

Artemis Stamatiadis
 Director – Outset Contemporary Art Fund Greece
 Total Time: 16:33
 10.09.2021

Regarding the question about the relation between the public and the private in Greece, in the last few years we see increasingly more collaborations taking place between the two sectors, resulting in really positive outcomes and great audience feedback. Therefore we can assume that we experience a unique and very important dynamics whenever the two sectors come close. I think that one of the main features that have prompted different organizations to invest in becoming extroverts and to go after these collaborations, is that they are strongly preoccupied with audience outreach. It is no longer enough for institutions to organize activities in their own premises – be they museums, collections, or what have you – so that the audience can approach and see into what each institution has to offer; now it's time for the institutions to make an effort to go beyond their geographical boundaries, which were much more rigid so far, and to try to address a wider audience. This is what makes your own work as an institution more interesting and substantial, but also more democratic (since the democratic context was mentioned earlier).

The best way for the institutions to reach that goal is to enter the public space: we see all the more organizations – such as NEON, which is active in public space since 2013, organizing a number of exhibitions housed in public buildings – opening up spaces for a wider audience in a way that hasn't been tried before. There are also collaborations taking place with public institutions, such as the Ephorate of Antiquities of Cyclades for Anthony Gormley's exhibition in Delos, whereas we now have something similar with the collaboration between the Greek Parliament for the former Tobacco Factory. So we see that the sense of trust between the private and the public sector is further intensified, but also the quality of it is high because it takes place in full seriousness, with common goals and keeping the wider audience in mind. What is also of great interest is the fact many activities are set in specific buildings, now utilized with a totally different form. So even if we don't leave the spot on the map where most of your activities are set, there are different ways to invite new people that wouldn't be directly associated with their work. I think that the most obvious example is the Stavros Niarchos Foundation, which houses the Greek National Library and the Greek National Opera, and by doing so it has actually changed the whole landscape of the area – and therefore the whole city. You have people who would come to do their everyday activities in this space: taking their kids for a walk, riding their bikes, whatever their interests might be, these people come into direct contact with culture. And their interest is mobilized in a much more direct and powerful way: so I think that in the course of time this will have a significant impact on the relation between the citizen and culture, which is a very important thing.

I also think that another important factor is that the public and the private factor function in quite different modes. Whereas the scope often can be similar, their function is different – and therefore, when they join forces, the result can be very powerful. On the one hand, the public has a strong appeal to the audience and a close connection with the “average citizen.” In other words, it has already secured this “wide audience” we keep discussing, it is in direct contact with it. Of course it can recruit several important resources around the city, be they specific buildings, streets, and squares that work on their own terms. And then comes the private sector, private institutions that tend to be more functional, as red tape can be much more limited due to their size; they can quickly respond to the needs that might arise in different fields, whereas they usually focus on something specific. So whereas the public needs to respond to all issues of the city and of the Greek citizen, institutions can concentrate on, say theater or contemporary art, developing much quicker reflexes and channel more important, targeted resources, exactly because their goal is more well-defined. So this collaboration is of special importance.

<https://3137.gr/when-dci-met-gabriela/en/>

Allow me to bring an example from the organization where I currently work: Outset is an international organization that started from England in 2003; from the get-go, one of its main features is that it comprises a private initiative that collaborates with public institutions, presenting several examples of this kind. They are initiatives that are geared towards examining thoroughly the changes that can be offered to artistic creation. A large part of the work is devoted to research, so that all things can be placed within a given framework. For example, one of the most powerful and positive things in London is its intense cultural life and the fact that people arrive in the city to visit theaters, museums, and art spaces, thus creating cash flow for those reasons. However, the artists themselves find it increasingly harder to make a living in the city. Actually, Outset has retrieved several statistics regarding the percentage of the artists' studios that had recently shut down, as an unsettling number of them has emerged. I believe they found that in 2018, a rough 67% of the new art studios that had opened in the city in the last four years had recently shut down. They couldn't face the pressure and the economic challenges of the city: what had happened? Even though the city is deeply engaged with artistic creation, creativity aborts the city, and consequently the dialogue and energy that lies in its center. This is how an initiative named Studio Makers was launched, aiming to provide affordable studios for new artists. This happened in the context of a collaboration between Outset, the Mayor of London, the UK's Arts Council (which is also a public institution), and Bloomberg Philanthropies. I think that this is how a paradigm is set: all these different organizations, which were the ones defining the extent to which each party contributes and affects the endeavor, are currently making an enormous effort, buying entire buildings, or even changing state regulations pertaining to the operation of these artist studios. The goal is to allow the artists to work with less money in the city. This is how the right conditions are created to protect artistic creation in the city. Theater provides one single example, because there are private and public institutions that share a common vision, and therefore we can assess the effectiveness of this overall effort. Outset alone has already gathered 7.5 million pounds via a fundraising campaign, so we can already estimate the impact. Wrapping up, I would like to stress that this can be an example of the importance of the collaboration between the private and the public; the importance to assign clear roles for each and everyone involved, for the sake of a healthier operation, to keep ourselves more open to this communication and collaboration, and to eventually trace the actual need for artistic creation and development.

So, one of the key points of the question is how can a code of conduct, a set of values, be reinforced and implemented. In my view, I don't think that the most productive way to change people's mindsets and make a value code relevant is to present something very specific that should work. Needless to say, there are some exceptions: Obviously if we are talking about sexual harassment in the workplace, at the moment it is clear that there must be protection. But in any other case related to social sensitivity, I do not think that applying a rule, and therefore saying it or imposing it on someone else is the most effective way to achieve your goal. Racists will not stop being racists because you told them not to use certain words or suggested that these behaviors do not exist. You will reach this goal if you slowly try to change mentalities. But how do you do that? For me, you can do it with culture and education, which goes hand in hand with culture – and this is why I work in this field.

I believe that the value of culture and contemporary art, which is my expertise, is that, while most people deal with the whole (and rightly so, as things need to be functional), culture brings individual histories on the table: individual experiences that will come to balance this preoccupation with the whole and the priority of the whole. In contemporary art, we deal with the artists themselves: we think about how they did what they did, what were their influences, what were their stories. Very often we see that the artists themselves articulate a voice (or deal with one, for that matter) that comes from the margins, voices that are much more intense and have a more intense need to be heard, because they are not heard in society as a whole. This is exactly the power and the beauty of art, I gather: it becomes a tool with the potential to render the world more aware. The deeper culture is integrated into the daily life of the average citizen, the greater is its potential to sensitize the world. So this is the code of values we are discussing: culture should find different ways to penetrate society, and it shouldn't be imposed on it.

This by extension allows for a much stronger development of dialogue. If you try to apply something very specific, sometimes the dialogue also fades, if a person doesn't feel comfortable expressing their true feelings. It is very important for things to evolve so that we can really listen to each other; so that we can firmly support our views. I think that culture and education can do that, or actually this is the reason I keep faith in what we do. In due time, this also runs across different ranks, bottom-up, and not vice versa. Other than that, I believe that every organization should try some self-reflection and try to think about what matters to them personally, how they work and how they can be more democratic and open, in order to build a more creative environment that will offer better outcomes and solutions. (I can only talk specifically about myself and the organization I work for, because this might not be the case for someone else.) What interests me the most is the empowerment of the individual. I am also interested in what takes place in the context of a collaboration, since we mainly sponsor and financially support artists, those involved in artistic creation or other associates. But our work is not over, it is very important for us to try to empower artistic creation, artists, curators, and other people we come in contact with. And this is not just a financial issue: we are part of a very large network, so it is very important for us to consider how to bring this network closer, how to work together (with an emphasis on "togetherness"), to have a more free and open dialogue, even if every time we have to re-discover the wheel.

Outset is a global organization, which means we have a global network. So if an artist is facing a specific problem, we are capable of locating it across different organizations in different countries, to see what they did and how they managed to overcome their problems or how they managed to reinforce the things they wanted. The goal is to get stronger as a whole, and respectively this is of great importance internally. I took over as the institution's director earlier this year, so the team isn't fully developed yet. I sincerely hope that we can have a bigger team and it is important to strengthen it. So since my personal experience comes from abroad, I should say that I was lucky to meet people that, already from the outset of my career, prioritized my personal development, allowing me to be constantly on their side, whatever we did. To bring an example, when I worked in Tate Modern, my boss Marko Daniel, whom I deeply appreciate, took me with him to every meeting he attended. So the point wasn't about participating (as I didn't always have the knowledge to participate) but I kept my ears open, I tried to grasp more things, I put more thinking into my work, and this is how I managed to I was able to grow. But other than that, it was also the policy of the organization: everyone always had meetings with people from higher ranks; they themselves assessed the point they had reached and what they wanted to achieve on a professional level,

how can their organization or a more experienced individual help out in this process of development. What I mean is that once you have options and feel supported by your organization, you will also enter the process of thinking about what you can do to contribute. In my case, there was also a budget to be allocated for this particular development, the professional one. I'm tempted to conclude that eventually the financial value of this budget was the least of its potentials: the value of the budget lied in the fact that people put some thinking into how to make the most out of it or what is of interest, so this gave everyone individually a strong professional and personal vibe; in extension, your team was also becoming much more effective and strong, as we all worked relentlessly for ourselves and our growth. So, to return to the code of conduct, which was the starting point of our conversation today, I will reiterate that I think that applying something specific can have benefits, but it is not the most efficient way: we need to focus on the individual. Culture promotes the individual experience, or what the DCI manual describes as "wet knowledge": this is exactly what I am trying to actively cultivate in the institution I work for.

<https://3137.gr/when-dci-met-gabriela/en/>