

Alain Quemin

## The Hierarchy of Countries in the Contemporary Art World and Market.

An Empirical Survey of the Globalization of the Visual Arts<sup>1</sup>

Since the end of the 1960s, works of art have been bought and sold largely on a worldwide market and international trade represents the »very heart« of the market.<sup>2</sup> The main institutions of the contemporary art world,<sup>3</sup> i.e., museums and art galleries, operate within a vast international network.

The various actors in this network frequently declare that geographical borders and nationalities, including those of the artist, are of negligible importance. Such an opinion, probably held by a majority of the actors in the contemporary art world at any given time is reinforced by the fact that validation in terms of physical space and geographical distance has replaced the validation in terms of time which characterized »ancient« art. Cultural globalization and *métissage*, and a general questioning of borders and traditional hierarchies between forms of artistic expression, are very much in vogue and go beyond the scope of mere contemporary art.

At the present time, although this trend is particularly pronounced in ideas circulating in the United States, other countries are no less influenced. The theme of *documenta 11*, held at Kassel in 2002, was world cultures, peripheral zones and the position of the artist in today's world. The 2003 edition of the *Venice biennale* was entitled *Plateau of Mankind*.

Nevertheless, although those in the contemporary art world are convinced of the reality of a cultural ferment and the related exchanges at a planetary level, and though they staunchly defend cultural relativism, declaring that no country is in a position to claim that it is more important than any other in terms of art – because in art, everything boils down to talent and individual artistic personality – they frequently recognize, without batting an eyelid, that a hierarchy between countries does exist. In fact, if we question the actors and they are able to overcome their basic scruples regarding the existence of leading countries<sup>4</sup> and countries that play

a secondary or marginal role, everybody more or less agrees on the same classification, and places the United States in first position, followed by Germany and then by other countries such as Switzerland or Great Britain, or France and Italy. Although this classification is implicit, it is familiar to all those involved as a fact of the contemporary art world<sup>5</sup> and assumed to be part of the relative importance of all of the respective actors in this same art world. For our part, we have sought to construct a whole range of indicators which reveal that, beyond the initial platitudes, such a hierarchy does indeed exist – both in terms of market and institutions – between the various countries involved in the contemporary art world. Moreover, our research made it possible to verify whether this classification, which we sought to make as objective as possible, is in line with that familiar to the actors in the contemporary international art world.

### The representation of the different countries in the largest French public collection

In order to assess the relative importance of different countries on an international level, we first sought to analyze the composition of the FNAC, the largest French public collection.<sup>6</sup> In spite of the repeated insistence of major public galleries and collections directors that country of origin is never taken into account when making purchases for public collections – only the talent of the individual creators and the quality of the individual works being considered for purchase would be taken into account –, the nationalities of the artists represented in this collection reveal extremely disconcerting phenomena of concentration. We can thus draw on the example of the *FNAC*<sup>7</sup> – *Fonds National d'Art Contemporain* (National French Collection of Contemporary Art) – which is the largest collection of contemporary art in France with almost 70.000 pieces.

Of 432 artists from which the FNAC purchased at least one work in 1994, 1995 and 1996, 157 were non-French (36 percent, representing 29 different nationalities), whereas the share of non-French artists between 1991 and 1993 was 50 percent. The share of non-French artists represented 50 percent of all artists (215 out of 427) whose work was acquired by the *FNAC* between 1997–1999, 53 percent between 2000–2004 (257 out of 487). (It should be stressed that in the middle term, the FNAC buys similar proportions of works from French artists and non-French artists.)

If we analyze the nationalities of all the various non-French artists whose works have been acquired by the FNAC since the beginning of the 1990's,<sup>8</sup> we obtain table 1.

Table 1: Number of artist (whose nationality is known) from different countries per years

	1991–1996	1997–1999	2000–2004	TOTAL
United States	102	35	74	211
Germany	45	22	26	93
Italy	31	18	11	60
Great Britain	29	22	22	73
Switzerland	22	12	22	56
Yugoslavia	14	1	3	18
Belgium	13	8	8	29
Canada	12	3	10	25
Japan	9	4	1	14
Spain	9	9	8	26
Israel	9	2	4	15
The Netherlands	8	9	8	25
Austria	8	5	7	20
Greece	8	3	2	13
China	6	4	4	14
Ireland	6	3	2	11
Morocco	4	2	1	7
Sweden	3	2	3	8
USSR   Russia	3	3	3	9
Brasil	3	1	3	7
Algeria	3	0	1	4
Argentina	3	2	1	6
South Korea	3	5	2	10
Cuba	3	1	0	4
Poland	3	3	3	9
Czechoslovakia Czech Rep.	3	2	1	6
Norway	2	1	1	4
Hungary	2	1	0	3
Uruguay	2	0	0	2
Chile	2	0	0	2
Denmark	1	2	3	6
Portugal	1	1	0	2
Dominican Republic	1	0	0	1
Lebanon	1	0	1	2
Iran	1	0	1	2
Romania	1	0	1	2
Vietnam	1	0	0	1
Mexico	1	1	0	2
Australia	1	0	1	2
Iceland	0	1	0	1
Finland	0	0	1	1
Bielorussia	0	0	1	1
Lithuania	0	0	1	1
Croatia	0	0	1	1
Albania	0	0	1	1

	1991–1996	1997–1999	2000–2004	TOTAL
Turkey	0	1	0	1
Palestine	0	1	0	1
Egypt	0	1	1	2
South Africa	0	1	2	3
Benin	0	1	0	1
Cameroon	0	0	1	1
Mali	0	0	1	1
Thailand	0	1	1	2
India	0	0	1	1
TOTAL	379 <sup>9</sup>	194 <sup>10</sup>	251	824

In theory, the FNAC may acquire works of art from any country. In over 15 years, no less than 54 nationalities have been represented in the collection. With time, the FNAC tends to become more open, as only 39 countries were represented between 1990 and 1996, while 43 were represented between 2000 and 2004. Yet the representation of different countries is extremely unequal. The share of the United States is enormous as it represents 26 percent of all non-French artists from 1991 to 2004. Moreover, the five most heavily represented countries – the United States, Germany, Great Britain, Italy and Switzerland – account for 60 percent of the non-French artists whose work was acquired by the FNAC between 1991 and 1996. These five Western countries are among the world’s richest. Since the beginning of the 1990s, at a time when globalization and *métissage* were already supposed to have triumphed, the countries of Western Europe and North America have accounted for more than three quarters (76.9 percent) of the artists represented in the largest French public collection.

Since the beginning of the 1990’s, the ranking of the most heavily-represented nationalities in the FNAC collection has changed very little. The five countries at the top of the list remain unchanged (United States, Germany, Great Britain, Italy and Switzerland) and these five countries alone always account for about 60 percent of the works of non-French artists acquired by the FNAC. The concentration of acquisitions among a small number of nationalities is therefore very pronounced and consistent over time. Even though the portion acquired from U.S. artists seems to have fallen quite markedly, from 27 percent to 18 percent of all artists acquired during the first two periods, this has by no means knocked U.S. artists out of first place. Their share increased again during the 2000–2004 period (29 percent of artists). The position and share of German artists remained quite stable (around 11 percent), however this country lost a slight part of the lead it had previously held over its immediate rivals, Great Britain and Italy. The most marked development was the rise of artists from Great Britain at the end of the 1990’s, which is very clearly reflected

in the above statistics (Great Britain gained three percentage points and two places, overtaking Italy to arrive alongside Germany). Moreover it greatly reduced the gap previously separating it from the United States. The rise of Great Britain – which we will also return to later – is part of a phenomenon frequently mentioned by those involved in the contemporary art world, i.e., the breakthrough achieved by *Young British Artists* on the international art scene during the 1990's.<sup>11</sup>

Spain encountered real difficulties in maintaining its position, oscillating between sixth and eleventh place in the table. The range between these two rankings would appear to define its relative importance within the international contemporary art world. Indeed, the other indicators which we have developed generally reflect the weakness of Spain's position within the international contemporary art world.

Since the beginning of the twenty-first century, there has been a sharp decline in the number of Italian art purchases by the most important French public collection. Yugoslavia also took a nosedive in the rankings (from sixth place to the end of the table), reflecting political and economic turmoil in that country. Fewer works by Japanese artists were purchased; those artists did not benefit from the interest in the emerging Asian countries. Instead, they were passed over in favor of Chinese and Korean artists. Purchases from Canada also decreased quite markedly before once again increasing significantly.

As we already mentioned, since the beginning of the 1990s, the *Fonds National d'Art Contemporain* has acquired the works of artists of 55 different nationalities. This may be an illustration of the ideas of cultural and artistic pluralism currently in vogue.

Thus, the FNAC adopted an eclectic acquisition strategy in terms of the nationality of the artists whose works it acquired. While Western countries occupy a central position via the United States, Germany, Great Britain, Italy and Switzerland, the five continents are generally represented by many different countries, regardless of past or present political or economic divisions: Western Europe is represented in all its diversity, excluding the four main countries previously mentioned, by Spain, Portugal, Greece, Austria, the Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Ireland and Iceland. Eastern Europe is by no means absent thanks to artists from Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia (and then by the Czech Republic), Romania, Yugoslavia, the USSR (and then by Russia), Latvia, Bielorrussia, Croatia and Albania. The Middle East and Asia are also represented by Israel, Palestine, Lebanon, Iran and Turkey. Africa is represented by several North African countries, but also by artists from certain Sub-Saharan African countries: Algeria, Morocco, Egypt, Benin, Cameroon, Mali and South Africa. In addition to the United States, America is also represented by artists from North, Central and South American countries: Canada, Mexico, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Uruguay, Brazil, Argentina and

Chile. Asian artists from Japan, China, Korea, Thailand, Vietnam and India also figure in the *FNACs* acquisitions. Lastly, the fifth continent of Oceania is represented by Australia.

However, beneath this genuine diversity, there lies a rigid hierarchy, at least in the medium term. This may appear all the more surprising in that artists' nationalities are not supposed to be taken into account in decisions to buy works of art.

In spite of the insistence, or the genuine belief, that only the talent of artists and the quality of individual works of art are taken into account, a tally of artists' nationalities presents a distinct hierarchy of countries in terms of the acquisitions made by the *Fonds National d'Art Contemporain*.

Do certain countries or peoples have more artistic creative talent than others? Those who may be attracted by explanations based on biology or – in a more refined form – on culture, will undoubtedly find it difficult to explain why the French, so artistically talented in the 19<sup>th</sup> and at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, were subsequently eclipsed by the Americans.<sup>12</sup> It is obvious that the classification of countries, which we encounter again and again, is that which underlies the social representations of actors in the art world and our analyses essentially underlines current relationships in this domain.

In particular, given that the respective share of French and non-French artist's work acquired by the *FNAC* varies quite notably between the periods which we have studied (the portion of non-French artists fluctuates between one-third<sup>13</sup> and a half of all works acquired), the stability of the ranking by nationality is all the more surprising. An increase or decrease in the portion of non-French artists does not affect the structure of artists' nationalities, which is much more permanent, in spite of marginal changes in the medium term.

## The hierarchy between the different countries illustrated by the works exhibited in institutions

An analysis of the nationalities of artists whose works hang in the largest international museums and galleries of contemporary art also highlights the extent of the phenomena of concentration and the existence of a hierarchy. To give just one example, at the *Hamburger Bahnhof*, which is the largest contemporary art museum in Berlin, the artists on view at the time of our visit at the end of 2000, could be neatly divided up into just two nationalities: German and American.

Another example is the *Tate Modern*, which opened in May 2000 in London. Commentators have emphasized the dominant presence of paintings by British artists, although American artists have been exhibited in even greater number, but

this fact has elicited very little commentary as if it were entirely natural. German artists are suitably represented, especially the young generation, as are French artists; nevertheless, regarding the latter, the works are mainly drawn from the modern, not the contemporary period. In comparison, artists of other nationalities are not well represented.

In 2003, the works of 87 different artists were exhibited at *Centre Georges Pompidou* in Paris. Thirty-four artists were French (39 percent) and 53 were non-French (61 percent). Only eleven different countries were represented and their shares indicate a very strong hierarchy. The United States occupies a strong first position with 32 percent of foreign artists, followed by Italy with a share of 23 percent, Germany (19 percent), Switzerland (7.5 percent), Great-Britain (5.7 percent) and Belgium (3.8 percent). Austria, South Korea, China, Brazil and Israel (1.9 percent for each of them) played only a minor role.

The hierarchy that is revealed by the analysis of the works exhibited at the *Museum of Modern Art* (MoMA) in New York is very striking. If one puts aside works that belong to the modern art category in order to concentrate on contemporary art, the sections of the 4<sup>th</sup> floor of the museum that are devoted to historical contemporary art and those of the third floor that reassemble contemporary works show a very distinct hierarchy. In October 2005, 62.5 percent of the artists were American, 5.9 percent British, 4.4 percent German, 4.4 percent French, 3.7 percent Swiss, 2.9 percent Italian, 2.2 percent Japanese, 2.2 percent Venezuelan, 2.2 percent Brazilian, 1.5 percent Spanish, 1.5 percent South-African. A last group of countries, which includes Austria, Belgium, Sweden, Yugoslavia, Canada, Cuba, Chile, Iran and Congo, accounts for 0.7 percent of the artists for each of the countries.

These figures clearly show that the most important so called international collections give a serious advantage to the artists of the countries where the collections are located (the USA in particular appears to be far less international than it often claims to be). For the rest, although it is explicitly and persistently denied, the same hierarchy which seems to structure the international art world is also in place here.

In general, the collections of the large »international« museums are characterized precisely by a concentration of the works of a small number of artists and nationalities who have achieved the greatest legitimacy in the international contemporary art world.<sup>14</sup>

What can be seen through the previous analysis of the works that are permanently shown in some of the most prestigious international contemporary art museums is also on display in important temporary exhibitions such as biennales. The 2005 edition of the *Venice biennale* is very illustrative. The representation of nationalities of the 97 artists whose works were exhibited in the two international sections of the biennale (entitled *Always a Little Further* and *The Experience of Art*) was as follows:

United States 12.4 percent; Spain 9.3 percent; Germany and Great Britain 7.2 percent each; South Africa 6.2 percent; Brazil 5.2 percent; France, Italy, Denmark and Cuba 4.1 percent each; Russia and Argentina 3.1 percent each; Switzerland, Portugal, Canada, Japan and Turkey 2.1 percent each; the Netherlands, Finland, Ireland, Greece, Poland, Albania, Lebanon, Jordan, Colombia, Mexico, Argentina, India, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Philippines, China, Taiwan, South Korea and Cameroon 1.0 percent each. Although 36 different countries are represented – a diverse but far from a worldwide selection – the Western world once again plays a major role.

The unusually large representation of Spain, Spanish speaking countries, and other countries that are within a Spanish sphere of influence (such as Portugal) may be due to the fact that in 2005, the two curators for the international section of the Venice biennale were ... Spanish.<sup>15</sup>

In our previous analyses, we frequently defined nationality with the country name which appears on an artist's passport. Are these analyses still valid if we consider another factor, that of the country of residence? 101 countries of residence are listed for the 97 artists represented at the 2005 *Venice Biennale*, and the results which are obtained using this guideline are as follows: United States 17.8 percent; Germany 14.9 percent; Great Britain 8.9 percent; Spain 7.9 percent; France 5.0 percent; Italy and Brazil 4.0 percent each; Portugal, South Africa and Russia 3 percent each; Switzerland, the Netherlands, Turkey, Mexico, Cuba, Puerto Rico and Argentina 2.0 percent each; Belgium, Austria, Finland, Poland, Greece, Palestine, Canada, Panama, Dominican Republic, Colombia, India, Vietnam, Philippines, Taiwan, and Cameroon 1.0 percent each.

In fact, although the artists who were represented at this *Venice biennale* came from 36 different countries according to their passports, taking into account the country of residence of the artist limits the number of countries represented to 32. The percentages of the Western countries that consistently occupy the upper tiers of all our various rankings are exactly those which tend to increase most when using this alternative guideline.

Another indicator, the *Kunst Kompass*,<sup>16</sup> a list which classifies artists in terms of their recognition by art institutions, is based mostly on the visibility of artists as defined by showings of their works in solo or group exhibitions in the most prestigious museums and contemporary art centers (as well as by articles in the specialized press).

Since 1970, this classification has been published each year in the October and November editions of the German magazine *Capital*. Thus, we can analyze the trends in the different countries represented over this period in order to gauge the leading countries in the long term, the changes in the classification over time and the new challengers. The *Kunst Kompass* is not a direct indicator of the economic value of



works of art; rather, it constitutes an indicator of the »reputation« value of contemporary living artists. As Raymonde Moulin writes in *L'artiste, l'institution et le marché*, the aim of the founder of *Kunst Kompass*, Willi Bongard, was to establish a measure of artists' »reputation« value considered as an equivalent to their aesthetic value.<sup>17</sup> An artist's ranking in the classification does not depend directly on the value of his/her work on the contemporary art market, but on the aggregate of a number of different judgments made by contemporary art »experts«.<sup>18</sup> Thus, what is measured is recognition from the directors of the (Western) world's largest museums, the owners of the largest private collections, and the most important publications devoted to contemporary art. One-man shows by artists are distinguished from group exhibitions and a certain number of points are attributed for various criteria. Once these computations are complete, a list of the 100 »best« artists is assembled and published.

Raymonde Moulin notes that the rankings calculated by Bongard, and those who carried on this work after him,<sup>19</sup> undoubtedly influence the position of German artists in the list as a whole. Nevertheless, in spite of the criticisms which may be leveled at the *Kunst Kompass*, its publication has never failed to have the effect of a self-fulfilling prophecy. Furthermore, although the over-representation of Germany in the *Kunst Kompass* is open to criticism (as is the significant weight given to neighboring countries),<sup>20</sup> changes in the ranking of each country over time within the *Kunst Kompass* are much less questionable, since they involve a far lesser degree of bias.

As we indicated previously, the *Kunst Kompass* appears in the form of a list. The 100 »best« artists are classified in decreasing order of recognition and fame. In 2004, each artist's ranking for the year was followed by his/her ranking in 2003, then by the name, age and nationality of the artist, the principal type of artwork they produce (painting, sculpture, video, installations, conceptual art, land art, etc.), the total number of points obtained as well as other information relating, in particular, to the artist's gallery, the average price of a piece of his/her work and the comparison of this price to the artist's ranking. This enables the magazine to state whether the artist in question is »very expensive«, »expensive«, »about the right price«, »good value« or »very good value« by comparing »reputation« value and financial value.

Of the 100 »best« artists in the world in 2004, 31 were American, 27 German, 7 British, 4 French, 3 Italian and 3 Swiss, while all the other countries in the world shared what was left of the list. This ranking resembles the pattern we found in the purchases of the French contemporary collections or the works on display in renowned contemporary art museums. (In addition to the afore-mentioned countries, the following are also represented, *although at a much weaker level*: Austria, the Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark, Greece, Yugoslavia, Russia, Canada, Cuba, Mexico, Brazil, Iran, Thailand, Japan, South Korea and South Africa. Amazingly, Spain is not represented, which is undoubtedly due to the influence of German art experts, who

are less sensitive to »Mediterranean« art). All told, a total of 22 countries made the list; however, Western artists are by far the best represented.<sup>21</sup>

In order to compare the positions of the different countries in 2000 and 2004, we added up the number of points accumulated by all the artists from a given country, and we then calculated the percentage of points per country. This gives each country's share in terms of the artists represented in the list:

Table 2: Number of points for each country in the *Kunst Kompass* 2000 and 2004 (in percent)

	2000	2004
United States	34.2	32.4
Germany	29.9	29.1
Great Britain	7.5	7.3
France	4.3	4.0
Italy	3.6	2.6
Switzerland	3.5	3.2
Austria	2.7	2.8
Russia	1.6	1.3
Japan	1.5	1.4
South Korea	1.3	1.1
Greece	1.1	1.0
South Africa	1.0	1.2
Canada	1.0	2.7

Artists from Iran, Mexico, Iceland, Yugoslavia, Denmark, Australia, Thailand, Cuba and the Netherlands also appeared in the list for 2000, however, the share of each of these countries was less than one percent in that year.<sup>22</sup>

The above list clearly illustrates the overwhelming dominance of American and German artists and, more generally, that of the group of Western countries on the international contemporary art scene. How has the relative importance of different countries evolved in terms of the *Kunst Kompass* rankings published over past years?

Before carrying out an exhaustive analysis of changes in the rankings over recent years, we may first study the changes in the list of »star artists« over the more than 30 years in which the *Kunst Kompass* has existed; the »star artists« are those appearing in the top ten at a given time. What conclusions can be drawn in terms of nationality?

A comparison of the representation of various countries in the top-ten artists in the 1970 and 2004 *Kunst Kompass* rankings follows:

1970 *Kunst Kompass* ranking: 1<sup>st</sup> – USA: 5 artists; 2<sup>nd</sup> – France: 3 artists; 3<sup>rd</sup> ex aequo: Italy and Switzerland (1 artist each).

2004 *Kunst Kompass* ranking: 1<sup>st</sup> ex aequo – USA and Germany: 4 artists; 3<sup>rd</sup> ex aequo: France and Austria (1 artist each).

Whereas in 1970, American artists dominated the top of the *Kunst Kompass* rankings, and US artists alone accounted for half of the »best« international artists, a bit more than thirty years later, this dominant position seems to be shared with Germany. Moreover, German artists have made spectacular inroads into the list, as they were completely absent from the top rankings in 1970. The other most noticeable change is undoubtedly the ground lost by France, which had three artists in the »top ten« in 1970, but only one thirty years later. It should also be noted that in both 1970 and 2004 rankings, the top spots were occupied by Western artists from a very small number of countries.

It is also possible to compare trends in the number of artists per country over time for the 100 artists figuring in the total list, which would, obviously, tend to bring other countries into the rankings:

Table 3: Number of artists for each country in the *Kunst Kompass*

	1979	1997	2000	2004
United States	50	40	33	32
Germany	11	28	28	29
Great Britain	12	8	8	7
France	9	6	5	4
Italy	4	5	4	3
Switzerland	3	2	3	3
Belgium	3	0	0	2
The Netherlands	2	1	1	1
Austria	1	2	3	3
Japan	1	1	2	1
Egypt	1	1	0	0
Argentina	1	0	0	0
Israel	1	0	0	0
Venezuela	1	0	0	0
Russia	0	1	1	1
South Korea	0	1	1	1
Greece	0	1	1	1
South Africa	0	0	1	1
Canada	0	1	1	3
Iran	0	0	1	1
Mexico	0	0	1	1
Island	0	0	1	0
Yugoslavia	0	1	1	1
Denmark	0	1	1	2
Australia	0	0	1	0
Thailand	0	0	1	1
Cuba	0	0	1	1
Brazil	0	0	0	1

It would appear from the above table, that over the past twenty-five years, the United States, even though it still occupies the top spot in terms of number of artists, is losing more and more ground to Germany, whose artists have steadily risen in the rankings. Austria's representation has also improved significantly. Nevertheless, the question arises as to whether the significant progress achieved by German and Austrian artists in the rankings is not partially a reflection of the increased importance ascribed to German institutions in the calculation of the points awarded.<sup>23</sup> The recent (though moderate) gains of Canada and Denmark in the rankings should also be noted.

Conversely, Great Britain has lost ground since the end of the 1970s, as has France; Belgium, after having disappeared from the list of the 100 »best« artists has entered the list again, while Italy and Switzerland have more or less maintained their positions.

We also note the disappearance of a number of »non-Western« countries. These countries seem to be particularly vulnerable as they are frequently represented by only one artist. However, between 1970 and the most recent ranking, a dozen or so other countries on the periphery of Europe and North America have appeared. Their numbers are greater than the numbers of the countries which have disappeared from the list, thus illustrating the phenomenon of multiculturalism.

In 2004, as in 2000, the 100 » best » international artists were drawn from only 22 countries, although in 1979, and even in 1997, they represented only 14 countries: thus, in recent years, there has indeed been a certain diversification in the geographical origins<sup>24</sup> of the best artists, which may also reflect the phenomenon of multiculturalism. Nevertheless, in 2004, 89 of these artists were still from Western European or North American countries (88 in 2000) and although this number, which reached 95 in 1979, has fallen, it clearly bears out the overwhelming dominance of these two geographical areas in the so-called »best« contemporary artistic production.

We have examined the changes in the number of artists per country over time. We will now consider changes over a period of ten years in the percentage of the total number of points obtained each year by each country represented by one, or a number of artists in the *Kunst Kompass*' top 100. This gives an indication of both the number of artists per country and their ranking and the number of points obtained by each. We have calculated this data for recent years in order to observe current trends in the international contemporary art world.

Table 4: Number of points for each country in the Kunst Kompass 1994–2004 (in percent)

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
U.S.	41.2	42.0	40.6	41.4	42.0	38.2	34.2	34.9	32.8	32.2	32.4
Germany	28.0	28.2	29.7	28.3	26.1	29.2	29.9	27.0	26.9	28.2	29.1
Great Britain	6.5	5.7	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.9	7.5	6.3	7.9	7.9	7.3
France	6.1	5.9	5.0	5.4	4.5	3.9	4.3	3.7	3.2	4.0	4.0
Italy	5.4	4.6	3.9	4.4	5.1	2.1	3.6	4.4	3.6	3.7	2.6
Austria	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.9	1.9	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.8	2.7	2.8
Belgium	1.5	0.7	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.8	1.5	1.7
Russia	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.5	1.4	1.3
South Korea	1.5	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.1
Greece	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.2	1.1	1.0	1.2	1.1	1.1
Switzerland	0.9	1.5	1.7	1.7	2.7	4.0	3.5	4.1	4.0	3.3	1.0
Spain	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Denmark	0.9	1.0	1.0	0.9	1.1	1.1	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7	2.0
Canada	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.2	1.2	1.0	1.0	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.7
Japan	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.6	1.5	2.1	2.2	2.2	1.4
Yugoslavia	0.8	0.9	1.0	0.9	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.7
Iran	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.9	1.1	1.1	1.0
Iceland	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.1	1.2	0.0
Netherlands	0.0	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.0	0.6	0.7	1.3	1.5	1.5
Australia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.0	0.0
Thailand	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8
Cuba	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.8
South Africa	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.2
Mexico	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.9
Brazil	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.7

The analysis of this indicator in 1994 highlights the preponderance of the United States, which alone represents more than 40 percent of the points obtained by the top 100 artists. Germany also plays a key role, with almost 30 percent of the total points in the indicator. Far behind these countries, which appear to be the clear leaders on the international art scene, are three other countries – Great Britain, France and Italy – which receive relatively modest artistic recognition. The group of countries ranked further below on the list are usually only represented by one artist: Austria, Belgium, Russia, South Korea, Greece, Switzerland, Spain, Denmark, Canada, Japan and Yugoslavia. In particular, we note the weak position of Switzerland. This country plays a leading role in the international contemporary art market and hosts both the Basel international art fair, as well as some of the world's leading galleries.<sup>25</sup> Although it plays quite a significant role in the art world, according to the *Kunst Kompass*, international recognition of Swiss artists is quite low.

Before analyzing changes in positions over a twelve-year period, a preliminary remark should be made. In our interviews all over the world (United States, Ger-

many, Great Britain, France, Italy, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Spain, Canada and South Korea), those involved in the contemporary art world almost always invoke the talent, or even the genius of the artist – i.e., individuality in its most extreme form – as the source of all artistic success and as the only criterion taken into account by experts; however, our analysis of trends in the *Kunst Kompass* clearly shows that artists' careers and choices of institutions are also based on other, frequently unconscious criteria. Indeed, although the ranking of individual artists can change, and sometimes quite considerably, from one year to another, and even though artists can disappear from the rankings altogether, or enter them anew, it is striking to note that the share of each country in the rankings of the *Kunst Kompass* rarely changes to any great extent from year to year, and that changes in respective shares between countries are instead a medium or long-term phenomenon. This factor indicates once again that nationality plays an important role in commercial dealings, even though this role is rarely overt.

Changes in the positions of certain countries in the rankings over a twelve-year period reveal certain medium-term trends. We have already seen traces of this phenomenon while considering other indicators: although the United States currently holds the top spot in the international contemporary art world, and although it constitutes its very heart, its position does appear to have weakened over the past few years. Indeed, according to the *Kunst Kompass*, a marked decline has occurred in the relative importance of US artists, who accumulated 40 percent of the points attributed to artists listed in the rankings in 1999. In previous years, US artists had always accounted for more than this share. And since 1999, their share tends to amount to approximately 32 percent.

Over the same period, Germany has maintained its share at around 30 percent. Great Britain, making the most of the *Young British Artists* phenomenon, has enhanced its standing in the rankings (from 6.5 percent to 7.3 percent) and pulled away from countries like France, who were serious rivals to Great Britain in 1994. The gap between these two countries has opened up to such an extent that France has lost considerable ground, and its share in the rankings has fallen from 6.1 percent in 1994, to a low of 3.7 percent in 2001, then recovering only slightly to 4.0 percent in 2004. With the exception of 2000 and 2003, when France's representation rose slightly, its ranking has fallen every year; this would appear to indicate an erosion in its position on the international contemporary art scene.<sup>26</sup>

Similarly, Italy's position has deteriorated markedly. Between 1994 and 1999, its share fell from 5.4 percent to a mere 2.1 percent. Nevertheless, in 2000, Italian artists recovered, with their share rising to 3.6 percent, just before a new decline to a percentage of 2.6 in 2004. Austria's position has improved significantly and the country has even managed to rise to a ranking just below that of France and Italy.

Switzerland's position seems to fluctuate dramatically, and a severe fall to a 1 percent position occurred in 2004. However, after plummeting and disappearing from the *Kunst Kompass* altogether, the standing of Belgian artists improved noticeably.

All other countries are of only minor importance in the results of the *Kunst Kompass*. Admittedly, in the space of twelve years, the number of countries included in the list has risen; however, with the exception of those mentioned above, all other countries account for only a minor share of the rankings.

A good indication of the existence of a concentration of particular nationalities and a hierarchy between different countries would appear to be the fact that the artists considered »very expensive« in the *Kunst Kompass* are mostly American. In 2004, apart from seven American artists, only three Germans, three Brits, one Italian and one Belgian were considered by the *Kunst Kompass* to be »very expensive« relative to their recognition by the art world. However, there were also many »expensive« artists drawn from several different countries (United States, Germany and Italy). Conversely, nearly all the French artists which have appeared in the *Kunst Kompass* since 1994 are described as being »very good value« or » good value » relative to their recognition by the art world. This clearly illustrates that the relationship between recognition by art institutions, which the *Kunst Kompass* seeks to estimate, and the financial value ascribed by the art market operates in different ways for artists of different nationalities. Although it is continually ignored or denied by the leading actors in the art world, the influence of nationality is nevertheless omnipresent if we only bother to look for it, and, based on numerous objective indicators, there is an ongoing contrast between a »center« and a »periphery«. The center clearly consists of the United States, or the United States and Germany, or even the group of five major Western countries, which is itself characterized by a distinct hierarchy. The United States, followed by Germany, Great Britain, France and Italy regularly feature at the top of the lists of artists by nationality which we have drawn up based on numerous different indicators. Our lists nearly always reveal a similar pattern: the United States dominates each list by a significant proportion, followed by Germany in second place, itself comfortably ahead of its next nearest rival. The Western world clearly constitutes the center of the international art scene.

## The hierarchy of countries as revealed by the market

As regards the participation of different countries in art shows, we will concentrate our attention here on the Basel art fair.<sup>27</sup>

As the world's biggest contemporary art show, the Basel art fair is of huge importance, both for the major galleries who wish to have their work shown, and for artists

from different countries.<sup>28</sup> Numerous observers account for the continued success of this show in terms of its ongoing innovation. It was the first art show in the world to host exhibitions for specially invited countries, to offer advantageous conditions for young artists and one-man shows, and to create independent platforms for photography, publishing, monumental sculpture and internet art and video. In 2000, it opened a new experimental platform entitled »Art Unlimited«.

The Basel art fair is renowned for its rigorous selection process,<sup>29</sup> as well as for the quality of the exhibitors allowed to take part.

*Table 5: The 2000 and 2005 Basel art fair: number of galleries per country<sup>30</sup>*

	2000	2005
Germany	63	52
United States	53	63
Switzerland	45	37
France	33	24
UK	24	25
Italy	21	16
Spain	9	8
Austria	9	9
Belgium	9	7
Japan	5	5
The Netherlands	4	3
Brazil	3	3
Canada	3	2
Sweden	3	2
Australia	2	1
China	2	1
South Korea	2	2
Luxemburg	2	1
Norway	2	1
Argentina	1	0
Denmark	1	3
Greece	1	1
Ireland	1	1
Monaco	1	0
Czech Republic	1	0
Portugal	0	1
Finland	0	1
Poland	0	2
Russia	0	1
Mexico	0	2
South Africa	0	1
Total <sup>31</sup>	300	274



At the 2005 Basel art fair, one group of six countries led all the others represented: the United States was best represented with 63 galleries, followed by Germany (with 52) and Switzerland (37); the UK was in fourth place (25), ahead of France (24) and Italy (16). Even though the six leading countries are those which systematically feature at the top of all the lists which we have compiled from numerous different indicators, the first three can also be characterized in terms of their enormous influence on the international contemporary art market. Even though Switzerland's importance is not as great in terms of its cultural institutions or the recognition accorded to its artists, it clearly plays a leading role in the market, just behind the United States and Germany.

At the Basel art fair, the effects of concentration in the geographical origin of the galleries are highly significant. The top-three countries alone – i.e., the United States, Germany and Switzerland – account for 55 percent of the galleries present; if we add the next three countries in the table – the UK, followed by France and Italy<sup>32</sup> – nearly 80 percent of the galleries represented are concentrated in this group of Western countries. It should be stressed that although the Basel art fair claims to present »the most important galleries of Europe, America, Asia and Oceania«, as is stated in the fair's 2000 exhibition catalogue, the relative importance of these different geographical areas is extremely unequal. In 2005, Western Europe alone accounts for 70 percent of the galleries present in Basel, while North America accounts for almost 24 percent. Outside of these two core-areas, all of the world's other geographical zones are represented by the remaining 6 percent of the galleries: 3 percent from Asia, 2 percent from South America, and less than 1 percent from Eastern Europe, Oceania and Africa combined. Thus, there is a huge imbalance between the Western countries, which make up 94 percent of the galleries present, and the other completely peripheral zones.

Claims regarding the globalization of culture and artistic *métissage* would appear to be completely invalidated by such figures. When the market itself is at stake, few countries outside of Western Europe and North America succeed in making a mark. Only Australia, South Africa, Japan, Brazil, Mexico, China, South Korea, Russia, Poland and the Czech Republic have broken into the tight circle of countries admitted to the Basel art fair. While several of these have been open to Western influences for quite some time (e.g., Japan and Australia), artists and galleries from others such as South Korea, which has been exposed to Western influences for a much shorter time, have been assimilated into the international contemporary art world because of cultural policies which favor the creation of contemporary art or support the arts with strong private initiatives.

In 2000, the organizers of the Basel art fair provided us with the number of countries (40) from which at least one gallery applied to participate. This number may be

compared with the number of countries actually represented in the same year: 25. (That is, 15 countries applied unsuccessfully; however, other applicants may have simply withdrawn if their applications did not measure up to the »quality« criteria of the organization committee of the Basel art fair.) Therefore, the selection process is extremely difficult, and this prevents galleries from certain countries from exhibiting at the world's primary contemporary art fair.

While the market highlights the impact of a high level of concentration in terms of the nationalities of galleries represented in art fairs, its other major component, i.e., the auction houses, reveals just as much information regarding the hierarchy existing between countries.

Even though the directors of both of the major auction houses, Christie's and Sotheby's, whom we met in New York, assured us that they never take an artist's nationality into account when organizing an auction, analysis of international auctions of contemporary art highlight the same concentration of artists' nationalities within a small number of countries, almost all of which are Western.

To give just one example, on the evening of November 16, 2000, in New York, Christie's held one of its two major annual auctions of international contemporary art. The catalogue presented the biographies of 48 artists whose works (62 in total) were to go under the hammer. A very large proportion of the artists (22) were American, or living in the United States (or had been living there at the time of their death). In addition to the list of American artists, we should add those who were born outside the US, but then moved there (4 artists).

The representation of other countries was paltry in comparison to the »American« artists. Nevertheless, in keeping with the findings of previous analyses, three countries managed a decent showing; Germany, Great Britain and Italy. Six UK artists were featured, as were five German artists and four Italians. Switzerland was represented by three artists, and Japan by two; France and South Africa were each represented by only one artist.

It is obvious that the concentration of nationalities is extreme and that, in terms of the recognition accorded by the market, only US and European artists are taken into account. Moreover, even within this group, the positions of the various countries are extremely unequal and the relative importance of the US appears particularly overwhelming, as this country on its own accounted for more than half of the artists whose works were being sold at one of the largest auctions of the season. Moreover, of the 48 artists whose works were for sale, no less than 45 came from either the US or Western Europe, which was itself represented by only a small number of countries, i.e., those which are always found at the top of artistic classifications, regardless of the criteria used.

## The ongoing division in the contemporary art world between the center and the periphery

Thus, over and above what is generally held to be true in the art world, some conclusions are inescapable. In fact, there is a remarkable convergence between various classifications, both in terms of the positions of the different countries in relation to the institutions of the international contemporary art world and in relation to the market. Nevertheless, a distinction should be made between exhibitions and the market itself.

First, in terms of exhibitions, Europe plays a central role because of the major biennials<sup>33</sup> which it hosts (in particular, those of Kassel and Venice), but also through its contemporary art museums, such as the *Centre Georges Pompidou* in Paris, or the *Tate Modern* in London. However, even in this domain, the United States holds a significant advantage because of prestigious institutions such as the MoMA or PS1 in New York City, frequently cited as the world's most important contemporary art center.

The market also highlights a certain geographical diversity, particularly given that it is composed of two sub-markets: sales by art galleries and by auction houses. No city has as large a concentration of galleries as New York, both in terms of sales and influence. Nevertheless, Germany and Switzerland, as well as Great Britain, are also home to major galleries. The most influential contemporary art fair in the world definitely is that held in Basel, Switzerland, and in general, Europe (which also hosts ARCO in Madrid and F.I.A.C in Paris, as well as the *Frieze Art Fair* in London, Berlin, Frankfurt, Stuttgart, etc.) is home for art fairs which are considered by many observers to be more important than those organized in the United States (which include those of Chicago, the *Armory Show* of New York, and the *Art Basel* in Miami, since December 2002).<sup>34</sup> Outside of this spectrum composed of a small number of European countries and the United States, no art fair has any real international influence.

Regarding the second sector of the market – sales of contemporary art by auction houses – the United States has the upper hand and, in particular, there has been a striking concentration of activity in New York. The only other country to organize international auctions of contemporary art – Great Britain – takes a distant second place behind the United States. We have already seen an example of how the highly concentrated nature of major international auctions results in a similar concentration of the nationalities of the artists whose work is sold at such auctions.

Finally, it is possible to draw up another list based on recognition of artists: a major concentration of artist's nationalities (and in particular the prestige of US and German artists) is highlighted by the reputation-based *Kunst Kompass* analyzed

previously. As we have seen, while in 1979, and even in 1997, the 100 »best« international artists came from just 14 countries, in 2000 and 2004, they represented 22 different countries. Therefore, over the past number of years, a certain diversification in terms of the geographical origin of the most reputable artists has indeed taken place, thus illustrating the phenomenon of multiculturalism. Nevertheless, as we have stressed, 90 out of these 100 artists were still drawn from Western Europe or the US,<sup>35</sup> and although this proportion had fallen (after reaching a high of 95 in 1979), it clearly illustrates the overwhelming influence of these two geographical zones in the most prestigious contemporary artistic production.

Similarly, Western artists predominate in the acquisitions of institutions such as the *Fonds National d'Art Contemporain* in France, or in the works displayed in the major »international« museums. The United States is almost always in first place; Germany, in the position of challenger, is comfortably tucked away in second place, and, a long way behind these two countries, we find Great Britain, France and Italy; all other nations play a negligible or nonexistent role.

In summary, the world of contemporary art has a clearly-defined center, and it functions as a duopoly between the United States and Europe (or more precisely a small number of Western European countries: Germany, Great Britain, France and sometimes Italy and Switzerland); Germany is clearly the heart of this second level.

The flip-side of this rich, Western center is an »artistic periphery« which consists of all the other countries outside of these two core geographical zones. This periphery includes but is not limited to the countries of the Third World, as illustrated by the examples of Japan or Spain. Although the general discourse concerning globalization, cultural relativism and *métissage*, current for the past few years, has led to the emergence of artists from a wider variety of countries – and from the Third World in particular – their recognition remains very marginal in terms of the market, which remains the preserve of Western countries. In general, non-Western countries play a minor role and their voices are seldom heard outside of the contemporary art biennials. Even though art exhibitions of this type<sup>36</sup> have spread throughout the globe, this has not resulted in any changes in the dominant geographic zones nor in any real sharing between the center and the periphery.

Therefore, the phenomenon of globalization needs to be re-examined. First, globalization challenges neither the US-European/US-German duopoly, nor even the US hegemony of the international contemporary art world. All the theories being developed in this regard, in particular by art critics, cannot hide the following reality: both the market and the recognition accorded by art institutions remain the preserve of Western countries, and especially the richest few. Moreover, it is artists from these countries which occupy the dominant positions in the international contemporary art scene.

Although the richest countries have allowed biennials to develop in peripheral countries, these do not really compete with the most prestigious exhibitions in the Western World. Moreover, the market – consisting of influential auction houses, fairs and galleries – has in no way been opened up to any potential rivals, and remains concentrated mainly in Great Britain, Switzerland and Germany, and the United States.

Although an increasing number of artists from peripheral countries are succeeding in gaining international recognition, at least in the rankings of the *Kunst Kompass* or in contemporary art biennials, such artists almost always *come from* peripheral countries.<sup>37</sup> For example, one of the most famous non-Western artists, Nam June Paik, has been living in the United States for a very long time. Similarly, Ilya Kabakov, who was born in the Soviet Union and whose work – as critics have pointed out – is inseparable from his personal history and that of the Soviet Union, has been living and working in New York for a number of years. As a final example, one of the rising stars in the contemporary art world, the young Japanese artist, Mariko Mori, whose work seeks to reach out to a universal public, also lives and works in New York. Therefore, it would appear that today, even more than in previous years, living and working in New York is almost a prerequisite for success, at least at the highest level, especially for artists from peripheral countries.

Although we noted an apparent erosion in the position of the United States in recent years, in particular on the basis of the *Kunst Kompass* rankings, this loss of ground is in reality largely due to the appearance in that list of new artists who, while they are not actually American, have obtained international recognition by moving to the United States. In the same way that the United States has, in the past, fed the perpetual whirl of innovation specific to the art world,<sup>38</sup> by launching generations of artists and artistic movements such as *pop art*, *minimalist art* or *conceptual art*, it has in more recent times helped to partially renew the art world by attracting the talents of artists who, though they still hold passports from their native countries, are nonetheless completely integrated into the New York art scene. An empirical survey of the globalization process in the contemporary art field highlights the phenomenon in a way that is radically different from the most common social representations and discourses.

## Conclusion

In spite of an increasing degree of internationalization, the various indicators which we have analyzed illustrate that this phenomenon has by no means eliminated the territorial dimension from the contemporary art scene. Various ideas currently in vogue – such as globalization, *métissage*, cultural relativism and the opening up of contemporary art to different world cultures – many of which have been put forward

by those involved in the contemporary art world, are largely an illusion. Furthermore, it is not a question of deliberate power, exercised in a cynical manner, but rather the consequence of a mechanism which allows market actors and institutions to carry out their respective roles while relying on a strong territorial dimension which is both denied and largely unconscious. While art fairs and exhibitions have sprouted up all over the globe, this has not led to a transfer of activity from the major zones, nor to any real sharing of influence between the center and the periphery.

## Notes

- 1 The author is grateful to Jennifer Parker Talwar (Penn State University) for some very useful conversations about the issues covered in this article.
- 2 Cf. Raymonde Moulin, *Le marché de l'art. Mondialisation et nouvelles technologies*, Paris 2000.
- 3 In this article, we will only deal with the visual arts. However, certain parallels may probably be drawn with other forms of contemporary artistic creation.
- 4 Cf. Alain Quemin, *Le rôle des pays prescripteurs sur le marché et dans le monde de l'art contemporain*, Paris (Ministère des Affaires Etrangères) 2001.
- 5 Cf. Howard S. Becker, *Art Worlds*, Berkeley CA 1982.
- 6 A similar study could be carried out with the public collections of other countries.
- 7 Cf. Geneviève Pesson et Bonnard Marielle, *Fonds national d'art contemporain Acquisitions 1994–1996. Peinture, sculpture, arts graphiques. Bilan statistique (Rapport du FNAC)*, Paris January 1997; Geneviève Pesson, *Fonds national d'art contemporain. Acquisition d'oeuvres d'art faite aux galeries. Comparaison 1987–1988 / 1997–1998*, (Rapport du FNAC), Paris December 1998.
- 8 The periods 1991–1996 and 1997–1999 are not identical in scope, however, we have based our analyses on the only available data, produced by the FNAC itself. The figures shown above may reflect a certain degree of inaccuracy as they have sometimes been obtained by adding the results for different years, with those referring to periods. Therefore, certain artists may have been counted several times if more than one piece of their work was acquired during different periods. Nevertheless, the indicator obtained, while it is not one-hundred-percent accurate, translates the relative importance of the different countries quite adequately.
- 9 We should point out that over this same period, the FNAC also acquired works by 12 artists who were either »stateless« or of undetermined nationality, or whose nationality was incorrectly completed in the FNACs statistics.
- 10 Over this same period, the FNAC also acquired works by seven artists whose nationality was not completed in the FNACs statistics.
- 11 Cf. Alain Quemin, Charles Saatchi, in: *Universalia 2002*, Paris 2002, 396. Cf. also the article by Anja Grebe in this issue.
- 12 Cf. Serge Guilbaut, *Comment New York vola l'idée d'art moderne*, Paris 1988; Annie Cohen-Solal, »Un jour, ils auront des peintres«. *L'avènement des peintres américains*. Paris 1867. New York 1948, Paris 2000.
- 13 The percentage of non-French artists was 30 over the period 1988–1990.
- 14 For other equally illuminating examples, cf. Alain Quemin, *L'art contemporain international. Entre les institutions et le marché*, Lyon and Nimes 2002.
- 15 This is very clear if the part of the previous countries and especially that of Spain in 2005 is compared with its share for the 2003 edition of the same biennale. Cf. Quemin, *l'art contemporain 2002*.
- 16 Cf. Raymonde Moulin, *L'artiste, l'institution et le marché*, Paris 1992; Quemin, *l'art contemporain 2002*.
- 17 Cf. Moulin, *L'artiste* 1992.
- 18 Cf. Pierre Bourdieu, *Le hit-parade des intellectuels français ou qui sera juge de la légitimité des juges?*, in: *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales* 52–53 (1984), 95 pp.

- 19 Willi Bongard, who died in 1985, edited *Art Aktuell*, a newsletter of confidential information (as its publication run was limited to 500 copies) on the international art market. It was published bi-monthly on a subscription basis. His collaborators, who included Linde Rohr-Bongard, continue this work today.
- 20 Cf. Quemin, *l'art contemporain* 2002.
- 21 Moreover, as we will see a little later, even when artists from more peripheral countries appear, most such artists have a gallery in the West, located either in the US, Germany or the UK, and they sometimes live in the West. We give just two examples here: Nam June Paik and Ilya Kabakov, whose respective nationalities, i.e., Korean and Russian, are listed in *Kunst Kompass*, but who have been living for a number of years in New York, in the very heart of the Western contemporary art world.
- 22 In 2004, the share of three of these countries had risen above the one percent level: Denmark (2.0 percent), Belgium (1.7 percent) and the Netherlands (1.5 percent). Six other countries appeared in the rankings, but their share was below one percent: Iran, Mexico, Yugoslavia, Thailand, Cuba and Brazil.
- 23 Cf. Quemin, *l'art contemporain* 2002.
- 24 We have deliberately used the expression »geographical origin« because, among the artists who come from the most peripheral zones of the contemporary art world, many no longer live or work in their country of origin. Similarly, very few of these artists succeed in gaining international recognition at the highest level without the intermediary of a »mainstream« Western gallery.
- 25 Cf. Piguët Philippe, Foires, biennales et salons internationaux d'art contemporain, in: *Universalia* 2000, Paris 2000, 301 pp; Quemin, rôle 2001; idem, *l'art contemporain* 2002; Marcel Fournier et Roy-Valex Myrtille, *Art contemporain et internationalisation: les rôles des galeries et des foires*. Report submitted to the Quebec Ministry for Culture and Communications, Quebec September 2001.
- 26 Cf. Alain Quemin, *Le marché de l'art contemporain en France*, in: *Universalia* 2001, Paris 2001, 209–213.
- 27 For the other major art fairs, see Quemin, rôle 2001; idem, *l'art contemporain* 2002; Fournier and Roy-Valex, *Art* 2001.
- 28 It would have been interesting to study the composition of the selection committee, as well as the nationality of its different members, which is not clearly shown in the catalogue for the Basel art fair. Are there representatives from peripheral countries, or are the members of the selection committee drawn essentially from Switzerland, Germany and the US?
- 29 Thence, the Piccadilly Gallery of London, which had participated in the fair for many years, was turned down for the 2000 Basel Art Fair. It's worth noting that in 2000, a record number of more than 800 galleries applied to take part, and only 271 were accepted.
- 30 List drawn up from the exhibition catalogue in 2000 and from the website in 2005; certain galleries with branches in several different countries have been included several times in 2000; in 2005, each of the few galleries that have locations in different countries is associated with the country that is mentioned first on the website.
- 31 The total thus obtained is slightly greater than the actual number of galleries present at the fair as the galleries with branches in several countries have been grouped with each of these countries in our statistics. Thus, of the 33 galleries identified as being French, nine of these are also present in other countries.
- 32 We should mention another group of countries which was relatively well represented, though its relative importance is not as great: Austria, Spain and Belgium.
- 33 Cf. Piguët, *Foires* 2000.
- 34 Cf. Fournier and Roy-Valex, *Art* 2001.
- 35 In 2000, the ten artists who appeared in the *Kunst Kompass* whose nationality was neither American, Canadian, nor that of a Western European country were Russian, South Korean, South African, Iranian, Mexican, Yugoslav, Japanese, Thai and Cuban. However, as we will see, several of these lived and worked in North America and Europe.
- 36 Cf. Piguët, *Foires* 2000; Alain Quemin, *L'art contemporain international à l'heure de la »globalisation«*. La place de la France dans le concert des nations, in: *Pratiques* 1 (2002), 100–163.
- 37 Cf. Quemin, *l'art contemporain international* 2002.
- 38 Cf. Raymonde Moulin, *Le marché de la peinture en France*, Paris 1967.