

I am Institution (Hear me Roar)

An Essay by Steven L. Bridges

December 6, 2006

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. A Brief History of Institutional Critique.....	2
3. The Institutionalization of Critique.....	5
4. Fraser Vs. Fraser: Cases In Point.....	7
5. Conclusion.....	11
6. Bibliography.....	18

List of Plates

Plate 1. Robert Smithson. *Spiral Jetty*, 1970.

Plate 2. Fred Wilson. *Mining the Museum*, 1992.

Plate 3. Andrea Fraser. *Museum Highlights: A Gallery Talk*, 1989.

Plate 4. Andrea Fraser. *Recorded Tour: An Introduction to the 1993 Biennial
Exhibition of the Whitney Museum of American Art*, 1993.

Plate 5. Andrea Fraser. *Little Frank and His Carp*, 2001.

Abstract

The critique of the museum has been continuous since its initial conception. Within the last half century, this critical probing of the museum's identity has taken on new life in the form of institutional critique as practiced by various artists, curators, directors, and arts administrators. This essay investigates the evolution of institutional critique over the last fifty years, as well as the ever-evolving complex of relationships, which continue to develop between the museum and its critics. This topic of inquiry is far too vast for an all encompassing analysis here, so it will be important to ground the analysis by touching upon specific, elucidating points of interest. To this end, the artwork and art-writings of Andrea Fraser will be invaluable. The investigation of Fraser's work brings forth many key issues, such as the evolution of institutional critique, the processes and motives of art-historical canonization, and the problems of maintaining a critical capacity in the wake of canonical subsumation.

Introduction

The practice of institutional critique has manifested itself in many ways throughout the course of its history. The museum has been, and continues to be, a focal point of these critical practices and the subject of much critical debate. Early in the 20th century, as many avant-garde circles were gaining momentum (and notoriety), the destruction and total obliteration of the museum entity was a common proclamation. This form of institutional critique is obviously an extreme case, one that is more inflammatory than substantial. Yet, it conjures many of the key issues surrounding the museum's identity and the manifestation of this identity in the public realm. In general, these issues deal with the museum's relation to history, its prison-like and even morgue-like characteristics, and its unique ability to subsume dissonance.

Within the last half century, this critical probing of the museum's identity has taken on new life in the form of institutional critique as practiced by various artists, curators, directors and arts administrators. In this period alone art historians and critics have identified at least three significant waves of institutional critique, each with the museum locked in its cross-hairs. These same historians and critics uphold that the third phase, our current critical paradigm, marks a unique inversion of the relationship between critic and institution. This so-called *institutionalization of critique* presents an intriguing point of entry into this ongoing discussion.

More intriguing than simply mapping the evolution of institutional critique is the way in which the museum, specifically, responds to the critical practices of artists, curators, and arts administrators alike, subsuming their practices in its ever-growing institutional framework. What effect does this process of art-historical canonization have on the critical capacity of these practices? How do the practitioners of critique maintain their criticality? How do they adapt their criticism to an ever-changing critical climate? To assess the nature of these issues, the artwork and art-writings of Andrea Fraser will prove invaluable.

As an artist/curator/critic, Fraser has been a prominent figure in, and theorist of, institutional critique for many years. Her work often engages the museum directly, questioning all aspects of both the museum's inner-workings and its relation to society. A

prolific writer, Fraser's numerous essays and statements regarding her own work and the dynamic role of the artist in relation to the museum provide especially rich insights for this investigation. Her ongoing participation in the practice of institutional critique helps to elucidate how it has changed, how it is currently being shaped, and how/if it will retain its vitality and agency in the future. In addition, if she was one of the first to use the term 'institutional critique' in reference to a type of artistic practice, which is a recent assertion, then she assumes a controversial role with regard to the process of canonization: she is critical of this process while simultaneously participating in it.

Due to the overwhelming vastness of this discussion, I will be forced to maintain a narrow perspective with regard to this line of inquiry. After a brief explanation of the main developments within institutional critique over the last half century, I will focus on the current critical climate: the shift towards the institutionalization of critique. As the subsumation of criticism itself by the museum presents some serious concerns for the future of institutional critique, I will address many of these concerns and consider the implications of this inversion. Much has changed since the days of the avant-garde, and yet the museum's identity crisis remains in constant flux. Is there no end? And if there is an end, will it also begin again?

A Brief History of Institutional Critique

The three surges of institutional critique mentioned above are characterized as generational, alluding to a familial kinship wherein the different generations grow out of the practices and values of the preceding. The fact by which one may refer to these periods of increased institutionally-minded critique as the first generation, or second generation, is an expression of its canonization. The imposed familial bond between the different generations is also a mark of this process, resulting from the simplification that historical hindsight is notably susceptible to. Regardless, in order to remain consistent and in line with the current discussion, I will also use this terminology to refer to the different waves of institutional critique.

The first generation of institutional critique, beginning in the 1960's and progressing

on into the 70's, is most often identified with the shift towards alternative artistic practices, such as Conceptual Art, Happenings, Land Art, etc. Simon Sheikh's account of this historical form of institutional critique is significant:

institutional critique was mainly conducted by artists, and was directed against the art institutions, such as museums, galleries, and collections. Arts institutions... were seen as spaces of cultural containment and circumscription, and thus as something to attack aesthetically, politically, and theoretically.¹

These alternative practices were marked by their revulsion of institutional authoritarianism. The artists who participated in these practices positioned themselves in direct opposition to the supposed tyranny of the museum. Often by avoiding object-based works of art, which easily lend themselves to museum consumption, many of these artists either critiqued the museum directly (exposing its inner-workings) or created work that was no longer bound to the museum tradition. The Land Art of Robert Smithson, and in particular his *Spiral Jetty*, 1970 [Plate 1], exemplify this practice.

Art history has long since cataloged this first generation of artists, and, as part of the process of canonization, the movement has become defined by a select group of artists. This list generally includes the artists Hans Haacke, Daniel Buren, Marcel Broodthaers, Michael Asher, and Robert Smithson. I refer to the writing of Robert Smithson to help convey the critical climate of this generation, for I find his descriptions particularly vivid. In his essay *Cultural Confinement*, written in 1972, Smithson is highly critical of the role of the curator:

Cultural confinement takes place when a curator imposes his own limits on an art exhibition, rather than asking an artist to set his limits... The function of the warden-curator is to separate art from the rest of society. Next comes integration. Once the work of art is totally neutralized, ineffective, abstracted, safe, and politically lobotomized it is ready to be consumed by society.²

He goes on to declare that “Museums, like asylums and jails, have wards and cells– in other words, neutral rooms called 'galleries.’” Smithson views the museum as a danger to the critical potency of artwork, and his critique is in line with the greater cultural criticism that prevailed in this period in the US as well as abroad. This characterization of the museum, and its key players, as prison-like, prevails throughout much of this period of institutional

1 Simon Sheikh, *The Trouble With Institutions, Or, Art And Its Publics*, in *Art And Its Institutions: Current Conflicts, Critique And Collaborations*, ed. by Nina Möntmann (London, UK: Black Dog Publishing, 2006), 142.

2 Robert Smithson, *Cultural Confinement*, from <http://www.robertsmithson.com/essays/cultural.htm>.

critique. The artists of this generation attempted to sever the reliance of artists on museums and curators for validation. However, according to Jan Verwoert, “it is also in the very process of the unfolding of this practical critique of the art institution, that the institution changed its face and the curator for the first time emerged as a free agent in the field of art.”³ The ramifications of this shift continue to resonate even today and have a deep impact on the resurgences of institutional critique.

The second wave of institutional critique swelled during the late 1980's and washed over into the 90's. This generation, while having much in common with the previous generation, necessarily adopted different approaches and discourses. The climate had changed significantly since the 1970's. Again I refer to the writing of Simon Sheikh, who points out how:

in the so-called second wave... the institutional framework became somewhat expanded to include the artist's role (the subject performing the critique) as institutionalized, as well as an investigation into other institutional spaces (and practices) besides the art space.⁴

Whereas the first generation of critique was defined through an oppositional binary between artist and institution, the second generation's practice often involved a self-reflexive awareness of the role of the artist within the institutional framework. Furthermore, the critical practice shifted from “a critique of institution towards a critique of representation.”⁵ The critical relationship between the artist and the museum became even more complex as the critique began to shift from the outside to the inside.⁶

Although many of the same artists from the first generation continued to practice the art of institutional critique, the second generation was more aptly defined by the work of artists like Fred Wilson, Barbara Bloom, and Andrea Fraser, to name only a few. It is important to note that much of the success of these artists' various projects was in large part due to their active blending of different artistic roles, especially as the once clearly demarcated boundaries between artists and curators (as well as other museum professionals) began to come into question. In regards to these considerations, Fred Wilson's exhibition

3 Jan Verwoert, *This Is Not An Exhibition*, in *Art And Its Institutions: Current Conflicts, Critique And Collaborations*, ed. by Nina Möntmann (London, UK: Black Dog Publishing, 2006), 133.

4 Simon Sheikh, *Notes On Institutional Critique*, from <http://transform.eicpcp.net/transversal/0106/sheikh/en>.

5 Hito Steyerl, *The Institution of Critique*, from <http://transform.eicpcp.net/transversal/0106/steyerl/en>.

6 Simon Sheikh, *Notes On Institutional Critique*, from <http://transform.eicpcp.net/transversal/0106/sheikh/en>.

Mining the Museum, 1992-93 [Plate 2], is highly relevant. For the moment, I will postpone discussion of this particular practice and return to it in the discussion of the trajectory of Andrea Fraser's artistic projects. First, however, it will be important to put the current resurgence of institutional critique, the proposed third wave, into perspective.

The Institutionalization of Critique

The defining characteristic of the current wave of institutional critique is the seemingly complete internalization of this critical practice, the so-called institutionalization of critique. In this respect, the critique has shifted entirely to a critique from within the institution. Perhaps even more importantly:

the current institutional-critical discussions seem predominantly propagated by curators and directors of the very same institutions, and usually *for*, rather than against them. That is, not in an effort to oppose or even destroy the institution, but rather to modify and solidify it.⁷

This description proposes that artists are no longer involved in the practice of critique. To the extent that they are involved, they are powerless against the internalization of their critique within the institutions themselves. Yet, I can not help but wonder if this formulation simplifies the greater complexity of the issue by failing to recognize the expansion of the role of the artist. In the current wave, artists are no longer simply artists; artists are curators, critics, art historians, and so on. In fact, the dissolution of the division of labor in the art world has had a great influence on the different waves of institutional critique.

In what way are these artists, curators, directors, and arts administrators practicing institutional critique? How is one able to describe these practices when they have not yet been succinctly identified (or canonized)? In part, the current resurgence can be traced back to developments in the 1990's, during the second generation of institutional critique. In Voerwert's explanation of these developments, the key factors are:

the renaissance of the institutional critique in art practice, the founding of university

⁷ Simon Sheikh, *The Trouble With Institutions, Or, Art And Its Publics*, in *Art And Its Institutions: Current Conflicts, Critique And Collaborations*, ed. by Nina Möntmann (London, UK: Black Dog Publishing, 2006), 142.

courses for curating and the concomitant establishment of curatorial studies as an academic field of knowledge, the growing importance of international Biennials as a platform for the declaration and discussion of curatorial agendas as well as the increased need to sustain progressive art institutions in the face of a rising hostility against non-profitable cultural projects.⁸

These developments help to explain how and why institutional critique became institutionalized. The rising significance of curatorial practices and the solidification of the curator's role in the field of art drastically changed institutional frameworks, but also for the first time placed curators and artists together (and at times in competition) as the creative impulses driving the arts. With the dissolution of the division of labor came the need to also redefine the relationships between these individuals and the institutions to which they were inextricably tied. In her seminal essay *A Curriculum For Institutional Critique, Or The Professionalisation Of Conceptual Art*, Julia Bryan-Wilson addresses many of these same concerns. Her description aligns the artists with the administrators, and here they are joined by the commonality of their critical stances:

young artists and up and coming art administrators alike cut their teeth on the premise that the museum itself is a loaded space, that the framing of the art contributes mightily to its reception, and that its corporate sponsors are a necessary evil.⁹

It is also important to acknowledge that this shift in the practice of institutional critique does not imply a co-optation of the practice by arts institutions. Bryan-Wilson goes on to recognize how the interplay between these factors allows the practice to continue “to evolve in multiple directions,” and that the museum “is also productive, exerting pressures and affording opportunities that artists respond to.”¹⁰

Therefore, there is a general consensus that institutional critique has in fact shifted from the outside to the inside. There is also consensus that the discussions instigated by these practitioners support the museum (among other art institutions). Furthermore, it is evident that the first and second waves of institutional critique “are today themselves part of the art institution, in the form of art history and education as much as in the general de-

8 Jan Verwoert, *This Is Not An Exhibition*, in *Art And Its Institutions: Current Conflicts, Critique And Collaborations*, ed. by Nina Möntmann (London, UK: Black Dog Publishing, 2006), 135.

9 Julia Bryan-Wilson, *A Curriculum For Institutional Critique, Or The Professionalisation Of Conceptual Art*, in *New Institutionalism*, ed. by Jonas Ekeberg (Oslo, Norway: Office for Contemporary Art, 2003), 103.

10 *Ibid.*, 103.

materialized and post- conceptual art practice of contemporary art.”¹¹ So, what are the implications of the canonization of these practices? What does this mean with regard for the current wave, and future thereof? In response to these questions, Gerald Raunig offers valuable insight:

If institutional critique is not to be fixed and paralyzed as something established in the art field and confined within its rules, then it has to continue to develop along with changes in society and especially to tie into other forms of critique both within and outside the art field...¹²

This, I believe, is the key to the continued relevance of institutional critique. For although the art institutions, and especially museums, have the enduring power to subsume criticism by canonizing its practitioners, this process does not necessarily neutralize the critical practice. Jan Verwoert points out that “the absorption of creative processes by institutional frameworks may release their energies by channeling them and thus start processes rather than end them.”¹³ The act of subsumation catalyzes discussions of reform within the institutions as they also strive to adapt to changing critical climates, in which they are deeply implicated.

In a lecture given at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago recently, Vasif Kortun expressed a similar stance. While discussing a recent trend in Italy to standardize higher education, Kortun remarked that such a move would produce critique, but not criticality.¹⁴ It is not a far stretch to relate this discussion to the present analysis of institutional critique. The standardization of education by large institutions is similar to the canonization of art practices by art institutions. In order for institutional critique to remain a relevant artistic practice (however it may manifest itself), it must not simply produce critique, but rather criticality. That is, a practice of criticism, a way of thinking that is not quarantined off, separated from the other mental faculties. It is the integration of this critical practice into an overall way of thinking, perhaps even living, that will ensure its longevity.

11 Simon Sheikh, *Notes On Institutional Critique*, from <http://transform.eipcp.net/transversal/0106/sheikh/en>.

12 Gerald Raunig, *Instituent Practices: Fleeing, Instituting, Transforming*, from <http://transform.eipcp.net/transversal/0106/raunig/en>.

13 Jan Verwoert, *This Is Not An Exhibition*, in *Art And Its Institutions: Current Conflicts, Critique And Collaborations*, ed. by Nina Möntmann (London, UK: Black Dog Publishing, 2006), 137.

14 Vasif Kortun, Lecture for Department of Arts Administration and Policy, SAIC, Chicago, IL, November 14, 2006.

Fraser Vs. Fraser: Cases In Point

Andrea Fraser's significant role in multiple facets of the arts allow for an enlightening cross-referencing of the many perspectives she simultaneously represents. It is rare nowadays for an artist to be only an artist, and by this I mean that they do not also partake in the practices of curation, administration, art criticism and history. Yet few seem to do so with such fervor and awareness as Andrea Fraser. In the following section I will assess Fraser's multiplicity of roles, and will rely heavily on her own writing for further elucidation. Furthermore, an analysis of a select few of her artistic projects will help our comprehension of this artist's trajectory through the changing critical climates of the past few decades. As a prominent figure in the practice of institutional critique, and herself relegated to the canon of art history, Fraser's different projects and writings will help to ground theory in the case studies of her practice.

Before I begin an investigation of her different artworks, it seems helpful to analyze her understanding and perspective of institutional critique and its subsequent developments over the years as she describes in a few of her texts. Interestingly enough, her writings over the years follow a similar trajectory as her artistic projects. In fact, many of her writings cross over into the realm of artwork, and this should be kept in mind when analyzing these essays. An earlier text of interest is *An Artist's Statement*, 1992, which is also an example of her art-writing style. This "statement" often requires the kind of interpretative lens that much of her artwork also requires. However, by not getting caught up in the apparent contradictions and occasional ironies of her assertions, one is able to discern some very illuminating perspectives:

The relations I might want to transform may be relations in which I feel myself to be a victim or a perpetrator. The ethical dimension of the imperative of site specificity, however, pertains entirely to my status as a perpetrator, that is, of the agency and authority accorded me as a producer, and as the subject of discourse, by the institutions in which I function. So when it comes to institutional critique, I am the institution's representative and the agent of its reproduction I am the enemy.¹⁵

What Fraser describes here is the complication of her role, as operating both from within

15 Andrea Fraser, *An Artist's Statement*, in Museum As Muse: Artists Reflect (New York, NY: Museum of Modern Art, 1999), 162.

and from the outside. At once, she maintains that she is a representative of the institution while also an enemy. The key here is how she defines each role and its position in relation to the institution. It should be of no surprise that she refers to the problem of representation in this passage, as it is indicative of the second generation of institutional critique to which she is most often assigned. Yet something is different, this is not merely the reaffirmation of the critique of representation prevalent in this period. Rather, Fraser has already shifted her stance to a critique of the representative.¹⁶

It should be noted that from early on in her work Fraser showed a great deal of interest with regard to the ideas of representation and its representative embodiment. There are two artistic projects of hers that I wish to focus upon, which deal directly with issues of representation. The first project is *Museum Highlights: A Gallery Talk*, 1989 [Plate 3], wherein Fraser transforms herself into a docent at the Philadelphia Museum of Art by the name of Jane Castleton. The tour focuses mainly on the relationship between the museum and its public, through representations of class and taste, as well as private philanthropy and public policy. Furthermore, Fraser contends that Castleton is not a character, but “a site defined by her function as the museum's representative.”¹⁷ Fraser's critical stance here is complex in its layering, and is difficult to pick apart. By displacing her own identity as an artist, she is able to enter into the museum, to join its staff as a docent. At the same time, she actively criticizes the museum in its shaping of an appropriate public, receptive to the class values and tastes that the museum embodies.

In *Recorded Tour: An Introduction to the 1993 Biennial Exhibition of the Whitney Museum of American Art*, 1993 [Plate 4], Fraser has abandoned the personage of Castleton, and assumes a vocal form. Her reasons for leaving this critical practice behind become evident when she explains that:

While I have the means to identify with museum guides— being a woman, an autodidact, and someone short on economic and objectified familial cultural capital— such an identification remains a misidentification, and a displacement of my status within these institutions.¹⁸

16 George Baker, *Fraser's Form*, in Andrea Fraser. Works: 1983-2003 (Hamburg, Germany: Kunstverein, 2003), 67.

17 Andrea Fraser, *Work Descriptions*, in Andrea Fraser. Works: 1983-2003 (Hamburg, Germany: Kunstverein, 2003), 114.

18 Andrea Fraser, *An Artist's Statement*, in Museum As Muse: Artists Reflect (New York, NY: Museum of Modern Art, 1999), 164.

This marks yet another significant shift, at least in consciousness if nothing else, for Fraser now fully identifies herself as an artist implicated within the museum. From this point on she continues to develop her critical practice within this context, and there is no longer a desire to try and position herself outside the institution. In *Recorded Tour*, she now directs her critical practice at museum professionals and the inner-workings of the museum. In this project Fraser conducts a series of interviews with the guest curators of the biennial. The result is the opposite of most audio tours. Rather than creating a sense of intimacy, the tape reveals the great distance between museum professionals and their intended publics.¹⁹ In a way, Fraser becomes a collaborator in this process, no longer identifiable as an outside agent, and consequently implicates herself in her own practices.

The final artistic project I would like to refer to is Fraser's *Little Frank and His Carp*, 2001 [Plate 5]. Taking place in the newly opened Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao, this piece is indicative of Fraser's transition to the practices of what is now referred to as the third generation of institutional critique, the institutionalization of critique. Today, years after the opening of Guggenheim Bilbao, there continues to be a great deal of debate surrounding this institution. Some critics remain up in arms over the Guggenheim's continued efforts to spread out internationally, often citing its corporatization as a major factor in the shift corruption of museum values. Before I return to the work of art cited above, I am compelled to refer to a quote from Fraser:

As an institutional critic with a commitment to self-reflexive analysis, my tendency is to assume that if the corporatisation of museums is moving forward at such an extraordinarily rapid pace, it can only be because it is consistent, on some level, with the interests and orientation of museum professionals and artists— including artist like myself— who staff and supply them; because we have accepted these trends as inevitable, necessary, or even desirable.²⁰

It is evident that the dissolution of the division of labor is almost complete at this point. Fraser still refers to herself as different from museum professionals, but, again, they together are deeply implicated in these decisions. So how does the practice of institutional critique orient itself in this climate? And to what end? Fraser positions herself as the museum

19 Andrea Fraser, *Work Descriptions*, in Andrea Fraser. Works: 1983-2003 (Hamburg, Germany: Kunstverein, 2003), 141.

20 Andrea Fraser, *A museum is not a business. It is run in a businesslike fashion*, in Art And Its Institutions: Current Conflicts, Critique And Collaborations, ed. by Nina Möntmann (London, UK: Black Dog Publishing, 2006), 90.

visitor in the work *Little Frank and His Carp* and she is willingly subservient to the commands of the museum's audio tour. George Baker describes how:

Fraser obeys as the museum now directly commands a social or desiring relationship, even if it is to itself. And no longer disrupting the hidden transference between the museum and its public, Fraser creates an echo of the transference that the museum openly admits is now crucial to its identity or its form.²¹

This is how I have come to understand the institutionalization of critique. The process by which the preceding generations practiced their different forms of critique caused both the institutions and the artists themselves to renegotiate their positions in relation to each other. Through a series of expansions, the museum's framework grew, and continues to grow, to encompass these artists and their practices. This subsumation in turn catalyzed a reconstitution of institutionally-minded artistic practices, where eventually the museum came to subsume the artistic identity itself (or was it the other way around?). Yet this process does not signify the co-optation of institutional critique.

In an article written by Fraser for Artforum in the fall of 2005, these issues are addressed, although not necessarily answered. Recounting the many years of her involvement in the practice of institutional critique, Fraser realizes that she may have been the one to actually label this form of critical artistic practice, thereby participating in the process of canonization. As I have described before, it is her multiplicity of roles that makes her such an interesting case. With this in mind, it is not simply a matter of the dissolution of the division of labor as I hypothesized earlier. It is also a matter of the individuals themselves coming to terms with the multiplicity of their identities and accepting the responsibility that accompanies each. Thus, it becomes apparent that:

It's not a question of being against the institution: We are the institution. It's a question of what kind of institution we are, what kind of values we institutionalize, what forms of practice we reward, and what kinds of rewards we aspire to. Because the institution of art is internalized, embodied, and performed by individuals, these are the questions that institutional critique demands we ask, above all, of ourselves. Finally, it is this self-questioning—more than a thematic like “the institution,” no matter how broadly conceived—that defines institutional critique as a practice.²²

This, I believe, is the current critical stance of institutional critique and the current practice

21 George Baker, *Fraser's Form*, in Andrea Fraser. Works: 1983-2003 (Hamburg, Germany: Kunstverein, 2003), 71.

22 Andrea Fraser, *From The Critique Of Institutions To An Institution Of Critique*, in Artforum 44, no. 1 (September 2005), 283.

of the third generation. What does it mean for the future of institutional critique? How will the process of subsumation and art-historical canonization adapt itself to this critical climate? I can not say for sure. What I can say is that these answers lie in the hands of the individual practitioners, each one of us who invest ourselves in trying to understand and negotiate these concerns.

Conclusion

Institutional critique has manifested itself in many ways over the last half century, and the current situation expands the possibilities of its influence even further. Yet, I have reservations about what the individualization of institutional values and the practice of institutional critique means. On the one hand, there seems to be an ideal of how each individual, as an institution, will diligently practice this self-awareness. In this manner, institutional critique maintains its potent agency and continues to be a driving force of reform in the field of art. On the other hand, this intense individualization could lead to a kind of disbanding of a critical focus, so long as each practitioner is concerned only with their own agenda.

As we have seen, the practice of institutional critique surges and resurges over time and while some may practice it throughout, its relevance and ability to catalyze change rely on many factors, many of which are outside the field of art. This refers back to the remark made by Vasif Kortun concerning the difference between critique and criticality. Whether in the realm of education or art or any other discipline, it is not sufficient to produce instances of critique, but rather to open one's mind to the greater situation, to be a practitioner of critique within and throughout. To quarantine these disciplines off from one another, to deny their reliance upon each other, their reciprocal interchanges, also obstructs the possibility of criticality. These issues require growth and flexibility, and in order to participate in them, one must also be able to grow and adapt to the continual fluctuations.

The practice of institutional critique (or perhaps I should refer to the practice as *institutional criticality*) will undoubtedly continue. The question of whether art-historical canonization means the neutralization of this practice, I think, has been sufficiently answered. It is interesting to think that the processes of canonization and the subsumation

of these practices into the museum context is actually a crucial player in the longevity and continued relevance of institutional critique. Again, I can not help but wonder how this current wave will manifest itself. Still I am a little uneasy, a little unsure as to what role the artist/administrator/curator/director will play. What change will be catalyzed? Is the question of subsumation now a moot point since the shift towards internalization? Is the act of questioning the answer for which I search?

Bibliography

1. Baker, George. *Fraser's Form*. In Andrea Fraser. Works: 1984 to 2003. Hamburg, Germany: Kunstverein, 2003.
2. Bryan-Wilson, Julia. *A Curriculum For Institutional Critique, Or The Professionalisation Of Conceptual Art*. In New Institutionalism. Ed. by Jonas Ekeberg. Oslo, Norway: Office for Contemporary Art, 2003.
3. Fraser, Andrea. *A museum is not a business. It is run in a businesslike fashion*. In Art And Its Institutions: Current Conflicts, Critique And Collaborations. Ed. by Nina Möntmann. London, UK: Black Dog Publishing, 2006.
4. _____. *An Artist's Statement*. In Museum As Muse: Artists Reflect. New York, NY: Museum of Modern Art, 1999.
5. _____. *From The Critique Of Institutions To An Institution Of Critique*. In Artforum 44, no. 1 (September 2005).
6. _____. *Work Descriptions*. In Andrea Fraser. Works: 1984 to 2003. Hamburg, Germany: Kunstverein, 2003.
7. Kortun, Vasif. *Lecture for Department of Arts Administration and Policy*. School of the Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago, IL. 14 Nov. 2006.
8. Möntmann, Nina. *Art And Its Institutions*. In Art And Its Institutions: Current Conflicts, Critique And Collaborations. Ed. by Nina Möntmann. London, UK: Black Dog Publishing, 2006.
9. Nowotny, Stefan. *Anti-Canonization: The Differential Knowledge Of Institutional Critique*. Trans. by Aileen Derieg. From <http://transform.eipcp.net/transversal/0106/nowotny/en>.
10. Raunig, Gerald. *Instituent Practices: Fleeing, Instituting, Transforming*. From <http://transform.eipcp.net/transversal/0106/raunig/en>.
11. Sheikh, Simon. *Notes On Institutional Critique*. From <http://transform.eipcp.net/transversal/0106/sheikh/en>.
12. _____. *The Trouble With Institutions, Or, Art And Its Publics*. In Art And Its Institutions: Current Conflicts, Critique And Collaborations. Ed. by Nina

Möntmann. London, UK: Black Dog Publishing, 2006.

13. Smithson, Robert. *Cultural Confinement*. From

<http://www.robertsmithson.com/essays/cultural.htm>.

14. Steyerl, Hito. *The Institution Of Critique*. From

<http://transform.eipcp.net/transversal/0106/steyerl/en>.

15. Verwoert, Jan. *This Is Not An Exhibition*. In Art And Its Institutions: Current Conflicts, Critique And Collaborations. Ed. by Nina Möntmann. London, UK: Black Dog Publishing, 2006.