

Who's Afraid of Artistic Research? On measuring artistic research output¹

Dieter Lesage

In the Fall of 2006, I was invited to participate in the exhibition *Academy. Learning from Art*, to be shown at MuHKA, the Museum of Contemporary Art in Antwerp.² The Antwerp exhibition was part of a larger project, developed by Angelika Nollert (Siemens Arts Program), Ylmaz Dziewior (Hamburger Kunstverein), Charles Esche and Kerstin Niemann (Vanabbe Museum Eindhoven), Irit Rogoff (Goldsmiths College, University of London), Bart De Baere and Dieter Roelstraete (MuHKA). A first *Academy* show had already been put on in 2004 by the Hamburger Kunstverein, and simultaneously with the 2006 *Academy* exhibition at MuHKA, the Vanabbe Museum Eindhoven presented *Academy. Learning from the Museum*.³

Although the curators' focus for both the exhibitions in Antwerp and Eindhoven was on learning, with my contribution to the Antwerp exhibition I wanted to draw attention to that other task of the Academy after Bologna, which is research. For the catalogue that accompanied the exhibition I wrote a polemical essay entitled 'A Portrait of the Artist as a Researcher', in which a fictitious character criticised in a quite unacademic way the attempts by universities and public authorities to get a grip on the emerging field of artistic research, among others by trying to define the criteria for the evaluation of artistic research output.⁴

My contribution to the *A.C.A.D.E.M.Y.* catalogue would mark the beginning of a more theoretical and collective approach to the problematic of artistic research as a key task of the Academy after Bologna. Indeed, since Bologna, time is ticking for the Academy as a space of learning, research and production, not determined by market imperatives, nor by heteronomic academic standards. Therefore more allies and more arguments for the recognition of the specificity of artistic research were needed.

During the preparation of the 179th and last issue of the Belgian media magazine AS, which conveniently borrowed its title from my short contribution to the *A.C.A.D.E.M.Y.* catalogue, and which I realised in cooperation with Kathrin Busch, I had the opportunity to meet a great number of highly respected 'allies' all over Europe, who each in his or her own way, sometimes polemical, sometimes 'academic', sometimes poetic, sometimes scientific, sometimes philosophical, sometimes pragmatic, developed a multitude of arguments for the recognition of the specificity of artistic research.⁵ These meetings with fellow-minded European artists, writers, curators, critics, sociologists, philosophers, etc., took the form of two conferences, one at a small, but ambitious German university, another at a big, and famous Austrian art academy, as well as of an exhibition and a lecture series in the Austrian capital.

Indeed, with Kathrin Busch, philosopher and professor at the Institut für Kulturtheorie of the Leuphana Universität Lüneburg, I organised a conference on *Verflechtungen zwischen künstlerischer und kulturwissenschaftlicher Forschung* on 11-12 May 2007 at the Leuphana Universität Lüneburg, during my stay at this university as a Visiting Professor in the summer semester 2007, with a Eurolecture grant from the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung F.V.S. (Hamburg). To this conference we invited theoreticians with well-known positions on artistic research, such as Elke Bippus, Sabeth Buchmann and Mika Hannula, but also Eva Meyer and Eran Schaerf, two artists whose artistic practice we would describe as artistic research, as well as Hans-Christian Dany, an artist whom we thought might have a very different take on the emerging discourse on artistic research. All their lectures at the conference in Lüneburg, as well as Kathrin Busch's and my own contribution to it, entitled 'Who's Afraid of Artistic Research?' are published in the volume of *AS*. The reader of the *AS#179* volume may appreciate, as much as 'we' did, the degree to which 'the artists' at the Lüneburg conference, refused to speak in a way one might have expected in an 'academic setting' such as a conference at a university, and maybe, for that very reason, have addressed the central question regarding the specificity of artistic research much more poignantly than 'we', 'theoreticians', probably did. At the Lüneburg conference, there was a tangible tension between those who practise artistic research, but are rather skeptical about the development of a meta-discourse on that practice, and those who, as theoreticians or as critics, reflect on practices of artistic research. One of the characteristics of the emerging discourse on artistic research that seems to alienate some artists - even if their own practice is often described by critics as a form of artistic research - is that the discourse on artistic research tends to be very much embedded, either in a critical, deconstructive or constructive way, in the contemporary debate on the reform of higher art education in general, and of the Academies in particular. And it should be clear that most artists have a love-hate relationship with the Academy. If one isn't so sure whether the Academy should exist at all, it is difficult to feel very passionate about a discussion on its reform. This tension in itself deserves proper attention in all further reflections on artistic research.

Nevertheless, the second conference on *Artistic Research and the Bologna Process*, which I had the pleasure to organise with Prof. Sabeth Buchmann at the Academy of Fine Arts in Vienna on 1 June 2007, turned out to be a lively and engaged debate on reform. Here all the participants felt very concerned about the impact of the Bologna Process on the Academy. The reason for this was the particular setting of the conference itself. The conference seemed to be a long-awaited event in the life of one of Europe's biggest, most important and influential Academies. Students took it as a brilliant occasion to discuss the Bologna Process with Stephan Schmidt-Wulffen, the newly re-elected Rector of the Academy, and some of the Viennese Academy's many well-known professors, such as Marion von Osten, Felicitas Thun-Hohenstein, Elisabeth von Samsonow, Diedrich Diederichsen, Christian Kravagna and of course Sabeth Buchmann, who diligently moderated the delicate debates. Other participants at the conference in Vienna were Beatrice von Bismarck, Hedwig Saxenhuber, Ina Wudtke, Ulf Wuggenig, Klaas Tindemans and myself. Most of the statements that have been presented at this conference in Vienna are equally to be found in the *AS* reader. At the Vienna conference, Marion von Osten presented a lecture on a future project. In this reader however, she is represented by a documentation of one of her former projects, *<reformpause>*, which she realised in cooperation with the Kunstraum at the Universität Lüneburg in 2006, and which reflected very specifically on the Bologna Process.

As if there were not enough exhibitions, during the summer of 2007, we decided to put up a little show ourselves. The exhibition *A Portrait of the Artist as a Researcher* (12 July – 26 August 2007), which Ina Wudtke and I curated at the Freiraum, quartier21/MQ in Vienna, questioned the ideology of the Bologna Process. On the one hand, it showed works that are the result of artistic research, on the other hand these works commented, circled around or criticised the discourse on ‘mobility’ and ‘flexibility’ that is characteristic of the Bologna Process. In his film *Capsular*, Herman Asselberghs addresses the question how much mobility Europe effectively supports. In Ceuta, a Spanish enclave in Morocco, he filmed the European wall which is supposed to stop African immigrants. The two architects of Office, Kersten Geers and David Van Severen, too, questioned the ‘state of exception’, exemplified by Ceuta. Their work - such as their plans for the new capital of South-Korea – is characterised by a critical reflection on the political circumstances of the architectural plan. The questionable philosophy of mobility was the theme of two German artists. The work of Annette Wehrmann reflected the use of public space in the MuseumsQuartier in Vienna. As in many other places in the western world, there are some ‘artist’s studios’ in the MuseumsQuartier. ‘Artist’s studios’ often correspond with a concept of artistic support, which sees the artist as a hypermobile nomad, who changes constantly between places and spaces. The film *A Portrait of the Artist as a Worker (rmx.)* of the Berlin artist Ina Wudtke, aka DJ T-INA, is an ironic self-presentation as mobile and flexible artist, moving constantly between cities and projects. In our flexible ‘project society’, we change so often between our different professional identities, that every rigid identity dissolves and it becomes unclear, what criteria quality control agencies should check. Our society is not only a ‘society of control’, as Foucault wrote. It is a ‘quality control society’. ‘Self evaluation’ – universities and academies know this quite well — is as much an instrument of this ‘society of control’ as surveillance cameras. With the work *Output (rmx.)* I had the ‘output’ of my research activities, all my publications, photographed. In this way, the publication list, one of the most well-known instruments of academic control, became a work of art, and yet another (artistic) publication. This volume also contains visual essays by Ina Wudtke and Herman Asselberghs, which document their works in this exhibition, as well as contributions by Stephan Dillemath and Jan De Pauw, who in July 2007 presented lectures during the exhibition.

This symposium *Who is Afraid of Artistic Research?* comes at a time when continental European higher education undergoes a far-reaching transformation. This transformation process, announced by the Sorbonne Joint Declaration of the Ministers of Higher Education of France, Italy, Germany and the UK in Paris on May 25th 1998, and launched by the Joint Declaration of European Ministers of Higher Education in Bologna on 19 June 1999, has been dubbed ‘the Bologna Process’.⁶ Every two years European Ministers of Higher Education gather to establish the progress made by the Bologna Process, to determine additional goals of the Process, to impose accelerations on the Process and to welcome new countries who join the Process.⁷ The actual number of countries participating in the Bologna Process is now 46.⁸

The Bologna Process is supposed to lead to the establishment of a European Higher Education Area in 2010, which should, in accordance with the Lisbon Strategy, contribute to establish the European Union as the world’s biggest knowledge economy from that same year on. ‘Innovation’, ‘creativity’ and ‘research’ are some of the buzz words that figure in every report on the progress made towards that goal. After Prague (in 2001), Berlin (in 2003) and Bergen (in 2005), where at each time the Ministers issued a Communiqué, the last meeting of the Bologna Follow-Up Group, which also includes the European Commission and a number of organisations with consultative member status, was held in London, on 17-18 May 2007.⁹

If conforming to certain academic standards, study courses at European higher education institutions will be accredited to deliver academic bachelor's degrees, master's degrees and doctor's degrees.¹⁰ European higher arts education too was invited, obliged or forced to take part in this procedure. In many European countries and regions, higher arts education committed itself to implement the Bologna Process, willingly or unwillingly. As a consequence, since a few years, the obligation to become 'academic' is what all the fuss in an important part of European higher arts education is about. As the classic representative institution of higher arts education has often been called an 'academy', the question became how to understand the obligation that academies should become academic. By 'academies' I will refer to all institutions of higher arts education, whether they teach visual or fine arts or film or drama or music, and whether they are indeed called 'academy' or not. Particularly confusing for these 'academies' was that many of them had precisely engaged in pedagogical efforts to assure that learning and teaching at 'academies' would become less 'academic' than it used to be. Whereas at universities, the adjective 'academic' sounds like a generic quality label, at academies 'academic' had already for quite some time become an insult, a signifier of a lack of artistic quality. And so it happened that, at the very moment that many European academies had become very anxious not to teach their students to produce 'academic art', they were told they had to 'academize' in order to get accreditations for their artistic study courses.

Of course, this is not the only reason why the academization process launched by the Bologna Declaration and its various national and regional implementations have met with a great variety of resistances and critiques I cannot thoroughly address at this time. Obviously, many important critics, such as Stephan Dillemath, already addressed in a rigorous way the issue of 'Bologna's hidden and not too hidden neo-liberal agenda.'¹¹ Although in postwar Italian political history, Bologna had been notorious as a bastion of communism, in more recent European political history, 'Bologna' became the signifier par excellence of the imposition of a neo-liberal agenda in educational matters. As a reply, ever since its meeting in Prague in 2001, the Bologna Follow-Up Group has at least been paying lip-service to this criticism both by stressing the social dimensions of higher education and acknowledging the public authorities' responsibility for higher education.

In my contribution to the reader *A Portrait of the Artist as a Researcher*, I develop the hypothesis that the Bologna Process, in a way that is completely unintentional, may eventually contribute to the end of the hegemony of the natural sciences in the field of research. What we are witnessing today, at least in those regions and countries where institutions of higher arts education, willingly or unwillingly, committed themselves to take part in the Bologna Process, is the beginning of a fierce battle for the definition of research. In many German Länder, where higher arts education, partly due to the efficient opposition by the 'Rektorenkonferenz der deutschen Kunsthochschulen' was allowed not to engage in the Bologna Process, this battle is probably only postponed.¹² Indeed, the exemption from the obligation to organise bachelor's and master's degrees in an internationally compatible way doesn't necessarily imply the exemption from the obligation to invest in research.

A brief outline of the history of this battle for the definition of research goes as follows. One of the most important maxims accompanying the various national and regional implementations of the Bologna Process is the idea that teaching in higher education should be based on research. As a logical consequence of this 'research maxim', in higher arts

education too, teaching in the arts should be based on research. As an interpretation of this logical consequence of the research maxim, institutions of higher arts education have put forward the idea that teaching in higher arts education should be based on *artistic* research. With the growing formation of a *discourse on artistic research*, the universities, who claim a monopoly on the definition of research, were confronted with an attack on their hegemony in research matters. More precisely, the attack on the university's hegemony in research matters is an attack on the internal hegemony of the natural sciences within the university.

As soon as a hegemony is under attack, one will witness fear among those who cherish their hegemony. As a hegemony is always the product of an alliance between different groups, the answer to the question "who's afraid of artistic research?" will have to describe those different groups and the way in which their hegemonic alliance is constructed. As an eventual counter-hegemony will also be based on an alternative alliance between different groups, one could then try to describe what kind of alliances may have counterhegemonic potential. It is my hypothesis that the concept of artistic research and the formation of a discourse on artistic research is feared both by groups within the academy and the arts world on the one hand, and by groups within the university and the scientific world on the other hand. It goes without saying that, where the opposition between academies and universities no longer makes any sense, either because some academies have become universities – as is the case in Hungary and Austria – or because some academies have been integrated into universities – as is the case in the UK – fear of artistic research hasn't necessarily disappeared.

First of all, the obligation for teaching in higher education in general — and thus also in higher arts education — to be based on research, has been at first understood by many as the obligation for academies to engage in *scientific* research. Although some may have genuinely misunderstood the sense of the obligation to engage in research — given indeed the hegemony of the natural sciences regarding the definition of research —, it is my hypothesis that others deliberately (mis)understand the obligation for academies to do research as the obligation to do *scientific* research because they are actually afraid of... *artistic* research. The stubborn rhetorical identification of 'research' with 'scientific research' allows them to get rid of every form of research within the academy. Art is different from science, artists are not trained as scientists, nor should they be trained as scientists, and therefore the obligation for art academies to engage in research makes no sense. Among the proponents of this position one may find most of those who think of art as the product of genius, some of those who think of the arts as a set of technical skills, as well as some of those who think of the arts as a combination of genius and technical skills.

However, within institutions of higher arts education which committed themselves to the Bologna Process, some have been defending the position that science has not the monopoly of research, that art too can be described as having research as an important component and that the commitment to the Bologna Process for academies implies a commitment to the development of *artistic* research, not scientific research. The notion of artistic research implies that artistic practice can be described in a way more or less analogous to scientific research. An artistic project, then, begins with the formulation, in a certain context, of an artistic problem, which necessitates an investigation, both artistic and topical, into a certain problematic, which may or may not lead to an artwork, intervention, performance or statement, with which the artist positions himself/herself with regard to the initial artistic problem and its context.

Whatever its merits may be for an attempt to argue for a pluralist concept of research, this analogy argument should be handled with care. The argument that artistic research is analogous to scientific research has already prompted some to the idea that, in this case, one should measure the artistic research output of an academy in a way analogous to the way in which the scientific research output of a university is measured. Academies, then, could be asked not only to count their artistic publications, but also to dress up a categorisation of different types of artistic publications, categories which should be attributed different weights, according to their importance for the artistic research community, analogous to the way in which scientific publications are valued according to whether they are published in A, B or C journals. Such a development would be as problematic for artistic research, as it is already for quite some time for the humanities in general and the cultural studies in particular.

Insofar as the official recognition of artistic research will be made to depend on the acceptance by artistic researchers of outrageous criteria of research output evaluation, dressed up in analogy to scientific research output criteria which seem to suit the natural sciences, but not the humanities, artistic researchers in search for the recognition of a pluralist concept of research that would include artistic research as well may find allies among their colleagues working in the field of the humanities in general and cultural studies in particular, many of whom also struggle with reductionist criteria of output evaluation. Many researchers in the humanities in general and in cultural studies in particular contest the idea that articles in international, peer-reviewed academic journals are to be considered as the most important academic publication format, as is the case in the natural sciences. Representatives of the natural sciences tend to impose the view that books, op-eds, articles or critiques in newspapers, essays in journals of a more general character, are to be considered of almost no academic value, although, for instance, many of the most important philosophers of the last decades, on which hundreds, if not thousands of articles in international, peer-reviewed academic journals have been published, haven't published themselves almost anything in international, peer-reviewed academic journals at all. As a matter of fact, within the scientific community itself, the normative character of 'double blind peer review' has already been under attack for many years. A number of high-profile scientific journals, such as the *British Medical Journal*, have made the decision, motivated by scientific studies, to abandon blind peer review in favor of open review, where the name of the referee is known to the author of the article under review.¹³ Today, it seems a scientifically proven fact that the quality of open review is as good as the quality of blind review.¹⁴

Citation analysis as a criterion to measure research output, is equally considered by many in the scientific community as a very flawed procedure to measure research output. Ever since Eugene Garfield published the first *Science Citation Index* in 1964, it has been a very controversial instrument, the eventual misuses of which were recognized from the very beginning by leading scientists, such as Nobel Prize winner Joshua Lederberg. Lederberg, while promoting it as a tool for research, fiercely rejected it as a tool for measuring research output.¹⁵ Not only are all known citation indexes far from complete, they are also terribly biased in favor of articles and against books. To that one might add that the *Science Citation Index* and the other citation indexes are products sold by Thomson, a media corporation which also owns a lot of academic journals. To me, this sounds very much like a conflict of interests. Nevertheless many research managers continue to consider citation analysis, based on the use of Thomson's citation indexes who enjoy an absolute commercial monopoly, as a useful tool to measure research output. In discussions on measuring *artistic* research output, it is often suggested that academies should invent 'analogous' tools for measuring artistic

research output. And thus it happens that some people are beginning to dream of an Art Citation Index, while others are talking about the need to classify artistic venues in the same way as academic journals are classified according to their 'impact factor'. It might not take long before somebody invents the new science of 'artometrics'.

The worst thing that could happen to the emerging field of artistic research is that international, peer-reviewed journals of artistic research, such as this venerable *Art & Research*, would become the only academically accepted forms of artistic research output. Journals for artistic research which intend to promote the emerging field of artistic research and to discuss all the questions that relate to this emergence are of course perfectly legitimate, but it would be wrong to restrict the notion of artistic research output to publications in these journals. I believe these journals should be very careful in thinking how they position themselves in respect to academic journals and all the rituals that characterise them, and be very precise about the way in which they intend to be different from those journals. Rather than imitate the academic boosterism of the natural sciences, the emerging field of artistic research should open itself up to those within the humanities and cultural studies who are in desperate need of allies for the recognition of other types of research output than the classic article in the international peer-reviewed journal. An exhibition, for instance, should also be recognized and valued as a possible research output. In any case, this is obviously the position defended by academies newly committed to research. Insofar as academies defend a pluralist concept of research, including artistic research, and a pluralist concept of research output, including exhibitions, performances, artworks, artistic interventions, etc., it is clear that academies are potential allies of researchers in the cultural studies who prefer academically unconventional formats for the presentation of their research.

Secondly, the obligation for teaching in higher education in general — and thus also in higher arts education — to be based on research, has been understood by some as the obligation to have *more theory* in the curricula of the study courses at the academy, and to have *less practice*. This may be seen as a variation of the first position. However, its focus is mainly on the distribution of courses, — and thus also of teaching jobs — between theoreticians and artists within the arts academy. The proponents of this position tend to see a strong opposition between theory and practice, expressed by the idea that research is not the responsibility of the artist, but of the theoretician. This position allows for different variations. There are the very few who believe there is no place whatsoever for theoreticians at an arts academy. There are those who believe that a limited dose of theory in an arts academy curriculum is a necessary evil. There are those who think there should be a right balance between some theory and much more practice. And among these one will find those who appreciate that their academy has some theoreticians, involved in research, so that the academy is safe when it comes to the question whether the academy is doing any research at all. These are the people who believe that the academy needs some theoreticians because the authorities nowadays always ask academies if they are doing any research. These proponents don't understand (yet) that research is a responsibility of academies to be shared both by theoreticians *and* artists, and that it can take the form of common projects with mixed methodologies or of individual projects with distinct methodologies.

The proponents of a manicheistic vision on the relationship between theory and art practice also feel very uncomfortable with hybrid figures, such as artists who also develop theories, or theorists with an arts practice. As far as the concept of artistic research precisely allows for a valorisation of these figures of artistic hybridity, the concept of artistic research is feared by

those who would like to keep a clearcut division of academic labor between artists and theorists. As far as they themselves are artists without any interest for theory, they tend to prefer not only other artists without any interest for theory, but they also tend to prefer hard core scientists without any interest in artistic practice that would go beyond the naive admiration for the genius of the painter, rather than the philosophers, sociologists and other KulturwissenschaftlerInnen, who constantly embarrass the artistic geniuses with their discursive contributions to artistic projects, which seem to contest implicitly or explicitly the aesthetics to which they themselves adhere to.

Institutionally, the implementation of the Bologna Process for higher arts education took very different forms. In some countries, certain academies would receive the status of university. It would allow them to deliver doctor's degrees in the arts. In other countries, academies were forced to become part of universities. And in the Dutch-speaking part of Belgium, the arts academies which had already been obliged to become a department of 'hogescholen', are now participating in a process whereby these 'hogescholen' are obliged to become part of an association with a university. Within this construction, universities claimed the right to deliver the doctoral degree in the arts, because they alone have a long-standing experience of delivering doctoral degrees. However, this unquestionable experience of universities in delivering doctoral degrees is coupled with a questionable inexperience in delivering degrees in the arts. The format of the new doctorate in the arts has been the subject of heated discussions between universities and academies. Although universities did pay attention to the demand that the new doctorate in the arts should respect the specificity of an artistic education, in that they accepted the idea that artists present a portfolio of their work as a doctorate, universities fiercely defended the idea that a doctorate in the arts would be inconceivable without a written supplement. As a result, the format of the new doctorate in the arts often requires both an artistic portfolio and a written supplement. The insistence of universities on the obligation of a written supplement seems to demonstrate the university's lack of confidence either in the capacity of the arts to speak in a meaningful, complex and critical way in a medium of their choosing, or in the university's own capacity to make sound judgments on the meaning, complexity and criticality of artistic output as such. What might happen now is that juries will mainly base their judgment on a reading of the written supplement, because it complies with a long-standing format of the doctorate, as if it were the doctorate itself, while at the same time being tempted to consider the artistic portfolio merely as a supplementary illustration. Contrary to this, the evaluation of a doctorate in the arts should focus on the capacity of the doctoral student to speak in the medium of his or her choice. And if this medium is film, or video, or painting, or sculpture, or sound, or 'new', or if the doctoral student wants to mix media, it will obviously require from a jury other ways of reading, interpretation and discussion, than those required by an academic text. To impose a medium on the artist is to fail to recognize the artist as an artist. An artist who wants to obtain a doctorate in the arts should be given the academic freedom to choose his or her own medium. Even then it would still be possible that he or she chooses text as the most appropriate medium for his or her artistic purposes. Therefore universities should prepare themselves for the moment that a writer will present a novel as a doctorate. I believe they aren't. According to the format of the doctorate in the arts, the writer will be asked to supplement his novel with a text. However, would one seriously want a writer who presents a novel as a doctorate in the arts to supply a written supplement? What should that written supplement say?

The formation of a discourse on artistic research, the multiple formats for the presentation of research which are made acceptable through this discourse, the networks of educational and artistic institutions that disseminate this discourse, the alliances they may begin to form with sections and representatives of the humanities in general and the cultural studies or cultural studies in particular at universities, all this could eventually provoke the end of the hegemony of the natural sciences, which is apparent in the dominance of its extremely reductionist valorisation of research output, on which the distribution of research funding heavily relies. If, as an unintended side-effect, thanks to the strategic alliances between researchers in the arts and researchers in cultural studies, the Bologna Process destroys the hegemony of the natural sciences, then we will have had one good reason to appreciate the Bologna Process, namely that it has the strange capacity to defeat itself.

¹ A version of this lecture was delivered at *Verflechtungen zwischen künstlerischer und kulturwissenschaftlicher Forschung*, Leuphana Universität Lüneburg, 11-12 May 2007

² *Academy. Learning from Art*, September 15 November 26, 2006, MuHKA, Museum van Hedendaagse Kunst Antwerpen, Belgium, <http://www.muhka.be>

³ *Academy. Learning from the Museum*, September 16 November 26, 2006

Van Abbemuseum, Eindhoven, The Netherlands, info@vanabbemuseum.nl

⁴ See Dieter Lesage, 'A Portrait of the Artist as a Researcher', in Angelika Nollert, Irit Rogoff, Bart De Baere, Yilmaz Dziewior, Charles Esche, Kerstin Niemann, Dieter Roelstraete, *A.C.A.D.E.M.Y.* (Frankfurt am Main: Revolver Verlag, 2006), p. 220-222.

⁵ Kathrin Busch and Dieter Lesage (eds.), *A Portrait of the Artist as a Researcher. The Academy and the Bologna Process*, (AS#179) (Antwerp: MuHKA, 2007).

⁶ All official European documents related to the Bologna Process until May 2005 can be downloaded from: <http://www.bologna-bergen.2005.no>.

⁷ In order to be accepted as a participating country in the Bologna Process, nation states don't have to be a Member state of the European Union. According to the Berlin Communiqué of 19 September 2003, all European countries who signed the European Cultural Convention and who accept the basic premises of the Bologna Declaration and strive to implement the Process on their national level, can become participating countries in the Bologna Process. The actual number of participating countries in the Bologna Process is 46. Three more countries who signed the European Cultural Convention are not (yet) participating in the Bologna Process: San Marino, Belarus, and Monaco. San Marino and Monaco may definitely not be interested for lack of higher education institutions. So one may expect that only one more country may join the Bologna Process in the next few years, and that is Belarus. Although this is quite unsure, as it is a 'non-aligned country', the only one geographically situated in Europe.

⁸ All participating countries in the Bologna Process are supposed to do so of their own accord. Unlike an Intergovernmental Treaty, the Bologna Declaration is not a legally binding document. What drives the whole process aren't European sanctions, but what some have called "international peer pressure".

⁹ On 18 May 2007, the Bologna Follow-Up Group issued its so-called 'London Communiqué'. 'Mobility', 'employability', 'compatibility', 'comparability', 'flexibility' are some of the buzz words that figure prominently in this 'London Communiqué'. Interestingly enough, one should add that the London Communiqué announced that the next meeting of the Bologna Follow Up Group will be held in Louvain-la-Neuve and in Louvain, in April 2009. This meeting of what one could be tempted to call the E46 could be the right time to finally voice some protest against the more problematic aspects of the Bologna Process.

¹⁰ The Berlin Communiqué of the Ministers of Education, on 19 September 2003, included for the first time the third cycle or doctorate in the Bologna Process, whereas the 'Bologna Declaration' of 19 June 1999 only referred to the first two cycles.

¹¹ Stephan Dilleuth, 'Old and New Monsters. The Academy and the Corporate Public', in Annette Hollywood and Barbara Wille (eds.), *Who is afraid of Master of Arts?* (Berlin: Internationale Gesellschaft der Bildenden Künste, 2007), p. 73-84. A shorter English version of this text is published in *AS #179*.

¹² Karin Stempel, 'Zum Stand der Dinge', in Hollywood & Wille (eds.), *Who is afraid of Master of Arts?*, pp. 23-32.

¹³ For a motivation of this change in editorial policy of the *British Medical Journal*: Richard Smith, 'Opening up BMJ peer review. A beginning that should lead to complete transparency', *British Medical Journal*, vol. 318, 2 January 1999, pp. 4-5.

¹⁴ Sandra Goldbeck-Wood, 'Evidence on peer review – scientific quality control or smokescreen?', *British Medical Journal*, vol. 318, 2 January 1999, pp. 44-45. On this issue, see also: Susan Van Rooyen, Fiona Godlee, Stephan Evans, Nick Black, Richard Smith, 'Effect of open peer review on quality of reviews and on reviewers' recommendations: a randomised trial', *British Medical Journal*, vol. 318, 2 January 1999, pp. 23-27.

¹⁵ On the history of the *Science Citation Index* and of scientometrics, see the excellent PhD thesis by Paul Wouters, *The Citation Culture*, University of Amsterdam, 1999. <http://www.garfield.library.upenn.edu/wouters/wouters.pdf>