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The Board of Directors, Creators’ Council and DACS Staff.
Established by artists for artists, DACS is a not-for-profit visual arts rights management organisation.

DACS was established 25 years ago by artists for artists. Among its founding artists were Eduardo Paolozzi, Susan Hiller and Elaine Kowalsky. DACS was set up to ensure that artists’ rights were protected and that those rights were recognised both financially and morally.

Over the past two decades, the visual arts in all their forms have contributed significantly to Britain’s multi-million pound creative industries. Today, protecting artists’ rights is even more important to ensure a thriving visual arts sector.
DACS translates rights into revenues for artists.

DACS exists to generate and distribute money to artists, which in turn, helps to sustain their practice and livelihood.

Today we represent nearly 60,000 artists and in 2009, we distributed over £6.1 million of royalties to artists and their beneficiaries. Royalty payments are paid to a wide range of artists and can range from £10 to £10,000.

We are committed to maintaining and growing revenues for artists at a time when the digital domain creates both challenges and opportunities.

DACS promotes the value of artists to society and culture.

We actively lobby on behalf of visual artists and their right to be recognised and rewarded for their work.

Culture is built from the contributions of thousands of photographers, fine artists, illustrators, cartoonists, designers, architects and other creative individuals and it is vital that society strikes a balance between protecting their rights and increasing public access to images and artworks.

DACS has an important role to play in ensuring that policy makers and opinion formers recognise the value of the contribution that visual artists make, not only to the economy but to society as a whole.
DACS has its eye on the future.

We are exploring ways in which we can support new and emerging practices in the visual arts so that artists can generate income from these new forms of practice.

We are also developing innovative new revenue streams so that artists and their practice can be sustained now and in the future.

Research and innovation are the key touchstones for DACS’ future strategy and development.
In the months and years ahead, DACS will need to be at the cutting edge of developing new licences, services and products that benefit both artists and consumers.

Over the past year we have been working with the museums sector and higher education sector to design licensing solutions for a digital age. These new licences will seek to allow museums and educational institutions to take full advantage of digital technology in an affordable way while ensuring that artists are recognised and rewarded.

There are undoubtedly significant challenges in the year ahead but DACS is more committed than ever to ensuring that the UK’s visual culture remains vibrant and influential both now and in the future.
What does DACS do?

We collect and distribute royalties to visual artists through our three rights management services: Payback, Artist’s Resale Right and Copyright Licensing.

In 2009, we paid a total of £6.1 million of royalties to over 13,000 artists through these services. We take a small administration charge for the royalties we collect on behalf of artists to cover operating costs.

To download a copy of DACS’ annual audited accounts please visit www.dacs.org.uk
In November 2009 DACS hosted the first in a new series of high-profile debates on visual artists in the 21st century. Chaired by Alan Yentob, a distinguished panel comprising artists Susan Hiller, Paul Graham, Michael Landy and Alan Freeman explored the value of the visual arts to the economy and society at a time when the value of traditional economic sectors are being seriously challenged.

The Economy of Art debate addressed how society attaches value to what visual artists do and make. Panelists questioned whether society fully understands the value chain from the point at which an artist has an idea, to the process of making work, to the economic impact of the creative industries as a whole. How do we begin to measure the value of art at a time when other parts of the economy which we believed to be valuable have proved to be a chimera? In the aftermath of the recent global economic crisis, the value of assets on which multi-million pound financial transactions depended have been revealed to be worthless. Should this change our perception of what is valuable? Is it time for us to re-assess what we designate as our nation's assets?

The Economy of Art debate addressed how society attaches value to what visual artists do and make. Panelists questioned whether society fully understands the value chain from the point at which an artist has an idea, to the process of making work, to the economic impact of the creative industries as a whole. What follows is an edited transcript of that discussion.
To start this debate off, let me begin who has a paid job at the Arts Council – every person on the invitation list who gets still didn't change. At the point when I was who were working in institutions or had a And all these people who had salaried jobs, very angry in a practical way about how trying to get exhibitions. I remember being force your way into it by making your art and which well known and adulated artists were the value is achieved and then of course we through that transformative process that In some societies they are outcast people, producers are treated with enormous regard. have to see that all societies have something and different?' In order to answer that, you makes them so very special and particular and these are for real people who have to all the time. I remember when I first left college, I could afford – and believing – that that didn't last very long. ML: Because people get jaded. It's not a collective, as a group ethos. They're a motley bunch of individuals basically. That is an interesting point in itself, that the whole nature of being an artist is something that is unique to you and perhaps more important. We have aesthetic pleasure from things happen. It's surprising that these was and is a work of art, an expression for the artists. Well clearly that hasn't quite if you look back, every great advance in civilisation is shaped by artists. We have a tremendous makes people think differently and feel differently about things that they didn't expect. And it's interesting how a government can have a strategy to make things happen. It's surprising that these things do work. The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA), this was engendered entirely by an enlightened government programme. It was the trigger for these things. In the other sense, one of the great advances of the Renaissance, well, wasn't it the Medicis and the others who had the means or the power to do things that moved the world? Someone had a vision didn't they? Of course they did but in this case it was Roy Stucker at the FSA. The problem is that for every success there are the ones that fail or where art has been manipulated by governments, from Congressionism to Nazi Germany to the CIA promoting post-war American photography. This was engendered entirely by an enlightened government programme. That is an interesting point in itself, that the whole nature of being an artist is something that is unique to you and perhaps more important. We have aesthetic pleasure from things happen. It's surprising that these was and is a work of art, an expression for the artists. Well clearly that hasn't quite if you look back, every great advance in civilisation is shaped by artists. We have a tremendous makes people think differently and feel differently about things that they didn't expect. And it's interesting how a government can have a strategy to make things happen. It's surprising that these things do work. The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA), this was engendered entirely by an enlightened government programme. It was the trigger for these things. In the other sense, one of the great advances of the Renaissance, well, wasn't it the Medicis and the others who had the means or the power to do things that moved the world? Someone had a vision didn't they? Of course they did but in this case it was Roy Stucker at the FSA. The problem is that for every success there are the ones that fail or where art has been manipulated by governments, from Congestionism to Nazi Germany to the CIA promoting post-war American photography. This was engendered entirely by an enlightened government programme. It was the trigger for these things. In the other sense, one of the great advances of the Renaissance, well, wasn't it the Medicis and the others who had the means or the power to do things that moved the world? Someone had a vision didn't they? Of course they did but in this case it was Roy Stucker at the FSA. The problem is that for every success there are the ones that fail or where art has been manipulated by governments, from Congestionism to Nazi Germany to the CIA promoting post-war American photography. This was engendered entirely by an enlightened government programme. It was the trigger for these things. In the other sense, one of the great advances of the Renaissance, well, wasn't it the Medicis and the others who had the means or the power to do things that moved the world? Someone had a vision didn't they?
AY: We’ll come to all of this, whether it’s quite fair. I don’t know. I’m not sure I agree actually. When Carl Andre’s bricks were presented to the Tate 15 years ago, there was shock and horror and the Arts Council of Britain was worried about upsetting anybody. I think that was a far worse state of affairs than the way it is now. Actually I think a lot of positive things have happened over the last 20 years, lots of galleries, and an explosion of interest in art.

SH: What I’m saying is that if there hadn’t been the money there wouldn’t have been the explosion. I’m saying that the two worlds would collapse together. That’s why we’re in a new situation now perhaps. It’s interesting that art has retained its value at a time financially where everything else is collapsing. That means that art has another kind of value. The buzz in galleries in recent years hasn’t been about the great contribution that this or that particular painter was making to the way everyone in the room was thinking about the world; the thing that was interesting to everyone was how much the paintings were selling for.

ML: The London art world is a completely different place now to what it was 20 years ago. There were only a handful of galleries such as ICP, Pollock, Reynolds, and Maureen Paley and now there are so many.

PG: No one can deny the economic impact that the YBA generation has had to the value of the arts industry, in Britain in the last 20 years or so since Frizier started in 1988 – it was phenomenal.

AY: My worry is that we are underestimating the value of art. Surely one of the capacities that art has is to be transformative but one can’t necessarily pin down the transformative effect in advance. I was going to ask you [Michael Landy] if you knew beforehand what the effect on the audience would be when you did your exhibition? Art is an engagement with an audience, and I think that an aspect of participation is that you don’t always necessarily know what effect you’re going to have on that audience.

ML: At the time people looked at my stuff and they said that it’s not particularly different to anyone else’s. Then suddenly people got it and they made a mental inventory of how much they possessed.

AY: One of the positive factors of the last 20 years, I would say, is art and education and the way that public institutions today, from the Tate to the National Gallery, to the British Museum are obliged to have an education programme of some kind that can engage and enthuse young people so they grow up with the arts. As a result, you will have a society which appreciates art and can make valued judgments, not feel unable to do so because they have no understanding of the idioms of contemporary art. How important is it that art can reach the parts that other things can’t reach?

PG: Well I’m self-taught so I didn’t have an art education. I remember talking to John Szarkowski who was the Chief Curator of Photography at the Museum of Modern Art (MOMA) in New York. He referred to the great ushering in of post-war art photography in America: soldiers coming back from the Second World War; being put back into further education; photographers employed for their technical skills would go back into education and this then led to the setting up of arts courses, some in photography, some in fine art, and then photography came into all our schools and somehow this community of people who are appreciative of the true art form of photography developed.

AY: We’re not all going to be artists, but we are all going to have our lives enriched if we have an understanding of art and if we grow up with it and that is after all the purpose.

ML: In another sense though, there are more art fairs now, there are more galleries, and there are more artists!

PG: Twenty years ago there were no professional photographers artists in this country who actually made a living, who didn’t have to do something else, teach, or do commercial work. And that has changed.

AY: Looking at art generally, the fact that some artists’ value has inflated, that there are stars and celebrities, has meant that more artists of this generation can actually make a living out of art, more so than the generation that preceded it.

ML: A market is a market, isn’t it? I remember the first piece of work I sold. I remember the first time someone put something into auction, you felt that there was some kind of betrayal. This exchange went on where they said they would look after it for the rest of their lives and then of course, two or three years later it’s an auction, and you take it personally. Then the market decides how much you’re worth, the...
value of your art at that particular point of time.

AY: Can you really appreciate art if you don’t in some way participate in producing it at some level? If you want to make your contribution to the value of society, you want to change the way society participates in art. Of course, different people play different roles in that, but the artistic public should be a producing public at some level, otherwise how can it appreciate the art?

ML: There’s nothing wrong with play and playing with materials and all those kind of things; there’s absolutely nothing wrong with it.

AY: It’s important that people get closer to art by trying to do it and that’s what’s supposed to happen in primary schools and other places.

SH: Do you then think that it’s a good idea that most of the arts budget in this country goes to projects that really should come under education? We have to be very clear about the difference between inspirations for art and how that’s put into practice. To my mind education and art are different. When art is just art, where any picture is art, and anything made with materials is art, there’s no understanding of this space, as the FSA did where they step in and help artists in the creation and establishment of new artistic territory for themselves. One of the most powerful and creative things anyone can do is to create a new artistic space and expand our boundaries. The market then eventually recognises that, dealers move in, museums make shows, it becomes known, it’s cited as a phenomenon, it becomes better known, and if that thing then can do be it in photography, painting, video, music, is to create a new artistic space and expand our boundaries. The market then eventually recognises that, dealers move in, museums make shows, it becomes known as a phenomenon, it becomes known as a movement and economically it gets advantageous to be used as such, for the artists and for society. From a public choice point of view, the arts world could enter into the debate on the same level as health and education, and all the other special products. If you could start to say, ‘well actually all this unrecognised value of art may be concealed, but we can ask some numbers on it for the public funder to take into account.’

ML: What has intrigued me is the concept of an artist strike. An equivalent in the arts might be to close the museums for a day. But I think you need to go beyond that and remove art from people’s homes. People would grasp the concept when art is removed and this would show how widespread it is and how we could be more powerful in reaching the general man on the street rather than those already in the arts.

AY: It’s taken for granted, that’s what we’re saying and I think that’s a point that you [turning to Alan Freeman] started off with, when you talked about all the things which enhance our lives.

FH: Hasan Bakhshi wrote a paper with myself and Graham Hitchon, because he convinced us that a dead end had been reached in this attempt to instrumentalise the benefits of art. The problem is that public choice is posed in monetary terms. That’s a difficulty, but things could be improved if the arts world could enter into the debate on the same level as health and education, and all the other special products. If you could start to say, ‘well actually all this unrecognised value of art may be concealed, but we can ask some numbers on it for the public funder to take into account.’

AY: If the art world did start to say ‘let’s work on this with the cultural economists, who have some methods and techniques for estimating the value that people place on art’, I think it would be astonished at...
Our provocation was to say that art has nothing to lose by attempting to say ‘the valuation of the market is not enough, and for this reason our funders often get it wrong, so why don’t we try and put a value on what we’re doing in consultation with our public?’

SH: I tried to say briefly, at the beginning that art is inevitable, it’s universal, in one form or another, and artists have a specific thing that they do which is to find a format for social and cultural values, presented out there in a curiously complicated way, where it allows people to reflect on it and on themselves and their relationship to it, and thus creates the possibility of change or stability. So it’s inevitable, it’s going to happen without funding.

AY: But that is its Achilles’ Heel, isn’t it?

SH: Yes, that’s its Achilles’ Heel. Somebody said why doesn’t art get itself together. Who is this ‘art”? We have people who represent artists, and perhaps it gets a little distant from us in that way. How can art speak for itself except by doing what it does?

AF: I’m rather intrigued by Susan’s idea of an artist strike. I’m trying to imagine a grey blanket pulled over everything in the Tate and the National Gallery, perhaps more as a day of awareness than a day of strike.

Audience: Paul Holton, Director, Contemporary Arts Society.

I think that the way financial value around contemporary practice is articulated is enormously complicated and involves a very wide range of artists and galleries, the publicly funded sector funded by the Arts Council, policy bodies, public collections and collectors who are involved in an extremely complicated and interesting range of transactions. If we think of contemporary art apart from economic value as a form of both knowledge and experience production, then the dissemination of discourse and the critical apparatus of art is enormously reliant upon the art world that you seem to be saying is somehow detached from artists. I’d like to think that we’re all in this together but the gross instrumentalisation of the value of culture over the last 20 or so years means that we still talk about art as if it’s a form of social work, or as if it’s a form of education or regeneration of a local area, but we haven’t worked with artists sufficiently to identify the intrinsic value of art.

I think art is inevitable because some people simply have to be artists, and they do it. The way this discussion is going has led me to a very strange thought, which is the policy makers equivalent to the artist strike. I think that the world would be shaped by collectors and philanthropists who by definition are people who have a lot of money, and it would be a bit medieval.
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SH: I think art is inevitable because some people simply have to be artists, and they do it. The way this discussion is going has led me to a very strange thought, which is the policy makers equivalent to the artist strike. I think that the world would be shaped by collectors and philanthropists who by definition are people who have a lot of money, and it would be a bit medieval.

PG: From an artist’s point of view, the contradiction inherent as a practising artist is on the one hand that you value your art above everything in your life, you have dedicated your life and your youth, your spirit to it for decades, whether you’re successful or not, and then on the other hand you don’t value your art because as Michael has said there’s this big shock when someone suddenly starts putting a figure or a number to your work, and then you have to work out the value of what you’re doing on a personal level. So sometimes asking artists to value the art is a very difficult issue because they are very conflicted about it, emotionally they’re deeply invested, financially they’re incredibly insecure and unsure as to its worth.

AF: I’m just wondering about this phrase that since art is inevitable there’s no need to fund it. I’m surprised that’s not more challenged because what one needs to think about is what the world would be like if there was no public funding of the arts, which is the policy makers equivalent to the artist strike. I think that the world would be shaped by collectors and philanthropists who by definition are people who have a lot of money, and it would be a bit medieval.
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It is difficult to define a typical DACS visual artist. We represent artists at every stage of their career including sculptors, painters, illustrators, jewellery designers, photographers, cartoonists, furniture designers, printmakers, graphic artists, to name but a few.

What unites these artists, no matter how diverse, is their passion to gain recognition and earn an income through their rights.

The idea for this series of portraits came out of a desire to celebrate this diversity and explore the range of visual artists whose rights we represent.

Over the course of two weeks in December 2009 DACS visited six visual artists in their studio spaces, talked about their work, their rights and about DACS. This is an ongoing series and the resulting artists’ profiles are documented on the following pages.
Susanna Heron is an artist who has gained international recognition for her collaborations with architects and large-scale site specific works. She was made an Honorary Fellow of the Royal Institute of British Architects in 1999. She is the daughter of the artist Patrick Heron (1920-1999). Susanna lives and works in London. www.susannaheron.com

What inspired you to become an artist?

I never thought of being anything else.

You started out as a jewellery designer before moving into sculpture? What prompted you to make this transition?

I started making sculpture 30 years ago after abandoning a career making jewellery which had ceased to provide sufficient scope. Nevertheless my preoccupation with the body and the space through which we move persists. As well as my studio work, I make commissions for site specific works that are integrated into the structure of buildings. It enables me to work on a scale I would not otherwise be able to command. I am more interested in making spaces than objects and often apply a two dimensional pictorial language to a three dimensional site. I work with drawings and relief. I see my work as time based, partly through its relation to movement and light.

Can you describe your studio and how you work?

After many years in a SPACE studio near the Olympic site in East London, I have a studio in Shoreditch which has changed my life. It is a beautiful quiet studio with top light in a vibrant part of London. On a sunny day I feel I have spent the day out of doors and can still go out to my favourite Italian café Franze and Evans for lunch. It reminds me of Soho, New York where I lived for a while in the late seventies.

What work are you most proud of?

A few years ago in Tokyo I made a 14m by 14m etched and sandblasted structural glass wall which reflected in water. More recently I collaborated with Stanton Williams architects on the façade of the House of Fraser in Bristol. The work incorporated a series of sheer reflective planes and subtle edges milled into an organic cast bronze façade. The visual weight and acoustic of bronze next to a very busy road somehow recalls the noise and metal of a marine shipyard.

What are the challenges of making site specific art work?

Making work that is integrated into the building contract is challenging. I work closely with my Project Manager, architect Mary Hogben, to make sure the work is not compromised during the construction process. The most interesting thing about working with buildings is the interaction between the two distinctly different disciplines of architecture and art. The context is an integral part of the work and needs to be protected. Changes to the site both during and after construction can undermine the artist’s intention and defeat the work.

What are you working on now?

A deep stone relief for the lecture theatre to the new Sainsbury Laboratory in Cambridge Botanic Garden. The building will house Darwin’s and Henslow’s collections of plants. Such a rich resource enables me to make a new body of work alongside the commission, continuing earlier passions for plants and landscape.

How did you first find out about DACS?

Through my father Patrick Heron who joined DACS in the early nineties. I manage the copyright issues of his estate and amongst other things look after the paintings and archive with my sister, architect Katharine Heron of Feary and Heron Architects.

How has DACS helped you as an artist and the estate of Patrick Heron?

I get royalties through Payback for my own work and I also receive royalties from Patrick’s work which is a welcome revenue that we would not otherwise receive.

Why is DACS important to you?

As we do not currently have any help with the estate administration, working with DACS means that a record of publications is maintained and they act as a first point of contact when others wish to license Patrick Heron’s images. Most importantly it enables me to maintain quality control over reproductions although the timescale can sometimes be limiting.

Finally, what do you see as the greatest challenge for new and emerging artists today?

There is no greater challenge than to make good work. Your best work is always ahead of you.
Chantal Joffe is best known for her expressive portraits of women and children. She initially studied at the Glasgow School of Art before completing her MA in Fine Art at the Royal College of Art in 1994. Chantal has exhibited nationally and internationally in both group and solo shows and in 2006 won the prestigious Royal Academy of Arts Charles Wollaston Award. She lives and works in London.

Have you always wanted to be painter? I remember the first proper exhibition I saw was when I was at school and it was a big Renoir show that I thought was fantastic. It was a revelation to me. My mum is a painter and although we did do a lot of art as children, as a family we didn’t go to lots of exhibitions. What were your early influences? I’ve always loved Soutine, Baselitz. I also love photography and I remember at art school seeing Diane Arbus’ work for the first time and being stunned as I hadn’t really known photography had existed in that way before. You started out at the time when painting wasn’t very popular at art school in the 1990s? What was that like? I still think painting is really uncool and it has been for some time. I graduated from my BA and MA from the Royal College of Art in the early 1990s, just as Goldsmiths emerged and took off. I was always conscious of it but this is what I am and you can’t be anything you’re not. For me there is no other. I don’t think of the world in such a way that lends itself to conceptual art [laughs]. What interests you about painting the female form? You paint what you know and what you are best at… if you’re a writer you tend to write as a male or female voice and I suppose I paint as a female voice. I generally find women more interesting to look at as a painter, men are visually more homogeneous to me. Can you describe your studio? I’m based in East London and I’ve been here for four years. I have had lots of studios in my time and this is certainly the best. I tend to come in quite early but there is no set day. There are days when I just paint but then other times I’ll make collages, draw or look at art books. Other days I’ll read or listen to music. Sometimes it’s just dead time, when you are waiting for something to happen in your head. How did you first find out about DACS? You wrote to me about the Artist’s Resale Right. I remember envelopes kept arriving addressed to me from DACS. At first I ignored them. I didn’t know if it was some weird con [laughs], and then it occurred to me that I wouldn’t get any royalties if someone didn’t collect them, so I signed up! It’s a brilliant service. I like the fact that you provide me with a little statement so that I can keep track of the royalties I get. That’s so useful because as an artist unless you spend your life ‘Googling’ things you wouldn’t know what sells on the secondary market at all. Is copyright important to you? My work does get used in magazines but usually I know about it because someone has asked me but I don’t necessarily get paid for it. I suppose I always see it as a good thing having your work out there. I mean I haven’t had my work copied like Gillian Wearing’s did for that advert – that would be depressing. In a funny way I am often doing the opposite, using advertising for my inspiration. So does your inspiration come from advertising? Yeah I guess, advertising, photography, magazines, anywhere really. I’m not that picky. I like other people’s photos. I love billboard posters, I like contemporary life and city life – I like the bigness. In Boston you get those massive billboard posters – even if they are for Marks and Spencers, I really love that.

What have you got lined up in 2010? I have a group show at Victoria Miro. I’m also doing a show in Amsterdam with the fashion photographer Miles Aldridge. We did a project for Paradise magazine where I painted his wife who was a supermodel in the 1980s/90s and Miles photographed her in my studio.
Martin Parr has developed an international reputation for his innovative imagery, his oblique approach to social documentary, and his contribution to photographic culture in the UK and abroad. In 1994 he became a full member of Magnum. Martin Parr will be curating the Brighton Photo Biennial in October 2010.

www.martinparr.com
Hew Locke

Born in Edinburgh, Locke moved to Guyana where he spent his formative years before returning to the UK in the 1980s. In 1994 he completed his MA in Sculpture at the Royal College of Art. In recent years Locke has focused on his fascination and ambivalence around ideas and images of Britishness in a global context, such as the Royal Family. Locke explores global cultural fusions, creating complex sculptural collages with an eclectic range of objects, including mass produced toys, souvenirs and consumer detritus. He lives and works in London. www.hewlocke.net

Where do you get your inspiration from?
I recently visited Venice, and I am currently obsessed with Halberds I saw in the Doge’s armoury. Previous obsessions have included Plaster of Paris Rastafarians, Indian miniatures, Mexican toys, fish stall displays and Tintoretto’s Last Supper.

What are you working on at the moment?
After a long absence, I have now returned to producing images of the Queen. There is one on my studio wall at the moment, with a face full of hair grips and sabre-tooth tigers, dripping beads down the wall onto the floor like blood. I’ve also recently published a limited edition book of my photographic series ‘How Do You Want Me?’ through French publishers Editions Jannink. Each book contains a rosette I made especially for this limited series.

Is there a particular work you are most proud of?
All of them. I don’t let anything out of my studio I am not happy with.

What’s your studio like?
Like many other artists my studio is in Hackney, East London. It is stuffed full of boxes of my materials – fabrics, textiles, toys, plastic dinosaurs, lizards and gorillas, old share certificates, boxes of transparencies, photographs ready to be painted on, pastels.

You’ve been a member of DACS for some time. How did you find out about us?
I first heard about DACS through my wife Indra Khanna.

What does copyright mean to you?
Protection. There are too many people out there who are not willing to ask permission before publishing work – taking potential income away from me. There seems to be a feeling that an artist’s work is for ‘free’. DACS gives me a bit of mental relief in this area. I know it is a cliché but... if you hire a plumber to do a job you expect to pay them. I have no idea why people think this doesn’t apply to artists.

What’s in store for 2010?
I am working towards a solo show and commission for ArtSway and a public art project in the 18th Century Brunswick cemetery gardens in Bristol.
As an illustrator, cartoonist and author, Raymond Briggs has won critical acclaim and popular success for his children’s books. Raymond studied at Wimbledon School of Art and at the Slade School of Art.

He has won numerous awards including the British Book Awards ‘Children’s Author of the Year’.

His studio is at his home in Sussex.

Did you always want to be a cartoonist?

At 10, I wanted to be a reporter. By 13 this had changed to cartoonist. Both meant working for printing, not fine art.

How did you move into creating work for children?

The main fields for the illustrator are advertising, magazines and newspapers, and books. Advertising pays best, but with boring stuff to illustrate. Books pay the worst of the three but has good stuff to illustrate. But soon I realised that books meant children’s books! This dismayed me at first, but even so, it couldn’t be worse than advertising.

What I loved about your books as a child was that they are very honest and they didn’t have happy endings. Was it always your objective to be so honest?

No, I don’t have any objectives, nor do I “aim” the book at a particular audience or age group. I start with a fantasy: Father Christmas, Fungus the Bogeyman, The Snowman, then imagine it is wholly real and treat it logically.

What comes first when creating your books?

First comes the writing: the script. Then in a so-called graphic novel you have to become a film director and visualise it. You then take on all the jobs of a film crew – actor, costume designer, set designer, lighting designer and cameraman. You then have to design the book and draw and paint it all. Then you do the endless hand-lettering. It all gets very tedious and is not to be recommended.

Do you have a favourite character?

Ethel and Ernest, my book about my mother and father, simply because it is about my parents and my early life in Wimbledon Park.

Do you have control over how your work gets reproduced?

No, I don’t have any control over the merchandising. It would be a huge task as there are thousands of items. I would get buried beneath the avalanche if they sent things for approval. I disapproved of the Snowman being used to promote “Irn Bru”, Kentucky Fried Chicken, and lavatory paper, but business people don’t understand how a creator feels about his own work. These characters are part of yourself.

You have claimed Payback through DACS for a couple of years. How did you first find out about DACS?

I received the forms every year and it always looked too complicated. Thankfully Nik (Payback Manager at DACS) was tremendously helpful and he helped my assistant Sue complete the form. I think it’s a wonderful idea.

Are you working on anything at the moment?

Yes. I’m doing a big fat book on old age and death. It’s been going on for two or three years now as it is over 150 pages of writing and drawing. The writing is more or less done, but the thought of 150 pages of drawing is overwhelming and intimidating – particularly as I was 76 recently.

Is it a children’s book?

No, though you never can tell. There is pain and suffering in it, but these feelings are not unknown to children.
Designer Max Lamb completed his degree in Three-Dimensional Design at Northumbria University in 2003. In the same year, he won the Peter Walker Award for Innovation in Furniture Design, followed by a Hettich International Design Award in 2004. Lamb completed his Masters Degree in Design Products at the Royal College of Art in 2006 and went on to work with Tom Dixon designing furniture for his Special Project series. He launched his own design practice in London in 2007.

www.maxlamb.org

What made you want to become a designer?
I had a creative childhood spent in Cornwall playing on the beach building castles and also on my grandpa’s farm in Yorkshire.

Are there any designers who have influenced your work?
I wouldn’t necessarily say influence but I have admiration for certain designers, especially from my education at the RCA, my two main tutors there, Martino Gamper and Tom Dixon, have helped me find my way.

How do you describe your work?
It feels very natural and organic but the processes you use are very complex. Some are very complex but also others are quite primitive. For me what I really want to do is exploit a process to its full potential and if that means doing it in an old school crafty way, that’s what I’ll do but the result doesn’t necessarily look like it’s made by a hobbyist. I am a fan of very basic tools and elemental materials: chunks of granite, pure copper and metals and clay as well.

Tell me about your studio?
This is my workshop and my home. I work, cook and sleep here, sometimes have parties and occasionally fill it with a polystyrene foam mess. It’s probably considered a big space but everything happens here and I work with objects which require a lot of space to store. If it’s good enough weather then I move a trestle table outside. My work is very low tech and uses few resources so that I can do it almost anywhere. I can go to the beach and do sandcasting or to a quarry and carve bits of furniture. Outdoors, surrounded by cliff walls or on the beach or in a quarry, is a really fantastic place to work. I feel very comfortable there.

When I am sat at my desk or computer writing, emailing and making telephone calls, I’m not happy. I get a bad back!

How did you first find out about DACS?
I had a letter from DACS saying that one of my works had sold at auction in London and that I was eligible for Artist’s Resale Right royalties which was a nice surprise. I had heard of resale royalties before. One of my works sold at auction in New York although I later found out that it didn’t qualify because it was sold in the States.

How did that feel to know your work sold at auction?
I was in New York at the time of the auction so I went and saw it at the preview. It was in between a Ron Arad piece and an original Jasper Morrison and so it felt quite nice [laughs]. It does make me wonder why people buy art and design in the first place. Is art and design purely for investment purposes or are people collecting objects because they love them? I’ve sold items to lots of people and I think only two or three things have come up at auction but then again I have only been making things for the last four years.

Is your copyright important to you?
When I started out I was very paranoid about people copying my ideas. Actually since then my attitude towards copyright has actually relaxed somewhat and I think it depends on who you are and what stage you are at. I have had a lot of support from the media. I think as long as I get it out there and seen with my name on it that’s as good as acknowledging my copyright.
The Board of Directors

Andrew Potter
Andrew has a background in music and publishing with previous posts as Chair of the Performing Right Society, Chair of the MCPS-PRS Alliance, and as Publishing Director at Oxford University Press. Andrew joined the Board as Chair in December 2005.

Brendan Fitzsimmons
Brendan is a QC specialising in criminal and regulatory law. He is a Trustee of a number of arts organisations including Tate Members and the British Museum Friends. He is a collector of art. Brendan joined the DACS Board in January 2010.

Matthew Flowers
Matthew is a contemporary art dealer. As Managing Director of Angela Flowers Gallery he oversees three art galleries located in London and New York. Matthew joined the DACS Board in 2008.

Sue Gollifer
Sue is an artist, academic, curator and leading authority on new technologies in fine art practice. Sue is a member of DACS and joined the Board in 2000.

Antony Gostyn
Antony is a solicitor at Swan Turton and has been involved with DACS since its inception. After five years on the Board, Antony stepped down in December 2009.

DACS was greatly saddened by the death of Simon Stern in March 2009. Simon was a talented illustrator who worked almost every branch of the profession during his 30-year career. He was a highly engaging and articulate champion of illustrators and their rights and served on the DACS Board from 1992-2008.

We are governed by a Board of Directors who bring a wide range of talents and experience to DACS. The Board includes artists, lawyers and other professionals with an interest in artists and their intellectual property. The Board ensures that DACS fulfils its mission to translate rights into revenue and recognition for visual artists.

We are governed by a Board of Directors who bring a wide range of talents and experience to DACS. The Board includes artists, lawyers and other professionals with an interest in artists and their intellectual property. The Board ensures that DACS fulfils its mission to translate rights into revenue and recognition for visual artists.
The Creators’ Council is a dynamic forum of visual artists who act as advisers to DACS, providing insight into the current work and practice of visual artists as well as acting as a sounding board for new ideas.

Most importantly the Creators’ Council act as the guardians of DACS’ Members’ Charter – our service pledge to all visual artists who use our services. Each year the Council reviews our performance against the Members’ Charter promises, to ensure we keep the interests of visual artists at the heart of everything we do.
The DACS team is committed to ensuring visual artists gain recognition and revenues from their rights. From artists to lawyers, each member of the team brings their own specialist knowledge and expertise to DACS, making it the organisation it is today.
DACS would like to thank the following for their support in 2009
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