971, Kaldor outlined what he hoped the project would achieve and enable:

Firstly, local artists and interested people will have the opportunity to get a better understanding of dominant international trends through first-hand observation and contact. Secondly, I hope that through these visits Australia will receive more and more international recognition and encouragement for the talent and potential we have here. Unfortunately it is not within my scope to bring to Australia major exhibitions either of trends or retrospective shows … The role I would like to play, from time to time, is to single out a dominant theme or personality whose impact will stimulate our scene. I also

---

39 Inhibodress, November 1970 until August 1972. For a history of the alternative gallery and role that it played within the development of conceptual art in Australia, see Cramer, Inhibodress, 1989; Barker and Green, ‘Flight from the object’, e-maj, 2009.

40 Eg, see above p. 135.

41 Baume, From Christo and Jeanne-Claude, 1995, p. 22; Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 77, 84-5. A small photograph of Szeemann installing work at the Bonython Gallery appears in Forbat (ed.) 40 Years, 2009, p. 78.
feel that at this formative state of our development the personal contact has a deeper meaning than just a straight-out exhibition."\(^{42}\)

Kaldor’s opening remarks signposted a number of key issues that would develop in his subsequent Art Projects. Kaldor would present leading contemporary international art to a local audience. He hoped that the international visits would focus attention on the work of Australian artists. He wished his projects to focus on individuals rather than large-scale surveys. Presenting, or being involved in, large-scale international survey exhibitions was not Kaldor’s interest. Financially costly, they also required curatorial and scholarly expertise and considerable time, none of which Kaldor possessed. With his international fabric business, frequent trips overseas, involvement in the Art Projects, and expanding personal collection, large-scale international exhibitions were not a serious possibility.

The significance of Szeemann’s visit was clear to reviewers. James Gleeson, for *The Sun* newspaper, wrote ‘it presents the conceptual artist’s point of view as decisively and with as much impact as the now famous *Field* exhibition’s presentation of abstract minimalism in 1968.’\(^{43}\) Critic and historian Terry Smith summed up the sentiment surrounding Szeemann’s visit in an article for *The Sunday Australian*: ‘Dr Szeemann will direct the exhibition *documenta* at Kassel, Germany, next year. He has to live up to its reputation as the biggest, most intelligent, most innovatory and just plain good mega-exhibition in the world … His exhibition of the “most exciting” art in Australia, is obviously less ambitious than *documenta* but in local terms almost as important.’\(^{44}\)

Similarly, artist Tim Johnson remembered the exhibition as a very important event. He had seen *When Attitudes Become Form* in London. He noted that it had been one of the two most significant exhibitions he had seen in London and New York.\(^{45}\) The exhibition offered Australian artists the chance to work with one of Europe’s most significant curators of the day. Working with Szeemann in Australia, however, left a little to be desired. Szeemann’s approach was autocratic (he informed Johnson that ‘You can’t put photos on the wall in a gallery’, referring to Tim Johnson’s exhibition of photographs at artist-run space Inhibodress). Everything was left to the

---


\(^{44}\) Smith, ‘Szeemann’, *Sunday Australian*, 1971.

last minute, and he did not spend much time actually talking to Johnson about his ideas and work. 46 Though his comments reflect much repeated concerns about curators, Szeemann’s whistle-stop tour of cities and venues – visiting seventy artists and selecting work from twenty-two, dinners and social events, and media presentations, would have left little time to actually talk or research.

Whilst I want to leave a nice well-done child here appears to have been largely well received, Kaldor did not achieve a secondary goal. No Australians were shown at Szeemann’s documenta V exhibition in 1972. Perhaps for this reason, Szeemann’s visit was the first and last JKAP that invited an international curator to make a show, instead of asking an international artist to present a work.

Nor did Szeemann’s Australian exhibition have much impact internationally. It was not reviewed overseas. The exhibition was included in the 2007 catalogue raisonné of Szeemann’s exhibitions, however it was not covered as extensively as other projects. Much of the six pages was taken up reproducing Szeemann’s hectic fourteen day itinerary. The Christo touring exhibition that Szeemann organized in 1970 was not mentioned at all.47

GILBERT & GEORGE

British artists Gilbert & George48 had achieved international notoriety as ‘living sculptures’ in 1969.49 John Kaldor invited them to present their Singing Sculpture in 1973 at AGNSW and NGV as his third Art Project.50 Atop a table, dressed in almost identical tailored suits and ties, their faces and hands covered in metallic paint whilst holding a cane and one rubber glove, the two artists genteelly sang along to Flanagan and Allen’s 1930s music hall tune, Underneath the Arches, which played on a portable tape recorder.51

48 Gilbert Proesch and George Passmore.
49 Crow noted that the artists’ collective entity, Gilbert & George, evoked a double act from the extinct English music hall tradition, a reference that was further revealed by The Singing Sculpture. See Crow, The Rise of the Sixties, 1996, p. 163.
50 Gilbert & George, John Kaldor Art Project 3, The Singing Sculpture, The Shrubberies Number 1, The Shrubberies Number 2; Sydney 16 – 21 August, Art Gallery of New South Wales; Melbourne, 29 August – 2 September, National Gallery of Victoria.
When Kaldor invited Gilbert & George to present *The Singing Sculpture* (1969-73) in Australia in 1973 it was already a well-known work internationally. The work had first been presented as *Our New Sculpture* in 1969 at St Martin’s School of Art, London, and other London art schools including the Royal College of Art and Camberwell School of Art. In the same year, Gilbert & George made two appearances before rock concert audiences, presenting *The Singing Sculpture* at the Lyceum Ballroom in London, and then at the National Jazz and Blues Festival in Plumpton, Sussex, alongside The Who. Deciding that this was not the appropriate context for their work, they then proceeded to present the work a further nineteen times between 1969 and 1972 in a series of commercial galleries and art museums across Europe. In 1971, Gilbert & George travelled to America to present the work at the launch of Ileana Sonnabend’s second New York Gallery on 420 West Broadway. The work’s New York presentation was reviewed in a number of key international art journals and magazines including *ARTnews*, *Studio International*, *The New Yorker* and *Artforum*.56

Kaldor regularly met with leading international contemporary gallerists at this time, and noted their influence. In 1970 he had launched his own business, John Kaldor Fabricmaker Pty Ltd. Kaldor noted that the experience of successfully organizing and presenting *Wrapped Coast* (1969) convinced him to start his own business. Business rapidly expanded during the mid-1970s. Kaldor regularly travelled between Sydney, New York, Paris and Tokyo. These trips enabled him to make regular visits to galleries and exhibitions and remain ‘well-informed about new art’. Gallerists such as Sonnabend were deeply connected with the European art world, and engaged

---

Gilbert & George, *The Singing Sculpture* (1973)
background, *The Shrubberies Number 1 and Number 2* (1972)
Installation view, Art Gallery of New South Wales
Photo: Macrae/Fairfaxphotos
with new artistic developments in New York as well. Kaldor has noted the influence she played in forming his ideas about art. Sonnabend’s advice in this period was significant not only in the acquisition of artwork, but also in influencing the direction of his Art Projects. Other New York dealers were also important as sources of information and introductions, including Antonio Homem and later, Paula Cooper and John Weber.

Artists also played a key role. Christo and Jeanne-Claude introduced Gilbert & George to Kaldor and they met for tea and conversation in London. Nigel Greenwood, who had presented their *Singing Sculpture* in his London gallery in 1970 and would later accompany the artists on their Australian visit, noted that when he first met Kaldor in London ‘He’d just done the Christo project in Sydney – the most daring thing Australia had yet seen.’ With the encouragement of Christo and Jeanne-Claude and Sonnabend, but without actually having seen *The Singing Sculpture*, Kaldor invited the two to Australia to present the work at the Art Gallery of New South Wales and the National Gallery of Victoria.

It was a little unusual that Kaldor could personally offer the artists exhibitions in two state art galleries. Kaldor had established relationships with both organization, their directors, and curatorial staff. However, he was neither a gallery trustee, nor did he have an official role. While it was an opportunity for each art gallery to present a significant work by leading international contemporary artists, it was odd for an invitation of this kind not to come from the gallery Directors themselves.

---

59 Archives of American Art, Leo Castelli archive now at the Smithsonian Institute also demonstrates this through correspondence between Castelli and his past wife. [http://www.aaa.si.edu/collections/interviews/oral-history-interview-leo-castelli-11784](http://www.aaa.si.edu/collections/interviews/oral-history-interview-leo-castelli-11784), accessed February 20, 2012.

60 See above p. 108.

61 Baume in Forbat, *40 Years*, 2009, p. 48. Kaldor also noted the importance of Leo Castelli at this early stage; Anthony d’Offay in London; Galerie Monika Spruth in Cologne in the 1990s when he began collecting German photography; and Matthew Marks in New York and Thomas Struth for Andreas Gursky and Thomas Struth; Ugo Rondinone from Matthew Marks and Peter Kilehmann in Zurich for Francis Alÿs. Tunnicliffe, *John Kaldor Family Collection*, 2011, p. 19.

62 In conversation with Forbat, Kaldor did not note the date of the meeting. Forbat, *40 Years*, 2009, p.88, p. 95.

63 Quoted in Baume, *From Christo and Jeanne-Claude*, 1995, p. 29.

64 Forbat, *40 Years*, 2009, p. 88.

65 These relationships only deepened over time: see below p. 294.

66 Directors of the NGV and AGNSW respectively were Eric Westbrook, Director, NGV, 1956-1973; Philip Laverty, Director, AGNSW, 1971-1978.
Kaldor’s invitation to the two artists reflected his complete confidence in Christo and Jeanne-Claude. It also reflected the close, advisory role that gallerists and artists played in Kaldor’s decisions about significant work and artistic developments, a role later taken up by curators and public gallery directors. Kaldor’s decision to present a work unseen also reflected, in all likelihood, the impact of Szeemann’s curatorial risk-taking. Szeemann had invited artists to participate in exhibitions without choosing specific works, reflecting an innate confidence in his choice of artist to continue to produce significant works.

Gilbert & George’s ‘living sculptures’ emerged at the same time as performance art, however they rejected this classification of their work. Whilst other artists during this period strove to bridge the gap between performer and audience, Gilbert & George appeared distant, removing all personal expression and placing themselves on a raised table dais. ‘We were a work of art’, they stated. Publications and interviews also reinforced their position, each performance accompanied by a dedicated text. Writings by the artists included ‘The Law of Sculptors’ published in 1969, and ‘A Guide to Singing Sculpture’ (1970), published for the audiences of their Singing Sculpture. At the time of their arrival in Australia, Gilbert & George’s new form of sculptural practice was still radical and groundbreaking.

Kaldor’s invitation to ‘perform’ The Singing Sculpture was to be the last one the artists accepted, as they did not wish to be known for just one signature work. It was, however, presented one further time as part of Sonnabend Gallery’s twentieth anniversary celebrations in New York in 1991, which coincided with a signature publication on the work by Thames and Hudson. The reprisal of the work, whose exhibition history had so significantly included John Kaldor Art Projects in Sydney and Melbourne, reflected the important role Sonnabend had clearly played in

---


68 According to Gilbert ‘We never did performance, ever. We never called it performance, ever.’ Wolf, Gilbert & George, 1989; Green, The Third Hand, 2001, p. 148.


71 The Law of Sculptors was one of two texts written to accompany the SHIT AND CUNT Magazine Sculpture, 1969; Gilbert & George, ‘A Guide to Singing Sculpture’, was under the imprint Art for All, 1970. See McCall, Gilbert & George, London, 1993, p. 37 and p. 50.


73 Baume, From Christo and Jeanne-Claude, 1995, p. 29.

Kaldor’s early projects (1971-1977)

the artists’ career and the importance she placed in this key, early work. The work was reprised one more time, for the ‘Valentine’s Day closure’ of the AGNSW’s exhibition 40 years: Kaldor Public Art Projects. It too attested to the strong links between Kaldor, the artists, the original hosting organisations – NGV and AGNSW, as well as the significance that this work, and the artists’ visit to Australia, had played in the history of KPAP.

The Singing Sculptures was the first project for which Kaldor published a catalogue. Conceived and designed by the artists, it was presented as an artists’ book rather than an exhibition catalogue. This was in keeping with the many publications they had already made. It contained images from their photographic work The General Jungle (1971) and details from a large ‘charcoal on paper sculpture’ drawing, The Shrubberies Number 1 and Number 2 (1972). Publications, invitations and announcements had formed a significant part of the artists’ production. Kaldor’s first publication accompanying a temporary artwork was his, and their, means of capturing an essentially ephemeral work. Brian Adams filmed a documentary of Gilbert & George’s visit for ABC TV’s Survey program. His films of the first three projects for the ABC had played an important role. Kaldor remembered a TV interview they did on arrival as being ‘so filled with double entendres that it could only be broadcast late at night’. Audiences attending the performances, Kaldor remembered in another much recounted anecdote, were ‘absolutely mesmerised’, staying at length.

Gilbert & George increased the profile of John Kaldor Art Projects and his artistic activities. Three projects highlighted the fact that the first two were not simply one-off experiments. John Kaldor decided to use the title ‘John Kaldor Art Projects’ as an overarching marketing brand. In his arrangements for the artists’ visit, Kaldor noted that he would acknowledge the project as the third in the John Kaldor Art Project series. Item 11 of the reminder noted: ‘11. Remember John


77 Baume, From Christo to Jeanne-Claude, 1995, p. 29.

Kaldor Art Project 3’.79 Whereas other philanthropists often chose anonymity, Kaldor’s note reflected his desire to be clearly identified, and for the individual project to be seen as part of a wider and ongoing program of philanthropy. As an astute and successful businessman, these were strategies that Kaldor had developed in his own business.

John Kaldor Art Projects’ third project consolidated Kaldor’s relationship with the country’s two leading state art museums.  Kaldor’s relationship with these art museums had begun during the Alcorso-Sekers scholarship, in the involvement of the Gallery Directors in the finalist selections, and through the exhibition at one of the two galleries.80 Kaldor had also been involved with both art museums through earlier Art Projects. As we have seen, Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s Woolworks had been shown at the NGV in 1969, as had Szeemann’s exhibition I want to leave a well-done child here in 1971. Kaldor’s relationship with curatorial staff was also important. Woolworks and Szeemann’s exhibition at the NGV had introduced Kaldor to John Stringer, Brian Finemore, and Frances McCarthy (later Lindsay), Brian Finemore’s Associate Curator of Australian Art at the NGV. In 1972, McCarthy was appointed Assistant Curator of Australian Art at AGNSW, working directly with Daniel Thomas.81

In Sydney, opening in 1972, the newly dedicated spaces for contemporary art, the James Cook Gallery of Contemporary Art, offered curatorial staff the chance to develop and present a vastly expanded program of exhibitions and events. Thomas noted that until that point, the staff size was small, and that the primary curatorial focus was on the care and development of collections, with exhibition-making as only ‘a very occasional activity for collection curators’.82 In contrast, the NGV was ‘rich and big and professional’.83 Thomas described the period from 1972-1978 as

79 Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 96.

80 See Sanders, Mildura Sculpture Triennials, 2009, and see above p. 114.


a ‘six-year golden age of exhibition-management and exhibition-making’. For Director Philip Laverty (1971-1978), Kaldor’s first series of Art Projects played an important role. They offered another means by which AGNSW could showcase leading international contemporary artists and their art as part of the institution’s expanded exhibition program.

Kaldor’s close association with major public art museums developed through close personal relationships with a key curator, Daniel Thomas, who played an integral role in his support of Kaldor’s Art Projects and his relationship with AGNSW. An ABC television program, Survey, documented Gilbert & George’s visit, filming Thomas with the artists at Mrs Macquarie’s Chair on the harbour. Though making much of the artists’ eccentricity, Thomas strongly endorsed the artists’ visit. A black and white photograph of Gilbert & George, Daniel Thomas, and others at the same harbourside event captured Thomas’s close friendship with the artists. This photograph was reproduced in both major retrospectives of JKAP. After the presentation at the AGNSW, The Singing Sculpture travelled to the NGV in Melbourne. JKAP was inextricably connected with state art museums. In 2011, in a conversation with Kaldor at the launch of the Kaldor Family Collection, Edmond Capon, AGNSW Director, described Gilbert & George’s Singing Sculpture as ‘a defining moment in the history of art in Australia.’ Kaldor’s ability to introduce international artists to an institution, and support their projects with a financial contribution, was a generous offer, one too difficult to refuse.

84 Miller, ‘Daniel Thomas’, Artlink, 2006. Thomas exhibitions from overseas, including Modern Masters, newest America art, Chinese antiquities, and in-house produced exhibitions of colonial art, historical modernism, and newest Australian art, such as Tim Burn’s A Change of Plan (1973), a closed-circuit TV piece in 1973, that he suggested ‘must have been the first New Media work seen by a big public.’
85 Image from film republished to accompany Daniel Thomas’ essay for Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 36.
86 Baume, From Christo and Jeanne-Claude, 1995, p. 29; Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 36.
87 Capon and Kaldor in Tunnicliffe, John Kaldor Family Collection, 2011.
ANTONI MIRALDA

On 18 September 1973, John Kaldor launched his new fabric showrooms in Surry Hills, in Sydney’s eastern suburbs. They had been designed by Australian artist, Mike Kitching. For the launch of the new showrooms, Kaldor invited New York-based artist Antoni Miralda to present one of his famous edible coloured feasts. Kaldor had met the artist with Christo and Jeanne-Claude in their apartment in 1972. Miralda’s large-scale public spectacles and coloured feasts had previously been included in parades for exhibitions, public events such as the Munich Olympics (1972) and festivals in New York. An estimated three-hundred guests were invited to partake of a feast that included purple pasta, blue eggs, coloured jellies, blue turkey, and brilliantly multi-hued bread, attracting notice in the local newspaper and society pages. Thomas attended. He later wrote about the event in an article titled ‘Miralda’, in Art & Australia. Daniel Thomas, as Senior Curator, AGNSW, arranged for Miralda to present a new work at the Gallery during his visit. Coloured bread was an 8.5 metre long table of dyed bread, displayed in the Gallery’s entrance. It was installed in front of Morris Louis’s Ayin (1958), a work the Gallery had acquired from Two Decades of American Painting (1967). The American abstract expressionist painter’s washes of colour offered a painterly contrast to Miralda’s equally formalist repetition of form in coloured bread.

At the time, neither of Miralda’s works was considered an Art Project alongside those of Christo and Jeanne-Claude (1969), or Gilbert & George’s more recent Singing Sculpture (1973). Miralda’s project was eventually retrospectively designated an Art Project in the 2009 publication

---

88 For descriptions of the event, see newspaper and magazine coverage of the social occasion including Leslie Walford, ‘Artist among the purple mayonnaise’, Sun-Herald, 23 September 1973, p. 96; and Valerie Carr, ‘First this … then this …and now this’, The Australian Women’s Weekly, Wednesday 19 September, 1973.
89 Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 102.
93 Coloured bread, 21 September – 4 October, 1973, Art Gallery of New South Wales.
95 See above p. 129.
96 As demonstrated by the original numeric order of subsequent projects following Miralda on JKAP Press Releases.
Miralda, *Coloured bread* (1973)
Installation view, Art Gallery of New South Wales, with Morris Louis’s *Ayin* (1958) in background
Photo: Douglas Thompson
Forbat (ed), *40 Years*, 2009, p. 103.
celebrating 40 years of Art Projects. While Miralda’s work was subsequently included in *documenta VI* in 1977, his work never achieved the critical success of the other international artists or projects that JKAP had presented in Australia between 1969-1977. Until its inclusion in the Kaldor history of 2009, it had left little, if any, artistic trace. The commercial motivations may have been the dominant driver of Miralda’s visit at the time.

**CHARLOTTE MOORMAN AND NAM JUNE PAIK**

Kaldor’s fourth project, with New York based, Korean video artist Nam June Paik and classically-trained New York cellist Charlotte Moorman, continued Kaldor’s presentation of contemporary art to Australians. Paik was incorporating electronic technologies in sound with images. Moorman was interpreting these through her modified classical cello. Paik and Moorman had been included in Szeemann’s performance festival, *Happening & Fluxus*, in Cologne in 1970. The exhibition documentation shows Szeemann tying on Moorman’s *TV-Bra for Living* (1969). Well-known for their experimental concerts, it was the first time the artists had performed in Australia. Moorman and Paik’s Art Project revealed Kaldor’s increasing understanding of the relevance of marketing and strategic communication to inform the public, and to mark the project as being ahead of the curve.

Though Kaldor had already presented projects in collaboration with state galleries, it was the first of Kaldor’s projects to receive government funding from the newly formed Visual Arts Board of the Australia Council. The Sydney series of events were also part of the Sydney Festival, partnering that increased the public audience’s awareness of the event. New York-based exhibitions coordinator, John Stringer, who had supported earlier Art Projects when he was

---

99 Adelaide: 21 & 26 March, 1976, Recitals, Performances, Exhibition, AGSA, 22-26 March, including *Ice Music for Adelaide*, 22 March; Flying cello, 23 March; *Cello sonata*, 24 March (Adelaide Festival). Sydney: Recitals, performances, exhibition, 1-7 April, AGNSW; and performances, *Cello Sonata*, April, *Ice music for Sydney*, April, AGNSW. Special events: *Candy (the ultimate Easter Bunny)*, 2 April, Coventry Gallery; *Sky kiss*, 11 April, Sydney Opera House forecourt.
103 Baume, *From Christo and Jeanne-Claude*, 1995, p. 35.
Charlotte Moorman and Nam June Paik, *Concerto for TV cello and videotapes* (1971)

Entrance vestibule, Art Gallery of New South Wales (1976)

Photo: Kerry Dundas

Forbat (ed), *40 Years*, 2009, p. 103.
curator at the National Gallery of Victoria, assisted with the coordination. The performances were also presented in conjunction with the Adelaide Festival, the Art Gallery of South Australia, The Art Gallery of New South Wales, and the Sydney Opera House. Moorman and Paik’s schedule reflected the ‘broader national support system for contemporary art’, that had developed since Kaldor’s first project in 1969.

As part of the forty events scheduled for Moorman and Paik’s 1976 JKAP, an Easter performance of Jim McWilliams’ *Chocolate cello* (1973) was performed as *Candy (The ultimate Easter Bunny)* at the Coventry Gallery. Moorman and her cello were smeared with thirteen kilograms of chocolate fudge. She sat amid a display of fake grass and wrapped Easter eggs. The most spectacular performance by Moorman was *Sky kiss* (1968) performed above the forecourt of the Sydney Opera House. Dressed in a bonnet, black jacket and white skirt, a suspended Moorman played her cello, held up, apparently, by bright coloured balloons. The event attracted wide public attention: satirized in a cartoon by Emeric that appeared in the *Sydney Morning Herald* on 13 April 1976. He drew former Prime Minister Gough Whitlam floating above the Opera House Moorman-style, playing a cello and supported by balloons. There was extensive coverage of the visit and performances in local newspapers. Most editorial headlines focused on the sensational nature of the art, the artists’ visit even hitting the front page of the *West Australian*, though the artists did not visit Perth, in an editorial piece headlined ‘Up, up and a-wail …’ The visit also attracted the interest of the glossy magazines, including *Cleo Australia*, *Australian Women’s Weekly*, and *Vogue Australia*. The weekly magazine *Bulletin* ran the story under an attention-

---

104 See details of performances and events in Forbat, *40 Years*, 2009, p. 111.
105 Increased support noted by Baume, *From Christo and Jeanne-Claude*, 1995, p. 35.
107 Also reproduced in Forbat, *40 Years*, 2009, p. 120.
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grabbing title ‘Topless Cellist’,\textsuperscript{111} while Daniel Thomas wrote on the artists’ visit for \textit{Art \& Australia}.\textsuperscript{112} The performances did not, however, appear to leave a lasting artistic legacy beyond these iconic images, though a later article in 2005 contextualised the artists’ Australian visit within the history of Nam June Paik, by then the well-established grandfather of video art.\textsuperscript{113}

Kaldor was unable to become close to the artists in the way that he had with Christo and Jeanne-Claude and Gilbert \& George. There is no doubt he respected their work, acquiring two works made by Paik linked to the Art Project. One was \textit{TV cello}, first created by Paik in 1971. For the Art Project, Paik created a second version of this now iconic work, which Moorman played at AGNSW in 1976. Paik also linked Kaldor’s personal collection and his Art Projects. \textit{TV Buddha} (1976) created by Paik for Kaldor on the visit incorporated an old Korean Maitreya (Buddha of the future) from Kaldor’s collection.\textsuperscript{114} Both works were gifted to AGNSW as part of the Kaldor Family Art Collection in 2008, and were presented in the inaugural exhibition hang. Though Kaldor clearly acknowledged Paik’s significance for subsequent developments in contemporary art, he noted that Paik was not only difficult to get to know, but also not easy to work with.\textsuperscript{115} None the less, Kaldor reminisced in 2011, they ‘eventually became very good friends’.\textsuperscript{116} The association did not, however, have the same artistic impact for subsequent Art Projects as Kaldor’s early friendship with Christo and Jeanne-Claude.

\textbf{SOL LEWITT AND RICHARD LONG}

Kaldor was primarily interested in collecting conceptual and minimal art. With this focus, the collection began to ‘emulate a more museum-like collecting practice’.\textsuperscript{117} The best comparison is Friedrich and Phillipa de Menil’s support for American artists in what was to become the Dia Art

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{112} Daniel Thomas, ‘Moorman and Paik in Australia’, \textit{Art \& Australia}, Vol. 14, No. 1, Jul-Sept 1976, pp. 36a-36c.
\item \textsuperscript{115} Tunnicliffe, \textit{John Kaldor Family Collection}, 2011, p. 20.
\item \textsuperscript{116} Tunnicliffe, \textit{John Kaldor Family Collection}, 2011, p. 20.
\item \textsuperscript{117} Tunnicliffe, \textit{John Kaldor Family Collection}, 2011, p. 21.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Kaldor’s fifth and sixth projects, with Sol LeWitt and Richard Long respectively, reflected this shift. In 1977, each artist made a site-specific installation at both the Art Gallery of New South Wales and the National Gallery of Victoria. Catalogues were published for both projects.

JKAP was not alone in bringing such art to Australia. A 1973-4 MoMA touring exhibition, *Some Recent American Art*, was important in this respect. Organised by the International Council of the Museum of Modern Art, New York, as part of their touring exhibition program, the exhibition was accompanied by curator Jennifer Licht, touring to Melbourne, Perth, Sydney, Adelaide and Auckland. It included work by Carl Andre, Vito Acconci, John Baldessari, Dan Flavin, Eva Hesse, Robert Irwin, Donald Judd, Joseph Kosuth, Sol LeWitt, Agnes Martin, Robert Morris, Robert Ryman, Richard Serra, Lawrence Weiner, and others in an exhibition comprised of installation and video art. The exhibition included significant works such as Eva Hesse’s *Contingent* (1969), which had occupied the cover of the May 1970 edition of *Artforum*.

Presented in the last phases of the Vietnam War, the exhibition was criticized by a vociferous group of Marxist artists and academics in Adelaide, who accused it of elitism and American cultural imperialism, condemning the self-referential quality of works presented. In Melbourne, Patrick McCaughey, art critic of *The Age*, wrote of the great significance of Andre’s floor piece, *Lever* (1966), comprised of one hundred and thirty-seven standard house bricks arranged in a line: “The value of seeing these particular objects in the flesh is immeasurable … So far we have heard the rhetoric but not seen the art.” The exhibition enabled artists and the public to see such works at first hand.

---

118 See above p. 44.


121 Tour details published in the exhibition catalogue, see Licht, *Some Recent American Art*, 1973. The exhibition was shown at the NGV, Art Gallery of Western Australia, AGNSW, Art Gallery of South Australia and the Auckland City Art Gallery.


Sol LeWitt, *All two part combinations of arcs from four corners, arcs from four sides, straight, not-straight & broken lines in four directions (1972-1977)*
Installation view, Art Gallery of New South Wales (1977)
Photo: Kerry Dundas

Sol LeWitt, *Lines to points on a grid.*
On yellow: Lines from the center of the wall. On red: Lines from four sides. On blue: Lines from four corners. On black: Lines from four sides, four corners and the center of the wall. (1975-7)
Installation view, National Gallery of Victoria (1977)
Forbat (ed), *40 Years*, 2009, p. 130
Works from the exhibition were acquired for the developing National Gallery of Australia collection. In 1973, the NGA acquired Hesse’s *Contingent* (1969) from the estate of the artist, whilst in 1975 the institution purchased Robert Morris’ *Untitled* (1969), a felt wall sculpture similar to the one included in the touring show. The NGV acquired two works from the exhibition in 1974: Morris’ felt work, *Untitled* (1970), and Donald Judd’s aluminium form with blue interior, *Untitled* (1969-71). Both were purchased through the Felton Bequest. Kaldor also acquired a work by Carl Andre from the exhibition in 1974: Andre’s *Steel-copper plain* (1969), a small square steel and copper floor piece of thirty-six units. Baume noted that the work had originally been made for the Guggenheim Museum, New York, as part of *37th Piece of Work* (1970), a gigantic floorpiece made up of 1296 metal plates, arranged alphabetically by the element symbol of the metals. The acquisitions reflected the significance of these works for both private and public collectors in Australia, and the key role of early touring exhibitions.

As major international works continued to be presented through exhibitions of this kind in state galleries, artists themselves increasingly travelled to Australia. Donald Judd, for instance, accepted an invitation to travel to Australia and create a public work in association with *Some Recent American Art*. As a suitable site could not be found at AGNSW, the offer was made to the Art Gallery of South Australia. Judd’s visit coincided with the exhibition tour. He created *Untitled* (1974-75), a large triangular concrete sculpture permanently installed in the courtyard of the Art Gallery of South Australia. As Ian North, the Gallery’s Curator of Paintings and Sculptures noted in the work’s press release, ‘the Judd sculpture was Adelaide’s *Blue Poles* – suggestive of artistic progressiveness against the conservatism of the times’. Judd did not stay for the final completion of the work. It was one of very few site-specific outdoor installations he

---


129 See Public programs arranged as part of the 30th anniversary display, Art Gallery of South Australia (AGSA), 15 October 2004 – 30 January 2005.

130 AGSA, 2004. North also gave a lecture as part of the 30 years celebrations, Thursday 14 October, 2004, noted in the media release, though no transcript exists.
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ever made. Where visits by leading international artists had to date been John Kaldor’s preserve, his Art Projects were no longer unique.

In 1978, Carl Andre visited Australia on the invitation of his Australian friend and fellow artist, Robert Hunter. Hunter had met Andre in 1971, when he had represented Australia at the Second Indian Triennale of Contemporary Art where Andre was also participating. The artists had become good friends. On his visit to Australia in 1978, Andre presented three joint exhibitions with Hunter, held almost simultaneously at Pinacotheca, Melbourne; Newcastle City Art Gallery, Newcastle; and the Institute of Modern Art, Brisbane. Each installation was different. Joanna Mendelsohn, reviewing the exhibition for Art & Australia, observed that the exhibition was a variation on the travelling shows that had dominated gallery programs.

For the 1977 JKAP project, Sol LeWitt created a wall drawing. All two part combinations of arcs from four corners and four sides, straight, not-straight and broken lines in four directions (1972-1977) had already been installed a number of times overseas. Acquired by the Italian collector Count Giuseppe Panza di Biumino, the permission was ‘lent’ to LeWitt for its temporary installation at AGNSW. By 1977, LeWitt’s wall drawings had been shown in leading museums worldwide. He was widely collected. With each installation, the instructions varied in size and dimensions. No two works were exactly the same: at the AGNSW’s central space, he used the double height

---

131 Others are in Germany, New York, and in the grounds of Philip Johnson’s Glass House, in New Canaan, Connecticut.
132 Duncan, Robert Hunter, 1987, p. 11. Also noted by Dodge in Duncan, Robert Hunter, 1987, p. 15.
Sol LeWitt and Richard Long

wall to join the old and new wings. Students from the Alexander Mackie College acted as LeWitt’s assistants.139

At the NGV, a 3 x 12 metre wall was divided into four equal panel squares of white lines on yellow, red, blue and black. The work’s title, Lines to points on a grid. On yellow: Lines from the centre of the wall. On red: Lines from four sides. On blue: Lines from four corners. On black: Lines from four sides, four corners and the centre of the wall, described the process of the work. Shown within this art museum, the differences were difficult to discern and the work was, in addition, not radically different from others that had previously been shown. For Australians, LeWitt’s works were not novel. Examples of the artist’s wall drawings had first been shown in Australia in Some recent American Art (1973).140 Artist Peter Cripps, then working at the NGV as an exhibitions officer, met LeWitt through this show, and then travelled around Australia installing the work at other venues.141 Cripps, artist Robert Rooney, and others exchanged post-cards with LeWitt following this exhibition.142

Kaldor’s interest in presenting a LeWitt Art Project developed from his purchase of the artist’s drawings and sculptures. Kaldor first acquired works by Sol LeWitt in 1975, shortly after Some Recent American Art (1973). He purchased two drawings from the John Weber Gallery, The location of 21 lines with lines from middle points mostly (1974), and The location of six geometric figures (1975).143 Kaldor continued to collect LeWitt. While the artist was in Australia for the 1977 JKAP, Kaldor commissioned LeWitt to make a wall drawing for his collection, Six geometric figures superimposed in two parts (1977).144 Kaldor’s personal collection and Art Projects were becoming intertwined.

139 Baume, From Christo and Jeanne-Claude, 1995, p. 38.
142 Conversation with Peter Cripps, Melbourne, August 26, 2012. Cripps noted that he was unaware that other artists in Melbourne were exchanging post-cards with LeWitt at that time, and discovered this when viewing other postcards to Rooney in Endless Present: Robert Rooney and Conceptual Art, curated by Maggie Finch, Assistant Curator, Photography NGV, 12 November 2010 – 27 March 2011.
143 Baume, From Christo and Jeanne-Claude to Jeff Koons, 1995, p. 32.
144 Baume, From Christo and Jeanne-Claude to Jeff Koons, 1995, p. 38.
The project with LeWitt had little immediate public impact. Media response was ‘muted, if generally positive’. Two reviews appeared in local Sydney papers, and Daniel Thomas wrote an article for *The Bulletin* locating LeWitt’s wall-drawings within the history of Minimal and conceptual art. Acknowledging Italian collector and patron, Count Giuseppe Panza di Buimino, who had keenly supported artists such as LeWitt through the acquisition and commission of works, Thomas also mentioned the financial support of the recently created Visual Arts Board of the Australia Council. A familiarity with LeWitt’s wall-drawings, existing connections between LeWitt and Australian artists, the rigorous quality of the work itself, and LeWitt’s reluctance to be the subject of a media program no doubt all played their part in the subdued response. Baume attributed the lack of interest to LeWitt’s ‘uninterest (sic) in personal publicity and the low-key nature of his work’.

When Sol LeWitt wrote to Kaldor on April 17, 1976, to confirm his visit to Australia and his desire to create wall drawings for Kaldor’s office, and the art museums in Sydney and Melbourne, he had noted that ‘I don’t want to do any lectures or parties, dinners and too much social stuff’. Jill Sykes, writing in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, noted the artist’s reluctance to answer questions about himself. Whilst LeWitt’s austere approach differed from the more theatrical earlier Kaldor projects, the presentation of work by an artist who had already been seen in Australia, with both large-scale wall works and as part of an exhibition, meant that the work was unlikely to receive the celebrity coverage of earlier projects. Presented within an art museum, the project looked like part of the institution’s exhibition program, rather than a special independent project.

---


146 Thomas also noted that the work was owned by Italian Count Giuseppe Panza di Buimino, who had an example of *Arcs and Lines* in his house at Varese, near Milan. As noted, he had lent the concept back to LeWitt temporarily, so it could be installed in Sydney. Thomas, ‘The master of the grid’, *Bulletin*, 1977.

147 Given Count Giuseppe Panza di Buimino’s involvement with Minimalist artists closely associated with Dia Art Foundation, it is likely that Kaldor knew of this method of support from a private individual. See Chave, ‘Revaluing Minimalism’, *Art Bulletin*, 2008.


Installation view, National Gallery of Victoria
Photo: Kerry Dundas
Forbat (ed), 40 Years, 2009, p. 140.

Installation view, Art Gallery of New South Wales
Forbat (ed), 40 Years, 2009, pp. 142-3.
Richard Long’s Art Project was similarly framed. Long’s *A straight hundred mile walk in Australia* (1977) was presented late in a body of works he had been making for several years.\(^{151}\) In an interview, Long said:

> Back in the early seventies I had this idea to make straight hundred mile walks along straight lines in different landscapes. I did one in the classical boggy temperate landscape of Ireland and then I did one on the prairies of Canada so that the idea was that the hundred mile walks were always the same but the landscape changed. I did another one in a bamboo forest in Japan, and another in the red Australian outback.\(^{152}\)

Kaldor had long been interested in Long’s installations and walks. He first invited Long to create a project in Australia in the early 1970s.\(^{153}\) By this time, the artist had already achieved considerable international recognition. A student of Anthony Caro at the St. Martin’s School of Art, London, along with Gilbert & George, by 1968 Long had already been shown in Düsseldorf in the gallery of Konrad Fischer.\(^{154}\) Szeemann included one of Long’s text works in *When attitudes become form* (1969).\(^{155}\) Kaldor was well aware of sustained interest in the artist. An article on Long’s walks and engagements with nature by Germano Celant for *domus* magazine in 1972 formed part of the JKAP project file on the artist.\(^{156}\) By 1977, Long’s work had been shown at the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York (1971); the Museum of Modern Art, New York (1972); *documenta* V (1972); and the Venice Biennale (1976), as Kaldor mentioned in the project press release.\(^{157}\) Long’s walks, sculptures and conceptually based photographic documentation were a well-established part of art museum and biennale programmes, and widely documented through images in exhibition catalogues and associated critical texts.

The project responded to the Australian outback. It was part of Long’s exploration of process through walks in many countries. Near Broken Hill, Long made solitary walks over a period of

---


\(^{155}\) See above p. 152.


\(^{157}\) Noted in John Kaldor Art Project 6 Press Release.
eight days and nights, walking in a straight line by compass and returning to the same, randomly chosen, campsite each night. Long documented this process in photographs he took. They were ‘simple and straightforward’, taken at eye-level. Long installed *Stone line* (1977) at AGNSW, and *Bushwood circle* (1977) at the NGV. An artist’s book was made of the documentary photographs of the walk. Like Sol LeWitt’s project earlier that year, Long’s Australian project was supported with assistance from the Visual Arts Board of the Australia Council. With both institutional and government support, Kaldor was now the leading partner in what were, effectively, consortia of private, art museum and government projects.

Long’s Australian visit was reflected in his choice of titles for subsequent exhibitions. He included images from Australia in later publications. His 1978 exhibition at Lisson Gallery, London, was titled *Outback*. It featured one of the artist’s black and white photographs of his bush camp surrounded by Australian eucalypts and native bush.

Richard Long’s Australian project drew derisory ‘silly season’ comments in the popular press. The response was again muted, due, in part, to the December-January summer slot. Critical reviews on Long’s work more generally appeared in February and May 1977, in *Art News* and *Art Monthly*. These assisted in attracting artworld interest to his Australian project. The private and solitary nature of Long’s walks also differed radically from Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s complex processes of social and political interaction, Szeemann’s sensationalism and Gilbert & George’s spectacle. The community participation involved in *Wrapped Coast* (1969) contrasted sharply with Long’s working method, which was solitary and invisible. Long’s exhibitions at the two state art museums could easily have been mistaken, once more, as having been generated by the


institutions themselves. Though Kaldor had long wanted to make a project with Long, by the time Kaldor’s Art Project with Long materialized, he was not only well-known, but had already received considerable official public recognition. Kaldor purchased a number of significant works by Long. It consolidated a personal relationship that Kaldor was to develop further in later years.

CHANGING CULTURAL CONTEXT

The subdued response to LeWitt and Long may also have reflected social and artistic changes in Australia. Cheaper travel and increased coverage of international exhibitions and artists made projects of this kind available to a widening audience. The establishment of the Sydney Biennale in 1973 had significantly altered the cultural and artistic frame for Kaldor’s projects. The 1976 Sydney Biennale, *Recent International forms in Art*, was curated by Thomas G. McCullough, who had been director of the innovative Mildura Sculpture Triennials in the 1970s. Working closely with AGNSW curators, where the biennale was primarily held, McCullough was able to bring together artists, critics and the public for a series of live events, installations and artworks that extended beyond the gallery context. McCullough involved curators Daniel Thomas, Frances McCarthy (Lindsay), Bernice Murphy, and Robert Lindsay, whom he described as ‘talented individuals’. He noted that their ‘employers placed too much emphasis on traditional things like the Archibald Prize to give them the scope to experiment’. The Biennale was now creating the opportunity to work closely with more experimental artists, both local and international.

With the establishment of the Visual Arts Board (VAB) in 1973, one of seven Boards of the newly chartered Australian Council for the Arts, government funding was now also more

---


available to support artist visits and exhibitions in Australia. Long’s project itself was presented with the financial assistance of the Visual Arts Board (VAB) of the Australia Council (as it had subsequently become), as noted in the Press Release for Long’s JKAP Art Project 6. The newly formed VAB defined its role in two parts. First, it was to mount Australian exhibitions to tour internationally, as outlined in the 1973 Australian Council for the Arts First Annual Report. Secondly, it was to co-operate with State galleries in bringing ‘outstanding overseas exhibitions to Australia’. Because both LeWitt and Long’s projects with JKAP were shown at major State galleries, they were eligible for support. Potential government funding offered another motivation to present Art Projects within a state art museum. But it also meant that the private initiative was ‘competing’ directly for government funds with other newly formed enterprises, such as the Sydney Biennale.

Australia’s national arts institutions were also coming of age. Though the National Gallery of Australia building in Canberra was yet to open, a significant collection of international art was being acquired, including the widely publicized, controversial purchase of American Abstract Expressionist Jackson Pollock’s *Blue Poles* (1952) in 1973. Acquired for more than $1 million dollars, the price was the largest figure spent by an Australian institution on a twentieth century painting. Its acquisition reflected both the increased prices of late modern and contemporary

---


174 Australian galleries had in the past acquired highly priced works for permanent collections, though not of a modernist or abstract nature. See Barrett, *The Prime Minister’s Christmas Card*, 2001, p. 16. There was some discrepancy in prices quoted for the work. The agreed price with the seller was US$2,000,000. However, the purchase price quoted by journalists on Whitlam’s announcement of the work’s acquisition was $1,340,000. See Barrett, *The Prime Minister’s Christmas Card*, 2001, p. 14 and p. 1. The National Gallery of Australia, Canberra, opened in 1984. James Mollison was appointed its first director.
art, and the confidence of this Australian institution, yet to open, in acquiring great international works of this stature.

Prime Minister Gough Whitlam’s very public endorsement of the acquisition reflected his Labor government’s brief, though very public, support for visual art and culture. As Sanders noted, Whitlam’s use of the image of Blue Poles for his 1973 Christmas card, coinciding with the opening of the iconic Sydney Opera House in late 1973, was a defiant, and very public proclamation of the changing status of art and culture in Australia. For some Australian artists and critics, however, the acquisition implied the privileging of international artists over Australians. It signaled that Australia was ‘buying cultural dependency’. With the VAB’s creation, and the increasing role of state and national institutions in contemporary art and emergent artforms, John Kaldor Art Projects needed to redefine the direction of its projects.

At the same time, Australia’s place within the global art world was hotly debated. Essays by Terry Smith and Ian Burn, members of Art and Language, showed their concern about the power of New York, about Australia’s dependency, and about the problems of translating cultures. Terry Smith’s 1974 Artforum essay ‘The Provincialism Problem’ presented the issue within a broad international and geopolitical frame. Artists, however, travelled increasingly between art centres such as London and New York, as distance became less of a barrier, and were able to spend extended periods of time working overseas through Australia Council residencies. The somewhat paternalistic idea of bringing the centre to the periphery, or of leading international artists to provincial outposts, was not only problematic but also increasingly outmoded. As Barker and Green noted, Smith’s essay on ‘the provincialism problem’ was framed within the ‘political rather than aesthetic context’. John Kaldor’s Art Projects were not exempt.

---


Changing cultural context

Australian politics was also changing rapidly in the 1970s. The 1967 referendum recognized Indigenous Australians as citizens. The Vietnam War and the subsequent arrival of a wave of refugees from Vietnam and other nearby neighbours focused attention on Asia, changing the country’s ethnic mix yet again. The Whitlam Labor government had reformed arts and culture, but then became a victim of its own political slogan, ‘It’s time’.

Thus by 1977 there were many other organisations engaged in similar activities to JKAP, all with the support of the VAB. Artists, academics and critics were questioning the value of bringing international artists to Australia to reproduce work with the supposition that locals could ‘learn’ from them.

The impact of this changing cultural landscape was illustrated by the visit of Mario Merz, whom Kaldor had cultivated through the acquisition of works and talk of a possible project, but whose high profile visit was ultimately auspiced by the Sydney Biennale. Kaldor’s interest in the Italian arte povera artist had been longstanding. Merz had been included in the 1969 publication Arte Povera, by Italian curator and writer Germano Celant, alongside other conceptual artists Joseph Beuys, Giuseppe Penone, from Europe; Richard Long and Barry Flanagan from Britain, and Americans Robert Smithson, Richard Serra, Evan Hesse, Robert Morris and Carl Andre. It appeared that Kaldor invited Merz to make an art project, in 1977 or thereabouts, although there is no firm record of the timing. As with many projects, there were material issues to resolve. An undated letter from Merz referred to the cost of stone tables for the work, which was prohibitive, and noted the possibility of making the work in concrete, though this would not have been as good. In a postscript, Merz requested that Kaldor keep the original drawings for his collection. In the end, the project did not eventuate. However, Kaldor collected at least two

---

180 A 1973 amendment to the Migration Act introduced a non-discriminatory immigration policy, and in 1975 the Racial Discrimination Act formally rejected the racist bias of the White Australia policy.

181 The Australian Labor Party ran on a slogan of ‘It’s time’ in the 1972 Federal election. Whitlam was dismissed by Governor-General Sir John Kerr.


184 Kaldor’s interest in Merz noted in Baume, From Christo and Jeanne-Claude, 1995, p. 60. Not discussed by Thomas, or Forbat in 40 Years, 2009, presumably because the project never eventuated.

185 Kaldor Archives, viewed Melbourne, Thursday 26 June 2008.
works, *Old Bison on the Savannah* (1979), and *The Architect* (1984),\(^{186}\) which were shown as part of the Kaldor Collection at the MCA in 1995.

Merz came to Australia on the invitation of Nick Waterlow for his Third Biennale of Sydney, *European Dialogue*, in 1979.\(^{187}\) Waterlow’s Biennale focused on European conceptual and post-object art, which, he noted he had not seen in Australia, though there had already been a number of important exhibitions on recent trends of American art in Australia.\(^{188}\) Waterlow had a strong community arts background, including work in the UK, where he became acquainted with these new European trends prior to moving to Australia in 1977.\(^{189}\) He included works by Marcel Broodthaers, Gerhard Richter, Hanne Darboven, Mario Merz, Valie Export, Daniel Buren and Armand Arman, as well as performances by Marina Abramović and Ulay, Ulrike Rosenback and others.\(^{190}\) Merz’s work for the Biennale, *Objet cache toi* (1979), dominated the whole of the AGNSW’s entrance court, and Merz visited Sydney and Melbourne, meeting many artists.\(^{191}\) It is possible that Kaldor’s enthusiasm waned once Merz had visited Australia as part of the Biennale rather than as one of his Projects.

---

\(^{186}\) Merz’s *Old Bison on the Savannah* (1979), and *The Architect* (1984) were both reproduced in Baume, *From Christo and Jeanne-Claude*, 1995, p. 54, p. 60, p. 85.


\(^{189}\) Waterlow was appointed director in November 1977. As artists Vivienne Binns and Ian Milliss noted in their history of the 1979 Biennale of Sydney, Waterlow’s strong community arts background was seen positively by the artistic community. In his previous role as Senior Recreation Officer, Waterlow had been responsible for the development of the arts in the new city of Milton Keynes, U.K., initiating community arts programmes. At the time of his appointment to the Biennale, Waterlow was teaching at Alexander Mackie College, and was a member of the steering committee of the N.S.W. Branch of the National Community Arts’ Co-operative. See Vivienne Binns & Ian Milliss, *Sydney Biennale: White Elephant or Red Herring: Comments from the art community 1979*, Ian Milliss website, [http://www.ianmilliss.com/documents/historyherstory.htm](http://www.ianmilliss.com/documents/historyherstory.htm), accessed September 24, 2012. Waterlow quoted on Biennale of Sydney website, [http://www.biennaleofsydneey.com.au/about/history/1979](http://www.biennaleofsydneey.com.au/about/history/1979), accessed February 23, 2012.


An Australian Accent (1984)
top: Ken Unsworth, *The mirror and other fables* (1983-84), installation view P.S.1, New York
Photo: Andrew Moore
bottom: Imants Tillers, installation view Corcoran Gallery of Art, Washington
Forbat (ed), *40 Years*, 2009, p. 140.

The growth of alternative avenues through which international artists could visit Australia, particularly the Biennale of Sydney and increased VAB support, may explain why JKAP presented only two projects in the seventeen years from 1978 to 1994. Of these, one was an experimental format that Kaldor did not repeat, and the other was a Christo and Jeanne-Claude retrospective that built on the historical significance of their JKAP project in 1969. If projects during this period were scarce, Kaldor continued to develop his personal collection, focusing on the work of leading international contemporary artists.

AN AUSTRALIAN ACCENT

Kaldor’s An Australian Accent (1984) was a curated exhibition, consisting of three artist projects by Mike Parr, Imants Tillers and Ken Unsworth. An Australian Accent was shown at the Institute for Art and Urban Resources Inc.’s permanent space, P.S.1 in Long Island City, Queens, New York.1 Its form, location, and Kaldor’s intent differentiated it from other John Kaldor Art Projects which all presented the work of international artists to Australians.

Harald Szeemann’s exhibition for Kaldor in 1971 may have been the precedent. Szeemann, however, was a curator and museum director, whilst Kaldor was not. As a museum professional, Szeemann preferred the term Ausstellungsmacher (exhibition maker) to describe his methodology of “controlled chaos”.2 His preference for an improvisational, laboratory approach and working style had more in common with the experimental and conceptual artists with whom he worked than the traditional academy.3 John Kaldor was not a professional exhibition-maker.

The show subsequently toured to the Corcoran Gallery in Washington DC, though this was not originally part of Kaldor’s exhibition plan. It was shown alongside an exhibition of German artists, Expressions.4 In Australia, An Australian Accent toured to the Art Gallery of Western

---

2 Quoted in Birnbaum, 'When attitude becomes form', Artforum, 2005.
3 Szeemann described his working process in these terms, as quoted by Birnbaum, ‘When attitude becomes form’, Artforum, 2005.
Australia in Perth and AGNSW. The work of the artists, Kaldor believed, ‘reflected a maturity of expression and an originality of style that reveals a new authority in Australian art.’ In New York, Kaldor was attempting to present an exhibition that would extend exhibition making by Australians beyond a nationalistic agenda to reveal them as ‘international artists’, comparable in artistic quality to any in the art world’s centre. It is hard not to read it as a philanthropist and collector’s engagement with the provincialism debate, and as something of a response to his earlier critics. Another exhibition of Australian art presented in New York in the same year had similar, though broader, aims. *Australian Visions: 1984 Exxon International Exhibition* was shown at the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York. It included many more artists, including Peter Booth, Dale Frank, Bill Henson, Mandy Martin, Jan Murray, John Nixon, Susan Norrie and Vivian Shark LeWitt. The catalogue contained a foreword by Betty Churcher, then Chair of the Visual Arts Board, Australia, and an essay entitled ‘Impressions of Australia’ by Diana Waldman, Solomon Guggenheim Museum deputy Director. The catalogue’s other essay was written by Australian writer and critic Memory Holloway and titled ‘Bleak Romantics’, though Philip Brophy remembered that it was included in place of a rejected essay commissioned from Paul Taylor, the larger than life creator and commissioning editor of Melbourne-based art magazine *Art & Text*. The Visual Arts Board sponsored the Guggenheim exhibition and Guggenheim curator Diana Waldman’s visit, in partnership with Exxon mining company. It formed part of the Guggenheim Museum’s series of country-focussed exhibitions. It was difficult to see the exhibition beyond a nationalistic frame. By contrast, Kaldor’s project aimed to reflect ‘a new internationalism in

---

Australian art’.10 His interest was to reveal the strength of Australian art within an international context. He had little interest in national identity.

In the early 1980s, Australia was ‘flavour of the month’. Australian film, literature and music had already attracted significant international interest. Peter Weir’s film *Picnic at Hanging Rock* (1975), Patrick White’s Nobel Prize for Literature in 1973, and Peter Carey’s *Bliss* (1981) had all garnered wide attention. Kaldor hoped that his exhibition of three Australian artists would do the same.11 Kaldor’s desire coincided with P.S.1 Director Alana Heiss’s interest in Australian art, though she cautiously noted that she neither wanted a ‘survey’, a ‘national advertisement’ nor an ‘obscure trend’ exhibition.12 Heiss had met John Kaldor in 1975 during a series of ‘Collectors of the Seventies’ exhibitions that were held at The Clocktower in New York in 1975, and knew him as a collector as well as the organizer of artists’ projects in Australia.13 Heiss noted in her foreword for the exhibition that she was also motivated by Kaldor’s long involvement with Christo and Jeanne-Claude.

Daniel Thomas, now the Senior Curator of Australian Art at the Australian National Gallery, and American curator Jonathan Fineberg were the project advisors. They contributed catalogue essays, and Thomas edited the publication.14 Thomas’s essay offered an Australian perspective on Kaldor, his Art Projects, and the artists; Fineberg’s essay presented a critical examination of the artists’ work from his New York perspective.

For Kaldor, the project was notable not only because it exhibited Australian artists overseas, but also because it was the first project for which he described his role as that of an exhibition curator.15 In his choice of artists, Kaldor noted that he did not attempt to represent Australia through the exhibition, but rather to ‘provide an introduction’.16 In part, this read as a broad

---


11 Kaldor noted, ‘Now, hopefully, we can show we have a thriving art world’, quoted in an article in the *New York Post*, 16 April 1984, p. 9.


16 Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 146.
justification for his limited choice of artists, and for the lack of a clear curatorial frame linking the
three beyond the loose ideas of the experimental or internationalism. Kaldor had originally
hoped to present a much larger exhibition, shortlisting five artists, subsequently reduced to
three.¹⁷ Thus he noted that the exhibition was drawn from ‘absolute personal conviction’,¹⁸
rather than any sort of curatorial or museological rationale. Daniel Thomas justified the obvious
lack of female artists and Sydney-centricity as the privilege of a private individual, unrestrained by
the demands of official exhibition requirements. ‘It is not’, Thomas stated, ‘his role to take on the
more complex political problems of a larger survey’.¹⁹ However, Thomas’s close involvement in
Kaldor’s An Australian Accent Art Project and its subsequent exhibition in Australian public
galleries amounted to an endorsement of the exhibition by an important figure working within
state and national institutions. It could not have occurred without the approval of his superior,
AGNSW Director, Edmund Capon. It reflected the allied interests of Kaldor and Capon, who
had been appointed Director of AGNSW in 1978, the same year that Kaldor had been made a
Trustee.

Both Kaldor and the artists subsequently mythologised the project, stressing its importance in
bringing their work to an international audience. Tillers and Parr each remembered that the
experience had a significant impact on their work and, in the case of Tillers, gave him increased
international visibility.²⁰ In 2009, as part of the 40th anniversary publication of KPAP, Parr even
suggested that the exhibition ‘precipitated a major change in Australian art’.²¹ However, Parr’s
comments, within the congratulatory glow of a 40 year celebration, would appear to owe more to
Kaldor’s position as senior statesman and significant benefactor to a Sydney institution, than an
objective appraisal of the impact of this unrepeated model. The objective evidence suggests that
An Australian Accent had a very limited bearing on the international awareness of the artists, and
almost none on Australian art more generally. Both Ken Unsworth and Mike Parr had already
represented Australia in the country’s national pavilion at the Venice Biennale in 1978 and 1980

¹⁷ Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 146.
²⁰ Forbat, 40 Year, 2009, p. 150.
²¹ Forbat, 40 Year, 2009, p. 150.
respectively.²² Tillers had already represented Australia at the 13th São Paolo Bienal in 1975. In 1979, Parr’s performances Black Box: Theatre of Self Correction, Part 1. Performances 1-6 (1979) had been included by Nick Waterlow in his 3rd Sydney Biennale, European Dialogue, alongside international contemporaries including Marina Abramović and Ulay, who travelled to Australia to make and present their work.²³

For Tillers, international exhibitions had already played a key role. In 1982, two years prior to An Australian Accent, his work had been included in Rudi Fuch’s documenta VII,²⁴ alongside other international artists invited to participate in what was widely recognized as the most important survey exhibition of contemporary art. These opportunities offered a more compelling context. Whilst Tillers may have extended his canvas-board paintings for the JKAP New York show, international exhibitions such as documenta VII curated by leading art professionals were a far more important platform. Tillers and others were also showing in commercial galleries in New York. When a review of Tiller’s exhibition of recent paintings shown at the Bess Cutler Gallery, New York, appeared in Artforum in December 1984, the reviewer noted that Tillers’ use of appropriation and canvas-board squares to that point did little other than merely affirm an Australian obsession with geographic isolation.²⁵ Two years after An Australian Accent, Tillers represented Australia at the 1986 Venice Biennale.²⁶ Tillers’ Venice biennale project had far greater artistic significance than An Australian Accent. Heart of the Wood (1985) and Mount Analogue


²³ Nick Waterlow, Artistic Director, European Dialogue: 3rd Biennale of Sydney, 1979 (Sydney: Art Gallery of New South Wales, 1979). In 1980 Abramović and Ulay returned to Australian to spend five months in the Australian outback. They performed ‘Gold found by the artists’ at the ANGSW, which was to become the first of a series of twenty-two performances collectively titled Nightsea Crossing. They also performed Animamundi tango at the First Australian Sculpture Triennial, Latrobe University, Melbourne in 1981. For details and photographic stills, see AGNSW collection, http://www.artgallery.nsw.gov.au/work/211.1981.1/, accessed January 30, 2012.

²⁴ documenta 7, Kassel, Germany, 982, Curator Rudi Fuchs.

²⁵ ‘As the proverbial “Down Under”, Australia suffers from its physical isolation it is discussed – and vocally discusses itself – in terms of its distance, and thus detachment, from Western culture… this situation is being altered, as much Australian art, and many Australian artists, are now appearing in America and Europe.’ Linker concluded her review noting ‘But what remains to be seen is what Tillers can actually do with such cultural and theoretical bric-a-brac.’ Kate Linker, ‘Imants Tillers, Bess Cutler Gallery’, Artforum, Volume XXIII No. 4, December 1984, pp. 89-90.

²⁶ Daniel Thomas, then Director of the Art Gallery of South Australia, organized the exhibition, which was presented in the majestic spaces of Venice’s Arsenale because Australia’s pavilion was yet to be installed.
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(1985), both included in Tillers’ Venice exhibition, were purchased for the NGA Collection in 1987. Both are regularly cited as key works in the artist’s oeuvre.27

Kaldor’s project did little to alter perceptions about Australian art and artists for an international audience. It did not reflect the experimental range of each of the artists’ work to that point. Kaldor may have had a more profound impact on the younger Tillers, but this was much earlier in Tillers’ career, and reflected the impact again of Christo and the experience of participating in *Wrapped Coast* (1969). The significance he later attributed to *An Australian Accent* may well have been coloured by his early association with Kaldor and Christo’s *Wrapped Coast* (1969).

With the benefit of hindsight, some parts of an artist’s oeuvre carry greater artistic weight than others. In 2008, Carolyn Christov-Bakargiev’s 16th Biennale of Sydney, *Revolutions – Forms that turn* featured Parr’s performance videos in a sprawling Cockatoo Island installation.28 Whilst previously private collections may have focused more on Parr’s works on paper, objects and installations, this international curator concentrated on Parr’s performances, as had other exhibitions overseas.29 Works included *Bottom of the Harbour* (2008), an installation and performance; and *MIRROR/ARSE* (2008), a sprawling suite of fourteen video programs drawn from seminal performances by the artist, installed in the evocatively derelict sailors’ barracks on the historic island.

Many other contemporary Australian artists also already had international exposure in the 1980s. *Art & Text*, *Flash Art* and *Artforum* had played an important role in disseminating the work of a younger generation of Australian artists. Half a dozen articles in leading contemporary art journals between 1981 and 1984 highlighted this work.30

---


A key factor was the emergence of a new Postmodern art, particularly by female artists. Melbourne-based Jenny Watson had featured in a range of exhibitions: the inaugural *Perspecta* exhibition at AGNSW (1981). *Popism*, Paul Taylor’s important exhibition introduced these new ideas at the NGV in 1982. Critical writing, by Taylor and others through *Art & Text*, on the work of Watson and other Australian artists of her generation contributed in bringing these artists to international attention. In the same year, William Wright’s 4th Biennale of Sydney *Vision in Disbelief* (1982) was also engaged with Postmodern art.

Ironically, *An Australian Accent* (1984) passed over these developments to highlight the more conventional side of the work of three, male, Sydney-based artists. Given the limited impact of *An Australian Accent* both in Australia or abroad, and its slight impact on the careers of the artists involved, it is perhaps not surprising that Kaldor did not repeat this format.

**CHRISTO AND JEANNE-CLAUDE RETROSPECTIVE**

Kaldor’s other project between 1978 and 1994 took the form of a large-scale Christo and Jeanne-Claude exhibition accompanied by a new Art Project by the same artists. In 1990 Kaldor invited Christo and Jeanne Claude to Australia to mark the 21st anniversary of *Wrapped Coast*. A survey exhibition, *Christo*, was staged at Sydney’s Art Gallery of New South Wales and Perth’s Art Gallery of Western Australia. It was organised by Nicholas Baume, curator of the MCA Sydney. Whilst the bulk of the exhibition was drawn from the collection of Jeanne-Claude Christo, other works were borrowed from private collections in Australia, London and Europe. The twelve works, credited as ‘Private Collection, Sydney’, were Kaldor’s own. A number were later gifted as part of the John Kaldor Family Collection to the AGNSW. Other works were lent by Chandler Coventry, Sydney, (in whose gallery Christo’s exhibition was held just prior to *Wrapped Coast*); R.E. Curtis, Sydney; Pro Hart Gallery, Broken Hill; Museum of Contemporary Art, Sydney (gift of Chandler Coventry 1972); New England Regional Art Museum, Armidale (on


Installation view, entrance vestibule, Art Gallery of New South Wales
Photo: Wolfgang Volz
Forbat (ed), *40 Years*, 2009, p. 163.
loan from Chandler Coventry); the AGNSW; and Australian National Gallery, Canberra the Art Gallery of New South Wales. Others had, therefore, also underpinned this project.

For the Sydney launch, Christo also created a new wrapped work, Wrapped Vestibule (1990), which shrouded the Neo-Classical antechamber leading onto the Gallery’s exhibition spaces. Marble busts, columns and the white cloth-covered floor (reminiscent of painters’ drop-sheets) were all bound in rope. Critic John McDonald commented, ‘At first it looks as though a team of workers has placed a huge drop cloth over everything in preparation of painting the ceiling. … it draws attention to a space that thousands of people pass through every week without really seeing it.’ John McDonald, ‘Concealment opens our eyes’, Sydney Morning Herald, 22 September 1990, p. 79.

One hundred and thirty-five works were displayed, many drawn from the artists’ private collection. The documentation of Wool Works (1969) was included, as well as Wrapped Trees (1969). Documentation, drawings and plans were also presented for ten of Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s public works, including Wrapped Kunsthalle, Bern (1967-68). From the 1969 Kaldor Project, Wrapped Coast (1969), a mural-sized photograph of the wrapped shoreline was presented, alongside models, drawings and collages. The JKAP project was clearly portrayed as the first in a worldwide series. The 1990 project looked backwards to Kaldor’s first project with the artists in 1969. Located in one of Australia’s major collecting institutions, it highlighted the pivotal role of John Kaldor Art Projects in the artists’ development. Wrapped Coast (1969) and its initiator, John Kaldor, had become part of the canon of Australian and international art.
Christo and Jeanne-Claude retrospective

*Christo* (1990)
Installation view, Art Gallery of New South Wales
Photo: Tim Marshall
Forbat (ed), *40 Years*, 2009, p. 159.
Wrapped Vestibule (1990) and Christo (1990) reflected the changing nature of John Kaldor Art Projects and the role of his private foundation. It was the public apotheosis of Kaldor’s relationship with Christo and Jeanne-Claude.\(^39\) It also demonstrated his close working relationship with one of the key Australian public institutions. Despite the enthusiasm surrounding this 1990 Christo retrospective, JKAP’s record at this point - only two projects in seventeen years - suggests a diminishing energy for the enterprise.

**REASONS FOR QUIET**

The absence of projects between 1978 and 1994 was in part a result of Kaldor’s internationally expanding business interests, which precluded him spending time actively involved in the development and realization of Art Projects. Kaldor’s philanthropy was probably also diverted by his appointment as Trustee of the AGNSW from 1978-1980, commencing the same year that Edmund Capon was appointed Director. The move not only acknowledged the contribution that Kaldor had made to contemporary art in Sydney through his Art Projects, but also cemented the ongoing relationship between the patron and institution.

The nature of large-scale installations was also changing. Many of these developments were not reflected in Kaldor’s personal collection. They may have interested him less. For example, Mary Kelly’s *Post Partum Document* (1973-79), and Judy Chicago’s, *The Dinner Party* (1974 – 1979) offered two responses to feminist debates and the representation of feminine sexuality. Jenny Holzer and Barbara Kruger both presented large public projects with New York’s Public Art Fund (PAF) and Artangel between the late 1970s and 1990s.\(^40\) The contributions of these, and other, women artists has attained an historic significance, as was reflected by the unrelated series of major survey exhibitions around the impact of feminism and art staged around the globe.\(^41\) Kaldor did not collect their work. These artists worked with large public installations and public billboards that often had a political edge. In 1982, Holzer’s *Aphorisms* were posted on the

---

\(^39\) Kaldor narrates the story of sending a bottle of aged cognac to Christo for his birthday. Christo returned it, wrapped, after having drunk the contents. Conversation with John Kaldor, Thursday August 14, 2008.


Spectracolor electric signboard in New York’s Times Square by Public Art Fund. Her pithy texts, such as ‘Abuse of power comes as no surprise’, blended in amongst the illuminated advertising billboards of the central site, offering viewers a new take on consumerism and power, and inextricably linking the viewing experience with the work’s content.42 Barbara Kruger’s agitprop style works, juxtaposing large photographic black and white images with pithy texts in Futura Bold typeface on red banners, carried an equally political message. In 1981, Kruger was included in the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum’s Nineteen Emerging Artists (1981); her work was included in Rudi Fuch’s documenta VII, Fridericianum, Kassel (1982), and La Biennale di Venezia, Venice (1982) in the same year; while in 1983, Kruger was also included in the 1983 Biennial Exhibition at the Whitney Museum of American Art, NYC, NY.43 In 1983, her work also featured in the Times Square Spectachrome Square Sign, NYC, NY, a commission by PAF.44 Her inclusion in this series of temporary billboard public works stemmed from her political messages that mixed advertising and art in a medium that promoted a wider engagement with her new form of art.

Later PAF commissions continued to explore themes of sexual and ethnic identity politics, HIV and AIDS.45 Felix Gonzales-Torres’ large black and white billboard poster, Untitled (1989), featured a black background, upon which two rows of names and dates were run across the bottom, referring to specific individuals and events directly linked to homosexuality, AIDS, the Stonewall Riots and Police harassment. It was presented by PAF in downtown Manhattan, NYC, within the community to which it spoke directly.46 Kaldor’s interests remained firmly rooted in Abstract, Minimal and post-Minimal sculpture and painting, and certain conceptual and performance works largely from Europe and America, and did not encompass the politicization

---


44 PAF Archive, New York, 12 January 2011.


46 Felix Gonzales-Torres, Untitled (1989), corner Christopher Street and Seventh Avenue, Gonzales-Torres made the work for the twentieth anniversary of the Stonewall Rebellion (1969). The billboard was installed directly across the street from the site that this took place.
of art-making that characterized much of the work of this period. A younger generation of artists working with performance art was also gaining increasing prominence, including American artists Joan Jonas and Laurie Anderson. However, the artistic developments of these international artist, and many others, was not reflected in the choice of the increasingly occasional organizer of the Art Projects.

Instead, Kaldor collected art predominantly made by American and European late Modernist and Postmodern male artists, all of whose work tended to be already exhibited by large public galleries and well-known private collections. It was for this reason, no doubt, that AGNSW curator Wayne Tunnicliffe thought Kaldor’s collecting interests during this period emulated ‘museum-friendly art’. Kaldor acquired Frank Stella’s painting Untitled (1966) in 1977, which had been included in Ileana Sonnabend’s first New York gallery exhibition of the artist in 1970. He also acquired work by experimental artists with established reputations, such as German artist Joseph Beuys. Beuys’ Untitled (Plight) (1985) was one of the artist’s rolls of felt hung diagonally on the wall. It was acquired in the same year from Anthony d’Offay Gallery, London, another of the gallerists Kaldor credited as playing a pivotal role in his collection. Kaldor’s interest in the Düsseldorf School of photographers was reflected in his purchase of work by Berndt & Hiller Becher from the late 1970s, with key works such as Cooling Towers, Germany (1964-93) and Framework houses (1959-71), now part of the ANGSW’s John Kaldor Family Collection. Kaldor also acquired work by the younger generation of German photographers influenced by the Bechers. For example, Kaldor purchased Thomas Struth’s Kunsthistorisches Museum II, Vienna (1989), one of a group of large-format photographs of visitors in the world’s most famous art museums. In 2011, Kaldor remembered being influenced by gallerists including Monica Sprüth in Cologne, (Galerie Monica Sprüth dealt in German photography including Berndt & Hilla

50 Reference to acquisition of work in Baume, From Christo and Jeanne-Claude, 1995, p. 60.
51 Importance of d’Offay in Tunnicliffe, John Kaldor Family Collection, 2011, p. 19.
52 See Annear in Tunnicliffe, John Kaldor Family Collection, 2011, pp. 217-245.
53 Reproduced in Baume, From Christo and Jeanne-Claude, 1995, p. 70.
Becher); Matthew Marks in New York (who represented Andreas Gursky); and Marian Goodman, New York (who represented Thomas Struth). Kaldor also acquired works by American Richard Prince, whose use of found images and media appropriations subsequently located him as a leading exponent of what popularly became known as the Pictures Generation of artists from the late 1970s and ’80s. In *Untitled (Cowboy)* (1989), the artist re-photographed one of the iconic images of American advertising, an appropriation technique that made him – along with Jeff Koons - one of the better-known international exponents of Postmodernism. Rather than making art that lent itself easily to site-specific, temporary Art Projects, these artists often focused on commodification, and the market in which their work circulated. The works were suited to the world of large-scale international exhibitions, easily becoming the domain of most collectors and art museums. Collecting these artists did not differentiate Kaldor from most other international contemporary collectors.

The increased activity of other international, not-for-profit private foundations may also have given artists more choices, reducing the attractiveness of JKAP’s support. New York based Dia Art Foundation had been established in 1974, with a specific focus on American minimal and abstract art. New York’s Public Art Fund was founded in 1977, the consolidation of City Walls and the Public Arts Council. London’s Artangel was formed later, in 1985. Like John Kaldor Art Projects, each of these foundations had been initiated largely through the drive and vision of one individual. Like JKAP, they were developed in response to new forms of art. None was named directly after its creator. Between 1977 and 1981, unlike John Kaldor Art Projects, each shifted their organization methods, professionalizing themselves to become not-for-profit institutions with formal structures. Each later appointed professional staff from arts

---

55 Prince was not included in the original exhibition curated by Douglas Crimp, *Pictures* (1977), shown at Artists Space in New York.
56 The work was gifted to the AGNSW as part of the John Kaldor Family Collection, along with a number of other significant works by the artist. See complete list of works in Tunnicliffe, *John Kaldor Family Collection*, 2011.
58 See above p. 43.
59 See above p. 52.
60 See above p. 46.
backgrounds. By contrast, until KAP shifted its status in 2008, with the creation of a Board and a Curatorial Advisory Group, John Kaldor Art Projects remained a private foundation dependent on its founder to identify projects, invite the artists, and to find time and money to pursue them.

The very paucity of activity between 1977 and 1994 inevitably reduced local and international recognition of the Kaldor name and institution, further reducing JKAP’s stature and ability to attract big international names. Combined with the increased ability of Australian public institutions to bring international artists to Australia, artistic shifts that may not have matched Kaldor’s interests, and increased competition from other private international operational not-for-profit foundations, it is perhaps not surprising that 1977 to 1994 were quiet years for JKAP.

---

61 See above p. 47; p. 54.
62 See below p. 242.
Installed outside the Museum of Contemporary Art, Sydney as part of the Sydney Festival
Photo: Peter Nuchtern


JEFF KOONS

Kaldor's project with Jeff Koons in 1995 reinvigorated JKAP. After a mere two projects in the seventeen years between 1977 and 1994, JKAP presented four projects in the nine years from 1994 to 2003. Three of these combined an art project with the public exhibition of the artist’s works from Kaldor’s collection. At a personal level, Kaldor met his second wife, Naomi Milgrom, through the Jeff Koons project. Her involvement in contemporary art, Kaldor has since recognized, revived his interest in his Art Projects.1

By the mid-1980s, Koons had become one of the most controversial, and most publicized New York-based artists of his generation.2 His sculptural objects and mass-market ready-mades had created a new form of visual language particularly well-tuned for the late capitalist culture in which they were made.3 His sculptures, objects and ready-mades fused the artificial and kitsch with Pop and Surrealist traditions, often incorporating baroque and rococo excess. Koons re-codedified icons from contemporary mass culture. He took every-day objects, low-brow source-material and gave them mirror finishes. Certain critics coined the term Neo-Geo to describe the group of artists working in this way, the group further consolidated when they were shown together at Sonnabend Gallery in New York in 1986.4 Koons, however, was the leading exponent. In 1987, one year before Kaldor began collecting Koons’ work, the artist was included in the Whitney Biennial in New York. The Saatchi Collection exhibition New York Art Now (1987) showcased New American Art of the 1980s, and used Koons’ work Rabbit (1986) as the cover picture for the catalogue. In 1987, Kaspar König invited Koons to participate in the

---

1 Noted by Michael Fitzgerald, ‘Impresario of the New’, Time Magazine, Thursday March 22, 2007. In his introduction to the 2009 publication, Kaldor acknowledged Milgrom’s role as ‘mentor and muse. We share a great love of art, and she has always encouraged me to devote my energies to projects and has supported their realisation. With our shared dedication the projects grew and expanded.’ Forbes, 49 Years, 2009, p. 20. See also David Marr, ‘A life’s work’, Sydney Morning Herald, May 7, 2011.

2 His first solo show, Equilibrium, International with Monuments, New York (1985), introduced Koons’ Total Equilibrium series, in which basketballs appeared suspended or floating in aquariums filled with water, alongside bronze casts of a rubber dinghy, snorkel and goggles, and other diving paraphernalia; this was followed by Lascaray and Degradation (1986); and Statuary (1986). See Angelika Muthesius, Jeff Koons, Taschen, Cologne, 1992.


Jeff Koons

outdoor Münster sculpture exhibition.\(^5\) Koons participated with his first outdoor sculpture, a recasting of the city’s familiar folklore public sculpture \textit{Kiepenkerl} (1987) in highly reflective stainless chrome steel.

For private collectors, Koons’ work was highly appealing. He rapidly attracted the support of major gallerists and collectors, including several key advisers to Kaldor: New York dealers Ileana Sonnabend and Geoffrey Deitsch, and London’s Anthony d’Offay.\(^6\) His notable private collectors included West Coast developer Eli Broad, Greek construction tycoon Dakis Joannou, and Christie’s auction house owner and luxury goods tycoon, François Pinault, amongst many others.\(^7\) Eli Broad and his wife Edythe had formed the Broad Art Foundation in 1984. Their stated aim was to share their growing art collection with museums, other institutions, and the public.\(^8\) Their collection included more works by Koons than any other public or private collection, with Broad actively involved in funding the fabrication of a number of the Koons works he acquired.\(^9\) Broad described his activities as ‘venture philanthropy’.\(^10\) Collector and artist were similar in their shrewd business acumen, and their ability to track art markets and anticipate trends. Though the financial risks associated with presenting a major work by Jeff Koons were great, the choice of artist was not.\(^11\) Thus, the major issue in Kaldor’s decision to invite Koons to re-present \textit{Puppy} in Sydney in 1995 was whether Koons would be interested in participating in the project. No doubt, the significance of Christo’s \textit{Wrapped Coast} (1969) played a part in Koons’ decision to accept. As well, the mixed response to his recent series, \textit{Made in Heaven} (1989), first shown at the Venice Biennale in 1990 to often negative reactions, might have encouraged him. \textit{Made in Heaven} (1989) had featured Koons’ soon to be wife Ilona Staller, an


\(^{6}\) See above p. 201; p. 108.

\(^{7}\) For a list of some notable collectors of Koons, see Kelly Devine Thomas, ‘The Selling of Jeff Koons’, \textit{ARTnews}, May 1, 2005.


\(^{10}\) See ‘Koons Collector: Eli Broad’, \textit{Art + Living}.

\(^{11}\) Thomas noted that Jeffrey Deitch, who helped bankroll Koons’ ambitious \textit{Celebration} (c.1995) series, nearly went bankrupt doing so in the 1990s. Thomas also noted that Koons had also persuaded patrons to pay for the fabrication of his sculptures, which could run into hundreds of thousands of dollars. See Thomas, \textit{The Selling of Jeff Koons}, \textit{ARTnews}, 2005.
Italian porn star and politician known as La Cicciolina. The explicitly sexual content and airbrushed perfection of the images had somewhat overshadowed the series.

Kaldor had begun collecting Koons’ in 1988, the year of the artist’s solo exhibition Banality held at Sonnabend Gallery.12 Kaldor purchased Vase of Flowers (1988), a rococo mirror piece later gifted to the AGNSW John Kaldor Family Collection.13 Koons has noted that in this show, he was ‘putting the bourgeois at my service – trying to help affect their moral belief.’14 He wanted to ‘remove their guilt and shame about the banality that motivates them and which they respond to.’15 The ironic mix of cuteness and kitsch, presented by one of New York’s leading commercial galleries, no doubt appealed to the many collectors, including Kaldor, who acquired Koons’ works.

Puppy (1995) was presented by John Kaldor Art Projects as part of the Sydney Festival on the forecourt of the Museum of Contemporary Art.16 The origins of the large-scaled public artwork lay in a small sculpture of a West Highland terrier, White Terrier (1991), acquired by Kaldor from Koons’ Made in Heaven exhibition that year.17 Scaled up to approximately twelve metres in height, the flower clad Puppy played upon the emotions of sentimentality and kitsch on a giant scale. In a pastiche of 18th century historic gardens, it consisted of near 70,000 brightly coloured flowering plants, including marigolds, begonias, impatiens, petunias and lobelias, all of which grew from pots in the steel and soil structure.18 Whilst the common bedding plants were no doubt chosen for their robustness and colourful floral display, their association with municipal plantings and

12 Baume described this as Koons’ ‘first solo show’, but this had occurred three years earlier: see above p. 205. Baume, From Christo and Jeanne-Claude, 1995, p. 64.
16 For a detailed description of the development and project management of Koons’ Puppy see Baume, From Christo and Jeanne-Claude, 1995, pp. 64 – 77. Also Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 164 – 173.
17 Baume, From Christo and Jeanne-Claude, 1995, p. 64. The White Terrier (1991) date of origin indicates that the work was first shown in Koons’ 1991 Sonnabend Gallery exhibition, the year after the photographs from the Made in Heaven series were shown at the Venice Biennale.
populist taste was clear. The work was a form of public sculpture that championed kitsch. It was a public monument.

In keeping with most John Kaldor Art Projects, the Australian presentation of *Puppy* was not a new commission. Nor was it the first time the work had been shown to an international art audience. Koons had been invited by curator Veit Loers in 1992 to present a work as part of a temporary exhibition not far from Kassel in Arolsen, Germany. Though *Puppy* was not part of *documenta IX* (1992), it was shown at the same time. *Puppy*’s critical reception and timing made it one of the highlights of the *documenta* European summer. Kaldor’s main contribution to the 1995 re-staging of the work in Sydney was to locate an engineering company who would create a recyclable structure for the giant work. Sophisticated computer modeling and engineering expertise created the structure, which was made from a series of stainless steel armatures constructed to hold over twenty-five tons of soil watered by an internal irrigation system.

*Puppy* was shown outside Sydney’s foremost contemporary art institution, the Museum of Contemporary Art (MCA). It stood on Circular Quay, opposite another of the city’s iconic buildings, the Sydney Opera House. *Puppy*’s central location and size made the project impossible to miss. The project was shown alongside an exhibition of John Kaldor’s art collection presented by the MCA, as well as a smaller exhibition relating to *Puppy* (1995) and its documentation, design and construction. The exhibition catalogue claimed that this was the first time that Kaldor’s public projects and private collection interests had been shown together, although Christo’s project at the AGNSW in 1990 had been accompanied by an exhibition that included a significant number of works from Kaldor’s personal collection, though not publically acknowledged at that time.

However, notwithstanding the public exposure that Koons’ *Puppy* (1995) attracted for the artist, the MCA, and Kaldor himself, questions were raised about the financial viability of presenting

---


21 Baume, *From Christo and Jeanne-Claude*, 1995, p. 73.


23 See above p. 195.
high cost projects such as these for an institution facing severe financial challenges. In the Annual Report 1995, MCA Chair John Reid drew attention to the financial vulnerability of the institution, noting that while Jeff Koons’ Puppy cost $1 million, it did, however, meet its budget. Reid also spoke of Kaldor’s extraordinary philanthropic gesture in announcing his intention to ‘give the Museum ongoing access to his private collection of international art, and to work with the Museum on an evolving series of contemporary projects, continuing the spirit of his now famous Art Projects over a 25-year period.’ Ruth Rentschler, in a paper entitled ‘Museum of Contemporary Art: an Entrepreneurial initiative in a University Context’, wrote that Leon Paroissien, MCA Director from 1989 to 1997, claimed Puppy’s $1 million dollar cost contributed to the MCA’s financial woes at the time, leaving the Museum $70,000 in debt by the end of 1996. Kaldor strenuously disputed Paroissien’s comments, claiming instead that the work was one hundred percent sponsored. Annual reports suggest that Puppy attracted additional project-specific sponsorship of around $250,000, and that there was also substantial support in kind.

From 1995 to 1996 the MCA dealt with substantial financial pressures by changing its scale and scope. The profile provided by Puppy was part of this transformation. As the Power bequest reduced its support from $950,000 in 1995 to $500,000 in 1996, the MCA substantially increased its activities. Operating revenue increased from $5.5 million to $6.9 million between 1995 and 1996. Operating costs increased from $5.3 million to $7.1 million, leading to an operating loss

---

24 From 1995-1996 the Power Bequest reduced by $450,000, and operating costs increased from $5.3 million to $7.2 million, with approximately $1 million of cost increase due to the presentation of Puppy. See Museum of Contemporary Art Annual Reports 1994, 1995, 1996.


29 A Year in the Life of the MCA, the renamed 1997 Annual Report, did not present detailed financial statements. Rather, the final page of the report detailed brief Sources of Revenue 1997, and a Balance Sheet at 31 December 1997. A note stated that Private Patronage in 1996 included an abnormal contribution for Puppy. Private Patronage in 1996 was $902,017, which dropped to $643,122 in 1997, implying that the difference was project-specific sponsorship for Puppy.

30 MCA Annual Report 1996, p 6 indicates Non-cash Sponsorship (or sponsorship in kind) of $924,000 in 1995, reducing to $276,000 in 1996. It is likely that much of the $648,000 difference between 1995 and 1996 can be attributed to Puppy.

Although the institution was financially vulnerable, it continued to present an artistically rigorous exhibition program. As part of the Sydney Festival, Jeff Koons’ Puppy offered the MCA a spectacular drawcard project that would attract wider audiences, with the potential of helping to redress the Museum’s financial imbalance.

In 1997, John Kaldor was appointed to the MCA board, and became Chairman in September 1998. Questions were again raised in a 2008 newspaper article, at the time that the John Kaldor Family Collection gift to the AGNSW was announced, about the long-term, free-of-charge storage by the MCA of Kaldor’s private collection. Kaldor noted, ‘I spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on the MCA and doing projects with the MCA, and I suppose that was a way of small compensation.’ Such an arrangement would no longer be possible with clearer ethical guidelines surrounding the role of trustees of art museums now in place both in Australia and overseas.

What both Puppy and the use of Kaldor’s private collection by the MCA reflect is that projects that may appear ostensibly ‘free’ for the art museum, offered through the largesse of an individual or private foundation, may still incur substantial associated costs for the institution.

32 MCA Annual Report 1996, p. 40. However, although the bottom line profit and net assets are consistent between the 1995 and 1996 Annual Reports, revenues, costs, assets and liabilities for 1995 were restated as substantially higher in 1996.

33 The 1997 exhibition program included Spirit and Place: Art in Australia 1861-1996, curated by Nick Waterlow and Ross Melick, featuring 100 artists plus Gurirr Gurirr performance by dancers and singers of the Gija language group of the East Kimberley; Eye of the Storm: Eight contemporary Indigenous Australian Artists, curated by Djon Mundine and the National Gallery of Australia; Natural Selection, Australian Perspecta 1997: Between Art and Nature, curated by Linda Michael; Pictures Britannica: Art from Britain, curated by Bernice Murphy; Primavera 1997; the Seppelt Contemporary Art Award 1997; and Yves Klein.


36 Quoted in Perkin, ‘$35 million gift a gain for gossips’, Australian, April 15, 2008.

For Kaldor, however, the presentation of Jeff Koons’ *Puppy* (1995) outside the entrance to the MCA signaled his reawakening desire to be seen as a major collector and contemporary art philanthropist both in Australia and overseas.

The subsequent acquisition of *Puppy* by Guggenheim Museum Bilbao in 1997 confirmed its significance, and Kaldor and Art Projects were back in the game. However, the project did little for the reputation of JKAP internationally. Although Kaldor’s Art Project enabled *Puppy* (1995) to be remade and modified, facilitating an edition of two and subsequent sales to the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum and the Brant Foundation, Greenwich, Connecticut, the catalogue entry for the work referred to its ‘first presentation’ in 1992, its ‘subsequent reconstruction’ in 1995, but made no direct mention of JKAP.38 For the museum, the provenance and the initial date of the work were more significant than the physical redevelopment or restagings thereafter. When the work was presented as part of Public Art Fund’s programme of public sculpture in New York City’s Rockefeller Centre in 2000, the first time the work had been shown in the USA, the project press release did note that the work ‘will be brought to the United States from Sydney, Australia’.39 References were made to the sculpture’s first installation in Germany in 1992, its Sydney staging in 1995, and later acquisition for the collection of the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao in 1997, but these did not mention JKAP’s involvement directly.40 Koons’ entry in the 2004 Public Art Fund publication, *Plop, recent projects of the Public Art Fund*, noted, ‘First created for the German city of Arolsen in 1992, *Puppy* logged time in both Sydney and Bilbao before settling into its almost four-month residency in midtown Manhattan.’41 There was no mention made of JKAP, and Sydney was a short stop on a global itinerary that, logically, concluded in New York. Kaldor’s invitation to artists arose from personal contact developed through collecting their work, confirmed in letter-form.42 Unlike standard museum practice, legally binding contractual agreements did not appear to have been exchanged, stipulating image

---


42 As in the case of Christo’s invitation to Australia in 1969, and subsequent Art Projects.
credits and wording for acknowledgements. These agreements, however, do not always mean that a patron will be acknowledged in subsequent showings of a commissioned work.

**SOL LEWITT - AGAIN**

In 1998, Kaldor presented a second project with veteran American post-minimalist and conceptual artist Sol LeWitt.\(^{43}\) It built on the Art Project with the artist from 1977. New works were presented as part of a substantial exhibition of LeWitt’s work at the MCA, Sydney. Curated by Nicholas Baume, the exhibition was accompanied by an exhibition catalogue published by the MCA.\(^{44}\) LeWitt’s large, bright, acrylic *Wall pieces*, first shown at Ace Gallery in New York in 1997, were reconstructed.\(^{45}\) Earlier works from Kaldor’s collection were also exhibited, to provide a broader context for the artist’s work. The exhibition was critically well-received. Green’s review of the exhibition for international art magazine *Art/Text* contextualized these later brightly-coloured wall works with LeWitt’s earlier, more austere, wall-drawings, and described the large black wall-works as a form of enormous black-on-black Ad Reinhardt-esque environment. It was, Green noted, an ‘exquisite exhibition’.\(^{46}\) For local audiences, the Art Project appeared little different from other survey exhibitions by international artists in the Museum’s program. Unlike other Art Projects, it gave little or no opportunity for local artists and students to meet with or work alongside the artist. Instead, in a trend increasingly common for successful international artists with major exhibition demands, LeWitt’s assistant, Sachiko Cho, travelled from New York to oversee the installation of the work.\(^{47}\) The project did, however, have a significant impact on the career of curator Nicholas Baume. He moved to the US in 1998 as curator at the Wadsworth Atheneum. He again worked with LeWitt on an exhibition in 2001 entitled *Sol LeWitt: Incomplete Open Cubes*.\(^{48}\) Then, on his appointment as Director and Chief Curator of Public Art Fund in 2011, Baume curated the first outdoor career survey, *SOL LEWITT: Structures, 1965-2006*, presenting twenty-seven works from the artist’s modular, serial, geometric and irregular structure

---

\(^{43}\) See above p. 173.


\(^{45}\) Forbat, *40 Years*, 2009, p. 176.


\(^{47}\) See Forbat, *40 Years*, 2009, p. 176. LeWitt travelled to Sydney to ‘see the finished result’.

Sol LeWitt (1998)
Photo: Paul Green
Forbat (ed), 40 Years, 2009, p. 178.
series in City Hall Park, New York. Both were substantial international presentations of an artist who had played a major role in the artistic history and development of both New York and Sydney. Baume’s early association with the artist through Kaldor Art Projects provided him with an important initial introduction. It was no longer possible for a contemporary curator or collector to simply approach directly an artist of LeWitt’s standing and exhibition record for a possible exhibition. The contemporary art world had become an ever more formal place, governed by a clear, though unwritten, set of protocols and rules.

**VANESSA BEECROFT**

Reflecting Kaldor’s ongoing interest in performance, and the impact of the spectacular in biennale exhibitions, JKAP’s next project was Vanessa Beecroft’s *VB40* (1999), staged at the Museum of Contemporary Art in 1999. Featuring a configuration of naked and near-naked women, dressed in underwear, cherry red tights, and designer heels, the two and a half hour performances in the MCA’s historic Art Deco Centennial Hall continued Beecroft’s elaboration on the codes of fashion, consumerism, and the objectifying gaze. Again, this project brought a leading international artist to Australia, but, again, the work appeared only subtly different from other works by the same artist presented in many previous biennales and museum exhibitions.

Between 1993 and 1999, the year of Kaldor’s Project, Beecroft had presented her work at many leading European and American public and commercial galleries, museums, and luxury designer stores such as Miu Miu, in New York. JKAP’s *VB40* performance was very similar to Beecroft’s performance *VB28* (1997), at the Venice Biennale, which had also featured performers dressed in designer sandals, camouflage tights, and white bras. For Beecroft’s *Show, VB35* (1998)

---


50. Vanessa Beecroft, *VB40*, Sydney, 2, 4 & 5 August, Museum of Contemporary Art. See Forbat, *40 Years*, 2009, pp. 185 – 191. The title of the work denotes the number of performances presented by the artist as part of an ongoing series. Kaldor’s was 40th in this series. For a discussion of the rise of biennales, large-scale immersive installations and the spectacular, see p. 77.

Vanessa Beecroft, 'VB40' (1999)
Museum of Contemporary Art, Sydney
Photo: Giasco Bertoli
at the Solomon Guggenheim Museum, New York, fifteen model-thin women dressed in Gucci bikinis and stilettos were presented, alongside five other naked women. The performance was the most expensive Beecroft had staged. The one-night performance was prominently reviewed. Roberta Smith, reviewing the show for the *New York Times*, noted that if Beecroft’s earlier Venice Biennale performance (*VB28*, 1997) resulted in a “‘Hey, sailor’ raunchiness”, the combination of a big budget, attractive models and designer goods in the upper Fifth Avenue venue made this one ‘decidedly tonier’. With its relative modesty and focus on designer fashion, *VB40* echoed earlier performances such as *VB35* (1998) presented at the Guggenheim. It lacked the shock or the critical edge of some of her other works that brought issues such as female objectification, viewer participation, and the relationship to luxury fashion labels and contemporary art into more stark relief.

JKAP’s commission lacked the shock value of some of Beecroft’s earlier performances. It did, however, present a spectacle more commonly seen in overseas biennale for a local audience. But for artists and art professionals alike, cheaper flights and increased international travel meant that many had already seen Beecroft’s work. Nevertheless, like other projects previously presented by JKAP, Beecroft’s project at the MCA enabled Kaldor to show work by a leading international artist to a wide Australian audience. Beecroft’s *VB 40*, with its critique of the beauty industry and luxury fashion labels was a voyeuristic performance that consciously excluded the viewer. It remains the only JKAP project that has presented the work of a solo female artist.

---


55 See for example VB32 (1997), presented at the Städisches Museum Abteibier, Mönchengladbach, where performers were dressed in white underwear, platform shoes, and red nails; VB33 (1997), presented at the ICA London, in which performers were dressed in black tops and shoes, and were naked from the waist down; or VB34 (1998), presented at the Moderna Museet, Stockholm, in which stilettos, Stetson hats, and an American flag presented stark contrast to the nude pantyhose and partial dress. Images featured on Vanessa Beecroft website for full details, http://www.vanessabeecroft.com/frameset.html, accessed October 13, 2011.
In 2003, Kaldor Art Projects presented Swiss-born, New York-based artist Ugo Rondinone’s large illuminated sign on the roof of the MCA. *Our Magic Hour* (2003) appeared alongside the artist’s work in Sydney and Melbourne art museum exhibitions. The same year, Kaldor’s foundation was renamed Art Projects Incorporated (for this project only).

In Sydney, the illuminated sign was shown alongside a substantial exhibition of Rondinone’s works at the MCA. The exhibition included a diverse range of Rondinone’s art: target paintings; an installation of framed photographic prints; videos (both on monitors and as an installation); an installation of mirror and sound (later gifted to AGNSW and installed in the first exhibition in the John Kaldor Family Galleries in 2011); and a number of the artist’s lifelike clown sculptures. Of the eleven works presented as part of the MCA exhibition, many of them large installations, eight were drawn from private collections. The project evolved from Kaldor’s personal interest in collecting Rondinone’s work. Kaldor had first seen the artist’s work presented as part of New York’s major art fair for commercial galleries, the Armory show. From that point, he and Milgrom had acquired a number of significant works by the artist. Many of these were featured in the MCA exhibition. Rondinone’s MCA exhibition, drawn largely from Kaldor and Milgrom’s separate collections, revealed the interrelated ties between the patron as a collector and past board member, and the public art museum. Both the MCA Rondinone exhibition and temporary Art Project could be read as a generous extension of Kaldor and Milgrom’s personal collecting interests and private patronage, which the museums then publicly endorsed and benefited from.

With the increasing sophistication and worldliness of art audiences in Australia, the value of showing Art Projects within the broader context of an artist’s work had become an important consideration. Elizabeth Ann Macgregor, the Director of the MCA, noted in her foreword that

---


58 Of the eleven works drawn collectively from Kaldor and Milgrom’s collections, Kaldor subsequently gifted three of his works by Rondinone that were shown at the MCA. Rondinone’s *What do you want* (2002), a large wall, mirror and sound piece; *No. 210 (SIEBTER)JULIZITAUSSENDUNDNULL* (2000), a target painting; and *If there were anywhere but desert, Wednesday* (2000), one of Rondinone’s clown series now form part of AGNSW, John Kaldor Family Collection. See Tunnicliffe, *John Kaldor Family Collection*, 2011, pp. 314 – 326.

Museum of Contemporary Art, Sydney
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Installation views, MCA, Sydney
Photo: Nick Bowers
Kaldor had approached the Museum with a proposal to present a project. This had coincided with the Museum’s own interest in the artist.\textsuperscript{60} It also coincided with the interests in Melbourne of ACCA Artistic Director, Juliana Engberg. She had previously invited Rondinone to Australia to present work as part of her Melbourne International Biennale exhibition in 1999, \textit{Signs of Life},\textsuperscript{61} when she showed Rondinone’s video works and a mixed media installation.\textsuperscript{62} Her essay on the artist referred to an earlier illuminated sign, \textit{Cry me a River} (1997), featuring the rainbow colours of gay rights and words from Julie London’s song of the same name. Kaldor’s project in 2003 gave Engberg the impetus to work with Rondinone again, presenting a substantial exhibition of the artist’s work for the first time in the new ACCA space.\textsuperscript{53} However, rather than showcasing works drawn predominantly from private collections available in Australia, Engberg chose to contextualize certain key works with new works made specifically for the Melbourne exhibition. The Melbourne exhibition further revealed the range and variety of Rondinone’s art, which lent itself equally to private collections and large-scale art museum and biennial shows.

For Melbourne’s Rondinone show, \textit{Clockwork for Oracle} (2004), Engberg included three works from the private collections that had been shown in Sydney which represented key motifs in Rondinone’s work: the clown, the target and the window.\textsuperscript{64} The exhibition showed the disparate nature of Rondinone’s art, using photography, video, installations, painting, sculpture and sound. For ACCA’s exhibition, Rondinone created \textit{TWENTYFOURHOURS} (2004), a massive sculptural X that stretched from floor to ceiling, effectively punctuating the gallery space. The sound of regular long inhalations and exhalations emanated from the form, offering an organic dimension to the minimalist inspired darkened stained wood form. In the same gallery, a series of twelve cast black rubber masks of \textit{MOONRISE} (2003) melded popular cultural references with art historical precedent. Each of the masks signified a month in the lunar calendar, as the title of the work suggested, though their shapes and forms were reminiscent of the wooden reproduction flea market versions of early 20\textsuperscript{th} century African masks on which they were based. Their rubberized material, however, owed more to the black leather and latex of S & M fetish

\textsuperscript{60} Storer, \textit{Ugo Rondinone}, MCA, 2003, p. 25.

\textsuperscript{61} Engberg, \textit{Signs of Life}, 1999, p. 15.


\textsuperscript{63} ACCA moved to a new, purpose designed building by Melbourne architects Wood Marsh in 2002.

\textsuperscript{64} For details of work, see Juliana Engberg, \textit{Clockwork for Oracle}, (ex. cat.), Australian Centre for Contemporary Art, Melbourne, 2003, p. 35.
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Forbat (ed), *40 Years*, 2009, p. 201.
objects and forms. Rondinone’s clown sculpture, ghoulishly propped up in the corner of one of the galleries, a target painting, and large photographic installation were also included from the MCA exhibition. *Clockwork for Oracle* (2004), a new immersive video installation, was added for Melbourne. The exhibition reflected the breadth of Rondinone’s practice in a way that the Sydney exhibition did not. Rondinone’s illuminated sign, *Our Magic Hour* (2003), was not installed in Melbourne as part of the exhibition. Projected freight and installation costs made it prohibitive.65 However, in 2008, the work, first presented as a temporary Art Project on the MCA’s rooftop, was permanently installed on the roof of Milgrom’s ARJ Sussan Group’s company headquarters in inner-city Richmond. Its prime location made it a visible beacon of art philanthropy illuminated and reflected in the Yarra River at night.

The programming of Australia’s two kunsthalles – the MCA in Sydney and ACCA in Melbourne – revealed the ambitions of both organisations to showcase Australian contemporary artists in an international context.66 Both did this through an ambitious program of solo Australian and international artist shows and large group exhibitions. With limited government funds and sponsorship available, new forms of support and funding for exhibitions were always being sought. A Kaldor Art Project and generous loan of a significant number of works from private collectors was one way of presenting works by international artists for which freight to Australia would be significant. However, the profile of KAP was limited. The Rondinone exhibitions formed part of a larger art museum or gallery exhibition program. They were not particularly distinctive from other projects by those institutions.67 Ironically, the permanently installed *Our Magic Hour* (2003) in Melbourne may ultimately become an iconic symbol like the advertising neons such as the Vinegar Skipping Girl in Richmond, or the Nylex clock in Cremorne, although few in Melbourne would be able to name its artist.

---

65 The author was curator at ACCA between 2002-2007, although she did not work on this exhibition.

66 The MCA is not technically a kunsthalle, as it has a permanent collection. However, its ambitious exhibition program functions in the same way.

67 The MCA opened in 1991, while ACCA’s new purpose built gallery, designed by Wood Marsh, opened in Southbank in 2002. ACCA’s new space offered substantially larger gallery spaces than its previous home, which had been located in a small Victorian cottage in the Domain.
THE KALDOR COLLECTION AND KALDOR ART PROJECTS

In 2003, the Art Gallery of South Australia mounted an exhibition, *Journey to Now: John Kaldor Art Projects and Collection*, which press releases hyperbolically described as the ‘single most important collection of cutting edge contemporary art today.’ The exhibition was curated by Adam Free, curator of European Paintings and Sculpture at AGSA. Free had previously catalogued Kaldor’s private collection and suggested the idea for the exhibition. Over seventy works were shown from Kaldor’s collection, including works associated with some of the ten public Art Projects. The exhibition particularly highlighted Christo’s *Wrapped Coast* (1969) and Koons’ giant floral *Puppy* (1995). The pay exhibition enabled the Gallery to present major works by international artists working in the Pop Art, Minimalist and Conceptual styles. It also enabled Kaldor to integrate his private activities as a collector with the public recognition of the better-known John Kaldor Art Projects presented since 1969. Patrick McDonald, writing for the local Adelaide newspaper, *The Advertiser*, noted that the presentation of Kaldor’s collection at a state art museum was part of a wider spate of exhibitions around the country that raised the profile of Australian art patrons. It was hoped that these individuals would in turn become high-profile benefactors. The exhibition consolidated Kaldor’s relationship with another state gallery. It also provided a public institutional imprimatur from another state gallery as to the quality of Kaldor’s personal collection.

Between 1990 and 2003, Kaldor Art Projects substantially increased the public profile of Kaldor’s personal collection. The Koons, LeWitt and Rondinone projects all coincided with exhibitions at public institutions that included a number of works from Kaldor’s collection. The period concluded with the AGSA exhibition featuring the Kaldor collection itself, *Journey to Now: John Kaldor Art Projects and Collection*. This was the second major survey exhibition drawn from Kaldor’s collection in a state art museum. These exhibitions, and the tantalising possibility of

---


subsequent bequests, marked the increasingly close links between Kaldor as private collector and the public art institutions.
Barry McGee, *The stars were aligned ...* (2004)
Installation view, Metropolitan Meat Market, Melbourne
Photo: Garry Sommerfield
CHAPTER SEVEN: KALDOR AND NEW INSTITUTIONALISM (2004-2012)

Between 2004-2012, KAP became increasingly professionalised. It also started to focus on projects that responded more specifically to their sites. It can be argued that both professionalism and site specificity reflected similar developments in other international not-for-profit foundations that had occurred in the preceding years.

ORGANISATIONAL CHANGES

In 2004 the private foundation Art Projects Incorporated changed its name again to Kaldor Art Projects (2004-2008), a move that reflected its shift in legal status. The organization applied to be added to the Commonwealth’s Register of Cultural Organisations, which entitled it to receive tax deductible donations, both from Kaldor and the public.1 Kaldor suggested that at this point ‘a more disciplined approach’ was required.2 Kaldor noted that he now aimed to present two art projects a year plus an education project.3 A new focus on education brought him in line with the educational activities of other not-for-profit foundations and organisations, who had also followed the established example of art museums in this area. The change of the foundation’s name from John Kaldor Art Projects to Kaldor Art Projects also indicated a desire for change. It suggested a conscious move away from the individual, by dropping Kaldor’s Christian name, to the creation of a brand. Where Kaldor Fabrics had been in the business of fabric and design, Kaldor Art Projects was in the business of a globalized contemporary art. However, unlike other international foundations of this kind, Kaldor appointed neither an artistic director nor a curator for the Foundation. KAP, and its choice of artists, remained inextricably linked with its creator.

KAP expanded its website to provide a better understanding of the complete history of the Foundation’s past projects. Whilst Kaldor Art Projects may have been only subtly different from projects presented by art organisations and museums as part of ongoing exhibition programs, the website attempted to frame the Kaldor projects as an historic and evolving series that matched the development of contemporary art in Australia. More significantly, it made visually seductive

---


2 Kaldor was referring specifically to the number of projects per year. Baume, ‘The Artist as Model’, in 40 Years, 2009, p. 47.

images from earlier projects, that a younger generation may not even know, instantly accessible around the world for a global audience.

The expanded website made the developing educational focus of Kaldor Art Project's activities more visible. MOVE was initiated in 2005 to provide a collection of video art for secondary schools to screen and study outside the museum environment.² Kaldor noted that he initiated the MOVE project as a direct result of his involvement with the affiliated educational programs of Australia's Venice Biennale program in 2005, of which he was Commissioner.⁵ For the first pilot program, Kaldor Art Projects worked with the New South Wales Department of Education and four Sydney secondary schools, whilst artists agreed to have their works made accessible a special education edition.⁵ Video works were drawn from existing work in the John Kaldor Family Collection, and included international artists Paul Pfeiffer, Saskia Olde Wolbers and Thomas Demand, and Australians including TV Moore and Daniel Crooks.⁷ Adam Free, who had worked with Kaldor on the AGSW exhibition in 2003, co-ordinated the project. He noted that feedback received from the pilot program influenced the final program,⁸ though what form this took was unclear. Subsequently, twelve artworks were commissioned over a three-year period. Artists included Daniel Crooks, John Tonkin, Todd McMillan, TV Moore and Grant Stevens in the first program; Shaun Gladwell, Daniel von Sturmer and Patricia Piccinini in the second; and The Kingpins, Jess MacNeil, Tracey Moffatt and David Rosetzky in the third. The Kaldor Public Art Projects' board 'identified expanding the resource as a key element in realizing the organisation’s educational goals, extending to regional areas and beyond New South Wales'.⁹ In 2008, the program was expanded to South Australia and Victoria, and by the end of 2009 had

---

² Free in Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 273.
⁴ Schools included Dulwich Hill, Fairfield, Killara and Freshwater.
⁷ Free in Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 273.
⁸ Free in Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 273.
⁹ Free in Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 276.
reached over 1400 high schools across these states.\footnote{Free in Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 276.} Without some sort of qualitative appraisal system with which to judge the program, it is easy for feedback to appear anecdotal and self-endorsing. While it may have been an important initiative in keeping with wider art education trends, it was impossible to judge the success or impact of the project.

MOVE enabled KAP to expand its audience beyond those attending art galleries and related events: moving out of the gallery and into high schools, the video programs were a resource for teachers to use with the next generation of potential gallery-goers. Education and public programs had been highly, and successfully, developed in art museums and galleries both internationally and in Australia. Examples such as the Gallery of Modern Art (GOMA) and Queensland Art Gallery (QAG), Brisbane’s programmes for temporary exhibitions such as the *Asia Pacific Triennial*, extended notions of the role that education could play as part of an integrated exhibition brief; while international examples such as the Tate Modern, London, and New York’s Museum of Modern Art were both leaders in this field.\footnote{GOMA commissioned specific interactive artworks by exhibiting artists as part of an extended education program. The APT website noted, ‘The highly acclaimed Kids’ APT program, initiated in 1999, features commissioned interactive artworks by exhibiting artists. Kids’ APT is an integral part of the exhibition series, aiming to engage young visitors with the ideas and work of contemporary artists from across the region. Other features of Kids’ APT include a publishing program, workshops and Kids’ APT on Tour, extending artists’ projects to regional and remote Queensland.’ Asia Pacific Triennial of Contemporary Art, URL: http://www.qagoma.qld.gov.au/exhibitions/apt, accessed November 14, 2012. The role of education and public programs more widely had been the focus of much research and in the UK and US. See E. Hooper-Greenhill, *Museums and the Interpretation of Visual Culture*, London, Routledge, 2000; E. Hooper-Greenhill, *Museums and Education: Purpose, Pedagogy and Performance*, London, Routledge, 2007. For a discussion of the role of education and public programs in contemporary art museums, using the Tate Modern as a case study, see Esther Sayers, ‘Investigating the Impact of Contrasting Paradigms of Knowledge on the Emancipatory Aims of Gallery Programmes for Young People’, *International Journal of Art and Design Education*, Vol. 30, Issue. 3, October 2011, pp. 409-420. Myer also noted the importance of educational programs. See Rupert Myer, ‘Educating for Art and Society’, *Art Monthly Australia*, No. 227, Mar 2010, pp. 24-25.} Kaldor would have been familiar with both given his membership of international committees of both institutions.\footnote{Australia Council website, http://www.australiacouncil.gov.au/news/items/pre-2010/australian_commissioner_for_2007_venice_biennale, accessed April 12, 2012.} As part of a biennale exhibition, education was also a well-established and integral element of the curatorial frame.\footnote{See above p. 79, p. 154.} The educational component of KAP’s activities invited comparisons with international institutions. It also further differentiated KAP’s activities from many other Australian private foundations set up in the 1980s and 1990s that functioned as grant giving foundations, supporting other not-for-profit or charitable organisations, but that did not initiate
or manage contemporary art projects themselves.\textsuperscript{14} The educational program also provided a platform for Kaldor Art Projects to work with Australian and female artists, who had not been featured by KAP, given its historic focus on international contemporary art, and its male-dominated choice of artists. The paucity of projects by female artists had become more evident as the expanded KAP website detailed all projects from KAP’s inception in 1969.

**INTERNATIONAL TRENDS TO SITE-SPECIFICITY**

Globally, the international profile of a temporary site-specific project depended increasingly on its relationship to its site. The art world was now globalized. News of ephemeral works spread quickly, and they were rapidly re-presented around the world. The rise of social networks such as twitter and facebook, and image-sharing web-based networks such as Flickr and You Tube, facilitated the amateur exchange of these images and experiences. The growth of biennale events and foundations dedicated to presenting these works accelerated these trends. Maintaining a leading position at the forefront of contemporary art has always depended on presenting distinctive unique works. A work that responded to its site might be subsequently repeated elsewhere, but its context and physical location would never be the same again.\textsuperscript{15} This rendered the viewing-experience of the temporary work wholly unique.\textsuperscript{16}

With the proliferation of large-scale ephemeral works, artists working in this manner, and venues to present them, commissioning not-for-profit foundations and organisations such as Artangel paid more attention to the relationship between artwork and site.\textsuperscript{17} Critical writings supported this trend, as Miwon Kwon’s *One place after another: site-specific art and locational identity* (2004) became a seminal text on the subject.\textsuperscript{18} The critical framing of site in the 1990s had enabled a greater understanding of its role in curatorial practice by agencies such as Artangel, which in turn

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{14} In Australia, Charitable Trusts were well established as a form of grant-giving. Prescribed Private Funds (PPFs) were established by the Australian Government on 30 June 2001. A comprehensive history and definition of PPFs can be found on the Philanthropy Australia website, \url{www.philanthropy.org.au/ppfs/index.htm}, accessed July 20, 2008. Artangel described their project supporters as Angels, which included charitable trusts and foundations, and private individuals. KPAP similarly listed financial supporters for all projects in publications and website.
\item \textsuperscript{15} See above p. 16.
\item \textsuperscript{16} See above p. 18.
\item \textsuperscript{17} See above p. 49; other foundations presenting works with strong response to site included PAF p. 54; Creative Time p. 56; Trussardi Foundation p. 62; T BA 21 p. 72; and a number of works presented by foundations in conjunction with biennale events – see above p. 83.
\item \textsuperscript{18} See above p. 16.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
enabled an increased likelihood that their projects would be seen as unique experiences, unrepeatable elsewhere. Apart from the works by Christo and Jeanne-Claude in 1969 and 1990, and those of LeWitt and Long in 1977, none of KAP’s projects had been particularly responsive to their site. All the other works had been presented in substantially similar form with substantially similar effects somewhere else before KAP presented them – and they were usually then presented at other locations again. With the growth of Australian institutions, the Art Projects’ partnership with art museums and galleries was not clearly differentiated from the institutions’ own exhibition programs.

For these temporary works to gain traction within an increasingly prolific art world, high quality images and a prominent web profile were also required. In contrast to the aesthetic of early documentary photography of performances and happenings in the late 1960s and early 1970s, photographs of these later site-specific installations often appeared as theatrically staged as some of the works themselves.

**BARRY MCGEE**

Perhaps for these reasons, and paralleling the approach of other foundations presenting ephemeral works, from 2004 onwards, KAP paid increasing attention to the relationship between work and site. For example, much was made of the historic Meat Market venue for West-Coast American graffiti artist Barry McGee’s project in Melbourne in 2004. Robert Nelson, reviewing the work for The Age, grandiosely described the work as having ‘radically redefined this morbidly ceremonial space’. Kaldor had previously acquired work by the artist, which had been included in the exhibition of Kaldor’s collection, Journey to Now (2003) at AGSA. The Melbourne project, *The stars were aligned …* (2004), was a sprawling installation of piles and stacks of derelict materials and objects, upturned mini-vans, tagged with a checkerboard patterning of geometric designs and urban figures and shapes. It was shown at the historic Metropolitan Meat Market building in North Melbourne, with its cavernous interior, bluestone cobbled flooring and thick

---

19 See for example Artangel’s website for Horn’s *Library of Water* (2007) discussed above p. 51; or *One Day Sculpture* (2008), p. 76.

20 See for example the photographic images of performances by Chris Burden, Vito Acconci, and later, the interventions of Gordon Matta-Clark.


wooden beams. Despite the publicity, the Meat Market work was not particularly dependent on its site. In 2005, the KAP installation was restaged at Deitch Projects in New York, in a similar configuration of painting, video and upturned cars.\textsuperscript{23} Whilst reviews of the work discussed the integration of graffiti and outsider art into the gallery space, no mention was made of Kaldor’s 2004 project, or an Australian link.\textsuperscript{24}

A second McGee work, presented at the same time at the NGV, provided the institutional imprimatur for the offsite Meat Market project. Whether it was part of the KAP project or was simply presented at the same time was not clear, as Nelson noted in his 2004 newspaper review of the project.\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Water wall mural (2004)} was a temporary drawing on the large semi-circular glass window of the NGV that fronts St Kilda Road. This work was tailored to the peculiar features of the water wall site. However, it really re-presented many of the techniques used in an earlier water-wall painting by American artist Keith Haring in 1984.\textsuperscript{26} Haring had been bought to Australia by John Buckley, founding director of the Australian Centre for Contemporary Art. Buckley had seen Haring’s signature white crayon works on disused black advertising panels in Manhattan’s subway stations on a visit to New York.\textsuperscript{27} Haring painted a mural on the NGV Water Wall, another on the AGNSW’s forecourt, and other impromptu works at sites around Melbourne – including the Collingwood Technical College (Collingwood TAFE). For the NGV, Haring’s graffiti-style painting featured a ‘dynamic field of flying saucers, dancing figures, blocky dogs, and his signature motif “the radiant child”’, all painted to a soundtrack of American hip hop music.\textsuperscript{28} The work brightened the imposing, fortress entrance of the institution, but damage to the window caused by a member of the public overnight closed the installation after only two days.\textsuperscript{29} Twenty years later, McGee’s characteristic style enlivened the same Water Wall in an approach that fused Mexican muralists with street art. It was reminiscent of graffiti art of the


\textsuperscript{26} For details of the work see Ted Gott, ‘Fragile Memories: Keith Haring and the water window Mural at the National Gallery of Victoria’ in \textit{Art Bulletin of Victoria}, Vol. 43. Melbourne, National Gallery of Victoria, 2004, p. 8.


\textsuperscript{28} Murray, \textit{The NGV Story}, 2011, p. 129.

\textsuperscript{29} Murray, \textit{The NGV Story}, 2011, p. 129-130.
Installation view, National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne
Photo: Predrag Cancar
1970s and 1980s. Featuring his trademark icon, a male caricature with sagging eyes and a bemused expression, in another form of visually compelling social critique, McGee’s temporary form of art museum graffiti recalled the homeless, transient people that he had encountered while working on the street in the US.

However, the context for the McGee Art Project in 2004 was radically different from Haring’s twenty years earlier. Where Haring’s mural remained publically visible on the exterior façade of the old Collingwood Technical College, surrounded by Housing Commission apartments and industry, the indoor setting of Melbourne’s Meat Market lacked a wider visibility and the community reach of Haring’s earlier work, while the NGV setting gave it an institutional character. McGee’s project lacked the social and political impact of Haring’s socially engaged art.

Nor did either of McGee’s projects have the institutional impact of earlier Kaldor projects presented at the NGV, such as Harald Szeemann’s exhibition or Gilbert & George’s Singing Sculpture (1972). Like many of the KAP projects, McGee had an international profile and exhibition history. While articles regularly noted McGee’s early activities as a graffiti artist, like many artists of his generation he was the product of an art school education, graduating from San Francisco Art School in 1991. While his early work may have been developed on the street, he rapidly moved into galleries and exhibition shows. He worked with the Deste Foundation Centre for Contemporary Art, Athens, the Prada Foundation, Milan, and the Dakis Joannou Collection, Athens. All reflected the close links between the contemporary collections of the patrons and the public exhibitions and projects. Kaldor’s decision to invite him to make a project placed

---

30 For the significance of Haring’s mural both at the NGV and on the façade of the Collingwood TAFE, see Mathews, “Fade to Grey’, Art & Australia, 2011; Hannah Mathews (ed.), Caterpillars and Computers: Keith Haring in Australia, Australian Centre for Contemporary Art, 2012.

31 Solo exhibitions included Installation, Center for the Arts Yerba Buena Gardens, San Francisco (1994); Regards, Walker Art Center, Minneapolis (1998); The Buddy System, Deitch Projects, New York (1999); Hoss, Rice University Art Gallery, Houston (1999); UCLA Hammer Museum, Los Angeles (2000); Modern Art, London (2004); Prada Foundation, Milan (2004), Rose Art Museum, Brandeis University Boston (2004). Prior to 1998, McGee’s work was largely included in group exhibitions presented by commercial galleries and project spaces. In 1998 he was included in Art from Around the Bay, San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, and from that point he achieved a wider international profile. In 2001, he was included in Szeemann’s Venice Biennale (2001), and in the same year, Un Art Populaire, Foundation Cartier pour l’art contemporain, Paris (2001); Holdfast, Barry McGee & Margaret Kilgallen, Deste Foundation Centre for Contemporary Art, Athens (2002); the Liverpool Biennale, Liverpool (2002); Prada Foundation, Milan (2002); and Monument to Now, the Dakis Joannou Collection, Athens (2004). For details see Cheim & Read gallery website, http://www.cheimread.com/artists/barry-mcgee/?view=bio, accessed June 30, 2012.

KAP within that lineage of private support. McGee’s work simply manifested the latest trend in collectable art, albeit art of a more alternative nature. An *Artforum* article on McGee in 2008 titled ‘Market Index Barry McGee’ reflected the collector-driven interest in McGee’s practice.\(^3\) The choice of McGee, therefore, was relatively safe, as Kaldor followed in the footsteps of other internationally recognized collectors and foundations.

**URS FISCHER**

From 2007, KAP presented projects by artists who were far more internationally recognized than McGee. Projects were presented more regularly, and from this date, KAP presented two projects each year.

For *Cockatoo Island Installation* (2007), Urs Fischer used the historic island site of Cockatoo Island at the centre of Sydney Harbour, a site that was to be used to enormous effect in Christov-Bakargiev’s Sydney Biennale in the following year.\(^3\) A twenty minute ferry ride from Sydney’s Circular Quay, the island was familiar to Kaldor as it is overlooked by the nearby suburb of Woolwich, where Kaldor’s family home is located. The island’s rich history of convict penal settlement, ship-building yards and remand centre for delinquent girls gave the project a unique context and site. For this work, Fischer’s conspicuously low-tech cast sculptural assemblages responded to the ‘psychogeography’ of buildings and sites on the island.\(^3\) The six-part mixed media installation included a sinuous white fibreglass form that hovered in the courtyard of the old sandstone prison. Inside, plaster-cast hands of the artist, a skeleton carved from Styrofoam boxes, and a pink upturned head inhabited interior rooms. Kaldor now said that he wanted artists to work directly with the ‘challenging locations that are typically Australian’, differentiating KAP projects from those of art museums.\(^3\) However, rather than engaging directly with the site and its history, Fischer used buildings and interiors as large frames in which to house the work.

---

\(^3\) See Michelle Kuo, ‘Market Index Barry McGee’, *Artforum*, April 2008, pp. 338 – 339. The article included images of the 2004 project. It also reproduced *Untitled* (2005), a work featuring McGee’s iconic sad faced man painted onto sixty-eight glass bottles tied together and installed on the wall by wire, a work subsequently acquired by Kaldor’s wife, Naomi Milgrom.

\(^3\) Urs Fischer, *Cockatoo Island installation*, Sydney, 20 April – 3 June, 2007.


Urs Fischer, *Cockatoo Island installation* (2007)
Cockatoo Island, Sydney
Photo: Jenny Hare
As Fairley noted, his use of the historic site was as a stage-set and did not directly engage with its history or architecture.\(^{37}\)

This no doubt contributed in part to the underwhelming nature of the work. Kaldor’s personal antipathy to the artist may well have also played a part in a project that did not reach its full potential, and left little trace either locally or within the artist’s oeuvre.\(^{38}\) Whilst the site’s unusual architecture and history provided a unique context for the installed objects, the lack of contextual significance, the very remoteness of the location and reliance on ferry timetables ensured that it remained an experience for the dedicated and knowledgeable art follower rather than any accidental passer-by.

Fischer’s project with KAP did not receive the critical acclaim or public response generated by earlier Kaldor Art Projects. The paucity of commentary did not reflect any lack of international interest in the artist’s work.\(^{39}\) For example, Fischer’s project _Jet Set Lady_ (2005), presented by the Fondazione Nicola Trussardi in 2005 at the Istituto dei Ciechi (Blind Institute) in Milan, was critically received and widely discussed in art journals including _Flash Art_, _Artforum_ and the more popular _Vanity Fair_.\(^{40}\) Gioni continued to develop an association with Fischer, with a large-scale exhibition of his work at the New Museum, New York, in 2009.\(^{41}\) Key elements from the 2005 Trussardi project were showcased again when Gioni curated the exhibition project _8 ½_ in 2010.\(^{42}\) As part of the Arsenale show at the Venice Biennale in 2011, Fischer’s large sculptural figures of wax with lit wick, which gradually dissolved into a pool of melted wax, were given central position.\(^{43}\) These figures included a full-scale wax rendition of Giovanni Bologna’s _Rape of the

---


38 In a public program event held at the AGNSW in 2011, a conversation between Capon and Kaldor, Kaldor noted his dislike of the artist. Capon asked, ‘I don’t think you have ever bought a work of art from an artist who you don’t like’. Kaldor: ‘That’s not true. I like most artists whose work I acquired….. I couldn’t stand Urs Fischer.’ Edmund Capon and John Kaldor, ‘In conversation’, podcast, AGNSW public programs, May 21, 2011.


42 See above p 67.

43 Bice Curiger, _ILLUMInations_, 54th Venice Biennale, 2011.
Saline Women (1583), in characteristic Greco-Roman sculptural form; a standard office chair based on one found in the artist’s studio; and a suited and bespectacled man, eerily similar to the international bankers and art dealers frequenting the Biennale vernissage.44

GREGOR SCHNEIDER

Gregor Schneider presented 21 Beach cells (2007) on Sydney’s iconic Bondi Beach in September of the same year as Fischer’s installation.45 Its location was far more publically, and visibly sited. The work formed part of the artist’s ongoing interest in psychological torture and military detention, such as America’s use of Guantanamo Bay.46 The geometrically structured metal cages also referred to Australia’s own recent history of refugee detention centres. Sme explained the piece in relation to Schneider’s earlier art in his review in The Australian newspaper.47 However, for a wider passing public, the greatest impact was the uncanny juxtaposition of bikini-clad bathers lounging on the artwork’s blue inflatable lilos and beach umbrellas in cages. Images in newspapers, web-based google images or Flickr, located the work within Australia’s cultural stereotype of beaches and bikinis.48 There was little notice paid to a more complex reading of the black, bin-liner bundles in the corners of the cages, nor much analysis of the artist’s political intent. A wider public appeared to view Schneider’s consciously political work as anything but political.49 Ironically, the work regained its political implications when it was subsequently installed at Herzliya, Arcadia Beach, Israel, in 2009.50

44 Urs Fischer, full-scale replica of Giambologna’s Rape of the Saline Women (2011); Untitled (2011); and Untitled (Rudolf Stingel (2011).
45 Gregor Schneider, 21 beach cells, Bondi Beach, Sydney, 28 September – 21 October 2007.
46 See for example Schneider’s Weisse Folter (White torture) (2007), which explored aspects of confinement, disorientation and created a strong sense of unease in the viewer.
49 See below p. 273
Gregor Schneider, 21 beach cells (2007)
Installation view, Bondi Beach, Sydney
Photo: Gregor Schneider
At the time of the KPAP project, Schneider’s international reputation made him one of the world’s most recognized installation artists. 51 Schneider’s work recalled Schwitters’ *Merzbaume* (1933), a seminal work for the development of contemporary installation art. 52 Schwitters’ Dadaist re-working of the interior of his own house between 1923 and 1937 only ended with his escape from Nazi Europe, and the work was subsequently destroyed. Schneider’s immersive environments were also psychologically disturbing and ambitiously scaled and detailed. For *Totes Haus ur* (1985 – 1997), Schneider obsessively reconfigured his parents’ house over a twelve-year period. Located in the picturesque German Rhine town of Rheydt, it resulted in an increasingly complex series of labyrinthine rooms and spaces, which were both claustrophobic and created a sense of profound unease in the viewer. 53 In 2001, Schneider represented Germany as part of the 49th Venice Biennale, transforming Albert Speer’s classically proportioned and nationalistically imposing architectural pavilion into a series of complex rooms and dead-ends, for which he was awarded a Golden Lion award for best national participation. 54 In the autumn of 2004, Artangel, the London-based not-for-profit foundation, presented Schneider’s *Die Familie Schneider* (2004). 55 Two adjacent terrace houses in London’s Whitechapel were opened by appointment only. Two visitors at a time entered a terrace house alone. Schneider explored repression, reproduction and repetition, employing actors and the creation of disturbingly familiar working-class domestic interiors. The viewing experience was theatrical and shockingly disquieting. The work achieved national and international critical acclaim. 56

Schneider’s projects had not been without controversy. Invited to participate in Rosa Martinez’s curated exhibition *Always a Little Further* (2005) for the 51st Venice Biennale in the Arsenale, Schneider proposed *Cube Venice*, a large, black, geometric sculptural form, approximately 14 metres square. Draped in black muslin, and anchored to the ground in St Mark’s Square, the

---

53 For a discussion of the work, and its location in a global exhibition context, see Birnbaum, ‘Interiority Complex’, *Artforum*, 2000.
iconic location of the floating city, the work was to be based on the proportions of the sacred Ka’aba in Mecca, Islam’s site of religious pilgrimage. Authorities subsequently banned the work, citing both aesthetic and security concerns.57 The Biennale’s exhibition short guide included a black square in place of Schneider’s censored work.58 Schneider subsequently printed an English-language book on the project, its title Cubes: Art in the Age of Global Terrorism, reflecting the political nature of the project.59 However, he denied the provocation in his artwork, stating that it was ‘a way to illustrate the deep connection between both cultures.’60 To be presented in St Mark’s square, with its architectural history of Moorish architectural features intersecting with Renaissance European styles, the work’s monumental black cube would have recalled Kasmir Malevich’s black squares, and minimalist sculpture of the 1970s.61 The work was later proposed for presentation in Berlin, which was also not permitted. Its ultimate installation outside the Hamburger Kunsthalle as part of an exhibition honouring Malevich in 2007 reflected the potential for the work to be read beyond a political frame. The political potency of Schneider’s works was best illustrated by his April 2007 installation Weisse folter (White torture) at the Kunstsammlung NordrheinWestfalen, K21, in Düsseldorf.62 The work’s title, which refers to a type of psychological torture that leaves no physical trace on the body, its disorientating interior space, and use of techniques more commonly associated with twenty-first century warfare and torture, were modeled on the US army’s Camp V at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Like Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s Wrapped Coast (1969), site played an integral part in Schneider’s Sydney 21 beach cells (2007). Perhaps for this reason Christov-Bakargiev’s essay for the 2009 retrospective of 40 years of KPAP focused on Schneider’s 21 beach cells (2007) alongside Christo

58 51st International Art Exhibition, La Biennale di Venezia, Short Guide, 2005, p. 35. The Experience of Art, Director, Maria de Corral; Always a Little Farther, Director, Rosa Martinez. Schneider’s work was proposed as part of Rosa Martinez’s exhibition in the Arsenale.
59 See Gregor Schneider, Eugene Blume, Amine Haase, Cubes: Art in the Age of Global Terrorism, Charta, 2006; Peter Schiering, Cube, documentary film presented on German television channel ZDF, March 24, 2007.
61 See Kasmir Malevich, Black Square (1915), oil on canvas, State Russian Museum, St Petersburg; or large sculptural installations of American minimalist sculptor Robert Morris.
and Jeanne-Claude’s *Wrapped Coast* (1969). Christov-Bakargiev wrote about the visual and participatory aspects of Schneider’s project, which she may well have seen when visiting Australia to prepare for the Sydney Biennale she curated in 2008. She analysed how the experience of visiting a temporary artwork first-hand must differ from any understanding gained from images and documentary material, a fact well established in the literature on the topic. She made a compelling argument for the historical significance of site-specific temporary projects, but she did not enter into the strength of one work over another. Nevertheless, by discussing Schneider’s work alongside Christo’s seminal work of 1969, she implied that Schneider’s work on Bondi Beach had a comparable artistic weight.

Whilst Christov-Bakargiev’s essay brought her international endorsement to KAP, she did not provide a nuanced explanation of the political, cultural and public impact of Schneider’s work in Australia. By contrast with many of Schneider’s other works, *21 Beach cells* (2007) has not become a cultural reference point for the issues to which the work alluded. Other works at the time in Australia were far more effective in penetrating public consciousness. When Schneider’s *21 Beach Cells* (2007) was presented in Sydney, the city had recently staged the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation meeting (APEC). The security barriers and two-metre high cyclone fences that lined most of the city’s central streets attracted national and international attention when the political comedians and satirists, *The Chaser*, walked through multiple security checkpoints with one in their midst dressed as Osama bin Laden. The event drew widespread attention to anti-terrorism measures, whilst associations of the kind generated by Schneider’s KPAP went relatively unremarked. Coverage of Schneider’s project was scant. Schneider’s talk for Sydney’s College of Fine Arts was attended by no more than sixty-five people. For an artist of this international standing, the number was small. As William Wright noted in his *Art and Australia* article of Autumn 2008, it is almost unimaginable that a ‘celebrated contemporary European

---

63 Christov-Bakargiev in Forbat, *40 Years*, 2009, pp. 32-35.
64 Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), Sydney, 8-9 September 2007.
artist could come to Australia to produce a major installation work on one of our most popular and populous public sites and go largely unnoticed.  

ORGANISATIONAL VISIBILITY

In the five years from 2008-2012, Kaldor’s projects became substantially more institutional. He established an international Curatorial Advisory Group, and a management board of well-known Australian philanthropists and business people. In keeping with its international focus, and a desire to mark out its status in the international sphere of not-for-profit organisations engaged in public art, in 2008, Kaldor Art Projects underwent a further name change and became Kaldor Public Art Projects (KPAP). The move, John Kaldor stated, ‘more accurately reflect[ed] our activities.’

The inclusion of the word ‘Public’ brought its title in line with other not-for-profit foundations, such as New York’s Public Art Fund, which also included the term in their name. Public Art has been the subject of substantial scholarship, and the inclusion of the term in KPAP’s name firmly located its activities within this realm.

Achieving international recognition was not easy for an organization in a country that is not central to a Euro-American-centric artworld and does not have the cultural cachet of an exotic Third-World nation either. However, KAP’s long-lived reputation as a not-for-profit foundation involved with temporary, often site-specific art projects by international artists from Europe and America differentiated it from many other private foundations that presented permanent site-specific contemporary art, or that evolved into permanent private art museum, albeit in exotic locations. An expanded and relaunched website with more images, links to texts, and other related material, further consolidated KAP’s position.

---

70 See above p. 88 for a discussion of ‘destination art’ presented by foundations such as the Benesse Foundation, Naoshima, Japan; Instituto Inhotim, Brazil; the Gibbs Farm, New Zealand; and the Museum of Old and New Art (MONA), Tasmania.
ORGANISATIONAL PROFESSIONALISATION

In 2008, KPAP also set up a much more professional and international advisory structure. It consolidated its links with global contemporary art professionals and patrons and supporters through the appointment of a Curatorial Advisory Group and Management Board. The strategic appointment of key individuals to these positions professionalised what had previously been an organization directed by one individual, with sole responsibility for each invitation to artists.

Curatorial Advisory Group

The advice of the Curatorial Advisory Group reflected newer critical thinking and knowledge of contemporary art. It also reflected the increasing power of the international, or ‘uber’ curator, whose role had arguably supplanted the pivotal role of the dealer and critic in the 1960s to 1980s. The Curatorial Advisory Group provided stronger curatorial links with artistic directors and curators of international stature and position, who could provide wider contacts, greater international credibility regarding the choice of artists, and act as international ambassadors for the activities of KPAP. Kaldor’s dependence on international experts could also be seen in an alternative light, reflecting a need for external validation of the Art Projects that had echoes of Smith’s ‘provincialism problem’, though the contemporary art world was now a very different place. In his Preface for the 40 Years publication of 2009, Kaldor said that the members of the Curatorial Advisory Group ‘keep us abreast of the latest developments in contemporary art and introduce us to artists whose projects will break new ground in Australia.’ Whilst in the past, this role may have been undertaken informally through conversations with gallerists such as Ileana Sonnabend, Leo Castelli, Anthony d’Offay, and with key artists, formalizing this process reflected shifts in the artworld since the early days of John Kaldor Art Projects.

---

71 See above p. 6.
73 Kaldor in Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 21.
The new governance structure followed the model of a number of other international organisations of this kind. The contemporary art industry had become increasingly professionalised, and advisory structures of this nature proliferated, giving independent advice free from the financial conflicts often associated with interest of commercial gallery directors and other interested parties.

For KPAP, the inclusion of leading arts professionals bestowed prestige, whilst for the curators, it gave them a closer working relationship with potential supporters of future projects. The association with international curators also reduced the perception that one individual was driving the artistic decision-making process of the not-for-profit Foundation. At the same time it enabled Kaldor Public Art Projects to retain the association with the history and significance of projects and collection of the previous years.

The Curatorial Advisory Group was composed of prominent contemporary art professionals, each of whom was based overseas. Nicholas Baume was the only Australian, though he had been living in America since leaving the Museum of Contemporary Art (MCA), Sydney in 1998. An internationally recognized curator of contemporary art, Baume was the Chief Curator at the Institute of Contemporary Art, Boston from 2003 – 2009, and then the Director and Chief Curator of New York’s Public Art Fund in September 2009. He had a long history with John Kaldor. He grew up as a close neighbour to the Kaldor family in Sydney and acknowledges Kaldor’s influence on his own interest in contemporary art. Kaldor often likened Baume to a “fifth” son. He was curator of the Kaldor collection and of John Kaldor Art Projects from 1988 to 1992, during which time he organised the exhibition of Christo’s sculptures and wrappings held at the AGNSW in 1990. Baume was appointed curator at the MCA in 1993, and curated From Christo and Jeanne-Claude to Jeff Koons: John Kaldor Art Projects and Collection at that institution in 1995, which coincided with the Kaldor Public Art Project by Jeff Koons, Puppy (1995).
Another member of the Curatorial Advisory Group was Jessica Morgan, Curator of Contemporary Art, Tate Modern, London.\footnote{Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 291. Morgan joined the Tate in 2002, and curated numerous group and solo exhibitions including John Baldessari (2009), Martin Kippenberger (2006), and the Unilever Commission in 2006 and 2008 working with artists Carsten Höller and Dominique Gonzalez-Foerster respectively. Morgan was appointed the Daskalopoulos Curator, International Art, at the Tate Modern in September 2010. E-flux, September 26, 2010.} As well as bringing her expertise from one of the world’s leading contemporary art museums, Morgan also had extensive experience working in America, where the role of the private philanthropist is well established. Before moving to Tate Modern, she was the Chief Curator at the Institute of Contemporary Art, Boston, a role that Nicholas Baume took over from her in 2003.

The Curatorial Advisory Group also included Carolyn Christov-Bakargiev, whose experience encompassed Senior Curator of Exhibitions at P.S.1 in New York; Chief Curator and Interim Director at the Castello di Rivoli, Turin, from 2002 – 2009; and then Artistic Director of the 16th Biennale of Sydney in 2008, of which Kaldor was a Board Member.\footnote{Christov-Bakargiev was Chief Curator at the Castello di Rivoli Museum of Contemporary Art in Turin from 2002 to 2008 and interim director of the museum in 2009. From 1999 to 2001 she was Senior Curator of Exhibitions at P.S.1 Contemporary Art Center – a MoMA Affiliate. See Biennale Foundation website for details, http://www.biennalfoundation.org/biennials/documenta/, accessed January 9, 2012. See also Biennale of Sydney, 2008, p. 302 for Board Members.} She was then appointed Artistic Director of documenta 13 in 2012, the most significant exhibition of contemporary art in the world.\footnote{See Biennale Foundation website, http://www.biennalfoundation.org/biennials/documenta/, accessed January 9, 2012.} She was very familiar with the role and impact of private foundations in creating site-specific works. Christov-Bakargiev had included Janet Cardiff and George Bures Miller’s large-scale sound installation, \textit{The Murder of Crows} (2008), as part of her 2008 Biennale of Sydney at Sydney’s Pier 2/3, a work that had been commissioned by Thyssen-Bornemisza Art Contemporary, Vienna.\footnote{The installation in Sydney also was made possible with the generous support of the Canada Council for the Arts, the Biennale of Sydney and Bowers & Wilkins Speakers. The presentation of the work was also supported by Andrew and Cathy Cameron. Biennale of Sydney 2008 website, http://www.bos2008.com/app/biennale/artist/23, accessed September 29, 2011.} Christov-Bakargiev had worked closely with these artists in the past, curating a major exhibition of their work for P.S. 1, Contemporary Art Center in 2001, which toured to venues in Canada and Italy. The exhibition was accompanied by a comprehensive catalogue featuring an extended essay by the curator on the artists’ work.\footnote{See Christov-Bakargiev, \textit{Janet Cardiff} (ex. cat.), 2001, P.S. 1. Published to accompany the exhibition organized by P.S. 1 Contemporary Art Center, Long Island City, N.Y., October 14, 2001-January 2002. Touring venues: Musée d’art contemporain de Montréal, Montreal, Quebec (May 23-September 8, 2002); Palazzo delle esposizioni, Rome, Italy (November 13, 2002-January 30, 2003).} Notification that Cardiff and Miller had been awarded La Biennale di Venezia Special Award, or Golden Lion, and the Benesse Prize in 2005 was also made by Christov-Bakargiev, for their project representing...
Canada, *The Paradise Institute* (2005) as part of the Venice Biennale that year.\(^8\) Christov-Bakargiev’s Sydney Biennale also included William Kentridge’s performance on Cockatoo Island, *I am not me, the horse is not mine* (2008) which was financially supported by John Kaldor and Naomi Milgrom Kaldor.\(^9\)

The fourth member of the Curatorial Advisory Group was Klaus Biesenbach, Director of P.S.1 Contemporary Art Centre, New York and Chief Curator, Department of Media and Performance Art, Museum of Modern Art, New York. Biesenbach is one of a younger generation of Euro-American transnationals, equally at home in the art society pages as in the museum.\(^7\) Beginning his career in a post-wall Berlin, Biesenbach founded Kunst-Werke (KW) Institute for Contemporary Art in that city in 1991, as well as the Berlin Biennale in 1996. He retained the role as Founding Director at both entities. Moving to New York, he held the positions of Chief Curatorial Advisor at P.S.1 and Chief Curatorial Advisor at Large at MoMA prior to his appointment as Director of P.S. 1 in 2009, succeeding their Founding Director Alanna Heiss.\(^8\) In 2010, he curated *Marina Abramović: the Artist is Present* (2010), and *William Kentridge: five themes* (2010) for MoMA, two of the most highly regarded exhibitions of that year.\(^9\) For AGNSW’s publication *John Kaldor Family Collection* in 2011, Biesenbach contributed an essay contextualizing the history and significance of performance art in Kaldor’s private collection.\(^9\)

Vincente Todoli was appointed the fifth member of the Curatorial Advisory Group in 2012.\(^\) From 1986 to 1988 Todoli was chief curator of IVAM, The Valencia Institute for Modern Art, Spain, and from 1989 to 1996, he was the Artistic Director of that institute. From 1996 to 2002

---


\(^7\) See for example Scene and Herd, *Artforum*.


he was the Director of the Museum of Contemporary Art Fundação De Serralves in Porto, Portugal; and in 2003 he was appointed Director of the Tate Modern, London (2003 – 2010). He was well placed to bring a strong European perspective to Kaldor’s curatorial advisory board.

**Board**

While the Curatorial Advisory Group consisted of European and American-based international curators, the Board was composed largely of Melbourne and Sydney business people and philanthropists. Most were already well connected to international contemporary art institutions. The Board’s Chair was Rupert Myer. An art collector and philanthropist, Myer had held numerous positions in leading Australian cultural institutions. These included his role as a Council Member of the National Gallery of Australia (which he chaired from 2005 to 2012), a Trustee of the National Gallery of Victoria (1997-2002) and Board Member of the MCA (Myer was appointed on 18 May 1997, the same date that Kaldor was appointed to the MCA Board). He had chaired the Contemporary Visual Arts and Craft Inquiry, known as the Myer Report, in 2002. Like Kaldor, Myer had been a member of the Tate International Council. He was also Chair of the Myer Family Company and Vice President of the Myer Foundation, one of Australia’s leading philanthropic foundations.

Other board members included businesswoman Jillian Broadbent AO; actor and TV and film producer, Santo Cilauro; a partner with the accountant ant firm Deloittes, Craig Holland; Kaldor himself; businessman, Mark Nelson; and businesswoman, Naomi Milgrom, Kaldor’s wife. As sole owner, the Executive Chair and CEO of the Sussan Group, Naomi Milgrom had overseen the expansion of her fashion group to become one of Australia’s largest privately held retailers. She sat on numerous philanthropic boards, such as the Howard Florey Institute, (a leading

---


95 Mr and Mrs Rupert Myer were listed as Members of the International Council for the Tate Gallery, The Tate Report 2002-2004.


97 The Suzanne group was made up of fashion labels Sussan, Suzanne Grae and Sportsgirl.
Melbourne-based medical research institute), and was former Chair of the L’Oreal Fashion Festival. Milgrom was also a significant collector of contemporary art in her own right, a passion which had been recognized publically through appointments to the boards of a number of Melbourne’s leading contemporary art and public galleries – including Chair of the Australian Centre for Contemporary Art, and as a Trustee of the National Gallery of Victoria. Whilst Kaldor had acknowledged Milgrom for reinvigorating his interest in working with artists, she was also credited with ‘encouraging her husband to donate two hundred contemporary works from his collection worth between $35 million and $40 million to the AGNSW in May [2011].’

The KPAP Management Board was composed of high profile Australian business people and philanthropists, each very successful individually, with a visible public presence. Each was equipped to financially support initiatives of Kaldor Public Art Projects, and to connect the organization to others in financial or decision-making positions, able to support ambitious contemporary art projects by international artists.

Staff

The management staff and resources of KAP (as it was known in 2007), while professional, were not dedicated to KAP alone. In 2008, I visited the Essential Art Services offices in Botany, Sydney, where the archival material for Kaldor Art Projects was then located. At that stage, Kaldor Art Projects appeared to be a small operation solely driven by John Kaldor who made all artistic decisions. Whilst Adam Free was substantially involved, there appeared to be no full-time


99 Milgrom was Chair of the Australian Centre for Contemporary Art (ACCA) from 2004 – 2011. She resigned as Chair of ACCA to take up a position as Trustee on the Council for Trustees for the National Gallery of Victoria in July 2011, a position she had previously held in 2003-4. Milgrom is daughter of well-known business people and philanthropists Marcus Besen AO and Eva Besen AO, founders of the Tarrawarra Museum of Art, in the Yarra Valley, Victoria. In October 2011, a newspaper article in The Age indicated that Milgrom would be the next Chair of the NGV Trustees commencing in April 2012 on the retirement of Alan Myers QC. See State Government of Victoria, ‘Fresh perspectives on the arts with new board members’, Thursday, 21 July 2011; Raymond Gill, ‘Fresh face to usher in new era for the NGV’, The Age, October 11, 2011. However, Bruce Parmeutt was ultimately appointed in October 2012: see Mathew Dunckley and John Stensholt, ‘Banker tapped for NGV board’s chair’, The Australian Financial Review, October 9, 2012; John Stensholt, ‘Bruce Parmeutt next NGV council president’, The Australian Financial Review, October 10, 2012.

100 See Gill, ‘Fresh face’, The Age, 2011.


102 Kaldor Art Projects Archive, May 1, 2008.
staff working permanently in the Botany offices. Expertise was bought in on a project-by-project basis, coordinated by Free. This was not unusual: project organisations of this sort routinely expand and contract as temporary staff are required nearer to a project’s realisation. The organization appeared to function through a small group of specialized staff who juggled their work for Kaldor Art Projects with other professional responsibilities, some related to and others independent of John Kaldor’s collecting and patronage activities.

Kaldor described his staff as a ‘small dedicated team of collaborators to help realize the projects’. Kaldor Public Art Projects’ list of staff included Director John Kaldor; Consultant Jennifer Lindsay; curators Charlotte Day and Adam Free; Project manager Alison Guthrie; Curatorial research & publications manager Sophie Forbat; Financial officer Louise Merhi; Executive assistant Elizabeth Flynn; IT consultant Robin Stern; Service staff Ron Clark and Daniel Barnacoat; and Event management Daniel Raux-Copin. Few amongst this group appeared to be committed full-time to KPAP. For example, the curator, Charlotte Day, was also Associate Curator at the Australian Centre for Contemporary Art. She worked as a curator of independent projects such as the Tarrawarra Biennial (2008), and was co-curator of the 2010 Adelaide Biennial of Australian Art. She was also co-curator of another significant collection of art, the Michael Buxton Collection of Contemporary Australian Art. Day first worked with Kaldor when he was Commissioner of the Australian pavilion for the Venice Biennale in 2005 and then again in 2007, as Curator of Ricky Swallow’s exhibition in the Australian Pavilion, This time another year (2005), and as Project Curator for Callum Morton’s Valhallab (2007), one of the three projects for the 2007 Australian pavilion projects. In 2008, she was also project curator for the Kaldor project with Martin Boyce.
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103 Kaldor in Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 20.
104 Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 291.
106 Callum Morton, Valhallab, Palazzo Zenobio, Palazzo Zenobio, one of three projects representing the official Australian Pavilion projects, 52nd Venice Biennale, Italy (2007).
Similarly, Sydney-based Adam Free combined his work as a freelance curator, critic and consultant with curatorial work for Kaldor Art Projects. His involvement with John Kaldor began when he catalogued Kaldor’s private collection. As Curator of European Paintings and Sculptures at the Art Gallery of South Australia, he curated the exhibition *Journey to now: John Kaldor art projects and collection* (2003) drawn from Kaldor’s personal art collection. With expertise in online interfaces, Free oversaw the development of the comprehensive website for Kaldor Art Projects and the educational MOVE video program. He also worked as the project curator for a number of Art Projects.

Alison Guthrie was listed as project manager for KPAP. She had worked with Kaldor since 2000, when she and Kaldor established Essential Art Services, a Sydney based art storage, handling, transportation and collection management business. A key part of their business was managing, storing and transporting Kaldor’s own personal collection. Following the sale of the business to King & Wilson in 2010, Guthrie remained in the Sydney office as a member of the Essential Art Services staff.

Sophie Forbat, editor of the 2009 Kaldor publication, was responsible for curatorial research and publications manager. Previously, she had worked at the Biennale of Sydney, under Artistic Director, Carolyn Christov Bakargiev. She was curatorial research manager for the 16th Biennale of Sydney (2008) and was managing editor of the catalogue and guide.

As these biographies illustrate, there was a web of relationships between those working on KAP, Kaldor’s collection, Kaldor’s other activities (principally as Australian Commissioner for the Venice Biennale 2005 and 2007, and Board Member of the Biennale of Sydney), and the
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108 Free appeared as one of the three directors of art.net.au, an online directory of galleries, artists, services and museums in Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific. All works appearing on the website were for sale. Art.net.au, http://www.art.net.au/about.asp, accessed August 1, 2011. Prior to setting up the online website, Free was Curator of European Paintings & Sculptures, Art Gallery of South Australia, Adelaide, and a former head of paintings department, Sotheby’s Sydney.


110 Art Gallery of South Australia, 2003. Kaldor was the keynote speaker at the Art Gallery of South Australia’s launch of their new contemporary collectors’ initiative, June 11 2003.

111 In 2010, the business was sold to Andrew Wilson, an executive of Melbourne-based King & Wilson transporters, who were keen to consolidate their move into the art handling side of the transport business. FIDI Focus, 2010.

112 Forbat had previously worked as administrative assistant on the 14th Biennale of Sydney curated by Isobel Carlos, *Reason and emotion* (2004); program coordinator for the 15th Biennale of Sydney curated by Charles Merewether, *Zones of Contact* (2006); followed by her experience working with Christov Bakargiev as curatorial research and publications manager, BOS 2008. Forbat, *40 Years*, 2009, p. 293.
members of the Curatorial Advisory Group.\footnote{In 2012, the staff structure evolved again. Bettina Kaldor, John Kaldor’s daughter, became General Manager, while Sophie Forbat was appointed Program Manager. Other positions included a Manager of Education, Interpretation and Engagement; Curatorial and Communications Coordinator; Finance Office, IT Consultant; and Executive Assistant to John Kaldor. See \url{http://kaldorartprojects.org.au/about/our-team}, accessed September 22, 2012.} This was little different from the many other overlapping relationships in the Australian and the international art world.

**GIFT OF THE JOHN KALDOR FAMILY COLLECTION**

The validation of KPAP through more professionalised governance, curatorial advice and management was reinforced by the institutional corroboration of Kaldor’s parallel collecting activities.\footnote{The relationship between KPAP and Kaldor’s collection is explored in more detail above at p. 104 and p. 222.} In 2008, John Kaldor announced the gift of part of his private collection to the AGNSW as the John Kaldor Family Collection.\footnote{See for example Perkin, ‘$35 million gift’, *Australian*, 2008; Young, ‘The Great Commissioner’, *Art & Asia Pacific*, 2009; Marr, ‘A life’s work’, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 2011; Charlotte Day, ‘From private to public domains: Presenting the John Kaldor Family Gallery’, *Art & Australia*, Vol. 48, No. 4, Winter 2011, pp. 610-615.} Built up over fifty years, the gift of two hundred and sixty works was valued at AUD 35 million (USD 29 million) in 2008, and was according to AGNSW’s director Edmund Capon, ‘the most significant single gift of contemporary art in Australian history’.\footnote{Young, ‘The Great Commissioner’, *Art & Asia Pacific*, 2009.} Rumors of a significant gift from Kaldor to one of Australia’s state museums had been voiced certainly since he had been on the board of the MCA.\footnote{This was discussed as one reason why the MCA stored Kaldor’s collection without charge. Noted in Perkin, ‘$35 million gift’, *Australian*, 2008.} Naomi Milgrom was credited with encouraging the donation,\footnote{Raymond Gill, ‘Fresh face’, *The Age*, 2011; Marr, ‘A life’s work’, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 2011.} and she may have assisted Kaldor to conclude the negotiations and decide on AGNSW, determine a name for the galleries in which part of the collection would always be displayed, and the terms of the gift.

Kaldor’s gift was matched by further public and private funding totaling $65 million: the NSW State Labor government of Morris Iemma committed $25.7 million to build a new storehouse for the Gallery in Sydney’s inner west, whilst the Belgiorno-Nettis family gave $4 million to assist with the conversion of the old storage floor into a vast new exhibition space.\footnote{Marr, ‘A life’s work’, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 2011.} The 1,500 square metre exhibition space would be known as the John W. Kaldor Family Gallery for Contemporary Art.\footnote{Young, ‘The Great Commissioner’, *Art & Asia Pacific*, 2009.}
John Kaldor Family Collection, AGNSW (2011)
R Ugo Rondinone, If there were anywhere but desert, wednesday (2000)
Art Gallery of New South Wales
The gift included works by many of the artists whose projects featured in KPAP’s history. The second major display of the John Kaldor Family Collection in AGNSW in 2012 included two new works by artists who had been involved in previous Kaldor Art Projects. Gregor Schneider, who had first worked with KPAP in 2007, presented *Basement Haus ur* (Basement cellar house) (1985-2012), a re-working of part of his signature work that had achieved international recognition. The project was initiated by John Kaldor and presented in collaboration with the AGNSW. Richard Long’s *Stone Line* was again restaged at the AGNSW, which had first presented it in 1977 as JKAP Project 7. In 2009, an exhibition documenting the history of the Art Projects was held at the AGNSW, coinciding with the 40th anniversary of Kaldor Public Art Projects. Director, Edmund Capon, noted in the media release at the time of opening:

> For an institution such as ours, with the aspiration to develop and maintain a distinguished and impressive representation of contemporary art, it would be hard to overestimate the significance of the gift of the John Kaldor Family Collection, a milestone that happens once in a century. It will be a transforming experience for the Art Gallery of New South Wales.

Kaldor observed the link between the collection and the Art Projects, even though he had always consistently maintained the distinction between the public and private nature of the activities. He stated:

> I have shared my love of contemporary art with the Australian public for more than 40 years through Kaldor Public Art Projects. My collection, on the other hand, has remained private. Donating it to the Art Gallery of New South Wales is a natural extension of my aim to share art with the public. It is also my largest-ever art project.

Writing about the gift in the book published by the AGNSW to coincide with the opening of the new wing for the John Kaldor Family Collection, Klaus Biesenbach and others discussed
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121 See above p. 238.
125 Tunnicliffe, *John Kaldor Family Collection*, 2011. For example, ‘The formation of much of the John Kaldor Family Collection occurred concurrently with the commissioning and production of new work through the Kaldor Public Art Projects. … Kaldor’s private passion, embodied in his art collection, has long been wedded to his role in bringing international artists to Australia to create public art and making it accessible to a wide audience.’ Biesenbach in Tunnicliffe, *John Kaldor Family Collection*, 2011.
Kaldor’s public and private art activities in a manner that implied they were inextricably linked. Biesenbach’s roles afforded him a global perspective on the rise of the collector, and the intertwined nature of public and private activities in contemporary art. Within the critical literature, this was also widely acknowledged: a 2011 edition of *Texte zur Kunste* entitled ‘The Collector’ specifically focused on the role that the collector played not only in acquiring works of art, but also in the involvement with, or initiation of, commissions from contemporary artists. Launched in time to coincide with the start of the Art Fair season in 2012, the journal’s focus signaled the singular shift that had occurred in the role of the private collector of contemporary art since the 1980s.

The link between Kaldor’s Art Projects and the gift of the collection was valuable to the AGNSW. It differentiated the collection from other contemporary art collections both in Australia and internationally. The institution’s desire to incorporate the history of the Art Projects within the gift enabled AGNSW to embed the history of certain key projects with its own development as an institution of international standing. The collection filled gaps in the Gallery’s own collection, with works that it could not possibly hope to acquire, and more importantly, it enabled the institution to offer a broader display of art from the early 1960s to the present day.

Kaldor’s decision to donate a substantial part of his private collection to a major public institution differed from many other contemporary art initiatives that instead set up private museums, both in Australia and internationally. He was quizzed by journalists at the time of the gift about his decision to donate such a substantial part of his personal collection to the AGNSW rather than opening his own private museum to showcase his collection, a trend that had become common practice worldwide and a model that Naomi Milgrom-Kaldor’s own parents adopted. Kaldor emphasized, ‘I haven’t got the finances for that’.

---


127 See for example the inclusion of works from AGNSW permanent collection alongside those from the John Kaldor Family Gift, including examples by Roslynd Piggott, Christine Borland, Rachel Whiteread and Julie Rrap, Joseph Kosuth, Yves Klein, Richard Hamilton, Svetlana Kopystiansky and Gerhard Richter. Visit by author, March 29, 2012.

128 For example, TarraWarra Museum of Art, Victoria; MONA, Tasmania; White Rabbit, Sydney; Lyon House Museum, Melbourne. See Jana Hyner (ed.), *BMW Art Guide by Independent Collectors*, Hatje Cantz, Berlin, 2012, published by BMW luxury car brand, and which listed some of the most recent examples of international private museums. See above p. 30.

129 TarraWarra Museum of Art (TWMA) is located in Victoria’s Yarra Valley, and is described as a ‘privately funded, art museum’. It was a gift to the Australian public by founders Eva and Marc Besen, and showcases works from their private collection.
experience as Chair of the Australian Centre for Contemporary Art, a non-collecting kunsthalle in Melbourne, alongside Kaldor’s own experience as Chair of the MCA between 1997–2002, during which time it was alleged he lent his collection to the MCA in return for free storage, gave him a better understanding of the costs and complexities in commissioning and running a private art museum.

The collection included an ironic tourist. Appropriately, this was Christo’s work. The Kaldor Family Gift to the AGNSW included two wrapped gum tree works that Christo made on John Kaldor’s front lawn at the same time as Wrapped Coast in 1969. While the Art Project was being shown, the larger tree was offered to the Art Gallery of New South Wales for acquisition ‘with the proviso that they [both works] should be shown together.’ Christo gave the other tree to Kaldor, no doubt as a momento of the project they had just presented together. It became a much talked about part of John Kaldor’s private collection, and appeared in images documenting its contents. The wrapped eucalypts blocked a doorway in the hall of his family house in the Sydney suburb of Woolwich, near Hunter’s Hill. The works have now become part of the mythology surrounding the development of Kaldor’s collection. As Kaldor has narrated, when Christo’s larger wrapped tree was taken to the Gallery and the Board met to review the gift, the work was rejected out of hand. The work was returned to Kaldor, remaining part of his collection along with the gift of the first tree from Christo to Kaldor. In 1990, when Christo and Jeanne-Claude were invited to Australia to create a second wrapped project in the vestibule of AGNSW, the accompanying exhibition included the two wrapped trees. Christo’s Two Wrapped Trees (1969) were presented again in the inaugural display of works alongside a program of temporary exhibitions. It was established as a company limited by guarantee in October 2000, and is run as a not-for-profit institution. Launched by the Prime Minister, John Howard in April 2002, it was first shown in temporary premises at the Metropolitan Meat Market, North Melbourne, then moving to a purpose-built gallery designed by Allan Powell in 2003.

132 Their creation was documented by Brian Adams for ABC television, 1969.
133 Baume in Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 43.
135 Baume in Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 43.
136 See installation pictures included in Baume, Christo, 1990; Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 159; and Tunnicliffe, John Kaldor Family Collection, 2011.
from the John Kaldor Family Collection at the same gallery as part of the gift to the AGNSW. Their presence amounted to a final validation of Kaldor’s Art Projects and his collection.

In 2009, the exhibition *40 Years: Kaldor Public Art Projects* was presented at AGNSW, drawn largely from objects, ephemera and documentation of the KPAP. It was accompanied by a publication of the same name, commissioned by Kaldor, designed by AGNSW, published by KPAP and distributed by AGNSW. The extensive publication featured a full-wrap cover adorned with Harry Shunk’s signature black and white photographs of Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s *Wrapped Coast* (1969). The catalogue provided a chronological record of each project since 1969, reproduced archival material and images of the ephemeral projects, and contextualized these with essays from leading local and international curators who had been involved in the projects. Its tone was justifiably celebratory. It did not, however, offer an objective contextualization of the Art Projects or KPAP’s role within a broader international frame.

In 2011, when the John Kaldor Family Collection was opened at the AGNSW in its newly refurbished spaces, a second hardcover publication was published by the institution. An open weekend was held on 21 and 22 March 2011 to launch the newly installed galleries, with events that included keynote talks by leading international and Australian artists, floor talks by Director Edmund Capon and John Kaldor, and an extensive performance and film program. A further series of public programs, lectures and events included artists whose work had been presented as part of KPAP, artists whose works were included in the permanent collection, and visiting academics and curators of contemporary art. The gift was the subject of numerous newspaper features, and largely all were extremely positive, as befitted the generous gift. Long articles
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137 Forbat, *40 Years*, 2009.
138 American photographer Harry Shunk documented many of Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s early works. See Bourdon, *Christo*, 1972. Shunk is most widely known for his photographs of Yves Klein’s infamous *Leap into the Void* (1960), constructed photographs of the French artist appearing to leap from a second-floor window into thin air.
139 Edmund Capon, Anthony Bond, Carolyn Christov-Bakargiev, Daniel Thomas and John Kaldor in conversation with Nicholas Baume in Forbat, *40 Years*, 2009, pp. 18 – 43.
141 For details see AGNSW Media Release, ‘New Contemporary Galleries, John Kaldor Family Collection, Art Gallery of New South Wales’, 2011; KPAP website, and AGNSW website.
were also published in art magazines, including *Art & Australia, Apollo*, and *Frieze*. The tone again was celebratory. All noted the relationship between the private collection and the Public Art Projects over the forty-year period. Any criticism was very gently couched. The art world is often reluctant to publically debate controversial questions, not least those raised by a gift and its content. Charlotte Day noted the omissions that the gift revealed when a private collection became public, such as the lack of women artists, and more significantly the focus on international over local. Groom concluded her piece in *Frieze* magazine by suggesting that the focus on 1960s and 1970s Conceptual, Fluxus and Land art in the Kaldor Collection served as a reminder that the dematerialization of the art object did not necessarily equate with anti-commercialisation. What had originally been conceived as ephemeral, cheap, reproducible or unseen, could just as easily now be bought and expensively sold. The presence of Christo’s *Wrapped Trees* (1969), now incorporated into a public gallery through a private bequest, marked the complete commodification of the uncommodifiable.

These articles did not discuss, however, the potential impact of the gift on the institution’s future ability to continue to expand and develop its contemporary art collecting. All donations and sponsorship to institutions may and can affect institutional priorities. All institutional priorities, whether a gift or potential project, are subject to the influence of key stakeholders - from directors and curatorial staff, to trustees, other donors, and government agency. Generous gifts such as these can be a catalyst for important change. During times of institutional conservatism or limited funds, a visionary benefactor has the potential to assist an institution in engaging with areas that are not part of the exhibition program, such as contemporary art at AGNSW in the 1970s, through a donor’s ability to donate or attract funding, or influence trustees through the example of their own successful business enterprises. In contrast, the conditions of a gift or project may have a significant impact on institutional resources. While it would be easy to say that these should have been taken into account on acceptance or not of the gift, not all choices are as black and white. As institutions carefully divide limited acquisition and gallery funds between different departments, it is often difficult to justify further substantial investment in

---


areas already well resourced. The ability to acquire further work in the area of a gift, conditions of dedicated gallery space, or the need for additional staff must all be taken into account.\textsuperscript{146} While terms of a gift may in some cases be able to be modified or amended, retrospective interpretation of legally binding terms should not be assumed.

Given the scale and significance of the gift, a dedicated gallery space in which to present the art was a requirement of Kaldor’s bequest to AGNSW. It was to be known as the John Kaldor Family Gallery. Existing collection storage spaces were used for this purpose. After the first installation, the galleries were not dedicated to the display of that collection alone, however, and in subsequent hangs other parts of the permanent collection were shown alongside the Kaldor gift while works from the Kaldor collection were also presented in other galleries alongside other contemporary works from the permanent collection. Kaldor noted that he did not wish the collection to be static, “that somehow there should be a chance to add to it, so that it’s kept up to date.”\textsuperscript{147} The Kaldor Collection’s publication divided the gift into specific areas of focus: including Robert Rauschenberg, Christo, American Minimal and Abstraction, Action and Object, Pop Art, recent German photography, Bill Viola, video art, and a number of other contemporary artists.\textsuperscript{148} Artists who had also presented Art Projects played a prominent role, including Christo, Nam June Paik, Michael Landy, Jeff Koons, Barry McGee, Bill Viola, Urs Fischer, Gregor Schneider and Ugo Rondinone.

By 2012, the second hang in the John Kaldor Family Collection gallery included works from the Kaldor Collection alongside other works from the AGNSW’s holdings. The inclusion of women artists, a greater number of Australian artists – both men and women, and a wider range of Conceptual, Fluxus and performance art from Europe and the USA went some way to telling a more nuanced history than Kaldor’s personal collecting interests allowed.\textsuperscript{149} They remained,

\textsuperscript{146} See for example a discussion of the gift of the Joseph Brown collection to the National Gallery of Victoria. Brown’s donation to the NGV was made on the condition that the work be held together and in perpetuity. See Ashley Wilson, ‘Galleries’ friend and benefactor to the end’,\textit{Australian}, August 27, 2009; Patrick McCaughey, ‘Move would make asset of albatross of generosity’,\textit{The Age}, January 21, 2006. For a reference to founding director Leon Paroissien’s interpretation of John Power’s will in establishing the terms of the MCA, see Joyce Morgan, ‘The Art of Survival: the MCA’s fight to stay in the picture’,\textit{Sydney Morning Herald}, September 11, 2001, p. 20.

\textsuperscript{147} Marr, ‘A life’s work’,\textit{Sydney Morning Herald}, 2011.


however, overwhelmingly Euro-American-centric. While the gift enabled AGNSW to present significant examples of key artists from the 1960s to the present day, the emphasis of these artists over others through the sheer number of works, of which a certain number would always be on display, ensured that certain histories and narratives would remain at the forefront of AGNSW’s institutional framing of the key conceptual, theoretical and art historical shifts that marked the development of contemporary art.

BILL VIOLA

Reflecting the influence of the Curatorial Advisory Group, projects from 2008 onwards demonstrated a greater emphasis on artists who had previously presented large-scale site specific works with other international independent foundations and biennales. Whilst the choice of artists may have revealed the advice of the curatorial board in presenting a range of artists whose practices were critically well received, the difficulty remained in how to differentiate KPAP’s projects from those presented as part of institutional programs. Partnering with local biennales and festivals to present site-specific, temporary projects was one solution to the problem of achieving prominence amongst a dense offering of contemporary Australian and international art.

In 2008, Kaldor presented the first of two projects with renowned American video artist Bill Viola, known for his large-scale, immersive video and sound installations.\textsuperscript{150} Viola’s large-scale installations and video works were widely acknowledged as pivotal in the development of video art. By 1995, when he exhibited in the American Pavilion at the Venice Biennale, Viola’s work had already been the subject of three substantial solo catalogues and smaller publications, whilst a number of his large-scale installations had exerted a powerful presence within the art world.\textsuperscript{151} Chrissie Iles noted that the Venice ‘exhibition mark[ed] an important moment in the history of video installation, developing further the ground established by Viola’s and Garry Hill’s single pieces in \textit{documenta}, both of which were widely considered to be the strongest works in the entire exhibition.’\textsuperscript{152} Then curator and head of exhibitions at the Museum of Modern Art, Oxford,\textsuperscript{153}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{150} Bill Viola, \textit{The Tristian Project}, St Saviour’s Church, Redfern, Sydney, 9 April – 23 May, 2008.
\item\textsuperscript{153} In 2002, the Museum of Modern Art, Oxford, changed its name to Modern Art Oxford (MAO). Its lack of a permanent collection meant that it was not technically a museum according to current definitions.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
part of the series *The Tristan Project* (2005)
Installation view, St Saviour's Church, Sydney (2008)
Photo: Kira Perov
England, Iles went on to become the curator of film and video at the Whitney Museum, New York, one of the defining institutions for the presentation of work of this kind.154

For Australians, a major survey of Viola’s work had previously been held at the National Gallery of Australia in 2005.155 Organised by the J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles, the touring exhibition had also been shown in London and Madrid. It had presented a definitive and scholarly exhibition of Viola’s recent works that included twelve works from *The Passions* series, and an all-enveloping environment of sight and sound, *Fire Angels for the Millennium* (2001).

Kaldor’s project repeated this immersive viewing and sound experience. The location of the project, however, took Viola’s work out of the white cube, and into a space laden with historic, cultural and architectural significance. Two parts of Viola’s *The Tristan Project* (2005) were presented at St Saviour’s Church, Redfern.156 The location was suggested to Kaldor by author David Malouf.157 Viola had previously used religious sites as the location for his immersive video projections.158 St Saviour’s Church is significant not only for its Romanesque revival style of architecture, but its connection to the local Aboriginal community. At the same time as *Fire Woman* (2005) and *Tristan’s Ascension* (2005) were presented as a Kaldor project at St Saviour’s Church, AGNSW showed *The Fall into Paradise* (2005), another video work from *The Tristan Project* (2005). The parallel presentations both showed the scope of this significant series and also reflected the ever closer institutional relationship between Kaldor and the ANGSW. In 2012, the work was presented again, this time as part of the Melbourne International Arts Festival (MIAF), alongside an exhibition of Viola’s *The Raft* (2004) at the Australian Centre for the Moving Image (ACMI).159 Like its Sydney installation, *The Tristan Project* was shown in the historic St Carthage’s Catholic Church, Parkville. The work’s presentation, both in conjunction with ACMI and as part of MIAF reflected Kaldor’s new approach. He was staging site-specific temporary work during a

---


156 *Fire Woman* and *Tristan’s Ascension (The Sound of a Mountain Under a Waterfall)* (2005).

157 Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 240.

158 *The Messenger*, Durham Cathedral, England (1996); also shown at the AGNSW in 1999; and *Ocean Without a Shore* (2007), that employed the three stone altars of the 15th century Church of San Gallo, Venice, during the Venice Biennale of 2007.

159 Bill Viola, *The Raft* (2004), Australian Centre for the Moving Image, Melbourne (ACMI), curated by Alessio Cavallaro and Kate Warren. The work was presented by ACMI and Kaldor Public Art Projects in association with the Melbourne International Arts Festival.
major local arts festival, contributing to the festival visual arts programme, and co-opting their wider reach of audience.

**MARTIN BOYCE, TATZU NISHI AND STEPHEN VITIELLO**

The next three projects following Viola all responded very specifically to site and context: RMIT’s Alumni Courtyard, the public sculptures outside the AGNSW, and the kilns of the Sydney Park Brickworks. Martin Boyce’s Australian project with JKAP, *We are shipwrecked and landlocked* (2008), was presented in RMIT’s Alumni Courtyard, adjoining the Old Melbourne Gaol in Melbourne’s CBD. Boyce had previously visited Melbourne in 1988, when his work was included as part of a group exhibition entitled *Strolling – the art of arcades, boulevards, barricades, publicity*, curated by Max Delany at the Heide Museum of Modern Art. This was part of the Melbourne Festival. Boyce had also earlier worked outdoors, on a site-specific temporary work as part of the *Münster Sculpture Project 07*. Like his Münster project, entitled *We are still and reflective* (2007), Boyce’s KAP drew inspiration from photographs of the cubist-trees created by twin brothers Joël and Jan Martel for the 1925 *Exposition des arts décoratifs* in Paris. For Münster, Boyce developed these abstract tree forms to create an outdoor floor piece installed on the site of the premises of the former Münster zoo. Thirteen pre-formed concrete slabs with bands of brass were installed in selected gaps to create the words ‘We are still and reflective’. Boyce described these as producing ‘a perfect unity of architecture and nature’, and he talked of them conveying an idea of a landscape that hovered between a real physical space and an imaginary one.

In Melbourne, the exhibition site played a significant role. The project curator Charlotte Day noted that Boyce chose the site for its self-contained nature, as well as its openness within the dense architecture of the city. On a previous site visit, she had taken him to visit historic

---


Martin Boyce, *We are shipwrecked and landlocked* (2008)
Installation view, Old Melbourne Gaol, RMIT University, Melbourne
Photo: Adam Free
Forbat (ed), *40 Years*, 2009, p. 259. Boyce
locations that included the ballroom in Flinders Street Station, a larger warehouse space in Melbourne’s Docklands, the Abbotsford Convent, and the underground Modernist concrete carpark at the University of Melbourne.\footnote{ACCA Podcast, ‘An evening with … Charlotte Day’, 2009.} None was suitable, as the site’s purpose and history was either too dominating, or did not enable the artist to achieve what he wanted. RMIT’s Alumni Courtyard already had a history of use as a platform for site-specific temporary artworks and performances.\footnote{It had been used by Maudie Palmer, Curator of the Visual Arts Program for the Melbourne Festival in 1997 and 1998.} Surrounded by the bluestone walls of what was once part of the Old Melbourne Gaol, the historic and cultural references of the site added further meaning to the work. Construction regulations forced the project staff to treat a temporary project in the same way as a permanent installation. However the relationship of the site to one of Melbourne’s leading teaching institutions, the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT), created other opportunities. Kaldor spoke to RMIT students about the Art Projects, and a Forum was held in collaboration with RMIT, which featured panelists Martin Boyce; Max Delany, Director, Monash University Museum of Art (MUMA); artist Callum Morton; Associate Professor SueAnne Ware; and Professor Elizabeth Grierson.\footnote{Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT), ‘Forum – Out of Tme’, Wednesday 22 October 2008, RMIT Storey Hall.} Many of RMIT’s students were involved in the exhibition as part of their university courses.\footnote{See RMIT website for details of scholarly outcomes, \url{http://emedia.rmit.edu.au/kaldor/boyce}, accessed May 21, 2012.} They also worked in a voluntary or paid capacity as invigilators.\footnote{Conversation with artist Susan Jacobs, co-ordinating invigilator for the Art Project, Melbourne, Tuesday October 21, 2008.} As with Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s \textit{Wrapped Coast} (1969),\footnote{See above p. 134.} this direct working involvement with the project enabled students to develop a sense of ownership in the work, and a first hand understanding of site-specific installations.

The project was important for Boyce. Boyce developed further outdoor site-specific projects in the US as a result of the Melbourne Kaldor Project.\footnote{Conversation with Charlotte Day, Melbourne, Tuesday October, 21 2008. Also noted by Day, ACCA Podcast, ‘A conversation with …’, 2009.} In 2009, he presented \textit{No Reflections} in Venice’s Palazzo Pisani as Scotland’s representative for the 2009 Venice Biennale.\footnote{No Reflections, curated by Dundee Contemporary arts (DCA), Scottish Presentation at the 53rd International Art Exhibition, La Biennale di Venezia, 7 June – 22 November (2009), Palazzo Pisani, Calle delle Erbe, Cannaregio.} He drew heavily on the artistic language and motifs developed for his Melbourne installation. Boyce continued to re-work the form, material and structures derived from the early 1925 exhibition
photographs of the trees, creating an alternative urban landscape replete with discarded benches and upturned dustbins. Boyce won the prestigious Turner Prize in 2011 based on his solo exhibition at Galerie Eva Presenhuber, Zurich, and his Venice exhibition in 2009. Even though these works derived from his Melbourne project, the Turner Prize did not specifically refer to Boyce’s 2008 Australian work, presumably because the project was located far from the cultural centres of the northern hemisphere.

Boyce’s project with KPAP clearly had a local impact. At a tangible level, the three white tree elements of *We are shipwrecked and landlocked* (2008-2010) were eventually gifted to the Queensland Art Gallery and Gallery of Modern Art, Brisbane (QAG & GOMA) by Kaldor Public Art Projects, where they were installed as part of the exhibition *21st Century: Art in the First Decade* (2011). They remain permanently at GOMA.

Boyce’s visit also strengthened artists’ networks. In 2010, the Jane Scally Developing Artist Award was inaugurated, presented by ACCA and Peter Jopling, in memory of his wife. The award enabled a young Australian artist to travel internationally, and to be mentored by an international artist whose work had some relationship to their own. The form of the award built on the important role that international residencies had played in fostering stronger links with artists and artistic networks globally. It also offered the means of financial support for the often conceptually-based, exhibition-driven generation of ‘urban nomad artists’, who resided in one country, but saw the global artworld as their stage. In 2010 the inaugural award was given to Melbourne artists Pat Foster and Jen Berean, who chose to travel to Scotland to study with Boyce. Day had included Foster and Berean in NEW09, an exhibition showcasing new

---


175 For details of the award see ACCA website, [http://www.accaonline.org.au/JaneScallyArtistAward](http://www.accaonline.org.au/JaneScallyArtistAward), accessed January 30, 2012. A selection panel included Max Delany, Monash University Museum of Art Director; artist Lou Hubbard, ACCA Board member, Peter Jopling QC; with ACCA’s Artistic Director Juliana Engberg as convenor and Chair.


Tatzu Nishi, *War and peace and in between* (2009)
exterior and interior views, Art Gallery of New South Wales, Sydney
featuring Gilbert Bayes, *The offerings of peace* (1923)
Photo: Rebecca Coates
commissions by emerging artists held annually at the Australian Centre for Contemporary Art. She had also curated Boyce’s project in Melbourne for KPAP. Her support of the two artists in their approach to Boyce, to secure his mentorship, reflected the wider international networks of the 2009 arts community relative to those of 1969 when Kaldor began presenting projects. As the value of working overseas was increasingly recognized, the support of curators reflected the extended role of independent and institutional curators. They were now part of a more complex, and durable, system of artistic professional development.

In 2009, KPAP invited Japanese artist Tatzu Nishi to present one of his signature installations as JKAP Project 19. Nishi chose to reinvent the two 19th century equestrian sculptures by Gilbert Bayes, The offerings of peace (1923) and The offerings of war (1923), that flank the entrance to the AGNSW for his project War and peace and in between (2009). Subverting the historic public sculptures made of bronze and steel, depicting men of war and symbols of the state on monumental plinths, Nishi instead constructed rooms around the giant bronze figures, a domestic living room and bedroom. Accessed by ladders, they offered a unique view of familiar, or often overlooked, aspects of the Gallery’s entrance. Nishi’s work had been regularly included in international biennale and art museum projects. In 2012, Nicholas Baume presented Discovering Columbus for the Public Art Fund, in N.Y.C. Nishi’s large-scale temporary installation recontextualised Christopher Columbus by placing him in the middle of a contemporary living room, six stories above the street. Like Nishi’s smaller KPAP project, it was a form of large-scale sensational installation art that enabled a playful reconsideration of traditional forms of public sculpture as monument, and revealed the often too familiar aspects of local sites and architectural settings. Roberta Smith noted that the experience possibly was not surrealist enough, though it offered wonderful views of the surrounding city, and a disturbing example of the increasing privatization of public space by the rich and powerful. Unlike Nishi’s monumental project in the urban heart of New York City, KPAP’s project was located in an art museum context. It did not break new ground with the Sydney presentation.

178 NEW09, ACCA, 17 March - 17 May 2009, curator, Charlotte Day; including artists Jen Berean and Pat Foster.

179 Tatsuo Nishi: Discovering Columbus, Public Art Fund, September 20-November 18, 2012. The Columbus Monument was designed by Gaetano Russo and erected in 1892 to commemorate Columbus’s first voyage to the Americas. As part of the project, PAF also oversaw the conservation of the Columbus Monument in association with the New York City Department of Parks & Recreation.

Stephen Vitiello’s project with KPAP reflected another significant trend in contemporary art. Vitiello is a US artist working in the medium of sound installation. He had created significant installations in New York City. Kaldor’s choice reflected a broader interest worldwide towards sound installation. Originally a punk musician, Vitiello was influenced by contemporary artists in the 1990s when he worked firstly with Nam June Paik, and later with Joan Jonas, Tony Ousler and others. His connection with Nam June Paik, an older artist who was well represented in Kaldor’s collection and with whom JKAP had already worked on a 1976 Art Project, may well have influenced KPAP to choose Vitiello rather than other artists. Vitiello had previously shown in Australia, in a collaborative work with Julie Mehretu, at the MCA as part of curator Charles Merewether’s 16th Biennale of Sydney Zones of Contact (2006). Vitiello’s exhibition history was not extensive.

The Sound of Red Earth (2010) was the result of sound recordings captured by the artist on field trips through the Kimberley region of Western Australia. Presented in Sydney Park Brickworks, the historic part-subterranean kilns were enlivened through saturated coloured light and surrounding multi-channeled sound. Vitiello’s use of these well-known, but rarely accessible buildings, enabled visitors to the work and those using the nearby parks to access history that was at once familiar but often overlooked. The choice of subject-matter, however, bringing the outback Australian bush to the city, raised questions about the ability of international artists to create significant new works in a country in which they had spent relatively little time and whose understanding of the complexity of context and site may well be limited. In a lecture to art


185 The Sound of Red Earth, 12 August – 12 September (2010), Sydney Park Brickworks, Sydney. The Birds, 11 August – 12 September (2010), AGNSW.

186 This is a common concern for international artists ‘parachuted’ into international biennale presenting works that are intended to respond to site and context.
Installation view, Sydney Park Brickworks, Sydney
students in 2012, Kaldor noted that he had invited Vitiello to work specifically with the unique Australian bush, which Kaldor had only in recent years come to discover. The soundscapes, whilst evocative, did little to alter perceptions of the historic kilns, or to capture the country’s uniqueness. In contrast, Vitiello’s project created for the New York High Line just prior to his Australian project, *A bell for every minute* (2010) presented in partnership with Creative Time and the New York City Department of Parks & Recreation, was an evocative soundscape of aspects of New York City life so familiar as to be easily missed. He made field recordings all across New York City, making a sound map that captured the daily life in the busy metropolis.

Vitiello also presented part of his Kaldor project under the eaves of the AGNSW portico. *The Birds* (2010) was a cacophony of Australian native bird song for visitors seated on the Gallery benches. Its title was from Daphne du Maurier’s book of the same name, and Alfred Hitchcock’s disturbing black and white film. From KPAP’s perspective, *The Birds* (2010) located Vitiello’s project at the entrance – and exit – of the highly visited art institution, and acted as a means of informing visitors of the other, larger project in a location not normally associated with contemporary art. From AGNSW’s perspective, the project enabled the gallery to present work by an internationally recognized contemporary artist working within the field of sound art.

Vitiello’s performance at AGNSW, working with Australian artist and musician Lawrence English, was part of the public program series. As has been discussed earlier, educational events, such as lectures and symposia, had become an increasing feature of other not-for-profit foundations, such as Fondazione Nicola Trussardi in Milan, or Thyssen Bornemisza Contemporary in Vienna. Presented in partnership with the art institutions co-presenting the

187 Victorian College of the Arts (VCA), Art Forum Series #18: John Kaldor, VCA Federation Hall, Tuesday 25 September, 12.30pm.
Art Projects, KPAP education and public program events formed a part of broader institutional educational programs.

**SANTIAGO SIERRA**

Kaldor’s twenty-second project was Santiago Sierra’s 7 forms measuring 600 x 60 x 60 cm constructed to be held horizontal to a wall (2010), exhibited at Brisbane’s Gallery of Modern Art. This was a work by an artist with a considerable exhibition history in biennales and art museums.¹⁹¹ The artist hired employees at a minimum wage to hold heavy timber beams on their shoulders for the duration of each working day. The work presented varying notions of engagement, actively involving the artist, paid participants, and viewers alike. This project was an extension of earlier projects, such as Group of persons facing a wall (2002) at the Tate Modern Turbine Hall in 2008. For this earlier work, Sierra invited homeless women to line up with their face to the wall. For this they were paid the equivalent of a night at a hostel.¹⁹²

Sierra intended to create a ‘physical portrait of the labor economy’.¹⁹³ Reminiscent of Atlas, the classical figure commanded to carry the weight of the world on his shoulders, the actions of these workers represented for Sierra the ‘social burial’ of labor. Sierra’s projects and installations have been aligned with the term ‘relational aesthetics’, coined by Nicolas Bourriaud in 1996, and widely discussed by Bishop and others to describe socially engaged art that aimed to reveal power structures.¹⁹⁴ However, as Bishop noted, Sierra’s projects were more aesthetic and visually compelling than many of the projects characterized as ‘socially engaged’ art.¹⁹⁵

---


¹⁹² For a discussion of Sierra’s works, see Bishop, ‘Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics’, *October*, 2004, pp. 70-74.


¹⁹⁴ See above p. 11.

¹⁹⁵ See above p. 13.
Santiago Sierra, 7 forms measuring 600 x 60 x 60 cm
constructed to be held horizontal to a wall (2010)
Queensland Art Gallery/Gallery of Modern Art, Brisbane
monolithic spaces of Queensland's Gallery of Modern Art, the massive timber forms of Sierra’s project, raised upon the shoulders of the employed participants, owed more to the Minimalist sculptures of Carl Andre and Donald Judd than a social theory about the erosion of the distinctions between institutional and social space, and artist and viewer.196

Sierra’s performances and installations had often dealt with politicized issues of collectivity, collaboration and direct engagement with specific social groups. Bishop noted in her critique of relational aesthetics in 2004 that neither the work of Sierra or Thomas Hirschhorn was discussed in Bourriaud’s texts of 1998 and 2002.197 Nevertheless, Bourriaud’s approach could easily be applied to Sierra’s focus on relationships – between the artist, the participants and the audience – and his introduction of collaborators from explicitly diverse economic backgrounds. Bishop read Sierra’s work as a ‘nihilistic reflection on Marx’s theory of the exchange value of Labor’.198 Presenting work with such an agenda might seem like a bold approach for a private not-for-profit foundation developed through a successful textile business. However, Sierra’s art was firmly embedded within an international biennale and exhibition frame. As Hito Steyerl noted in an article entitled ‘Politics of Art: Art and the transition to Post-Democracy’ in the online journal e-flux in 2010, ‘a quite absurd, but radical phenomenon, is that radical art is nowadays very often sponsored by the most predatory banks or arms traders and completely embedded in rhetorics of city marketing, branding, and social engineering.’199 As part of an art museum’s program, Sierra’s project reflected the de-radicalisation of much that was described as political art, while at the same time reflecting the neo-liberal underpinnings of their financial structures of support. For GOMA, who had regularly commissioned, showcased and acquired ephemeral, performative and sound based works as part of its Asia Pacific Triennial exhibitions, that was often of a political nature,200 Sierra’s project was immediately recognizable as part of an ongoing engagement with wider social and political debates.

---

For KPAP, the association with the state museum located the ephemeral performance within an overarching program, reducing the risk that the project would get lost in a complex Australian cultural landscape. Location within GOMA’s highly visible, successful and well-attended program of contemporary Australian and international art gave KPAP access to a large and diverse audience. It extended the awareness of the Art Projects to far wider audience than those with a specific interest in site-specific, temporary, or performance based art.

Whilst projects such as Sierra’s could be seen as anti-materialist and politically engaged, creating particular challenges for the art museums or institutions that exhibited them, independent not-for-profit commissioning organisations working beyond the public gallery space such as Artangel in London, and SKOR in the Netherlands, were regularly involved in projects of this kind. KPAP’s presentation of Sierra’s project reflected the Australian foundation’s desire to be considered within this international context. KPAP’s presentation of art that was conspicuously antimarket and socially engaged arguably reflected the influence of the Curatorial Advisory Group.

As with other projects in this period, Sierra’s KPAP project was accompanied by a more extensive series of public lectures, discussions and related educational events. These were held at the Cervantes Institute, Sydney; the National Gallery of Australia, Canberra, and GOMA, Brisbane. The speakers and participants included Australian indigenous artists Richard Bell and re a alongside institutional directors and curators, offering perspectives on the project as

---

201 For details of QAG and GOMA’s program of exhibitions and events under the directorship of Tony Elwood, including the establishment of facilities such as the cinemateque and Children’s Art Centre, innovative programming, and an expanded notion of public programs, see Queensland Art Gallery Annual Report, 2007-08, QAG. Attendance for the period includes 541,226 visitors to QAG and 763,214 visitors to GOMA.

202 Jeremy Deller’s *The Battle of Orgreave*, 17 June 2001, could be seen as a further manifestation of what Bishop described as ‘relational antagonism’ in *Installation*, 2005, p. 120, and other texts. A one day re-enactment of a key event from the English miners’ strike of 1984, video documentation of the event was filmed by Mike Figgis for a one-hour work, commissioned by Artangel Media and Channel 4 Television. Thomas Hirschhorn’s ‘displays’, that took the form of impermanent outdoor ‘monuments’ dedicated to philosophers, makeshift ‘altars’ celebrating writers and artists and other displays of objects and information, were another form of this form of art. Hirschhorn, however, noted that he did not make political art, but rather made art politically. See Thomas Hirschhorn, ‘Interview with Okwui Enwezor’, in James Rondeau and Suzanne Ghez (eds.), *Thomas Hirschhorn: Jumbo Spoons and Big Cake*, The Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago, 2000, p. 27.

part of a wider cultural, political, and artistic debate. For KPAP, with little previous history of involvement with ‘socially engaged art’, the work appeared to be an unlikely choice. However, the associated public program involving Australian artists and critical theorists offered some attempt at relating the politics of the Art Project to a localized social and political debate, even if the inclusion of an indigenous perspective via commentary on another international artist’s work, rather than art itself, could be perceived as too little too late.

JOHN BALDESSARI AND MICHAEL LANDY

Public participation and a strong conceptual focus were key features of two Kaldor projects in 2011. *Your Name in Lights* (2011) was a work by American West-Coast conceptual artist, John Baldessari. Baldessari had been the subject of over two hundred solo exhibitions worldwide, reflecting the pivotal role he had played in the development of conceptual art since the 1960s, and had considerable influence on younger generations through his teaching at the California Institute of the Arts (CalArts). 204 This was underscored in 2009 when he was awarded the Golden Lion at the Venice Biennale for lifetime achievement. 205 In October the same year, the largest-ever solo exhibition of Baldessari’s work was presented at the Tate Modern, London, an exhibition jointly organized by the Los Angeles County Museum of Art in Los Angeles and the Tate Modern, London. 206

204 California Institute of the Arts was founded and created by Walt Disney in the early 1960s, and played a pivotal role in the development of the West Coast contemporary arts. See Calvin Tomkins, ‘No more Boring Art’, *New Yorker*, 18 October 2010, Issue 32, pp. 42-48; see also Michael Baers, ‘Michael Asher (1943-2012): Parting Words and Unfinished Works’, *e-flux journal* #39, November 2012.


John Baldessari, *Your name in lights* (2011)
Australian Museum, Sydney, part of the Sydney Festival
digital illustration
Image: Toby and Pete
For an Australian audience, KPAP’s project brought a major statesman of American West-Coast conceptual art to Australia, bringing Baldessari’s art to the attention of a younger generation of artists and students at first hand. In a melding of public spectacle and online technology, participants whose names had been lodged online could watch them appear for a brief fifteen seconds in lights on a large-scale illuminated billboard on the façade of the Australian Museum’s Williams Street façade. *Your Name in Lights* (2011) offered a contemporary take on Warhol’s fifteen minutes of fame, in a highly public, and publicized social context. It drew on Baldessari’s ongoing interest in Hollywood and film, through his use of imagery and reference to Broadway spectacles and the cinematic tradition, while playfully engaging with Western society’s 21st century obsession with celebrity and fame.

This was not the first time Baldessari had worked with a private foundation on a site-specific commission. In 2010, he created *The Giacometti Variations* for the Fondazione Prada, Milan, curated by Germano Celant, in a project that fused art with fashion.²⁰⁷ Nine 4.5 metre high resin and steel sculptures sprayed with bronze, inspired by the Swiss artist’s emaciated female figures after whom the project was named, were dressed by Baldessari in an unexpected array of costumes and accessories. Ranging from Hollywood Marilyn Monroe-esque glamorous pink satin bows, to Dorothy’s *Wizard of Oz* red glitter shoes, they offered an unusual take on luxury fashion and contemporary art, with Baldessari’s signature flourishes of Hollywood glamour and celebrity obsession.²⁰⁸ KPAP’s project with Baldessari in 2010 located KPAP’s project firmly alongside other international projects such as Prada’s, creating unique temporary projects with leading contemporary artists of the time.

For Australian audiences, the work held more popular appeal than critical artistic experience. The work was presented in conjunction with the Sydney Festival in January 2011. The second collaboration between KPAP and the Sydney Festival, like Jeff Koons’ *Puppy* in 1995, the project enabled KPAP to attract a wider, and more populist general audience for an installation that was at once fun and lighthearted, while also presenting the work of a leading international contemporary art figure. The choice of artist, however, like Koons in 1995, took few risks. Like Koons, the artist had a vast exhibition history and following, was widely collected by both public

---

²⁰⁷ On the approach of the Prada Foundation, see above p. 68.
²⁰⁸ See Loredana Mascheroni, ‘John Baldessari at the Prada Foundation’, *domus*, 4 November 2010.
and private institutions, and was the subject of extensive writing and criticism within the artworld. KPAP offered a popular, and arguably populist, public project by a revered and popular artist. The Summer edition of *Art & Australia* featured a special cover commission designed by Baldessari, and, as in the past, it included a lengthy interview between the artist and editor Michael Fitzgerald. \(^{209}\) International art criticism for the Australian project was scant.

In June 2011, Baldessari’s *Your Name in Lights* was presented for a second time in Amsterdam by The Stedelijk Museum, together with the Holland Festival. \(^{210}\) The work was installed in Amsterdam’s Museumplein, in front of the annex of the Stedelijk Museum that was under construction. As was the case with Sydney, the work could also be watched online, via a live stream on a dedicated website. For a museum under construction, Baldessari’s large-scale, inclusive public art project, offered a highly visible form of art by a leading contemporary artist. The choice of artist also alluded to the institution’s history presenting avant-garde and conceptual art. \(^{211}\) Auspiced as part of a major national festival, it reached a far wider local audience. However, for an artist of Baldessari’s reputation and position within the international artworld, the project, in either Sydney or Amsterdam, could not hope to reflect the breadth of Baldessari’s art. Nor could it have the same impact on increasingly sophisticated and knowledgeable art audiences as a major survey exhibition of the artist’s work, such as Baldessari’s exhibition *Pure Beauty* (2010), organized by the Tate Modern and Los Angeles County Museum, readily accessible globally through images, podcasts, extensive website resources, and exhibition catalogues distributed quickly and cheaply via booksellers online.

Later in 2011, British artist Michael Landy staged the twenty-fourth Kaldor Public Art Project *Acts of Kindness* in September – October 2011 in central Sydney. \(^{212}\) The work was first conceived by Landy at the time he produced *Break Down* (2001), when he was systematically destroying all his worldly goods. In June 2011, some ten years later, *Acts of Kindness* was presented to regular commuters using London’s Green Park Station in June 2011. \(^{213}\) For Sydney, *Acts of Kindness*

---


John Baldessari and Michael Landy

investigate[d] the meaning of kindness in today’s fast-paced world, focusing on the simple everyday gestures of compassion and generosity that occur throughout the city streets and often go unnoticed. Members of the Sydney public were invited to send in stories of kindness via email and other social media networks. A thirteen-metre installation in St Martin Place mapped the Sydney CBD and indicated the location of two hundred stories of kindness. Like KPAP projects with Sierra (2010) and Baldessari (2011), the work was socially inclusive and participatory. And like Baldessari’s project, the work took place outside of the gallery space.

Why a project with Landy at this time in his career? Landy was best known as one of the generation of British artists in the 1990s who became known as the yBa generation. Having studied at Goldsmiths College London, and included in Damian Hirst’s group exhibition Freeze (1988), the group of young British artists achieved critical fame for their shock tactics, use of everyday materials, and the quality and ‘newness’ of certain iconic pieces of their work. Like many artists in Britain in the 1990s, as Rainbird has noted, Landy’s work caught the mood of social change, labor market reform and political ideological debate at the tail end of the Thatcher era. In 1997, Landy was included in Saatchi’s Sensation exhibition at the Royal Academy of the Arts, London (1997), alongside other contemporaries of this generation including Damien Hirst, Garry Hume, Sarah Lucas, Tracey Emin and Gillian Wearing. His most notable and breakthrough work, however, had been his performance and installation Break Down (February 2001), commissioned by Artangel, in which he made an inventory of everything he owned and then destroyed it during a fourteen day undertaking in the former C&A department store on London’s shopping mecca, Oxford Street. This work examined notions of value and waste,

215 For a discussion of socially engaged participatory art, see above p. 13.
218 Michael Landy, Break Down, February 2001, Former C&A Store, Oxford Street, London W1. ‘Landy proposed his project to Artangel via The Times/Artangel Open, conceived to give artists a unique opportunity to realise unusually ambitious projects. For the first time Artangel opened the doors for proposals from artists, rather than inviting them individually. Some seven-hundred proposals were tendered. Break Down was selected by a panel comprising Brian Eno, Rachel Whiteread, Richard Cork and
human labour and worth in a 21st century Western society. Presented in a high street shop front of a well-known London department store during a period of rapid economic growth under new Labor, Landy’s project questioned his society’s increasingly consumerist behavior.

Kaldor’s association with Landy stemmed from the experience of Break Down (2001). The publicity surrounding the work, and its subsequent artistic impact, played an important role in Kaldor’s decision to invite Landy to make a project in Australia. Kaldor reminisced that he visited Break Down (2001) at eight in the morning, before the work had opened to the public, a testament to Kaldor’s tenacity, and his authority as a significant collector and patron of contemporary art. His parting gift to the artist, a publication on the foundation, Kaldor Art Projects, and the projects it had presented, was subsequently destroyed once it became part of Landy’s possessions. Landy’s project crossed the line between art and life. Produced in part in response to the market-driven ‘Cool Britannia’ entrepreneurship of the day, Landy’s project made use of the vast commercial space that had become available for use through the economic downturn of the 1990s. For Kaldor, Landy’s work appeared a perfect fusion of the spectacular and the every-day, made in direct response to its site and context.

Kaldor’s experience of Break Down (2001) played a pivotal role in his relationship with Landy, both as a collector and patron and as instigator and artistic director of Kaldor Art Projects. As the friendship developed, and Kaldor continued to purchase work by the artist, they began discussions about Landy making a project in Australia. On a number of visits to Australia, various projects were suggested, though it took ten years from their first meeting to bring the 2011 project to fruition. Kaldor’s persistence reflected his commitment to the artist, which appeared to be consolidated through a better knowledge over time and acquisition of his work.


222 Kaldor describes their relationship as a friendship. Landy accompanied his partner, fellow yBa artist Gillian Wearing, to Australia at the time of her exhibition Living Proof, October 7 – December 3, 2006, at the Australian Centre for Contemporary Art. See KPAP, ‘Michael Landy and John Kaldor interview’, 2011; and Meacham, ‘Creative act of kindness’, Sydney Morning Herald, 2011.
detail from Michael Landy's original drawing for *Acts of Kindness* (2011), showing the lower Martin Place location of his 13-metre-long installation for the project.
Photo: Paul Green
It also reflected the desire to present work in Australia by an artist who had achieved major international acclaim for a project that championed the artist’s anti-consumerist values, largely enabled through the support of market led cultural enterprise and private foundations.

Landy produced significant solo and group exhibitions in the intervening years since Kaldor first approached him to make a project, including solo exhibitions at The Tate Britain (2004), the South London Gallery (2010), and London’s National Portrait Gallery (2011). His work was also included in significant group exhibitions including the Fondazione Palazzo Strozzi, Florence (2008), de Appel, Amsterdam (2008), and Palais de Tokyo, Paris (2010). None, however, achieved the international press or critical response of his early project with Artangel in 2001. While Landy’s work continued to explore and develop themes from this early project, his close association with a particular historic artistic and cultural period made it difficult to read later works as part of a more contemporary zeitgeist.

Landy’s project with Kaldor in 2011 was not the first time he had shown in Sydney. Kaldor was closely associated with this earlier visit and exhibition. In 2007, Landy presented an exhibition at Sydney’s Sherman Galleries, then a commercial gallery, entitled *Man in Oxford Street is Auto-Destructive.* It included etchings and drawings from his *Nourishment* (2002) series, depicting common weeds gathered from urban spaces, and a body of drawings from the *H.2.N.Y. Self Destroying Work of Art* (2006) series, based on sculptor Jean Tinguely’s self-destructing machine, *Homage to New York*, which the latter constructed in the garden of the Museum of Modern Art in 1960. Works from both of these series had been collected by Kaldor, and were subsequently gifted to the AGNSW. They were hung as part of the opening display of work from the John Kaldor Family Collection, Tunnicliffe, *John Kaldor Family Collection*, 2011.

---


225 XXIV Bienal de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil (2002); *Bad Behavior*, Arts Council Collection touring exhibition from the Hayward Collection (2004); *Art, Price and Value*, Fondazione palazzo Strozzi, Florence (2008); *To Burn Oneself with Oneself: The Romantic Damage Show*, de Appel, Amsterdam, Netherlands (2008); *Fresh Hell*, Palais de Tokyo, Paris (2010).


228 See Landy works as part of the John Kaldor Family Collection, Tunnicliffe, *John Kaldor Family Collection*, 2011.
Kaldor Family Collection, and featured in the background to Landy’s videod discussions about his forthcoming Kaldor Public Art Project.\textsuperscript{229} Presumably this was intended to acknowledge the relationship between Kaldor’s personal collection, and KPAP projects, state art institutions, and the location of Landy’s project within the history of KPAP itself. While attracting popular press, neither project was critically reviewed.\textsuperscript{230} The timing of Landy’s project, his strong association with an earlier generation of British artists, and the fact that the installation did not break new ground for Landy himself, meant that the work left little cultural trace.

In 2012, as Britain suffered under Conservative budgetary cuts and the effects of the 2011 global recession, Landy’s \textit{Acts of Kindness} was presented again as the London Underground Project, part of a series of art projects in the lead-up to the 2012 London Olympic Games. As in Sydney, commuters were invited to log incidents of kindness that would be used as a form of public art, commissioned for the top of bus shelters to herald the Olympics. The work was described as ‘feelgood art’; journalists noting that the desire of the artists to ‘cheer people up’ was at odds with their past tactics of delighting to shock.\textsuperscript{231} As Landy noted, the idea for the project came to him before the global financial crisis.\textsuperscript{232} It, like other projects presented in early 2012 by artists including Jeremy Deller, Martin Creed and David Shrigley, were easy to read as a message to Britain to ‘Keep Calm and Carry On’ – much like the public campaigns devised in Britain during the Second World War, or those used to later effect by British advertising agency Saatchi \& Saatchi.\textsuperscript{233} The presentation of a quieter, community based art, such as Landy’s \textit{Acts of Kindness}, gained far greater potency presented in this social climate, and read in a revised economic and historic light.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{229} Kaldor Public Art Project, 2011, Episode 2; and AGNSW You Tube footage of Landy’s talk, art \textit{After Hours}, June 2011, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tq9HDaDLqae, accessed September 8, 2011.
\item \textsuperscript{230} The work received bylines in a number of local newspapers, and one article, see Meacham, ‘Creative act of kindness’, Sydney \textit{Morning Herald}, 2011; Bridget Cormack, ‘Landy’s subversive acts of pure kindness’, \textit{The Australian}, September 23, 2011.
\item \textsuperscript{232} Thorpe, ‘Feelgood art’, \textit{The Guardian}, 2012.
\item \textsuperscript{233} Saatchi \& Saatchi developed the campaign ‘Labour isn’t working’ for the British Conservative Party in 1978.
\end{itemize}
THOMAS DEMAND

Thomas Demand’s *The Dailies* (2012), KPAP’s 25th project, was presented within the Commercial Travellers’ Association (CTA) club, Sydney, part of the MLC Centre designed by Australian architect Harry Seidler in the mid-1970s. Though Demand found the building himself whilst on a site-visit to Australia, both Harry and Penelope Seidler had been keen supporters of Kaldor’s Art Projects since *Wrapped Coast* (1969). Like Kaldor, Seidler had been a vocal advocate for change in the Australian cultural landscape. Demand noted that he was drawn to the building not only for its architectural form and late Modernist history, but also because no-one he spoke to knew its actual function, even though it was in one of Sydney CBD’s busiest thoroughfares. It was a building that was invisible in plain view, much like the often insignificant or overlooked objects and moments that Demand captured on film.

Since the 1990s, Demand had been known for his full-scale recreations of environments made entirely from paper and card, carefully photographed and then later destroyed, so that they remained only as images. Drawing on an accumulated archive of found and discovered images, often gathered from newspapers and other media sources from every-day life, Demand’s photographic image-making was discussed as a form of ‘national self-understanding’, and in relation to the way images can contribute to the collective memory of places and events. Demand’s 2009 exhibition, *Nationalgalerie* at Neue Nationalgalerie, Berlin, presented work from the last fifteen years developed from key images of decisive political events and moments that offered a different vision of this post-war history. Other subjects included the American White House Oval Office, and the control room from the Fukushima Nuclear Plant that workers were forced to evacuate after the tsunami of March 11, 2011. Whilst Demand’s photographs of these realistic scenes appeared like veracious images of a particular time and place, closer

---

234 For Kaldor’s early involvement with the Seidlers, see above p. 98.

235 Thomas Demand, free public talk, National Gallery of Victoria, 24 March 2012.

236 For a detailed analysis of the significance of photography, and Thomas Demand, see Michael Fried, *Why Photography Matters as Art as Never Before*, Yale University Press, 2008.


inspection revealed a subtle manipulation of the original source. Demand highlighted the insignificant aspect, such as the patterning of ceiling panels that hung in random sculptural forms from the Fukushima control room ceiling. Photographs of the paper model of the image revealed subtle imperfections that indicated the photograph's artifice. They enabled the viewer to question the process of cultural mythmaking which framed the original source material.

Demand’s photographs and films were the subject of numerous large-scale solo international exhibitions. His photographs, method and material were the focus of extensive critical texts, particularly with respect to the shift of the photographic medium into the broader field of contemporary art. His work was extensively collected, both by public art institutions and private collectors alike. At the time of Demand’s KPAP project, at an institutional level in Australia, his work was included in the permanent collections at the NGV and GOMA, whilst a work by Demand had recently been donated to the NGA. The AGNSW held five works by Demand as part of the John Kaldor Family Collection. Kaldor began collecting Demand’s films ‘at a time when there weren’t many to collect’, and his gift to the AGNSW included one of these film works. As Demand noted in his interview with Fitzgerald, from this early association as a collector, Kaldor went on to suggest the idea of an art project.

Demand had previously worked with other international foundations commissioning site-specific and temporary art projects. These included his installation and exhibition Processo grottesco (2007), presented by the Fondazione Prada and shown during the 2007 Venice Biennale. In 2011, Demand again collaborated with the Fondazione Prada on the installation of their inaugural exhibition at Ca’ Corner della Regina, their new exhibition space in Venice, which was opened to

---


242 GOMA, purchased 2008; NGV, acquired 2010; Demand work gifted to the NGA by Rupert Myer, though not listed on the NGA collection website April 27, 2012.

243 For details of ANGSW collection works see Tunnicliffe, John Kaldor Family Collection, 2011.


245 See above p. 85.
Thomas Demand, *The Dailies* (2012)
Harry Seidler, Commercial Travellers Association (CTA) club, St Martin’s Place, Sydney
Photo: Rebecca Coates.

Thomas Demand, *The Dailies* (2012)
interior view, Commercial Travellers Association club, St Martin’s Place, Sydney
Photo: Rebecca Coates.
coincide with the 2011 Venice Biennale.\textsuperscript{246} Whilst the exhibition included wallpaper conceived by Demand, extending his interest in a medium first explored as part of his Serpentine Gallery exhibition in 2006, it also enabled the artist to develop his interest in curating the work and collections of others.\textsuperscript{247}

For Kaldor, the project further developed his interest in the artist, first reflected in the acquisition of Demand’s work. It demonstrated KPAP’s ability to interest internationally recognized artists in presenting often site-specific temporary projects in Australia. Given the close involvement of artists such as Demand, Landy, Boyce, Nishi, Vitiello and Baldessari with other internationally recognized private foundations, such as the Fondazione Prada, the Demand project reflected KPAP’s increasingly visible standing in a globalized contemporary artworld.

As with many of Demand’s previous works, Seidler’s CTC building and its location played a pivotal role. A unique Australian element – whether the Australian coastline of Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s \textit{Wrapped Coast} (1969), the setting of Bondi Beach for Schneider’s \textit{21 Beach cells} (2007), or Seidler’s particular form of Australian Modernist architecture that Demand employed – differentiated each project from similar works by these artists in other parts of the world. Demand had previously developed the idea of installations in which to present his photographic works. For his exhibition at the Neu Nationalgalerie in 2009, Demand hung photographs in front of curtains that mimicked the interior design of Lily Roth. For his exhibition at the Serpentine Gallery London in 2006, he collaborated with designers to create an intimate and domestic feeling to the spaces, presenting photographs on walls hung with William Morris wallpaper.\textsuperscript{248} Demand’s project in Sydney occupied the entire fourth floor of the hotel and was presented in fifteen of the sixteen bedrooms that radiated out from a central lift and circular internal corridor. The bedrooms’ institutional Modernist anonymity particularly appealed to Demand.\textsuperscript{249} In an article in \textit{Artforum} in October 2012, Sylvia Lavin located Demand’s KPAP

\textsuperscript{246}For details of the site, exhibition, and history, see Fondazione Prada, \url{http://www.prada.com/fondazione/cacorner/index.html#en/exib_page}, accessed June 12, 2012.


\textsuperscript{248}\textit{Thomas Demand}, 6 June – 20 August 2006. The catalogue included essays by Beatriz Colomina and a conversation between Alexander Kluge and Thomas Demand.

\textsuperscript{249}Thomas Demand, free public talk, National Gallery of Victoria, 24 March 2012, with introductions by Gerard Vaughan, Director of the NGV, and Rupert Myer, Chair of KPAP.
project within the broader development of contemporary pavilions.\textsuperscript{250} For Lavin, Demand’s project exemplified the shift towards a form of contemporary pavilion in which the art and architecture had become seamlessly fused.

Like Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s \textit{Wrapped Coast} (1969), Demand’s work was truly site-specific and temporal. The building offered a unique experience for viewing this series of Demand’s photographs, \textit{The Dailies}. Demand replaced the flat screen TV – the only concession to modernization in the rooms – with one of \textit{The Dailies} photographs. Each work was chosen for its relationship with specific architectural details in the room, or visual associations with outside elements visible from the window.

For the Kaldor Public Art Project, Demand continued his series \textit{The Dailies}, which he had started working on three years previously.\textsuperscript{251} Like earlier work, these images focused on the invisible spaces of our modern cities: aspects that are often so familiar they become invisible. Cigarette butts in ashtrays, discarded take-away cups, and ‘Do Not Disturb’ signs are small and often banal details that form part of every-day modern life but are often overlooked. Demand constructed models of such details that he observed and photographed while walking the streets. Like his other photographs, they formed a series of scenes and associations normally filtered from consciousness and created memory. By rendering them in card and paper, Demand made the everyday and familiar both interesting and unsettling, ‘fixing’ these ephemeral details in our memory.

The title of the series referred to cinematic and photographic traditions. More specifically, it referred to the rushes of films: images left over on the cutting room floor after each day’s editing. Moving in 2012 to Los Angeles, to a location steeped in the traditions of cinema and film, this new context no doubt enabled Demand to further develop his interest in cinematic traditions.\textsuperscript{252}

\textsuperscript{250} Sylvia Lavin, ‘Vanishing Point, the contemporary pavilion’, \textit{Artforum}, 2012.

\textsuperscript{251} \textit{The Dailies} was also shown at Sprüth Magers, a commercial gallery in London, at the same time as the KPAP project in Sydney. Waters, 2012. \textit{The Telegraph} website, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/art/art-reviews/9208678/Thomas-Demand-The-Dailies-Spruth-Magers-review.html, accessed April 25, 2012.

In *The Dailies* Demand continued to explore new developments through his work. He extended his photographic techniques to use a dye-transfer printing process that employs gelatin to fix dyes to normal, matt paper.\(^{253}\) The technique is more commonly associated with costly advertising processes because of the vividness of colour. Demand noted that only a small number of experts are still able to make these prints.\(^{254}\) Like Tacita Dean, whose 16mm films also explored notions of time, and with whom Demand shared a studio in Berlin, Demand's exploration of obsolete photographic and cinematic techniques became an integral element of his artistic process.

For the KPAP project, Demand not only presented a series of photographic works on which he had been working, but also collaborated with others in a form of exhibition-making and manipulation of narrative. The project extended Demand's interest in site-specific installations that included collaborations with literature, decorative arts, fashion and design.\(^{255}\) As well as their architectural context, *The Dailies* (2012) involved two other contributors. Novelist and retired lawyer, Louis Begley, created a short story about a commercial traveller’s dream-state visit to the CTA. Fragments of the story, *Gregor in Sydney*, were printed and laminated and left in each room propped up on the desk, replacing the usual hotel instructions left for visitors. Miuccia Prada, whose private Fondazione Prada had commissioned Demand to make projects in the past, created a unique scent for each room, which subtly added to the atmosphere of each space. Demand noted that collaborative aspect playfully acknowledged the location of Seidler's Sydney building, surrounded by luxury goods stores such as Prada, Bulgari, and the headquarters of several major banks.\(^{256}\) It also reflected Demand's position within the global art world, as an important artist with whom celebrity writers, architects, designers and creators of luxury goods willingly worked.

In many ways, the Demand project brought KPAP full circle to its origins. The project worked with a building designed by Seidler, one of Kaldor’s early associates and friends. Like Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s *Wrapped Coast* (1969), it was a truly site specific work with important artist

\(^{253}\) Demand discussed this process at length in his Melbourne talk, March 24, 2012. Also discussed by Florence Waters, 'Thomas Demand: *The Dailies*,' Sprüth Magers, review, *The Telegraph*, 17 April 2012.

\(^{254}\) Thomas Demand, Melbourne talk, March 24, 2012.

\(^{255}\) Demand used wallpaper and domestic design elements as part of his installations at the Serpentine Gallery, London, and at the first Prada Foundation exhibition in their new gallery space in Venice in 2011. His installation at the Neue Nationalgalerie in Berlin (2009 – 2010) employed a complex installation of curtains as a background for his work. See Demand, *Thomas Demand*, 2009 for details.

\(^{256}\) Thomas Demand, Melbourne talk, March 24, 2012.
elements that could never be captured again. Like *Wrapped Coast* (1969), and unlike many of the intervening projects, it was a significant work for the development of the artist’s practice. Unlike Christo and Jeanne-Claude, Demand’s work did not attract significant public attention, but then it lacked a spectacular public site, and the contemporary art world was somewhat more crowded.
CHAPTER EIGHT: CONCLUSIONS

EVOLVING FOCUS OF KPAP AND OTHER FOUNDATIONS

The role of KPAP and other foundations in a global contemporary art world has evolved over the last forty years. The key periods of KPAP’s development all had a different focus. Each was triggered by broader developments in contemporary art. In each case KPAP wanted to present experiences that were not otherwise available in Australia, but did so, and adopted different models, with varying degrees of success. Its wider significance should be evaluated against this background.

During the period 1969-1977, Kaldor presented a series of projects that explored post-sculptural practice and performance art. Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s *Wrapped Coast* (1969) became a global landmark in the emergence of site-specific, ephemeral practice. It, and other projects, had a substantial impact on the development of Australian contemporary art. Ephemeral artwork, often outside the gallery, was still a relatively recent phenomenon, and though well understood by artists and the small artistic community, was largely beyond the experience of wider audiences. Within an international context, Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s *Wrapped Coast* (1969) formed part of a broader artistic trend, through the creation of ambitious, sometimes site-specific, temporary and permanent installations known as Land Art. Many were supported by Dia Art Foundation. Similarly, Szemann’s exhibition, *I want to leave a nice well-done child here* (1971) was a ground-breaking exhibition of conceptual art in Australia. Subsequent projects between 1972-1977 with international artists making or presenting existing works – including Gilbert & George, Nam June Paik, Sol LeWitt and Richard Long – while significant, had a declining impact. International contemporary art was increasingly accessible in Australia through artist-led, and institutional avenues as Australian public art museums matured.

In the years between 1978-1994, only two projects were presented, each with mixed success. Kaldor, meanwhile, was focused on the pursuit of other business and participatory activities. He continued to collect. Overseas, Artangel, Creative Time and the Public Art Fund began commissioning public art projects in urban contexts that were often demonstrably socially engaged. Towards the end of this period, these foundations professionalised, moved beyond their founders, increased the scope of their ambitions, and began to present work that was increasingly responsive to its site and wider contemporary art trends. Such temporary works
often had lasting impact because they lodged themselves in the cultural memory – precisely because they lacked an ongoing, physical reality.

Between 1995-2004, Kaldor renewed his interest in the Art Projects, which became more publicly linked with Kaldor’s own developing personal collection. Several Art Projects were delivered in conjunction with an art museum exhibition of the artist’s collectable works, usually drawing on works from Kaldor’s, and later Milgrom’s, personal collection. This created contemporary art experiences for Australian audiences that differed from both installations offered within the context of biennales, whose presence in Australia was increasing, and public art museum exhibitions, also growing in significance and stature as budgets and the ability to borrow works from a range of different sources grew. Exhibitions drawn from Kaldor’s personal collection were shown at state galleries and art museums, such as the exhibition curated by Baume in 1995 at the MCA, and by Free in 2003 at the AGSA. These reinforced the connections between Kaldor’s private and public art activities. The entwined public projects and private collection reflected the rise in status of contemporary art collectors around the world, and the public awareness of contemporary art. Meanwhile, foundations worldwide were increasingly visible players in a global contemporary art world, presenting large-scale installations that often became central to the development of contemporary art. New foundations emerged such as PEER, the Fondazione Nicola Trussardi, Prada Foundation, and Thyssen Bornemisza Art Contemporary (T-B A21). Installation art became more important in the evolution of biennales, and coincided with the development of a new generation of public art spaces, often in disused industrial buildings, that generated a new form of institutional debate. Both biennales and these new spaces were well suited to presenting large-scale temporary works. These trends combined as foundations increasingly presented signature installations in association with biennales.

From 2005, KPAP projects reflected the rising importance of other international foundations with similar aims. Most KPAP projects presented artists who already had a substantial track record with these international foundations. In order to strengthen its links with these other institutions, and reflecting structures that international foundations had generally adopted several years earlier, KPAP became more professionalised in its processes and developed a Curatorial Advisory Group. As a result, KPAP focused on artists already well-established and key players in the global contemporary art world, rather than those who were ahead of the trend. With the exception of Kaldor’s first Art Project, Wrapped Coast (1969), within an international context, KPAP was a follower, not a risk-taker or maker of reputations. Within a local context, KPAP’s initiatives presented a number of international contemporary artists in partnership with other art
The rise of biennales in Australia created other more compelling venues for large-scale installations and spectacular artworks. The curatorial themes of successive biennale exhibitions also enabled a more complex framing of specific contemporary works. Coupled with the increasing mobility of international art and artists, foundations such as KPAP were no longer distinctive or essential to large-scale immersive installations and temporary art experiences. Consequently, KPAP – following similar international foundations – looked for projects that more consciously interconnected with sites and contexts. Foundations, including KPAP, increasingly sought to present projects that would be unique, unrepeatable, and offer a different experience for those who saw the project. In this they can be seen to have not only facilitated major ephemeral artworks, but generated many of them. At the same time, educational presence and online platforms were improved, offering audiences a means of extending their engagement with the art through different formats and means.

The initiators of foundations presenting temporary installations and site-specific projects had a variety of motives and influences. As this thesis has demonstrated, some sought political shifts through socially engaged art. Others, at least in part, saw temporary installations as a vehicle for culturally-led renewal. All, including JKAP, saw temporary projects and installations as being at the cutting edge of global contemporary art, and wanted to be associated with these developments. Many, including Kaldor, both collected art and presented projects, often by the same artists. For some, presenting art projects by the leading international artists was itself a form of collecting, which not only made for an enriching quasi-collaborative experience, but also conferred ever higher social status precisely because the ephemeral, or temporary, nature of these projects made them far more difficult to collect.

PROFESSIONALIZATION

From its inception in 1969 as John Kaldor Art Projects (JKAP) to its most recent development as Kaldor Public Art Projects (KPAP) in 2009, this private foundation changed and professionalised. These shifts were in keeping with increased professionalisation within art organisations at the time, and the later development of independent not-for-profit organisations supporting site-specific temporary art projects that developed independently of institutional art spaces. All developed extremely well-connected advisory boards of international curators and art professionals. Almost all were fronted by a curator or artistic director with substantial presence and expertise in a global art world, often with multiple appointments in several countries. This thesis has shown that John Kaldor’s role also evolved from project co-ordinator and manager, to
Institutional positioning of the Art Projects

curator, to a position from 2008 that was no longer ‘hands on’,¹ but remained analogous, perhaps, to an ‘artistic director’. Unlike other international foundations, however, the founder of JKAP retained visible responsibility for the key artistic choices of artists and projects.

INSTITUTIONAL POSITIONING OF THE ART PROJECTS

JKAP has been closely aligned with public state art institutions from its inception to the present day. This was consistent with the practice of other foundations which also aligned themselves with public art institutions, particularly contemporary art events such as biennales. Many were also engaged with public art museums, at least through overlapping personnel.

Kaldor’s first engagement with state galleries came through the agreement that the directors of the AGNSW and NGV would judge and present the Alcorso-Sekers Sculpture Prize. Kaldor’s example was his mentor, Alcorso, whose 1947 Modernage exhibition catalogue featured essays by the then-director of AGNSW, Hal Missingham.

From the first project in 1969, there was a symbiotic relationship between Australia’s state art museums and Kaldor’s Art Projects. This extended to Kaldor himself and his developing collection of mostly international contemporary art. Kaldor’s strongest relationships were with AGNSW, NGV and the MCA, each of whom provided him with venues to stage art projects. Kaldor brought to these projects his relationships with leading contemporary artists, often created by collecting their works, his reputation for staging Art Projects; and his support, all of which assisted these institutions to present work by leading international artists as part of their program. KPAP provided the institutions with works and relationships with artists that they might not have otherwise been able to develop. The Kaldor Art Projects brand itself added to the cachet of the projects. There was a showmanship and an excitement to early projects, on which Kaldor consciously built. Not surprisingly, art gallery directors were keen to collaborate with Kaldor’s projects.² For the institutions, contact and connection with a collector and patron represented links with a wealthy collector, who was a potential donor of funds or work.

AGNSW’s acceptance of Kaldor’s collection, and its construction of a permanent space to

¹ Kaldor in Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 20.
² Eg, Peter Laverty, Director of AGNSW 1971 to 1978: Baume, 1995, p. 31.
exhibit that collection, provided official recognition of the importance of Kaldor’s contribution to contemporary art in Australia.

Of course, there was a price. As a result of the projects, a private individual was able to influence the direction of state art museums’ exhibition programs. The projects inevitably diverted funds and staff resources from what might otherwise have been the institution’s own priorities.

This thesis has argued that the relationship between these institutions and Kaldor was reinforced by his personal participation in the institutions themselves. Kaldor was a trustee of the AGNSW from 1978-1980; a board member of the MCA from 1996 and Chair from 1997-2002; a board member of the Biennale of Sydney from 2000-2008; and Commissioner for Australia at the Venice Biennale in 2005 and 2007. In 2005 he was also a member of the International Council of the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA), New York, and the Tate Modern in London. These appointments acknowledged the contribution that Kaldor had made to contemporary art through his public Art Projects, his role as a collector, and also ensured the ongoing working relationship between the patron and the institution.

As shown in Table 1, the vast majority of KPAP’s projects were directly linked to public galleries and institutions. Of the twenty-five projects to 2012, fourteen were held at a major public gallery, another five had an associated exhibition at a major public gallery, and three others were organized in conjunction with public institutions (RMIT University, MIAF, and the Sydney Festival). Only three projects were truly ‘stand alone’ with no link to a public institution (Urs Fischer, Gregor Schneider and Thomas Demand). KPAP had been shown to have a broad reach. By 2012 (and including the Journey to Now exhibition reviewing the projects in 2003 at the AGSA), KPAP had worked with a major public gallery in each of the mainland state capitals.
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4 Noted in Biennale of Sydney exhibition catalogues.
5 Australia Council website, http://www.australiacouncil.gov.au/news/items/pre-2010/australian_commissioner_for_2007_venice_biennale, accessed April 12, 2012. Membership of these international councils was highly prestigious, by invitation only, and was taken as a sign of the public service contribution that an individual had made to the visual arts in their own country. Other Australian members of the International Council of MoMA included Ann Lewis (1972); Penelope Seidler (1973); and most recently Simon and Catriona Mordant, Chair of the MCA, Sydney, and Commissioner of the Australian Pavilion for the Venice Biennale, 2011, 2013. For a discussion of Ann Lewis’s role, see Leon Paroissien, ‘Ann Lewis Patron and Collector’, Art & Australia, Spring 1996, Vol 34, p. 54-63.
There are discernable patterns in KPAP's institutional partnerships. Not surprisingly, given Kaldor’s base in Sydney, fourteen projects involved NSW art institutions, with five projects involving Victorian public art institutions. Projects between 1969 and 1990 principally involved the AGNSW and the NGV. Between 1995 and 2003, KPAP collaborated principally with the MCA, overlapping with Kaldor’s appointment as Chair of the MCA board between 1997 and 2002. In more recent years, KPAP collaborated less with state art galleries, and more with festivals. This reflected the global shift towards projects that responded more specifically to particular sites, which thus tended not to be gallery spaces or art museums. It also reflected a desire to engage with audiences beyond the specific realm of contemporary art.

These relationships with institutions were valuable to Kaldor in a number of ways. They increased the status of his projects and his collection, both locally and internationally. They attracted audiences and conferred status on him in contemporary art circles. Kaldor’s ability to place Art Projects in major state art museum programs gave him a certain status when making connections with artists and institutions globally for future projects. Many of the projects used spaces that state art museums controlled. And they often contributed in kind or financially to the projects that appeared under Kaldor’s name. For Kaldor, institutional participation implicitly endorsed the artistic value of his Art Projects and effectively canonized the works. Senior art institution personnel regularly wrote extended essays for publications about Art Projects, often in their dual capacity as critics for local newspapers or magazines (including those not presented in the spaces of public institutions). These personnel often became involved in the governance of KPAP, giving support and informal advice.

Daniel Thomas, Senior Curator and Curator of Australian Art at the time of Gilbert & George’s project in 1973, was a keen supporter and advocate of both emerging artforms and Kaldor’s initiatives. As an institutional curator, and trained art historian, he was well aware of the changing nature of exhibition-making and the need for the AGNSW to be able to present more of the notable developments in international contemporary art. He wrote extensively on the first two John Kaldor Art Projects, those with Christo and Jeanne-Claude (1969) and Harald Szeemann (1971), and on Gilbert & George’s project in 1973 in his role as *Sydney Morning Herald* art critic. Thomas also wrote on other projects between 1973-1984. KPAP’s Curatorial
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Advisory Group included Nicholas Baume, who had been curator of the Kaldor collection before becoming curator at the MCA from 1993-1998. Many of KPAP’s staff had been staff or freelancers working at public art museums.

Public art institutions were also important in writing the history of KPAP itself, affirming its place in the official canon of Australian art. Four exhibitions in twenty years at public art institutions highlighted either Kaldor’s personal collection or the history of the Art Projects: the Christo and Jeanne-Claude retrospective at the AGNSW in 1990; the MCA’s exhibition in association with Koons’ Puppy in 1995; the exhibition at the AGSA, Journey to Now; and the exhibition at the AGNSW commemorating forty years of KPAP, in conjunction with the announcement of the substantial gift from Kaldor’s personal collection in 2009. Each of these exhibitions was accompanied by an exhibition catalogue, published by the Gallery, with essays by public gallery curators who worked on the shows. Public art museum curators and directors also wrote articles that focused on Kaldor’s role as patron and collector. These included articles by Thomas in *Art & Australia* and Capon in *Vogue Australia*.

The relationship between the institutions and John Kaldor was further consolidated through his collection. Works from the collection were shown in institutional exhibitions in conjunction with KPAP projects such as Christo (1990), Koons (1995), Rondinone (2003), *Journey from Now* (2003), and *40 Years* (2009). The collection was stored by the MCA for many years while Kaldor was on the board. In 2008, John Kaldor announced the gift of part of his private collection to the AGNSW, to be known as the John Kaldor Family Collection, in acknowledgement of the tacit support for the gift from his children, who would otherwise have benefited from the work. The gift included works by all of the artists whose projects feature in KPAP’s history. In 2009, an exhibition documenting the history of the Art Projects was held at the AGNSW, coinciding with the 40th anniversary of Kaldor Public Art Projects. Its presentation enabled the institution to take ownership of the history of the Art Projects in Australia, alongside Kaldor’s gift from his private collection.

---


7 See below p. 302.


collection of contemporary art. For the AGNSW, it was important that Kaldor’s Art Projects be perceived as an integral component of the benefactor’s gift. Their inclusion differentiated the collection from any other gift of contemporary art.

COLLECTING AND KPAP

Kaldor’s initial collecting was influenced by his early mentors, Sekers and Alcorso. However, Kaldor’s collecting and philanthropy was to be more focused. While Kaldor’s early collecting interests included a substantial Australian component, his attention rapidly shifted to the collection of international artists, particularly male artists working with US and European schools of minimalism and conceptual art. Heiner Friedrich and Philippa (de Menil) Pellizzi’s support of American minimal artists such as Donald Judd, and their creation of the Dia Art Foundation influenced him profoundly.

Kaldor drew a distinction between his collecting and the Art Projects. Collecting, Kaldor stated, ‘is about the object; projects are about realizing a concept.’10 He saw collecting as a more ‘passive’ activity. The Art Projects were seen by a wide Australian audience, whilst his private collecting was (originally at least) largely as a personal pursuit.

But this thesis has argued that the art projects and Kaldor’s collecting have always been closely linked, even if Kaldor repeatedly separated them as the ‘public’ and ‘private’ sides of his interests in contemporary art. Kaldor often built a relationship with an artist by collecting his work, which then led to Kaldor inviting the artist to make an art project. Items from the collection were sometimes shown to contextualize the projects. The projects themselves contributed to the significance of his collection as a series of mementos of the projects. Ultimately his collection, gifted to AGNSW, has assumed even greater value than its constituent parts because of the historic association with the projects.

Kaldor’s ambition was that his Art Projects would influence the direction of Australian contemporary art. As Kaldor wrote in 1984, in his introduction to An Australian Accent, ‘In an endeavor to play a more active part in the development of art in Australia I have – over the past fifteen years – invited leading artists from the United States and Europe to work in Australia and

10 Baume in Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 46. Kaldor drew a similar distinction in the preface to the catalogue for An Australian Accent (1984).
thereby to create an awareness of international contemporary art.\textsuperscript{11} This public ambition may have originally motivated Kaldor to try to separate his public and private art activities. The Art Projects inherently had a more public impact, the potential to profile visiting artists as celebrities, and (at least early in KPAP’s history), a novel format at the cutting edge of international contemporary art.

The impact of the ‘public’ projects depended on at least the perception that they were somehow an objective judgment of ‘important’ trends in international contemporary art. In reality, of course, the projects, particularly before the professionalisation of KPAP around 2009, were just as dependent on Kaldor’s personal selection of artists as the works in his collection. Indeed, Kaldor’s interests as a collector were very similar to his interests in selecting Art Projects. As Thomas commented in 1971, in a feature article in \textit{Art \& Australia} on John Kaldor, Kaldor’s interest in collecting was motivated by ‘the casual, the environmental and the participatory rather than for the work of art as an independent precious object’.\textsuperscript{12}

In fact, there was an enormous overlap between the artists whose work Kaldor acquired for his collection, and the artists invited by Kaldor to make projects. In 2009, Baume again noted that artworks were often acquired prior to the initiation of a project.\textsuperscript{13} Kaldor purchased a small \textit{Package} from Christo before the project was initiated in 1969. A similar train of events occurred with Sol LeWitt, Jeff Koons, Gilbert & George, and others. Kaldor’s collecting of contemporary artworks often provided the introduction to artists, subsequently invited to make projects, as well as introductions to gallerists, institutions and art professionals whose support was vital to the Art Projects given the symbiosis between KPAP and public institutions.

The collection was often discussed in relation to the projects. The first specifically collection-based exhibition drawn from Kaldor’s private collection was shown at the Museum of Contemporary Art in 1995.\textsuperscript{14} Baume, the curator of the exhibition and author of the comprehensive exhibition catalogue text, titled his essay ‘John Kaldor: Public Patron/Private Patron’.

\textsuperscript{11} Kaldor, introduction in Thomas, \textit{An Australian Accent}, 1984.


\textsuperscript{13} Baume had first explored Kaldor’s interest in an artist through acquisition of work, which often preceded an Art Projects, in Baume, \textit{From Christo and Jeanne-Claude}, 1995, and again in his interview with Kaldor in Forbat, \textit{40 Years}, 2009, p. 48.

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{From Christo and Jeanne-Claude: John Kaldor Art Projects and Collection}, 12 December 1995 to 17 March 1996. Museum of Contemporary Art, Curator, Nicholas Baume.
Collector’. Documentation of the John Kaldor Art Projects was an important aspect of the exhibition, which was interwoven with major works from the collection. The relationship was clear. The exhibition was shown concurrently with Kaldor Art Projects’ 10th project. Jeff Koons’ Puppy (1995) was presented in front of the MCA, in the central Sydney location on Circular Quay. Although both Kaldor and Baume went to great pains to distinguish the public from the private, and the art projects from the collection, they were inextricably interlinked.

The second exhibition that presented Kaldor’s private collection alongside the Public Art Projects was presented at the Art Gallery of South Australia. Journey to Now, John Kaldor Art Projects and Collection, was shown at the Art Gallery of South Australia between April – July 2003. Adam Free titled his essay for the exhibition catalogue ‘Collection as Biography’. In his essay, Free implicitly suggested that the collection and projects were inextricably linked through the inclusion of groupings of works that represented some of the ten projects to date presented by Kaldor Art Projects. The essay reinforced Kaldor’s position as a major philanthropist and collector of contemporary international art. Similarly, the exhibition at AGSA included works by artists with whom Kaldor had already presented projects, or with whom he subsequently made projects. The exhibition also included the work of two Australians: Aleks Danko, who had been included in both Szeemann’s exhibition in 1971 and Baume’s 1995 MCA show; and Aboriginal artists Paddy Bedford and George Tjungarrayi. Presumably they were, in part at least, included in an attempt to rebalance the focus of Kaldor’s collection on overseas white, male artists – Vanessa Beecroft was the only female artist in the show.

Exhibitions accompanying other projects also drew on Kaldor’s extensive collection. For the 2003 exhibition of work by Swiss artist Ugo Rondinone at the MCA which accompanied a Kaldor Art Project on the roof of the Museum, many of the works shown were drawn from the collections of John Kaldor and Naomi Milgrom. The inclusion of these works enabled the Museum to present a broad range of the artist’s diverse work, and enabled audiences to gain a
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16 Free, Journey To Now, 2003, p. 3-5.
17 Thomas Demand, Michael Landy, Bill Viola. For a complete list of artists see Free, Journey to Now, 2003.
18 Other Australian artists included in the MCA From Christo and Jeanne-Claude (1995) exhibition were Barry Humphries, Mike Parr, Imants Tillers and Ken Unsworth.
greater understanding of its breadth. It also reinforced the relationship between Kaldor’s
collection and the Public Art Projects.

The distinction between public projects and private collecting is also problematic because it is
arguable that the Art Projects themselves amounted to a form of collecting. The distinction
between ‘object’ and ‘project’ overlooks the shift in art-making in the mid to late 1960s.
Artworks became increasingly conceptual in nature, with instructional pieces, installation,
performance and large-scale temporary land works all manifestations of the shifting definitions of
the object in contemporary art. Early projects with Christo and Jeanne-Claude, Szeemann,
Gilbert & George, Paik and Moorman, LeWitt and Long all reflected this trend. John Kaldor Art
Projects gave Kaldor a means of creating a virtual historic collection of otherwise non-collectable
art. It is interesting to compare Kaldor’s Sydney contemporary Franco Belgiorno-Nettis, who
was actively involved in developing the Sydney Biennale in 1973. By contrast, Kaldor created his
own vehicle presenting a program of events where he retained personal artistic control over the
selection of artists and projects. Kaldor’s adoption of a private foundation model for the
presentation of site-specific art projects in Australia by leading international artists was, in 1969,
ahead of even the Friedrich/de Menil Dia Art Foundation founded in 1974.

Kaldor’s projects, while obviously distinct from a collection of physical objects, nevertheless
shared many of the features of ‘status-driven collecting’. The projects distinguished Kaldor and
his activities from most other contemporary art collectors of the time. Most contemporary
collectors at the time collected physical objects and sometimes commissioned artwork. These
objects often later formed the foundation of private museums in which to present the collection
of work. This ‘bricks and mortar’ approach is a development of the private museum, in a way
that Kaldor’s Art Projects are not.

Of course, in the end, Kaldor’s ‘private’ collecting became ‘public’ anyway. In 2008 a substantial
part of Kaldor’s collection, valued at $35 million, was given to the Art Gallery of New South
Wales on the condition that a new wing was made available for the presentation of the works.
Until the gift to the Art Gallery of New South Wales of the John Kaldor Family Collection was
announced in 2008, Kaldor had maintained his collecting was a ‘private endeavour’ shared with
family, friends and occasionally a visiting art group. The gift of works that would subsequently always be on partial display radically altered the private and public history of Kaldor’s collecting for an Australian public. As Jean Baudrillard noted in his critique of the value of permanent collections of public museums, ‘the fixed reserve of the museum is necessary for the functioning of the sign exchange of paintings. Museums play the role of banks in the political economy of paintings.’ While auction records of the secondary market may establish the monetary value of works of art, art museums establish the artistic value of the currency, and in turn, the reputation and status of the collector and donor.

By the time of Kaldor’s gift of his private family collection to the AGNSW in 2008, he and others widely referred to his role as a ‘dedicated collector, supporter and patron of contemporary art’. His role as patron became inextricably linked with his role as private collector, both validated by the public institution.

HISTORICISING KPAP

The image of KPAP as an autonomous entity has been consciously promoted since its early operations. It was portrayed as an ongoing institution from its early days, and this was consistently renewed with each new project. Annotated notes on press releases for JKAP’s Third Art Project, with Gilbert & George, reminded Kaldor to mention its status as part of a series. The work by Miralda, not seen at the time as an Art Project, was retrospectively included as an Art Project in 2007, and acknowledged as such in the 40 Years exhibition and publication. Documentation relating to projects such as letters, instructions, Christo’s fabric swatches, and other related material was preserved archivally. This material was displayed as part of subsequent exhibitions.

The history of the Art Projects and their place in the development of contemporary art in Australia was reinforced by no less than four substantial exhibitions about Kaldor’s art projects and collection in public galleries over twenty years, by any measure, extensive recognition for a

19 Baume in Forbat, 40 Years, 2009, p. 48.
series of nineteen projects when the last of these exhibitions was held in 2009. The publications, sponsored by KPAP, in conjunction with each of these exhibitions dominated the subsequent perception of KPAP. KPAP was similar to other foundations presenting projects overseas in publishing the only comprehensive retrospectives of its own work. Artangel, PAF, Creative Time and the Trussardi Foundation all published extensive publications documenting the history of their projects. Such publications will inevitably dominate subsequent evaluations of their activities. Although there was other writing about individual projects, nothing was written about KPAP as a whole independently of these publications. As a form of advocacy, they presented an uncritical view of the Art Projects. The early projects, particularly 1969-1977, were emphasised to historicise KPAP’s contribution to the development of contemporary art in Australia. The authority of this history was reinforced by the involvement of public art institutions and their curators, in the governance of KPAP, and in exhibiting and writing about the history itself of the projects and Kaldor’s collection. Journal articles were often written by curators involved with KPAP and the Art Projects, such as those by Thomas, Baume and Day. While they wrote from highly knowledgeable positions within the art world, their involvement with Kaldor meant that their opinions could be seen as a form of artistic and cultural advocacy on KPAP’s behalf. Included in Australian publications such as Art & Australia, the projects were firmly embedded within an artistic history of Australia. There was little competition.

LONG TERM IMPACT

There is no doubt that Kaldor’s first project with Christo and Jeanne-Claude, Wrapped Coast (1969), had the greatest impact locally and internationally of any KPAP project. It presented a new work by a groundbreaking international artist team. This Art Project enabled the artists to successfully realize their first large-scale temporary Wrapping. The images and stories attracted widespread interest both in Australia and worldwide. No Art Project has ever had such local or international impact again.

Kaldor’s subsequent projects between 1970-1977 were significant in developing the local artistic landscape. They enabled art museums such as AGNSW to increase the number of contemporary exhibitions and projects they could offer to a growing audience. They brought important and
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exciting works to Australia. However, their international impact was minimal, as the works were not new, nor did they offer an opportunity to the artists to develop something unrealizable elsewhere. Gilbert & George presented a work that had already been frequently shown in Europe, and with the exception of a valedictory presentation at Sonnabend Gallery, New York in (1991), the artists never presented it again. Szeemann’s visit had no lasting international impact, reflected not only by the fact that he did not include any Australian artists in documenta V the following year (1971), but also by the small profile it was accorded in Szeemann’s definitive catalogue raisonné. Until the 40 Years publication in 2009, Miralda’s project had sunk without a trace in Australia, though as the publication noted, he was included in documenta VI, Kassel in 1977. It is unlikely that the Kaldor project would have played any part in this, given the ostensibly private nature of the visit, and its invisible international profile. Projects by Paik and Moorman, LeWitt and Long, built on already existing international reputations. While interesting for Australians, and important in Kaldor’s collection, the Australian visits did little more than act as another project in already strong biographies of international exhibitions and projects. The advent of the Sydney Biennale in 1973 also meant that from then on KAP projects were presented in a radically different context within Australia, with far more competing artists’ projects of this nature.

The projects between 1984 and 1994 also had little international impact. An Australian Accent did not play any pivotal role in the careers of the three artists though they, and subsequent writing, would have us think differently. Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s 1990 exhibition and Art Project strengthened Kaldor’s relationship with the artists, and in turn with AGNSW. It reminded audiences of JKAP, and John Kaldor’s, central role in the development of the new Australian cultural landscape through Wrapped Coast (1969). But it was primarily a retrospective view.

Particular projects between 1995-2002 had at least some international impact. Koons’ Puppy (1995) came at a time in the artist’s career when the critical response to his recent work was divided. The JKAP Art Project enabled the work to be remade using the latest engineering technology. The feel-good factor and its spectacular appeal to a broader public made it highly attractive for institutions and public art opportunities, which required this sort of visibility to justify and compete for further public funding. The work was subsequently acquired by the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum and presented in the forecourt of Guggenheim Bilbao, and then at the iconic Rockerfeller Centre, New York, in 2000.
KPAP’s projects between 1999 and 2012 were set in an increasingly globalized frame of international exhibitions and biennales. With more international opportunities available to leading artists, it was increasingly unlikely that KPAP Projects would play a key role in the development of any artist’s practice. Each of the artists presented was already part of an international network. The projects generally lacked the site-specificity and contextual reading that had been the hallmark of JKAP’s first project.

Sol LeWitt and Rondinone’s projects formed part of each artist’s extensive exhibition biography. Neither had a lasting international impact. Beecroft was the only Art Project by a female artist throughout JKAP’s whole history. But the Australian project had no discernable international impact on her subsequent exhibition career. McGee’s project with Kaldor was subsequently exhibited at Deitch Projects, New York, but his subsequent work had limited impact.

As shown in Table 2, from McGee on, most KPAP artists had previously presented major works with other private foundations internationally. Often, these other private foundations’ projects were pivotal artworks in the artist’s ensuing development. Urs Fischer, Gregor Schneider, Bill Viola, Michael Landy, and Thomas Demand had all made major works for foundations and not-for-profit organisations before their KPAP projects. Generally the KPAP project was not key to their subsequent artistic development, as other major works and exhibition projects had been. Martin Boyce’s project was an exception: it was significant for the artist in developing themes that were later presented in the exhibition for the critically received Scottish Pavilion at the Venice Biennale in the following year. However the actual work presented in Australia played no clear role in his selection and award of the Turner Prize following Venice.

For a private foundation from Australia to have a lasting impact within this global framework, a project needed to offer something specifically unique that another foundation or context could not offer. The use of the Commercial Travellers’ Building in Sydney for Thomas Demand’s project offered this difference. While it is too early to tell what influence this work will have on Demand’s artistic career in the long run, for KPAP the work seemed to represent a return to the innovation embodied in Wrapped Coast (1969). Ultimately, however, KPAP has had limited impact on the development of an international installation art beyond Australia’s shores.

JKAP’s greatest international significance, apart from the initiation of Christo and Jeanne-Claude’s Wrapped Coast (1969), lay in the creation of an alternative philanthropic model that was neither rooted to a gallery space, nor to one, fixed place of presentation. In this way, JKAP could modify the requirements, and thus resources, needed for any one artistic project. This model of
alternative philanthropic support for contemporary artists emerged from a context where there was little public support available either through government funding or institutions for contemporary art. The Dia Art Foundation in the US represented a similar attempt to devise a new model to support contemporary art forms. However, Dia eventually evolved into a collection and permanent gallery space. Its exhibitions and scholarship continues to focus on specific artists and art historic themes. Kaldor’s model presaged the later development of not-for-profit organisations, such as Artangel, Public Art Fund, Creative Time, Trussardi, Prada, and T-B A21.

These foundations were important in presenting many of the ground-breaking temporary installations in globalized contemporary art. In part, the relationship between new forms of contemporary art and the private foundations that supported it were causal, in part responsive, and very often, the relationship was symbiotic. The foundations and not-for-profit organisations spear-headed the trend towards more site-responsive installations. Facing increasing competition from biennales, they effectively partnered with them, again producing many of the key works in globalized contemporary art from 2001-2009. There are signs – such as Artangel’s support for Horn’s *Library of Water* (2007), the Benesse Foundation’s Art House Projects, part of Art Site Naoshima, and Instituto Inhotim’s series of permanent pavilions for contemporary installations set in a botanical park in a remote part of Brazil – that the next original development may be a further evolution of the idea of ‘Destination art’, installations that are responsive to unique and often remote locations. And again, much of this may be supported by foundations.

**CONCLUSION: EXHIBITION HISTORIES**

Only recently has it become accepted that exhibition histories are an essential part of art history, especially since the late 1960s, when artists’ engagement with space and site became a fundamental part of their practice. Kaldor Public Art Projects at times played a key role in the evolution of the artistic landscape in Australia from the late 1960s. This thesis provides the first independent historical analysis of the evolution of the Art Projects, and their relationship to the development of contemporary art in a global frame.

As new forms of exhibition-making evolved, through the development of biennale and triennale in the 1990s, traditional forms of patronage and support for contemporary art also evolved. Since the 1990s, an unprecedented number of private foundations have been created. They play a specific role in society, and the motivations for their creation are often as much personal as for
the public good. This thesis presents the first definitive analysis of these trends, using KPAP as a case study. KPAP’s role is considered locally, and as part of a global contemporary art world. Any further research into this developing area can build on the scholarship that has been presented. It is now necessary to revise our understanding of the role that not-for-profit foundations have played, and will continue to play, as part of a global contemporary art world.
Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Artist / Project</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gallery space</th>
<th>Associated gallery exhibition</th>
<th>Associated organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Christo &amp; Jeanne-Claude</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
<td>NGV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Harald Szeemann</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>NGV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gilbert &amp; George</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>AGNSW, NGV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Miralda</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>AGNSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Moorman + Paik</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>AGNSW, AGSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sol LeWitt</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>AGNSW, NGV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Richard Long</td>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>AGNSW, NGV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>An Australian Accent</td>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>AGNSW, AGWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Christo &amp; Jeanne-Claude</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>AGNSW, AGWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jeff Koons</td>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>MCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sol LeWitt</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>MCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Vanessa Beecroft</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>MCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ugo Rondinone</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>MCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Barry McGee</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>NGV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Urs Fischer</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Gregor Schneider</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Bill Viola</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>AGNSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Martin Boyce</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>AGNSW</td>
<td>RMIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tatzu Nishi</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>AGNSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Stephen Vitiello</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>AGNSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Bill Viola</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>ACMI</td>
<td>Melbourne Festival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Santiago Sierra</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>GOMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>John Baldessari</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sydney Festival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Michael Landy</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sydney Festival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Thomas Demand</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**: 14  5  4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Artist / Project</th>
<th>Public galleries</th>
<th>Festival/Biennale</th>
<th>Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Miralda (1973)</td>
<td>Sonnabend Gallery, New York (1971)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>An Australian Accent (1984-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sao Paolo Bienial (1975)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imants Tillers Barry Unsworth Mike Parr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Documenta 7 (1982)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Venice Biennale (1978)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sydney Biennale (1979)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Venice Biennale (1980)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Christo &amp; Jeanne-Claude (1990)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Exhibition Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Exhibitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2011)  
Palais de Tokyo, Paris (2010)  
Break Down, Artangel (2001) |
Neue Nationalgalerie, Berlin (2009)  
Ca’ Corner della Regina, Prada Foundation, Venice (2011)  
German Pavilion, Venice Biennial (2004)  
Sao Paolo Biennial (2004)  
Fondazione Prada, Venice (2007) |
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