

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

DISCUSSIONS IN RUSSIAN ART THEORY AND CRITICISM II

7th Graduate Workshop
of the RUSSIAN ART & CULTURE GROUP

September 19-20,
2019



3. ЧТО ЭТО ЗНАЧИТ?

Jacobs University Bremen, Campus Ring 1, 28759 Bremen, Lab 3

Cover: Vladimir Mayakovsky, *3. Chto eto znachit?*, [digitized detail of ROSTA No. 498: *Davaite i poluchite*], November 1920.

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

DISCUSSIONS IN RUSSIAN ART THEORY AND CRITICISM II

The seventh graduate workshop of the Russian Art & Culture Group will focus on the main tendencies in Russian art theory from Russian modernism to the present day. We want to specifically explore responses to the question “What Is to Be Done?” [Что делать?] by artists, art critics, writers, and other members of the Russian intelligentsia, specifically reflecting upon movements such as the Russian avant-garde, neo-primitivism, constructivism, formalism, Socialist realism, and nonconformist art, and examine the use of artistic concepts such as parody, self-historization, or the center/periphery problem as well as responses to art movements from abroad, including cubism, concept art, and others.

7th Graduate Workshop of the Russian Art & Culture Group
Jacobs University Bremen and Forschungsstelle Osteuropa, Bremen

PROGRAM

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 19

VENUE: Jacobs University Bremen
Campus Ring 1, 28759 Bremen, Lab 3

10.30 **Opening: Welcome Address**
Prof. Dr. Isabel Wünsche, Jacobs University Bremen

Panel I: EXHIBITIONS OF RUSSIAN ART IN THE WEST
Chair: Miriam Leimer

11:00 **Estorick, Hammer & Sickle: Soviet Cultural Exchange in the 1960s**
Anastasia Kurlyandtseva, State Tretyakov Gallery, Moscow

11:30 **Revision: Russian Art and Revolution Through Definitive Exhibitions**
Olga Olkheft, Bielefeld Graduate School in History and Sociology,
Universität Bielefeld

12.00 **From Reclamation to Redefinition: No Longer Invisible**
Roann Barris, Radford University

12:30 *Lunch Break*

Panel II: RESPONSES TO ARTISTIC CONCEPTS AND ART MOVEMENTS
Chair: Isabel Wünsche

14:00 **Realism East-West**
Rahma Khazam, Institut ACTE, Sorbonne Paris 1

14:30 **A Failing Apology: Coming to Terms with Cubism in the Soviet Union after 1956**
Kirill Chunikhin, Higher School of Economics, St. Petersburg

15.00 "We Are All Talking About Him": The Art of Picasso and Its Soviet Interpretations
Vera Otdelnova, State Institute for Art Studies, Moscow

15.30 *Coffee Break*

Panel III: NEW ARTISTIC APPROACHES AND CONCEPTS

Chair: Ludmila Piters-Hofmann

16.00 Anticipating a New Sensorium: The Sense of Luminosity in Kliment Redko's *Electro-organism* (1922)
Ekaterina Tewes, Freie Universität Berlin

16.30 *Uslovnost'* and Parody in Kazimir Malevich's Early Work
Beniamino Foschini, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Munich

17.00 Humor and Laughter in the Nonconform Art Scene of Leningrad in the 1980s
Julia Krah, Universität Leipzig

18.00 *Dinner*

19.00 **GUEST LECTURE**
The Idea of *Ruskaia ideia*: Reflections on the Parafictional Subjects of Post-Soviet Russian Art
Jane Ashton Sharp, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

20.30 *Evening Reception*

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 20

VENUE: Forschungsstelle Osteuropa an der Universität Bremen
Osteuropa-Gebäude, Klagenfurter Str. 8,
28359 Bremen, room 3790 (conference room)

10.30 **VISIT of the archive of the FORSCHUNGSSTELLE OSTEUROPA**
Guided tour by Maria Klassen

12.30 *Lunch Break*

Panel IV: FROM ART INSTITUTIONS TO CONTEMPORARY ART PRACTICES

Chair: Kirill Chunikhin

14.00 **Linking Theory with Practice: The Genesis and Functions of the Scientific Research Institute of the Art Industry**

Elizaveta Berezina, Central European University, Budapest

14:30 **Alternative Regional Art Practices in Late Soviet Russia: The Urals Case**

Tamara Galeeva, Ural Federal University, Yekaterinburg

15.00 **The Impact of Internal Colonization in Russian Culture: Looking at Russian Contemporary Art**

Polina Lukina, Higher School of Economics, Moscow

15.30 **The Museum of the Future Society: Utopias in Russian Art and Philosophy**

Cristina Moraru, "George Enescu" National University of the Arts (UNAGE), Iași, Romania

16:00 **Concluding Discussion**

Initial idea and organization: Prof. Dr. Isabel Wünsche, Ludmila Piters-Hofmann, and Miriam Leimer.

The event is generously **supported by the Kroll Family Trust**, Switzerland.

The Russian Art & Culture Group is based at Jacobs University Bremen. Headed by Prof. Dr. Isabel Wünsche, it brings together scholars and young researchers from Eastern and Western Europe.

Contact: workshop@russian-art.net

<https://russian-art.net>

ABSTRACTS

Panel I: EXHIBITIONS OF RUSSIAN ART IN THE WEST

Estorick, Hammer & Sickle: Soviet Cultural Exchange in the 1960s *Anastasia Kurlyandtseva, State Tretyakov Gallery, Moscow*

In 1965, American arts journalist Grace Glueck published her article “An Art-Minded Fair” in *The New York Times*. [Glueck, Grace, “An Art-Minded Fair,” *The New York Times* (May 9, 1965), 19.] It was a caustic and sarcastic review about the main events—recent or upcoming—in the art world. Among other things, Glueck mentioned two Soviet one-man exhibitions that were on display during that exact period: Pavel Korin’s exhibition in the Hammer Galleries in New York (May 12–29) and Ernst Neizvestny’s exhibition in the Grosvenor Gallery in London (May 11–June 5). Korin’s show was the first one-man show of an “official” Soviet artist in the United States after the Second World War. It was organized in response to an exhibition of American artist Grandma Moses in the Pushkin Museum in Moscow in 1964 and is thus an interesting case of USSR/US cultural diplomacy of that time.

In her article, Glueck briefly compared Korin’s and Neizvestny’s shows and outlined the galleries’ different approaches to showing Russian “contemporary” art. The difference is reflected in the representation strategies, including the specific choice of artist (official/unofficial, realistic/abstract, old generation/young generation, etc.) as well as in the different ways of communication with officials in the Soviet Union, etc. My presentation will focus on the history of these two galleries and the emergence of these exhibitions. I will also discuss precedents of Russian post-war art entering the art market.

Revision: Russian Art and Revolution Through Definitive Exhibitions **Olga Olkheft, Bielefeld Graduate School in History and Sociology, Universität Bielefeld**

The 1980s were a booming time for defining exhibitions dedicated to Russian avant-garde art all over the world, among them "The Avant-Garde in Russia 1910-1930: New Perspectives" (Los Angeles, Washington, D.C., 1980-81), "Art and Revolution" (Tokyo, 1982 and 1988), "Kunst und Revolution 1910-1930" (Budapest, Vienna, 1987-88), and others. The only exhibition of this kind held in the Soviet Union was "Moscow-Paris: 1900-1930" (State Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow, 1981), previously shown in Paris in 1979. These exhibitions of Russian art of the early twentieth century used to showcase the same artistic trends and sets of artworks, simply using diverse aliases such as avant-garde art, modernist art, or revolutionary art. In different cases, these definitions were used as contradicting, interchanging, or successively, but they always imposed a certain interpretation that connected Russian art with the Russian October Revolution.

In my paper, I will discuss government-sponsored avant-garde exhibitions that were organized by the USSR for display in the West and compare them to US-organized exhibitions in order to reveal how the concept of *avant-garde/revolutionary* Russian art was defined and used by both the Soviet and American sides during the Cold War. My central hypothesis is that official Soviet ideology turned to a re-conception and legitimization of avant-garde art facing the pressure of Western awareness and contested ownership of the artistic history of revolutionary time.

From Reclamation to Redefinition: No Longer Invisible **Roann Barris, Radford University**

What I think of as an "invisible" history of American exhibitions of Russian art began in the early twentieth century with exhibitions that reflected idiosyncratic curatorial tastes and Soviet permissions. Although these

exhibitions did introduce the American public to Russian art, their goals may have had little to do with educating the public about Russian styles or history. In contrast, by the middle of the twentieth century, exhibitions of Russian art were dominated by the motives of American museums and reflected largescale collaborations between American and Russian museums. These exhibitions revealed a new interest in defining the styles of the avant-garde, emphasizing the revolutionary and often performative nature of this art. If the earliest or first phase of exhibitions was not dedicated to the education of museum visitors, it might be said that theory and definition became driving themes of the second phase, along with the promotion of the museum. Blockbuster exhibitions may be more about spectacular museums than art history. [e.g. The Great Utopia.]

Phase II morphed into phase III with the return of the artist and the return of history. [e.g. Amazons of the Avant Garde.] The 1980s marked the beginning of an era of exhibitions that made a concerted effort to approach art from the perspective of the artists who made it. If phase III continued the reclamation of history, it ended with the redefinition of history. [e.g. Neo-Constructivism; Art, Architecture, and Activism.] My presentation will emphasize late phase II exhibitions.

Panel II: **RESPONSES TO ARTISTIC CONCEPTS AND ART MOVEMENTS**

Realism East-West

Rahma Khazam, Institut ACTE, Sorbonne Paris 1

In this paper, I will examine the evolution of realism in Russian art and its connections with Western artistic concepts and aesthetic ideas. I will focus on that brief interlude in the history of the Soviet Union when Socialist realism was challenged by an even more ideologically driven realism, exemplified by the "Experimental Complex Marxist Exhibition" held at the State Tretyakov Gallery in Moscow in 1931. Curated by the Marxist art historian Aleksei Fedorov-Davydov and comprising documents, artefacts,

and the art of the proletariat, it eschewed the fetishism associated with the art object, referencing instead the relations of production of its time. It thereby stood in stark contrast to the idealized portrayals of the proletariat favored by Socialist Realism—which would soon be proclaimed the official style, eclipsing the Marxist exhibition entirely.

In this paper, I will explore the differences between these two forms of realism—the first resisting idealization and the second embracing it, the first rigorous and uncompromising, and the second a caricature of what it should have been. The Marxist exhibition demonstrated parallels with American social realism as well as affinities with the museum practices later implemented by Alfred H. Barr at the Museum of Modern Art in New York, while the socialist imaginary intersected with Western concepts at a cost: according to Susan Buck-Morss, it failed precisely because it mirrored the dreamworlds of capitalism too faithfully. Neither innocuous nor accidental, these far-reaching entanglements were among the factors that determined these movements' failure or success.

A Failing Apology: Coming to Terms with Cubism in the Soviet Union after 1956

Kirill Chunikhin, Higher School of Economics, St. Petersburg

Introducing previously neglected primary sources and suggesting an alternative approach to researching the history of art during the Cold War, in my paper, I rethink the Soviet Thaw- and post-Thaw fate of cubism. In doing so, I acknowledge the movement's major constituting role within the Soviet art discourse. In a first step, I analyze an unknown strategy of apologizing cubism as done by seminal *Kulturträger*s Igor Golomstock and Andrei Sinyavsky. This is to challenge dominant scholarly accounts paying overly strong attention to Soviet negative criticism of cubism while ignoring the actual complexity of the debates within an allegedly monolithic totalitarian discourse. Analyzing the results of this apology, I argue that the attempt to rehabilitate cubism caused an intensification of negative criticism characteristic of novel anti-modernist patterns such as

that by Mikhail Lifshitz, a prominent Soviet philosopher. This re-actualization of debates on cubism had both domestic and transnational premises. Ultimately, situating Soviet discussions of cubism within relevant European debates on modernist art, I challenge dominant isolationist interpretations of the Soviet art discourse.

"We Are All Talking About Him": The Art of Picasso and Its Soviet Interpretations

Vera Otdelnova, State Institute for Art Studies, Moscow

The first Picasso exhibition in the Soviet Union was held at the Museum of Fine Arts in Moscow in 1956 and provoked a series of hot public discussions. In an atmosphere of de-Stalinization, expressive works by Picasso were often interpreted as alternatives to the largely narrative pictures of the masters of the Stalinist Academy of Art. In this opposition, the art of Picasso was often described as "true realism." In conservative circles, however, the modernist style of Picasso was understood as a political intervention, penetrating into the Soviet art scene and destroying, primarily, the art of Socialist Realism, and, secondarily, socialism itself. According to the most radical point of view, expressed by Mikhail Lifshitz, the art of modernism, and particularly of Picasso, was even responsible for the horrors of World War II.

In reality, the goal of these fervent discussions was not to glorify or to denounce Picasso, but to establish new frameworks for contemporary Soviet art. The crucial questions were about the "shores" of Socialist realism and the limits of artistic freedom.

In my presentation, which is based on archival documents and Soviet periodicals, I will examine the rhetoric of different members of the Soviet art world, among them artists, young pro-modernist art critics, and theorists from the academy. Questions I wish to address include: How was the art of Picasso interpreted by each side? Did these interpretations correspond to the ideas of Picasso, or were they invented to serve specific artist's needs? What features did the discussants emphasize or ignore?

Finally, how did these discussions influence the further history of Soviet art and art criticism?

Panel III: **NEW ARTISTIC APPROACHES AND CONCEPTS**

Anticipating a New Sensorium: The Sense of Luminosity in Kliment Redko's Electro-organism (1922)

Ekaterina Tewes, Freie Universität Berlin

In his manifesto, "Art of Electro-organism" (1922), Kliment Redko proclaims that the substance of the new art is "light-electro-matter." According to Redko, art is progressive if it deals with light and luminosity and develops new artistic forms that are related to electricity, X-rays, and similar phenomena. Redko states: "The task of painting is to master the laws of light and to develop the sense of luminosity in us according to these laws." Thus, he envisions the sense of luminosity—a new sense, which should allow one to perceive the entire electromagnetic spectrum (not only the visible radiation/light) without any technical assistance. While the discovery of electricity and the invisible types of radiation revealed the limitations of the human senses, Redko intends, with his art of Electro-organism, to achieve a novel completeness of sensory perception.

In the Electro-organism, an aesthetic model and an anthropological project interlock. In my paper, I pursue this connection in a discourse-analytical and art-historical way. I examine how energetic concepts from physics enter into biological, psychological, and anthropological discourses and allow Redko to model the organism in new, "electrical," and non-mechanistic/non-vitalistic terms. From an art historical point of view, I show how Redko brings light into the foreground of painting.

***Uslovnost'* and Parody in Kazimir Malevich's Early Work**

Beniamino Foschini, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Munich

My PhD research project, *Parody and Kazimir Malevich: Victory over the Sun (1913) between Art, Literature, and Theatre*, focuses on Malevich and theatre. Although the notion of parody is not pivotal in Russian avant-garde scholarship (with a few notable exceptions), it is an actual issue in the frame of Russian dialogical culture. In the early twentieth century, the genesis of cabaret and *teatr miniatiur* [miniature theatre] scenes provide a great impulse to parody as a tool of *uslovnost'* [conventionality] and for the ideological reversal of values typical of every avant-garde form.

The aim of the paper is to present an aspect of my research, i.e. a possible genesis of Malevich's radical practice through an analysis of early works during his student years in Moscow. Parody and caricature were practiced at large at the Rerberg School, which Malevich attended. This is evident in the 1912 album *Friendly Caricatures of the Students of the Art School F.I. Rerberg and Parodies of their Paintings, 1908-1912*. Another work implying the use of parodic tools is the watercolor *Wedding (1907-08)*, which relates to subject-matter tradition in theatrical art (Gogol, Prutkov, Sukhovo-Kobylin, Chekhov). A third example is the relationship between the album of rotogravures *Anathema (1909, released January 1910)*, a commission by the Moscow Art Theatre after Leonid Andreev's play, and a related parodic watercolor (1910).

Humor and Laughter in the Nonconform Art Scene of Leningrad in the 1980s

Julia Krah, Universität Leipzig

My PhD project focuses on the examination of humor and laughter as an artistic strategy in nonconform Soviet art of the period 1970-2000. Having deep traditional roots in Russian folklore, silliness, foolishness, and irony appear in many of the non-aligned art works of late Soviet culture. My goal is to question the dichotomy of the official and the unofficial as well as to recognize the comedic potential that lies in the context of late Soviet

culture itself. In my presentation, I will introduce several art projects that are united by their ambivalent relationship with official/everyday Soviet culture as well as their performative character. The group "Mitki" formed a collective identity of a loveable but unclean Soviet loafer, who is unaware of personal aspirations, aside from getting drunk. This form of *Lebenskunst* is closely related to the early works of those who later became known as the Necrorealists. Before shooting highly macabre movies, they would play out nonsensical pranks, which can be defined as either happenings, performance art, or, just as well, deviant behavior. These approaches will be analyzed in respect to their comedic strategies and historical and theoretical roots, reaching from the Russian Orthodox idea of holy foolishness to Mikhail Bakhtin's writings on the carnivalesque. Sergey Kuryokhin's television hoax, in which he delivers an hour-long historic lecture on why Lenin was in fact a mushroom, will then serve as a conclusion of soviet comedic tradition.

GUEST LECTURE

The Idea of *Russkaia ideia*: Reflections on the Parafictional Subjects of Post-Soviet Russian Art

Jane Ashton Sharp, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

This paper addresses late- and post-Soviet era installations and performances that reengage representations of the national question, linked to the *Russkaia ideia* [Russian Idea]. Departing from the censorship and blasphemy cases of 1998, and continuing through the 2000s, this paper will consider projects individual artists have created and displayed that, while noteworthy for their potentially provocative consequences, also present a serious reevaluation of well-established tropes in critical forms of national discourse. I focus on specific performative installations, all of which deal with the past archaeologically, by establishing place paradoxically as a site of lost persons (anonymous, missing/unrecognized), and historical gaps, by constructing parafictional characters. Images, texts, and installations by Elena Elagina, Igor Makarevich, Il'ya Kabakov, and more recent collective endeavors, such as *Tsar' gory*, suggest more than the violence implicit in the act of expropriation or loss. They also realize a *desire to establish, recreate, reclaim a context*. Some wrest objects from context, others are primarily concerned with inventing new ones. In each situation, the object is already marked as "lost" when found: orphaned as they become assimilated to new iterations of the national narrative—and share in its legacy of intended and unintended consequences.

Linking Theory with Practice: The Genesis and Functions of the Scientific Research Institute of the Art Industry

Elizaveta Berezina, Central European University, Budapest

The history of the Scientific Research Institute of the Art Industry [*Nauchno-issledovatel'skii institut khudozhestvennoi promyshlennosti, NIiKhP*] is mostly overlooked in the research on Soviet art and culture. The main purpose of the institute was the supervision of the traditional and artistic crafts workshops and factories. It was established in 1932 and ran continuously till 1997 despite its fluctuating institutional affiliation, economic reforms, and regime turns. From the early beginning, the institute consolidated and involved celebrated art historians, artists, and connoisseurs of folk art working with the art industry. They developed a specific approach to studying arts and handicrafts and institutionalized the branch of art historical studies that dealt with national and folk crafts. The institute served as a mediator between the interests of artists and industries, the demands of markets and consumers.

The paper considers the Scientific Research Institute of the Art Industry as an emblematic institution of Soviet cultural policy, continuously navigating between the conflicting ideas of tradition and modernity, “unique” fine arts and mass-produced handicrafts, creative and reproductive art practices, and aesthetic and utilitarianism in production. Among other questions, I address the issues of knowledge transfers and the impact of European art theories on the organization of the artistic process within the Soviet model. For example, some underlying principles of the institute resembled those formative to the German *Werkbund*. However, later on, the Soviet institution probably served as a model for cultural institutions in other socialist states such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Romania.

Alternative Regional Art Practices in Late Soviet Russia: The Urals Case

Tamara Galeeva, Ural Federal University, Yekaterinburg

The paper will examine some alternative art practices in the Urals region of late Soviet Russia especially in Sverdlovsk (now Ekaterinburg). A cultural and artistic center of a vast industrial region, which was officially positioned as a “pivotal region of the country” during Soviet times, Sverdlovsk turned into a restricted-access military-industrial city, an industrial zone whose atmosphere was to a certain degree existentially depressing. But unofficial alternative art practices formed in its space, among them the so-called “Uktus School” (members often held meetings in the area of the Uktus mountain) in the period 1960-70s. The participants of this group created their own version of conceptualism, which was characterized by an integration of different areas of artistic work, a move into action poetry and performance. They published samizdat and hand-written magazines.

In the 1970s, other “informal” associations of artists appeared in Sverdlovsk, settling in traditional basements and, by an odd coincidence, all situated on the city’s central streets with “revolutionary” names (Red Army, Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Liebknecht, etc.). Their works did not claim formal novelty, but they generated new themes and images, presenting late Soviet reality in a way which evoked a lively reaction by the public. It was an alternative to official Soviet-style art.

The Impact of Internal Colonization in Russian Culture: Looking at Russian Contemporary Art

Polina Lukina, Higher School of Economics, Moscow

The global interest in the “center-periphery” problem coincides with the increased interest in the study of contemporary art of the Russian regions by various institutions and curators in the past few years. At the same time, there is still a gap in the academic study of both contemporary Russian art and its regional perspective in particular. The complex

situation of "center-periphery" has a significant impact on the artistic strategies of contemporary Russian artists and the ways of their presentation at global and local levels.

Internal colonization and over-centralization form the cultural distance between the center and the periphery in the Russian context. The Russian situation of over-centralization leads, on the one hand, to large-scale territorial exhibition projects, reproducing the logic of the unequal relationship between the "center" and the "periphery." On the other hand, this situation leads to the emergence of centrifugal methods in the artistic practice of regional artists.

Practices of Russian contemporary artists are resembling decolonial art practices, which provide decolonization (that is, liberation from the colonial canon) of memory, being, knowledge. This happens through the construction of an alternative history by referring to forgotten and non-obvious episodes of local culture, history, and memory. Such a comparison may be applicable in the framework of the theory of Russian internal colonization.

The Museum of the Future Society: Utopias in Russian Art and Philosophy

Cristina Moraru, "George Enescu" National University of the Arts (UNAGE), Iași, Romania

Russian art theory has developed multiple approaches concerning the future of society and frequently asks the question: *What is to be done?* Contemporary Russian theoreticians concerned about art and the future of society, among them Boris Groys, followed paradigms inspired by Russian philosophers such as Nikolai Fyodorovich Fyodorov, who envisioned a cosmic reconfiguration of future society as an art museum in which the government will act as an art curator and the citizens will be art works, contemplated as objects of revelation.

The Russian artist Arseny Zhilyaev explores this idea in his installation *Cradle of Humankind* (2015), in which the whole of humanity–

past and present—is reconstructed as a museum of the future, dedicated to the history of human life. The work is based on the Russian cosmist utopian scenario in which an unlimited production of time could be instituted once we discover a cure for the universally spreading disease of death. For Boris Groys, this discovery will allow us to reconfigure the entire society, rethinking the political power, redistributing the productive force, and reorganizing the socio-economic relations as a museum of the future, in which society will be treasured and its citizens will be cared for as works of art in a museum.

BIOGRAPHIES

Roann Barris, a professor of art history and museum studies at Radford University, wrote her dissertation and published several articles on Russian constructivism in the theater. Recently, she began to focus her research activities on a study of American exhibitions of Russian art in the past century. To date, this work has generated an article in *Experiment 23*, several presentations, and the draft of a book proposal. Her research has been supported by grants from IREX, the Fulbright Foundation, institutes sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities, and university grants.

Elizaveta Berezina is a PhD candidate at the Department of History of the Central European University in Budapest. Her research focuses on the institutional development of the Soviet art industry and on Soviet crafts as a cultural project used for promoting and displaying the cultural achievements of the socialist system both domestically and internationally. Her research interests include social history of art, material culture history, and cultural diplomacy. Before joining CEU, Berezina worked for two years as a lecturer and assistant researcher at the School of Cultural Studies at the Higher School of Economics in Moscow, from which she received her master's degree.

Kirill Chunikhin graduated with a BA degree in English Philology from Kemerovo State University in 2009. In 2012, he defended his MA thesis "Clement Greenberg: A Historical Apology of Modernism" at the Department of Art History of the European University in St. Petersburg. In 2014, Chunikhin was a Terra Foundation Predoctoral Fellow in American Art at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, DC. In 2016, he received his PhD from Jacobs University Bremen with a thesis on the representation of American visual art in the USSR during the Cold War. Currently, he is reworking his thesis into a book. His latest research on Soviet-American cultural history during the Cold War is forthcoming in *The Journal of Cold War Studies*.

Beniamino Foschini, born in Ravenna, Italy, is a PhD candidate at the Institut für Kunstgeschichte of Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität and a research associate at the Akademie der Bildenden Künste in Munich. Outside his academic career, he has been active as an independent curator for contemporary art. In 2008, he won the Milan-based residency *European Course for Curators of Contemporary Art*, organized by the Fondazione Ratti,

Como and its visiting professor Charles Esche. After writing for magazines such as *Exibart* and *Flash Art*, Foschini is now a contributor for www.doppiozero.com.

Tamara Galeeva is head of the Department of Art History and Museology at Ural Federal University (UrFU, Yekaterinburg, Russia). She is a member of the Art Critics and Art Historians Association (AIS) and the International Association of Art Critics (AICA, UNESCO). Her research focuses on Russian art of the twentieth century. Furthermore, she gives lectures on art history and contemporary Russian art. She is also director of the Center for Contemporary Culture, head of the Contemporary Art Practices Workshop, and co-organizer of the university's Museum of Unofficial Ural Art (Museum of B.U. Kashkin at UrFU).

Rahma Khazam is a Paris-based researcher and art historian who received her PhD in aesthetics and art theory from the Sorbonne. Her research interests span modernism and the avant-garde movements, contemporaneity, image theory, and speculative realism. She regularly publishes articles and essays in exhibition catalogues, edited volumes, and academic journals and recently completed an edited volume on the work of the artist Franck Leibovici. She is a member of the European Network for Avant-Garde and Modernism Studies (EAM) and the International Association of Art Critics (AICA) and received the AICA France Art Criticism Award in 2017.

Julia Krah completed her studies in art history at the University of Leipzig with a master's thesis on Boris Mikhailov's photographic Sots Art. In 2013-18, she worked as a research assistant and academic tutor under Prof. Michaela Marek and Prof. Tanja Zimmermann, who held the Chair for Eastern European Art and Culture. Her three-month research stay in St. Petersburg and Moscow for preparing her PhD project was funded through an ErasmusPlus-Grant. Currently, Krah holds a PhD-Fellowship of the SYLFF-Foundation (Sasakawa Young Leaders Fellowship Fund). Her most recent publication is "Ilya Kabakov: The man who flew into space from his apartment, Moskau 1985," in *Räume der Kunst. Ausstellungspraktiken im 20. und 21. Jhd*t (Leipzig, 2017).

Anastasia Kurlyandtseva is an art historian and curator at the State Tretyakov Gallery's Department of Contemporary Art. She is currently completing her PhD at the Higher School of Economics in Moscow. Her

research focuses on the cultural diplomacy in exhibition projects between the Soviet Union and the United States in the post-war era. She was co-curator of the *Thaw* exhibition in 2017 and is now working on a sequel about the “stagnation” period, i.e. Soviet culture of the 1970-80s. Kurlyandtseva is a participant in a long-term research project dedicated to Leonid Talochkin’s collection of Soviet unofficial art, which is organized by the State Tretyakov Gallery and the Garage Museum.

Miriam Leimer (née Häßler) studied art history and history at the universities of Münster and Hamburg. Her 2011 MA thesis examines the political and aesthetic dimensions of the ROSTA windows. From 2012 to 2014, she was assistant curator at the Bucerius Kunst Forum in Hamburg, where she worked on several exhibition projects, among them *Rodchenko. A New Era* (2013). After stations at the Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe Hamburg and the Hamburger Kunsthalle, she now works as a freelance curator and art historian. Since 2015, she is a member of the Graduate School “Geisteswissenschaften” at the University of Hamburg. Her doctoral thesis on the artistic and political aftermaths of the *First Russian Art Exhibition of 1922* is in progress.

Polina Lukina, born in Kirishi (Leningrad region) and currently based in Moscow, holds a BA in philosophy and a MA in museum and gallery management. At present, she is a second-year PhD student in the Art and Design Program of the Higher School of Economics in Moscow. Her main field of research is Russian contemporary art in a socio-political context. Polina is a member of the “Place of Art” research group, which examines the place of art in the context of other social practices. The group organizes the seminar series “Place of Art” and publishes the eponymous journal.

Cristina Moraru is an art theoretician, curator, and editor from Iași, Romania. She holds a PhD in Aesthetics from the University of the Arts (UNAGE), Iași and is working as a teaching associate there. She is editor of the volumes published by the Research Center CEAR of UNAGE and (co)editor of the academic journal SVAC. She is also a founding member of C_F_C Iași and participated in international studies programs at NCCR Iconic Criticism, University of Basel, CRC Affective Societies, Freie Universität Berlin, Salzburg International SAFA, EEPAP Lublin, Stacion - CCA Prishtina, Kosovo, and NEC Bucharest.

Olga Olkheft (née Kauhchan) holds a BA degree in Sociology (Pskov Volny Institute, Russia, 2006) and a MA degree in History of Arts (European University, St. Petersburg, Russia, 2014). Her MA thesis is titled "Moscow - Paris, 1900 - 1930: The Problems of Reception." Since 2019, Olkheft is working on her PhD project at the Bielefeld Graduate School in History and Sociology. The working title of the project is "Re-conception of Russian Avant-Garde Art in the Context of Cultural Cold War (1960s-1980s)."

Vera Otdelnova is a PhD candidate at the State Institute for Art Studies in Moscow. The title of her doctoral thesis is "The Moscow Union of Artists: Art and Politics in the Soviet Union in the 1960s and 70s." Some results of her research were presented at conferences organized by the State Moscow University, the European University in St. Petersburg, the State Institute for Art Studies in Moscow, the University in Bucharest, and Humboldt University in Berlin. Here papers were published in Russian and international peer-review journals and volumes, among them *Actual Problems of the History and Theory of Art*, *Observatory of Culture* (in Russian), *OnCulture*, *The State Artist in Romania and Eastern Europe*. *The Role of the Creative Unions* (in English).

Ludmila Piters-Hofmann is writing her PhD thesis at Jacobs University Bremen, supervised by Prof. Dr. Isabel Wünsche. Her research focuses on folk and fairy tales as subject matter in the work of the Russian painter Viktor Vasnetsov in the context of cultural transfer and Russian nationalism. Together with Louise Hardiman and Maria Taroutina, she is currently editing the 2019 issue of *Experiment: A Journal of Russian Culture* on "Abramtsevo and Its Legacies: Neo-National Art, Craft, and Design." Besides organizing the graduate workshop, she is engaged in editorial projects of the Russian Art & Culture Group.

A professor in the Department of Art History, at Rutgers, **Jane Sharp** also acts as Research Curator of the Dodge Collection of Nonconformist Art from the Soviet Union at the Zimmerli Art Museum, where she has curated over 15 exhibitions. Her publications on Russian avant-garde and Soviet era unofficial art include her book, *Russian Modernism between East and West: Natal'ia Goncharova and the Moscow Avant-Garde, 1905-14* (Cambridge University Press, 2006), which won the 2007 Robert Motherwell Prize from the Dedalus Art Foundation. A recent book, *Thinking Pictures: The Visual Field of Moscow Conceptualism*, served as the catalogue for her exhibition drawn from the Dodge Collection held at the Zimmerli Art Museum (2016-17), anticipated to

travel to Tallinn and Vilnius in 2021. It received honorable mention for an Alfred H. Barr award presented by the College Art Association. She is currently completing a book manuscript on abstract art and its reception in Moscow during the Thaw.

Ekaterina Tewes is a doctoral research fellow in the DFG project “Rhythm and Projection” at Freie Universität Berlin. She is currently writing her doctoral thesis on *“Projectionism” and Rhythmic Organization in Art, Theater, and Laboratory Science*. In particular, she investigates the theoretical concept of *Projectionism* developed by Solomon Nikritin as a meta-disciplinary aesthetic-epistemic method of artistic production in Moscow during the early 1920s.

Isabel Wünsche is Professor of Art and Art History at Jacobs University Bremen since 2001. She specializes in European modernism, the avant-garde movements, and abstract art. Her recent book publications include *Kunst & Leben. Michail Matjuschin und die russischen Avantgarde in St. Petersburg* (2012), *Meanings of Abstract Art: Between Nature and Theory* (2012), *The Organic School of the Russian Avant-Garde: Nature’s Creative Principles* (2015), *Marianne Werefkin and the Women Artists in Her Circle* (2016), *Practices of Abstract Art: Between Anarchism and Appropriation* (2016), and most recently *The Routledge Companion to Expressionism in a Transnational Context* (2018).

FOR YOUR NOTES



<https://russian-art.net>