

THE 30TH BIENAL DE SÃO PAULO: INTERVIEWS WITH LUIS PÉREZ-ORAMAS AND ANDRÉ SEVERO

Bruna Fetter

Translated by Ana Carolina Azevedo

The 30th Bienal de São Paulo, nicknamed *A Iminência das Poéticas* (“The Imminence of Poetics”), from September 7 to December 9, 2012 and situated at the the Bienal’s Pavilion at Ibirapuera Park is organized by curator Luis Pérez-Oramas and partner curators André Severo and Tobi Maier, together with assistant curator Isabela Villanueva. We had the opportunity to converse with Perez-Oramas and Severo in October 4 and 11, respectively.

INTERVIEW WITH LUIS PÉREZ-ORAMAS, CURATOR OF THE 30TH INTERNATIONAL BIENAL DE SÃO PAULO

Bruna Fetter:

I would like you to start by talking about the general concept of the 30th Bienal de São Paulo, exemplified by the title *The Imminence of Poetics*.

Luis Pérez-Oramas:

In fact, when we began planning the Bienal — we already knew intuitively, but afterwards it became clear, explicitly clear that we wanted to break free from the stereotypical Bienal that announces itself in the title. It announces itself in the sense that it is a themed Bienal whose public can expect an array of artists linked illustratively or representatively to this theme. That is why we found a reason — I like to speak of a reason, more than of a theme —, a reason summed up in this title, knowing that this Bienal would be known as the thirtieth. We wanted a reason, almost in the sense of a musical motif, that served as a pretext for the unfoldings that would go beyond the idea of a Bienal comprised by its title, whose title would comprise the Bienal. Obviously, I had a guess about the need — notably shared with André Severo — of a Bienal focusing its discussions on the issue of the survival of forms, in the

sense related to Aby Warburg’s perception of the term *Nachleben*, which refers to continuity or afterlife of motifs. In my opinion, it is essential to understand that the resurgences constitute the emergences, that resurgences *in the forms* constitute the emergence of the forms, against the myth of modern progress and the myth of modern forms. This fact, obviously, necessarily implied to think of a notion of return. But one would feel trapped if one thought of a notion of return in the world of contemporary art. The only way that contemporary art is able to reflect upon the issue of return is through the concept of return to order, or the return to the past, or the conscious return, and that is not the same return we were interest in making for the center of the discussion. It was more the fact that the motifs are always deformations of other motifs, the fact that the emergence of memory — which is an emergency that is beyond the entire program, beyond the entire project, beyond the whole intention —, this emergency constitutes the possibility of motifs. Obviously we knew there were radical artistic practices, such as the drifting practices, which wander away from logic in a way that is constituted as finished, and that there were contemporary artistic practices that revisit the modern scene and that are indeed resurgences or survivals or alternative forms of the modern motifs. That was all present in our conscience, but, to us, the important thing was to understand that the issue we wanted to put in the center of the discussion did not have a name. Then, one day, during a discussion with Homi Bhabha, there came the notion of *imminence*, and it became clear that this notion of imminence could be precisely a name for that matter we were thinking about. Today I understand that the issue of imminence has at least a double unfolding. It is an auspicious manner to back into putting the issue of imminent time, an issue that exists in all discussions throughout the contemporary world, a world that exists only in an imminent temporality and resists permanently to the possibility of being completely thought, revised and so on by the big systems. But the other dimension of imminence that is nowadays clearer to me, following the intuition that we used to have, was explained to us by Homi Bhabha and is clearly exposed by him in the catalogue’s text. Artistic motifs exist only in the iminencial time, keep happening one at each time and exist in the interaction and the difference between themselves in this event. The second reason, or motif, one that was clear to me and to my co-curators that we needed to build — a reason that was not a theme, neither a title — was the poetics issue, an issue way more in relation to the contemporary world. I wrote about it a little in my essay. I think it is important to understand that contemporary artistic practices are increasingly done in a discursive

manner, but the contemporary art world treats them as if they were pré-discursivas or metadiscursivas, it treats contemporary artistic motifs as if they were still modern, as if they were something else other than what they are. And if what they are is opposed to the modern, in the sense that modern requested, or claimed, or demanded a special resolution of language, one different than the language of the tribe. Contemporary artistic practices demand to be part of the tribe's languages, the ordinary language. And in this sense they are discursive arts. The question I pose to myself and for which I have no answer is whether that could also be a resurgence from the humanistic issue of the relationship between regulatory discursivity and the imaginative potential on art? But what I most basically wanted to try to establish as discussion is the possibility that poetics (in the old sense) are like an arsenal of questions about a contemporary art that intends to become discursive, and does so little by little. So there you go, the multiplicity of poetics and the imminence of poetics comes from that.

BF:

This year's Bienal was thought from a point of view of constellations (there are twelve of them: the construction of image, theatricality, the found object, the fictionalized world, the sound dimension of image, the serialisation, the anthropological view of day-to-day reality, the unexpected, language, public ambiance, archive, territory). That is to say, free formations that would skyrocket towards other situations, be it through language analogies or affective memory. Such proposal would hand over to the public the freedom to build their own associations and dialogues. How do you see that the public is dealing with this proposal?

LPO:

I think this is working. I was talking to André Severo the other day about it. His concern was that the links *in between* were possible. And one day he asked me how I was detecting this and I think that this is happening. First, the constellate question is more associated to a confidence that is almost natural, the linguistic confidence so to speak, which is an idea that comes from Saussure's work, according to which the language systems work differently. That is, the elements, the units of language, do not produce meanings by themselves: they produce meanings to the extent that they indicate a difference in regards to others. And I think this can be cast over the symbolic forms, if they produce meaning insofar as they indicate differences regarding others, so they only produce meaning in link potentiality, in the possibility to be binding or bound. And the unity of the

links, the entirety of links — one of the forms of entirety of links — forms a constellation. But, to us, it is not a question of proposing twelve constellations. These twelve constellations are a possibility. It is true that we have 111 artists and we had to organize them, because the communication and education departments needed to produce didactic devices and they needed us to accomplish these constellations. Then, a little against my own will, we started to produce these relationships, which resulted in 12 constellations that are open, just as you said, and have actually never been produced in the Bienal building, in the event's spatial materialization. I'd rather say that Bienal's constellar materialization has many forms, the constellations are in catalogues, in the Guide and audio guide, in the small constellation that are the five booklets, and so on. Furthermore, the spatial organization of the featured works of art in the building, and it was important to us that such organization worked seamlessly attached to each other. We had to solve an equation, something very difficult to solve, now and then: we wanted groups of works by a set of artists who could be backdated, whose works could be from various periods. That would come together with the idea that a constellar organization of works by the same artist could account for more of a process than a result. On another side, we wanted these groups of works to be open enough to be linked with others. So we suggested material juxtapositions in the Bienal's space. But my experience — of an educator and mediator — is that people are producing their own attachments that we have not seen yet. For example, I was told just about now of an extraordinary attachment between Helen Mirra and Nydia Negromonte, which I had not yet seen, but exists and is possible.

BF:

This Bienal has also another particularity: it offers very generous room to each artist, room in which we find an amount of works that end up by configuring individual exhibitions inside the Bienal universe. How was the process of materialization of the conceptual project, the selection of artists and works, in spatial terms?

LPO:

As for the materialization, what made this possible was the extraordinary experience in the building of Martin Corullon and his team of architects and the extraordinary communication between the curators and the architecture. They understood the project clearly, they grasp the needs of the project, the opening and so on. They brought ideas that were immediately proportionate to what we wanted. It was theirs the idea to produce an artistic

museography combining high and low intensities, with plenty to see in some spaces and nothing to see in others; one that didn't enclose the building, enabling lateral and central circulation, and allowing plenty of places to look from one external place to another throughout the building; one which builds itself from within, in response to the demands of the works of art that it houses, instead of imposing itself through a figurative or allegorical, or even architectural strength. Almost half of this curatorship was made by Martin Corullon, at the time he interpreted the groups of works and built spaces that were perfectly proportional to them.

BF:

This Bienal has also proposes to carry out a recent archaeology of contemporary art, bringing in the works by artists that are less recognized in the international circuit, while also proposing to put together a volume of significant works — for example, the artist August Sander, whose work was unpublished before the Bienal. That being said, I have two questions: 1) one is about the relevance of these artists, their thoughts and works as the foundation and conceptual basis of relevant issues to the 30th Bienal de São Paulo; and 2) how would the role of an art Bienal be in this context, since there would be a widespread expectation on the middle of which Bienals can showcase the big news of contemporary artistic production?

LPO:

The Bienal is obviously the outcome, and it's mission is this issue on the emergence of contemporary art. But I think that it is important to understand that emergency must have a density, and that this density is historical, and that this density is not a fact, it is a challenge that has to be built by us. It is not only history that builds us, we build history. The occasion of history enunciation is our contemporary situation. Unlike the historical myth, which supports that the situation of enunciation of the story is covered ground, a primitive topic, which coincides with a truth. Therefore, the idea of archeology for me is always an archaeology as a reversible engineering, you go back and rescue what you believe to be proportional and potential to consider the present's historical density. This is how I function, as a curator and an intellectual. I'm not interested in emergence for emergence's sake. And I think that the contemporary art that concerns itself only in the size of emergence inevitably falls into the trap and in the marketing mortgage of being entirely dependent on a contemporary style. In other words, the contemporary art that declares or formalizes itself

only in terms of emergence is in fact an international style, not contemporary art. And I always pose this question: is contemporary art an international style? And in this sense, is it a form that impossibilitates others? And as for bringing artists who I believed to be fundamental to the Bienal, but not sufficiently known, I was not exerting the odd practice of looking for rare artists. No, not that. I believe it to be essential to understand that the marketing mythology of masterpieces is just as such: a mythology. And that the masterpieces are only possible thanks to the (enclosed in quotation marks) smaller works. What allows a topological and stylistic dynamism, and a dynamism in our interests in art and our art history scriptures, is precisely to find that less known artists are not so small. It is then to discover the potential that we had not yet seen in artists whom we had not discovered as smaller. It is difficult for me to verbalize, but I wanted to put together a Bienal that wasn't known for its obvious names believed by us to be the great geniuses of the moment. That is because I do not believe it to be true, and also because I think it's important to put other references in our thoughts, that allows us to change. To me, Roberto Obregón is a fundamental artist, Ian Hamilton Finlay is a fundamental artist, Bernard Frize, Franz Ehrard Walther, and Arthur Bispo do Rosário as well... I mean, there are several key artists. But their relationship with others is what interested me. But it is essentially in order to be consistent with the idea that art does not work as a topography of escarpment, with peaks and chasms, but as a topology of relationships. Not big peaks and great depths, but vincular relations that actually look like a rhizome. And the last, on the idea of works which manifest themselves as medical imaging systems, for me, is very important to understand today that the art works, the symbolic forms, images, work as differential systems, that the uniqueness of a single unique is a myth. And we have to understand — just as we do, since long ago — that language is a system of differences, we have to understand that the Visual Arts are also a system of differences. And, therefore, it was important for us to bring works which materialized as files, as an atlas, as classification systems, as collections of images, such as repetitions, as other images differentiations, i.e. as systems. And so, this Bienal has many works that deal with this kind of character, like August Sander, Robert Filliou, Horst Ademeit and others. These are systems that work with the possibility of producing differences between them.

BF:

I read your statement on “the fate of the Bienal was to find a place ideally be between the market, the art fair and the Museum”.

How do you perceive the links between these instances in a Bienal? I would like you to comment on that statement.

LPO:

I think that the Bienal has to find its mission every day. But I think we need intermediate instances for thought and for experimentation. Instances that escape from the randomness of the market and the monumentality of the museum. Because the randomness of the market is the opposite of thought and the monumentality of the museum is the opposite of experimentation. Experimentation in the sense of hypothetical experimentation of relations, in order to produce sense between the works, the rupture of chronologies and attempts by other organizations. I think that museums have a trial and challenge to face, even though only some of them do. But I think that the Bienal is one of those potential instances for the thought of art to be produced between the market and the museum, that is to say, between the economic value's random whim that determines the symbolic value and the monumentalization of a symbolic value that determines the economic, the museum. Between these, I think that the Bienal is one of these possible spaces, just as academic journals are. By the way, another thing that I was talking about was my wish to escape from the temptation of two curator models, one being the hypermarket and the second one the ethnographic. The hypermarket curator is the one who is merely shopping at a shopping mall, bringing to his own store what's new on fashion. And the ethnographer curator goes to the world's most exotic extremes, the *finis terra*, and brings the absolutely weirdest example of exotic difference to path its way into a mainstream position. And I wished to avoid such models. I believe that the act of avoiding these two models has to do with the search for an intermediate space, the demand for an intermediate space for a thinking that is between the random market model, which determines an economic value and produces a symbolic value, and the monumental museum model, which stabilizes a symbolic value and determines an economic value.

BF:

How would you like this Bienal to be received by the general public? What is your partial evaluation now, a month after its opening?

LPO:

I can say two things. On the one hand, I did not know how the public was going to react to it. The public is not a subject, it is a condensation of contradictory multiplicities among themselves. The audience may be the general audience, or it can be the educational

audience, or it might yet be the specialized audience, as in critics or artists. So, I did not know how the Bienal was going to be received, but my hopes were that it would be well received. I hoped that people could perceive serious questions, perceive the transparent and honest curatorial work that we were trying to do, and I hoped that people would like it, not praise it, but like it in this sort of way. It was a hope. But I was not sure of its possibility. And I also don't believe much in the generosity of the art world, so wasn't expecting a lot from it. A month after opening the Bienal, I still do not believe in what is happening. I even feel a little shame, because people are celebrating this Bienal too much. But that means it has worked not because of our work, but because a series of circumstances have been articulated in a convenient moment, for they were never under our control. I think that comes from a certain weariness, a certain exhibition model. I think we brought in names that people did not know yet. We brought them to our audience, and they have surprised even some of the specialized public. I believe our honest and transparent work to be essential. We have always declared which were our limitations and we tried our best. I also think that the teams involved in the Bienal comprised very nice, excellent people. We were lucky and the whole circumstances worked out just great, so my evaluation from the time being is very positive indeed. But the perception of things, which frightens me a little, depends on time. I could be that this Bienal is going to be positive from today until December 9. And that in two or three years, it could be that it will lose its meaning. And it could be that it gains meaning with time. Finally, I believe, in an optimistic but still safekeeping tone, that this Bienal is bringing in artists who will determine, for many years, the references in the artistic practices of our cultural space and that, if people get interested by the works of these artists, this Bienal is going to resonate for years to come. I am convinced that we have brought in very important artists who have great potential to dialogue with the interests and the artistic practices of today and the near future.

INTERVIEW WITH ANDRÉ SEVERO, ASSOCIATE CURATOR AT THE 30TH INTERNATIONAL BIENAL DE SÃO PAULO

Bruna Fetter:

What do you consider to be your major contributions to the 30th Bienal de São Paulo's project?

André Severo:

Well, let's start at the beginning, then. When Luis invited me to be part of the curatorial team, it was supposed to be something much more simpler than what I ended up doing. He had invited me to be assistant curator, and I would work with the exhibition *derivas* [drifts], with complete autonomy to think about the question. But then he sent me the project's concept, I replied with some considerations, he replied, we kept on writing each other on the matter... Then, suddenly, without consulting me, he wrote to the Board and proposed another dynamic, which was not the dynamic often used in this kind of situation. So, we destroyed this hierarchy. At the beginning, we had curatorial areas, which served as a warning sign, which helped us understand the relationships, the links that we were going to propose. However, these areas were not there in the end, because we could not let these conceptual limitations begin to direct the reading of our works. If there's one thing about curatorship that I believe in is that, when you do a project like this one, you have to do two things: first, you have to link the ideas for the project and at the same time this linkage must be transparent, so as not to guide the viewer. To this effect, we had two aspects that would help us to achieve our goal, however they opposed a little to the kind of thing Luis is used to doing and the kind of thing that I have to do. Luis supports these association links, these curatorial readings, evident and established in dialogue. The first thing we focused on, our first idea for the Bienal, were these association links that are strongly based in Giordano Bruno's philosophy, that the things do not have meanings by themselves, they only begin to mean things when we establish relationships with them. At the same time, I wasn't going to come to a Bienal to do that — I stopped doing exhibitions ten years ago exactly because of these readings, which are a hindrance to the artistic thinking's autonomy in a group situation. So we set off with two issues. One was about creating this conceptual linkage, which was something we did through several steps: we established the areas, visit the artists, and got to know everyone. In a second, that all turned into a map. A map that was just a conceptual drawing on a sheet. So, this idea involving constellations was nothing more than how we started to call these maps that we were making, these linkages and relationships we were trying to establish. There was no center in these constellations, there was no major artist around whom unknown and known artists would gravitate. No, there was not. I'll give you an example: if Allan Kaprow were the center of a constellation that dealt in performance, he could also be in the edge of another constellation, one that dealt in language, autonomy,

and so on. So, these maps had an impossible spatial setting to be made in three rectangles — which was what we had, those three floors of the Bienal Pavilion. What were our two issues? One was to evidence the ties that bounded these artists together, which granted density to this Bienal. And the other issue was, how were we going to articulate this in order to allow each work to be autonomous, to allow each project, thought and artist to be in the shape they needed to. In this aspect there were some paths we could have taken. And we chose — and this is reflected in the large number of works of this issue — to have a compilation of each of these artists and to build a Bienal on an actual dialogue, not a rhetoric about this dialogue. We talked to each one of these artists — we visited every one of them; as to the ones who have already passed away, we visited their representants — and we decided not to look at what these people have, but also to exhibit what we have. We will show everyone the rules of this game. We will let everyone know what kind of Bienal this one is, what is it trying to convey. Concealed within it all, there are some questions, some issues so dear to us. Questionings about language, dialogical creation, questionings in the sense that what is this need felt by an artist when he or she realizes that the language he or she possesses (whatever the language) doesn't deal with certain things, so there is the need to create other ways to say or understand or develop relationships with things. Going back a little bit, we had these two things to convey, the relationships and the autonomy, the possibility each artists had to be by him or herself. But we were not sure that it would work out. So, we decided upon leaving to chance that these bonds would tie themselves in the long run, that an art exhibition is different from a theatrical play, or a moving picture, from which you receive the message only by viewing it. In a passive form. Since this long run is data, we will leave to it the task to create bounds. And we will propose to each one of our artists to have his and her own space and design it with us. For example, we denied the possibility that the artist's space could also be another artist's periphery. We have no temporary works, the only ones that break the space are the ones of artists who requested thus, works and projects that were making themselves available to this contamination. Therefore, the idea was that, by going to the exhibits in the Bienal, you would make the relationships. Each one of our rooms is an invitation for such. In the moment you accept it enters a room, the possibility to erase this conceptual dialogue and these bounds — even the neighbouring exhibits — and stay only with that work in particular is huge. After that, you leave the room, see another thing and start to think again. But, to us, this

entering was very important. It was a moment of unfamiliarity, of suspension. Behind this very rhetoric title, *The Imminence of Poetics* is that which is suspended, that which is to happen but you don't know yet. And you won't if you don't make yourself available to it. Many of the things I've been saying and much of the contact with the educational team is about preserving this unfamiliarity, this space where things are not given. Everyone is afraid of these dialogues, and this thing, this art hermeticism, it solidifies more and more each day, which is ridiculous and does not make sense. This unfamiliarity happens everyday, in life, with us, with people, we like or dislike people and that will determine your wish to know more or just leave and be miles away from a person or a situation. Why couldn't it be so in art as well? In a meeting proposed for the dialogue? Only this dialogue, as anything else in life, needs two things in order to happen: a minimum interest, something to wake it. And, sometimes, it doesn't wake. But, going back once more, many things about this Bienal sought to answer both these things, the bonds, that were very dear to Luis, and autonomy, which was dear to me, and with this reading it is not a given, it can offer this moment of suspension.

BF:

I would like you to mention some artists that were fundamental for the connection of the exhibition's concepts, and that were the source for many others, using the idea of constellations proposed by the curatorial team.

AS:

This is a very difficult question in the sense that, in the moment that the things were coming into shape, we took care to erase our steps. What I could easily say are which figures were most dear to Luis in a specific moment, and which ones were dear to me. And that, maybe, having started from them — which, since the beginning, had already established themselves in the exhibit — was a fundamental step, because it answered in some manner each one of our roles there. I think that, for Luis, Finlay, Horst Ademeit and Fernand Deligny are without a doubt very important artists. To me, actually almost the reason I was there in the first place, Tehching Hsieh and Kaprow were important artists. So we got to start from there. For example, Bispo, who was with us ever since the beginning, to answer questions concerning language. Because, at some point in this Bienal, things that happened outside the field of art, but that had power and could be read in this context, were part of the conductive wires... as the case of Deligny and Bispo himself, as

some other things that are based in an art thinking, but the end of the process is almost an abandonment of that, an exit, and that is where comes from both Kaprow and Tehching Hsieh. We took our chances with this Bienal. Why did we decide to create a collection of booklets, almost like archaic philosophy writings? Because many of our discussions about this Bienal's construction was done within the field of philosophy, in the field of ideas, that belong to an ethic of trying to understand art as a possibility of thinking, not only of dialogue articulation, but of the disarticulation of a thinking that, in any other manner, could be in a loop, always presenting the same results. For as soon as you start from a type of tool — even the tool of language — you will not be able to escape the limits of such tool, such language.

BF:

You quoted Deligny, Kaprow and Tehching Hsieh, artists from the 60's and 70's, who think very powerful thoughts, but do not necessarily represent art at the moment. Hence my question: how was the experience of updating their views and propose these links?

AS:

To answer this question I will have to go back to these bases, which were the early curatorial areas that we had, and that we erased so as not a single artist illustrated any axis. In the beginning, one of those areas was called *deriva* [drift] and was meant to contemplate, not only physical, but metaphorical and thought-related offset practices that could get to a point of denial of art, of this drift to really happen in order to exit, or thing that came from outside of the art world and, through some diversion, ended up entering it, and has now relevance. That was an area. We had also an area called *sobrevivências* [survivals] which attempted to produce thought about some works of art, projects and recent artists — and by recent I mean from the 60's up to nowadays, the so-called contemporary art — and attempt to understand what portion of this thought survives with resonance in the gestures of artists and updates itself, and why. And it was also the moment that — in my opinion, at least —, for the last time, art truly questioned itself about what were those borders, about language issues, that we had to do something about. When you have the moment of solidification of this possibility that is, in my view, incredibly powerful, and that you see in Visual Arts, but you don't see in other things. Even though the theater has broken every language, and even though nowadays we have postdramatic theater, it still has a recognizable structure, actors, public and a book, at some point or another. It is the same

in movies. Even when you mute off the sound, music still seeks for this structure, even if only for a contrast. Now, the Visual Arts, the fine arts, they do not need to be visual, they barely need anything, they are free. In order to configure a work of art, you can join thoughts from fields like anthropology or sociology... which is a very big power. But at the same time is a huge trap, because while it is powerful, it puts you in a permissive field in which you can easily apply what we have today, that is, a contemporary art grammar that can be used to configure anything. A third area was called *altemformas* [something along the lines of “alternative forms”], and we sought to ask ourselves what exactly, from this basic thought, survives deformed, transformed, in the artists’ practice. And you can see all this in a huge amount of artists these days, artists who work exclusively from their own art’s references. That can also be a trap, an Ouroboros, the serpent eating its own tail. But we needed to be able to think about what is contemporary art, what is discipline, what is antidiscipline within it. And we had another area, called *vozes* [voices] — it would be impossible to be more straightforward than that —, and it dealt with the plurality of anything, but we were trying to expand into something not only related to speech; the power that it has, but also when you decide not to speak, when you decide to pass on the opportunity to speak. These were the issues. But, going back a little bit, all these artists from the 60’s, why did we choose them? This is a current reflection, and today a Bienal like the Bienal de São Paulo has no longer the role that it had a while back, especially in a city like São Paulo. You need not bring Van Gogh or Caravaggio, because they are already there, people bring them to the Bienal with themselves. Thus, the Bienal no longer has that role, we were released from this obligation. And, as in our case, recently there had been a Bienal that proposed a link between works that were very different than what we had proposed; the exhibit we had in the Pavilion between the 29th and the 30th Bienals showcased big stars, that is, artists from the real market; thus, we were released from the obligation to show all these things, that is, we could focus on thinking, we could focus on that reflection. And the fact that we brought these artists from the 60’s, like Kaprow and Sander... they are all there because they deal with a kind of reflection, a kind of thinking, because the risks they take in their works, they touch these relevant aspects to us now. And more than anything, too — like it or not, even if it isn’t completely intentional, deep down I think it is important to emphasize —, there is a number of things being made today, and sometimes almost by an appropriation of form, albeit far from the content, and these things have been thought of much before

we know them to, without distinction between form and content. I understand that, in our jobs, form is content. In the moment that you’re thinking of dialogue and seeking for language, you cannot separate content from form or from the way things will be presented.

CAPTIONS FOR ILLUSTRATIONS

The images in this article are placed in its Portuguese version.

Figures 1 and 2. Main venue of 30th Bienal Internacional de São Paulo, 2012 (photos by *Porto Arte*).



LUIS PÉREZ-ORAMAS: PhD in Art History from the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris, 1994. Former Professor of Art History at Université Rennes 2, Haute Bretagne, Rennes, France (1987-1991), at École Régionale Supérieure des Beaux-Arts de Nantes, France (1992-1994), and at Instituto de Estudios Superiores de Artes Plásticas Armando Reverón, Caracas, Venezuela (1995-2002). He was a member of the Board of Directors of Galería de Arte Nacional (1995-2001) and curator of Colección Patricia Phelps de Cisneros (1995-2002), both in Caracas. In 2003, he became Assistant Curator in the Department of Drawings at the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA), New York, and, in December 2006, he was appointed The Estrellita Brodsky Curator of Latin American Art, at MoMA. Curator of the 30th Bienal de São Paulo, 2012. Born in Caracas, Venezuela. Currently living in New York.



ANDRÉ SCHULZ SEVERO: Holds a Bachelor and Masters Degree in Visual Poetics from the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, UFRGS (2007). He participated in the creation or collaborated with action or documentation projects on contemporary art, such as *Areal*, *Lomba Alta* and *Dois Vazios*. Participated in the Pedagogic Project of the 7th Bienal do Mercosul, in Porto Alegre. He was one of the curators of *Horizonte Expandido*, an exhibition held at Santander Cultural, in Porto Alegre, where he lives.



BRUNA FETTER: Doctoral candidate in History, Theory and Criticism from the Graduate Program in Visual Arts at Institute of Fine Arts (UFRGS). Holds a Masters degree in Social Science from Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul (PUCRS). His varied professional experience in the production of Visual Arts projects include *Agora/Ágora* and *Horizonte Expandido*, some exhibits held at Santander Cultural, in Porto Alegre, and the coordination of the 6th Bienal do Mercosul's curatorial team.