

## A New Approach to Arts Management in the Context of the Romanian Contemporary Art Scene

DANA ALTMAN  
FLORIN ȘTEFAN



FLORIN ȘTEFAN, *Dead Man*, 2012,  
oil on canvas, 40×60 cm

### **Dana Altman**

Independent theoretician and writer.  
Director of a New York City contemporary  
art gallery.

### **Florin Ștefan**

Painter and university professor at the  
Art and Design University in Cluj-Napoca;  
founder and director of Spațiu Intact.

**A**FTER 1989, Romania found itself integrated in an unexpected but real manner in the complex European cultural space. The main issue, which surfaced immediately, was the almost total absence of a general infrastructure, which would have allowed the successful promotion of both existing values and the values that were bound to appear. In the context of seismic social movements, the world of art had to find a new voice and a new matrix to allow the creative incorporation of its past and at the same time to produce new values during the process. Immediately, the new environment created a sharp need for new forms, to correspond to these new needs.

In the beginning, the forms were created by mimesis, following the model of traditional art galleries in Western Europe or the US, because often the lack of experience leads to imitation at an initial stage. The first galleries which were founded did not



CĂTĂLIN BURCEA, *The Expansibility of the Field of Struggle*, Spațiu Intact, 2013

take into consideration the obvious fact that generally commercial galleries survive due to the existence of a specialized art public, used to the existence of a functional art market, and with a certain type of transactions involving art. Romania in the 1990s did not have such a public in the way it existed in the capitalist world. It can take decades to shape it, and a business based on a model that requires its existence cannot survive. As a consequence, the system had to adapt to the local reality and new forms of promoting contemporary art took up, either mimetically or creatively, certain components of the North-American and West European system. At the same time, they also identified and exploited the strengths of the system of art transactions typical for the Romanian market. The result was a model adapted to the situation on the ground.

Overall, the system of selling and acquiring art is very complex, but at the same time it has not changed radically in the last decades. Today, artists at the beginning of their career still look for galleries to represent them, even though nowadays there are other less direct ways to obtain notoriety. Usually, an artist creates an Internet site to present his or her work to collectors or to galleries of interest. In its turn, a commercial gallery decides to work with artists first and foremost based on the preferences of the owner and/or director, or taking into account the commercial potential of the art in itself. Whether it is stated obvi-

ously or not in the curatorial policy (or whether such policy even exists), galleries are first and foremost glorified “shops,” selling an exclusive merchandise and surviving mostly by means of sales to private clients, to corporate clients who may wish to embellish their offices or to start a collection with investment potential, or to museums that want to acquire contemporary art or secondary market art, belonging to the rarefied market of important names. In order for the art to sell, the gallerist must make choices depending on the stable of clients, but must also look for new clients for the type of art that he or she considers worthy or innovative. If the advertising and sales process goes well, the artist starts to have a devoted audience following his or her career. This public may include art collectors and art critics or writers who appreciate the value and the novelty of the art, but also occasional buyers who may want to decorate their apartment, even though their numbers have decreased in the context of the economic crisis which affected the middle class. This can be the moment when museums and auction houses start being interested, especially if the artist has been promoted in the right manner. In recent years a new model has taken shape, namely the takeover by important galleries of artists promoted by collectors willing to invest, in the manner of artistic sponsorship, which has become more palatable; the launch can involve collectors ready to buy, or auctions already lined up. Sometimes, the gallery or representative is eliminated early in the game, when the artist reaches a certain market share and considers that he or she can control the market better with direct involvement.

As always, the main areas of focus are the art audience—in other words, the collectors who trust an artist enough to provide funds to assist in building a future and acquire the art based on purely aesthetic reasons or as an investment, in the hope that its value will increase—and the art critics (even though there is chatter about the death of art criticism, there are still lots of art columns in print or online) or curators, who can make or break the market price of an artist by their institutional vote and can influence a career. In recent years, much of the arts trade has taken place in auction houses, and often a high auction price or estimate determines an overall raise in prices for collectors. This border between auctions and galleries, which years ago was quite clear, has become increasingly blurred when the auction houses started selling inventory directly by means of spaces posing as commercial galleries, without going through the auction process, which undermines a whole sector of the art world. This approach represents an invasion of extreme commercialism in the traditional space of the art gallery, which exists, is perpetuated and cannot be ignored as a manner of trading in object-oriented art.

The situation has changed regarding the promotion of a visual artist. The share of direct advertising has gone down once the seismic changes in print me-

dia became a fact. Magazines considered very important and trendsetters have either disappeared completely, or became a different type of media entities, often with a different agenda. Social media arrived on the scene, and it has proven quickly that it can create a viral phenomenon from everything, including art, especially if there is any whiff of sensationalism either in terms of the theme or as an evolution, and which can generate income in other ways than direct sale transactions. Overnight, Facebook, Instagram or Twitter can make an artist or an image familiar to the whole computer literate world. Another recent shift is gallery participation in art fairs, which represent a concentration, albeit fake and temporary, of the market, and offer galleries who are not in the first tier access to a world of international collectors who would be out of bounds otherwise.

In this context, the evolution with the most impact may be the pervasive infiltration of social media communication in all the layers of daily life; it allows access to personalized information, while creating the illusion of the global community sharing the same interests, images, fashions, feelings. It is an evolution that Romania experienced directly post-1989, even though with less fervor than the US. It is true that the space has become more democratic, as the internet provided the false feeling that access to information is uniform, but at the same time the boundaries between fields of study and domains of expertise have become more fluid and it has become increasingly harder to access or identify the real markers of value due to the plethora of information and the multitude of fake experts. The world of art has always been characterized by a fundamental lack of transparency, which places it in contrast with the apparent lack of mediation in social media, based by definition on the concept of direct experience, a fundamentally fake concept. Often the fact that information (including information about auction prices, the market price of an artist, or reports about the evolution of prices in a given period of time) exists online and actually contributes to an increased lack of transparency, because the information is as manipulated in this field as it is in others, and what seems like “trending” is in fact another instance of 15 minute celebrity. Yesterday’s nuggets of information start being recycled the moment they appear in order to make room for the new ones, and there are companies specializing in “burying” unsavory information from the results of search engines and web crawlers. It is a recyclable continuum, a perpetuum mobile, tiresome in its mechanical rhythm. Inevitably, we live in a stupor of excess imagery and last-minute information, of five minute celebrity with Twitter followers, of live wars and lives spent online, together with millions of users who have access to a connected computer. The image has stopped belonging to its creator and it seems to belong instead to a collective digital subconscious. Visual identity is not an introspective process anymore, but often a collection of features, colors and images collected from various sources, Instagram-type. The

user is not necessarily unhappy with the offer and does not try to observe creatively or from a historical perspective, but responds with Pavlovian exactness to stimuli from an area in which the offer has become a synonym for saturation. The context has fundamentally made the production of something increasingly hard in the context of visual over-saturation.

As the capacity of selection of the contemporary individual seems to have been atrophied in order to relinquish supremacy to another hypertrophied organ, of consumerism and rapid elimination from the system, short term memory, minimal focus and ready-made perceptions are the easy choice and sell well. This phenomenon is easy to recognize in the art world, where tendencies follow one another rapidly and predictably. The eyes of the 21<sup>st</sup> century person perceive more than can be processed successfully.

The author of the image is often meaningless, and its role is replaced by the shock value of the object created or its novelty (often apparent or falsified). The effect is no longer satisfaction, but rather an all-encompassing cultural indigestion, which could be equivalent to boredom. Before digesting anything new, there is a new layer over it. Yesterday's artists are not needed tomorrow, others will come up, and the result is a depository of feelings and recycled nostalgias, of objects and ready-made perceptions, reminding us of a past which can be closer than we think, with a history that is in fact meaningless, because what exists is a monotonously pixilated present in which patterns are not always obvious, and which moves rapidly under our gluttonous eyes. In this new reality, artists are often content to recycle a formula which has already proven its curatorial viability; at other times, they look for originality on purpose either by borrowing tools and ideas which can be imbued with conceptual value from other fields (such is the case of bio art, rapid prototyping sculpture) or by experimenting with borderline ideas from other domains, in a perpetual extension of the domain of art which seems to evolve as far away from the visual as possible.

This structure, more or less stable and at the same time in continuous transformation in order to find the ideal balance between profit maximization and



FLORIN ȘTEFAN, *Interior Architecture*, 2014, oil on canvas, 200×130 cm

cultural activity (or its pretense), has been for years the standard operating procedure in the Western World, and it was the cultural paradigm Romania had to enter post-1990. The integration process was meant both to recover the lost steps, to create the non-existent structures, and to be able to synchronize everything with the ongoing activity.

**I**N THIS context, two important phenomena took place in Romania, chronologically: first, artists wanted to be in touch with the public outside the geographic boundaries without fully understanding what this entailed, and secondly, there was an acute need for cultural management, for something/somebody to select from the informational labyrinth and to offer the semblance of certainty while defining a clear axiology. At a pragmatic level, Romanian artists noticed quickly that the Uniunea Artiștilor Plastici (Union of Plastic Artists) galleries in existence were not a system with sufficient flexibility to satisfy this need in its current shape. A first development was the appearance of artist-run spaces, and of cultural and non-profit management.

The entry in the arena of contemporary Romanian art post-1989 may have seemed rather abrupt to the European and US audience; the situation is in fact entirely different. It is something that developed gradually. In the '90s, the first commercial galleries following the classical model, with private ownership, were opened first in Bucharest and then in other cities, among which Cluj-Napoca. The first centers for contemporary art were also inaugurated in this period (such as Pavilion Unicredit), the first biennials, such as Periferic (Iași) and the Bucharest Biennial, opened to the public. There were also magazines that survived during



CORNELIU BRUDAȘCU, *Family Portrait*, 1971,  
oil on canvas, 160×160

all the years of rapid transition and disappeared after a few issues. In other words, cultural life diversified rapidly and tremendously, and perhaps the most important fact was that there were voices different from the institutional ones, whose inflexible attitude had become synonymous with arrogance. The impact was immediate. Because in Romania everything takes place at the boundary between the Balkans and the West, contemporary art is perceived often as a reason for praise when there is an important success, but not as a meaningful in-

vestment because it does not provide immediate and tangible benefits, and the long term benefits are not taken into consideration. Due to the need for long term investment which is not perceived as worthy, almost everything happened without any significant contribution of the state-run cultural institutions, which preferred to support classical art, which does not threaten the established status quo, and have often ignored or sabotaged the contemporary art developments which took the form of non-profits, small galleries or magazines published in negligible numbers but which promoted artists without an obvious or anti-system agenda. The Sindan Cultural Foundation of Bucharest, a non-profit sponsored by the eponymous pharmaceutical company, was an important player, because it created the basis of a cultural center active in Cluj between 1999 and 2003. It was a period without too many local alternatives to showcase contemporary art; among the artists exhibited there were Victor Man, Adrian Ghenie, and Ciprian Mureșan. One of the important projects was *Re: Location*, in collaboration with the Tranzit Foundation, Cluj, CIAC Bucharest, the National Museum of Contemporary Art of Bucharest, the National Museum of Art of Cluj, the Cluj University of Art and Design and the French Cultural Center, financed from the 2000 European Union program for culture as a part of the network of European Art Centers.

Romania in the 1990s never had a presence such as Charles Saatchi, who understood both the financial and cultural potential of a real and long term investment in contemporary art, and who started a durable project, with results known to the whole world by now. On the contrary, there has been a bottled up conflict between the contemporary artists and a diseased old structure, which denied the inevitable changes unfolding with or without their cooperation. As a consequence, there were instances when Romanian artists who are known internationally discovered that they lost the studio spaces they had been assigned or were put down on Romanian blogs, exactly in an area where they should have had maximum support. A classical subject of cultural scandal is, for example, the 2010 evacuation by the University of Art (after two years without utilities) of the Archive of Contemporary Art from the Bucharest studio of Dan and Lia Perjovschi. It was an evacuation enthusiastically supported by some from the artistic milieu; the archive ended up in Sibiu. The argument of the contribution of the two to Romanian culture, their international fame or their marketability did not seem to matter in the context. Another example is the case of the fake scandal created by the exhibition organized by the Romanian Cultural Institute in New York while the institution was led by Horia-Roman Patapievici, and known for the symbol of the most famous artifact, the pink pony. The fact that an institution financed from public funds had finally decided to get involved in the promotion of contemporary art actively mattered only as long as it played a

clearly defined part in the background policy, and not as a step forward. The Romanian Cultural Institute, in fact the only government institution which had a coherent program of cultural management abroad in a certain period and which provided results, ended up as a scapegoat for an inexistent error and, in fact, for its own coherent accomplishments in an area of maximum confusion.

After a few years, a number of galleries from Romania managed to enter the international market by means of art fairs, and when artists participated in projects organized by famous curators. In time, some collectors have come to the fore (paradoxically for those who do not understand the cultural milieu in Romania, mostly collectors from other countries) and supported artists enough to raise their auction prices. Then, there were reviews in important magazines and newspapers, and the rest is already history. The Romanian school of art is an interesting topic again, and so is the Cluj School of art, and this time respect is quantified in something Western society can understand and respect, namely the power of very high prices and market share. The prices of Romanian artists are still on a growth curve and their art is already on the secondary market in the US and Europe. Adrian Ghenie was listed by artnet.com among the top 50 contemporary artists in terms of price growth.

The Paintbrush Factory of Cluj is already a well-known cultural space and has become a symbol of transition; it now hosts six galleries, offices for various artistic projects as well as numerous artist spaces. It all started as a project of the non-profit gallery Sabot, to which Gallery Plan B, looking for a new space at the time, became associated. In 2009, they decided together to move to a recently decommissioned industrial space that could be adapted to the needs of contemporary art. Gallery Plan B had started as a project of a few artists whose names are now internationally famous and who decided after a first and rather unsuccessful confrontation with the West to look for an alternative to operate independently from administrative interference and start by opening an independent space. In time, especially after the Paintbrush Factory became the host space for other galleries, it became much more than that, namely a brand-space for the new Romanian artistic matrix. The events hosted in recent years are often with international resonance, known not only in Romania, and often involve prestigious galleries or institutions from all over the world.

Contemporary Romanian artists, and especially the ones from Cluj, are now the focus of attention. In recent years, there have been a series of exhibitions in important private galleries and museums, and their auction prices are on an upward trend. A few names are nowadays well known to the American art public: Adrian Ghenie, exhibited by Haunch of Venison, David Nolan Gallery NYC and Pace Gallery, Marius Bercea, exhibited at David Nolan Gallery, Dan Perjovschi, with numerous exhibitions at Lombard Fried. Other exhibitions took place in



museums, such as Dumitru Gorzo's at the New Jersey Museum of Contemporary Art, Adrian Ghenie at the Denver Museum of Contemporary Art, or the exhibition *Six Lines of Flight: Shifting Geographies in Contemporary Art* at the San Francisco MoMA, which featured Adrian Ghenie, Victor Man, and Ciprian Mureșan. Dan Perjovschi created an installation in the Donald B. and Catherine C. Marron Atrium on the second floor of the new building of the New York Museum of Modern Art.

Is there an explanation for this extraordinary success of Romanian contemporary art, and especially of the Cluj School of artists? Could it be that the market is self-regulating, finding new material at various intervals, and will forget these artists rapidly when something more interesting surfaces? It appears rather as a fortuitous convergence of a series of factors, one of them being the timely appearance of an independent, flexible system of galleries, non-profits and cultural publications which function non-preferentially and without a political clientele, with cultural management programs that generate results. The artists and the future artistic managers traveled, learnt what was to learn and returned determined to apply what they thought could function in Romania, with the shoestring budgets and minimal means available. The emergence of this vital system of support coincided with the real integration of Romania in the system of cultural globalization which allowed artists from this geographic area to export an object, not only an idea, and provided the opportunity to be discovered by the ones who matter in the relatively opaque and not too generous world of art and top art collectors. There were attempts at cultural sponsorships from private individuals; even though they were considered controversial and seen as promotional market instruments operating for purely commercial reasons, they can be events which strengthen the trust in certain artists and reinforce a cultural model. In 2006, Espace Culturel Louis Vuitton hosted an exhibition entitled *Scènes Roumaines*, defined in the press release as an area in which "hyper-realism converges with the oneiric" and featuring artists Ioana Bătrânu, Dan Beudean, Mihael Boșcu Kafchin, Geta Brătescu, Simon Cantemir Hăuși, Oana Fărcaș, Adrian Ghenie, Ion Grigorescu, Ciprian Mureșan, Sergiu Toma, Mircea Suci, Șerban Savu, and Bogdan Vlăduță. In time, support from auction houses also became manifest. The support started on a small scale and became manifest in 2008 by means of an exhibition organized at Espace Tajan during FIAC Paris by Rodica Seward. The Romanian-born owner of Tajan auction house is an active collector who discovered Romanian contemporary artists at the Armory Fair in New York City and has been a constant supporter since then, and the results became manifest internationally. Another interesting exhibition that offered Romanian artists European exposure was at Arken Museum, Copenhagen, May 2013: *HOTSPOT CLUJ: New Romanian Art* (Marius

Bercea, Răzvan Botiș, Radu Cioca, Radu Comșa, Adrian Ghenie, Dan Măciucă, Ciprian Mureșan, Cristi Pogăcean, Șerban Savu) which discussed the transition from the communist system to the new society by means of painting, sculpture, performance art, video and drawing.

It all coincided with the preference of the collector and curatorial world in this exact historical moment for the symbolic figurative, which is the trademark of contemporary Romanian artists. The success of the visual artists became manifest in the same period when Romanian filmmakers were awarded important international prizes for films tackling the same issues of everyday life. It is a story of daily occurrences that present a transitional imaginary, an existential crisis, which is at the point of being crushed by History. Just like Romanian cinematography has appropriated these experiences and imbued them with universal relevance, visual art succeeded in penetrating the superficial layer of the communist experience and plugged into the same stream of ideas. The symbolic figuration of these artists feeds from specific experiences of the Ceaușescu years, which were formative. There are other influences in the background, since after 1989 the post-communist landscape and the results of the rapid implementation of capitalist principles had sometimes devastating consequences for the cultural paradigm. The underlying feeling of frustration, of movement which is too slow or takes place in a closed circle, in a universe outside of time, which rarely communicates with the exterior, with the world, was converted into a sharp need to restructure the opaque areas. Once that restructuring was discovered, it became apparent what all the multi-disciplinary artists had in common: the need to understand the history and the Romanian present, not only by means of clichés, but rather by deconstructing them in order to reconstruct them in a personal manner which has gained universal value. By adapting these very intimate elements, Romanian contemporary art has developed a personal semiotics, images and motifs that integrate the Romanian tradition with the imagery of global contemporary art, which become recognizable and managed to reconfigure the anxiety of entering a new system and adapting to it in a visual language that is unmistakable.

**H**OW DOES the Intact Cultural Foundation fit in this context? It is to a certain extent the embodiment of every artist's dream to exist and exhibit in a space run and managed by another artist, and which can exist without commercial interference. Intact Cultural Foundation, under whose supervision Spățiu Intact (translated in English as "Intact Space", [www.spatiuintact.ro](http://www.spatiuintact.ro)) is functioning, was founded in 2000. It started as a promotional entity focused on performing and visual arts, and it organized events in the fields of theater, music and visual art. Historically speaking, this was a fundamentally ex-

ploratory period, since cultural operators 10 years after 1989 were still in the process of defining the ground rules, exploring the options and literally attempting to create a new cultural matrix to allow them to function successfully as the new social system was shaping itself.

Since the system was at a point where major readjustments were needed but not necessarily in sight, funding was difficult to obtain for private cultural agents and operators. It was a time when Romania was not yet a member of the EU, so EU funding was a distant dream, and when the local structure had no plan or set place for cultural management, which was regarded as a luxury. At the same time, cultural management was lacking and the impact of its absence was starting to be felt on the local market. The educational system was in turmoil (and it still is) so any type of educational initiative was felt either as a threat by the system or as something that would not survive in the long run, which eliminated the incentive for investment. The foundation decided to focus initially on the musical scene and coordinated a series of successful exchanges in the Romanian and European cultural space, with fewer visual arts projects.

In the historical context then came the landmark moment when a group of artists and associations decided to start adapting the dilapidated industrial space of the Paintbrush Factory into a space for all the branches of contemporary art, since it was clear the establishment was not going to participate in the change. It was an ad-hoc action with a long term impact for the cultural scene of Cluj and ultimately, the world. As discussed in the first part of this essay, one of the first hurdles was





*You, Me and Every Thing in Between*, curator SIMONA NASTAC, Spațiu Intact, 2015

the observation that communication and collaboration between the existing institutions, namely the University of Art, the Union of Plastic Artists and the Ministry of Culture, was scarce and lacking focus, perspective or sometimes even the will to change. A space that soon became a destination for art promoters, gallerists and curators from abroad was not locally considered important enough to attract funding. It is an established fact that the cultural scene can change the face of a city or a country, but it is also a fact that it requires long term planning, commitment and initiative from the persons on the ground, who understand the logistic challenges. And it also requires patience, since it may sometimes take years for the results to be noticed.

What distinguishes the Intact Cultural Foundation and its off-shoot at the Paintbrush Factory, Spațiu Intact, is that it is first and foremost an artist-run space, and its founder, Florin Ștefan, is an artist himself, with an educational experience which provides it with a different dynamic. The purpose of the foundation when it moved into its new space was mainly to fill a niche, namely, to offer artist residencies to encourage independence and creativity in young artists who were in dire need of support early in their career. The foundation started by providing modest subsidies and financing, plus other opportunities, to members of the generation of young artists. But it was soon clear that the market required



REZI VAN LANKVELD, *Brrxop*, Spațiu Intact, 2015

more than that, so when the opportunity to expand became a reality, it became obvious that while gathering funding according to a non-profit model the foundation could also promote artists through means available to a commercial entity that could successfully be adapted to the non-profit model, so the decision was made to open an exhibition space.

Overall, the Intact Cultural Foundation and its off-shoot, Spațiu Intact, represent in fact a highly successful hybrid entity that seems to function at first glance as a commercial gallery, with an exhibition space that looks apparently no different from the “white cube” everyone is familiar with, but the gallery interface is in fact an umbrella which covers a much larger range of non-profit cultural management activities. Carefully curated exhibitions may introduce the work of an unknown but remarkable artist from Cluj to curators of international renown or artists in the top tier looking for a worthy mentee. The educational structure was always underlying, and the opportunity to extend the space in order to offer more residencies was invaluable. From the immediate objectives such as offering studio space, materials and access to current information to artists, the focus shifted to carefully organized events and meetings with curators, gallerists and collectors visiting the vibrant space which is the Paintbrush

Factory, to conferences and workshops that would spread the word about the available opportunities.

It is a type of opportunity a regular commercial gallery may not be in the position to offer because it does not benefit from the necessary infrastructure and especially because survival can be dependent on sales. Since the collector audience is still small in Romania and most collectors are, unfortunately, prestige collectors who prefer to acquire art by artists that are already known, or who already have a following and a gallery abroad, the chance of the very young artists who may represent Romanian contemporary art in the future may very well be lost before it even manifests itself, especially since their commercial potential is not obvious because they never had the much needed promotion. In fact, Spațiu Intact does what a commercial gallery with a structured curatorial policy does, while not having to submit to the whims and shifts of the market as a commercial gallery would: it promotes artists it believes in and who bring something new, and it does so with the help of sponsors and other artists who are already established and in the position to help others and who believe in the mission outlined by its founder. It is a unique entity in the context of the Romanian art market, where galleries that have been around for over a decade are still considered new developments, but at the same time it represents the realistic version of understanding cultural policy on the ground.

Such cultural policies may very well represent the future, since they have a series of elements that are valuable and can function in the context of a weaker art market. A few defining features can be emphasized: such entities, if devoted to the promotion of contemporary art in a specific geographic region and not only to exploiting and safeguarding, for example, the patrimony of one artist, can easily attract funding by means of collaborative projects with well-known entities in order to promote the development of a whole new generation. A cultural foundation is in the position to generate income through exhibitions that are viable and curatorially challenging and which can attract sponsorships while also reflecting a realistic understanding of a very specific market with its issues and advantages and tapping into resources a commercial entity cannot access. And, last but not least, they can incorporate the educational component and offer direct access to information and contacts that would otherwise be inaccessible, even in the age of an apparently total transparency. Its success represents a validation of its capability to function as a hybrid entity, a dynamic interface that serves both collectors and artists, and its legacy, besides its present accomplishments, may very well be the proof that not all solutions exist already and there is still room for innovation in the existing cultural paradigm.



**Abstract****A New Approach to Arts Management  
in the Context of the Romanian Contemporary Art Scene**

After the fall of the communist regime, Romania found itself integrated in the complex European cultural space but faced the almost total absence of a general infrastructure, which would have allowed the successful promotion of both existing values and the values that were bound to appear. The world of art had to find a new voice and a new matrix to allow the incorporation of its past and to produce new values during the process. The present paper looks at the manner in which the Romanian artistic community responded to these challenges, from the new practices of art galleries or auction houses, through the recourse to social media, to artist-run spaces and especially the experience of the Spațiu Intact project.

**Keywords**

arts management, art galleries, art collectors, auction houses, social media, artist-run spaces, Romanian contemporary arts