

Contemporary patronage:



Money, access and growth

Management and patronage: the paved road to market.
While there is a slow trend towards artists becoming creative entrepreneurs, there is still a large gap in access and knowledge between the largest art markets and the middle men. Moreover, the jump from being a local artist with potential to being 'ready' isn't as often as straightforward as it might be.

Some might argue that the latest innovation in the art market has made it possible for artists to sell direct to buyers, and yet the support and patronage of galleries and organisations like Isis Phoenix Arts give artists a pedigree that supports the secondary market, and hence buyer confidence.

For over a decade Jason Colchin-Carter has developed a reputation as a serious collectors' barometer, and as someone who understands that for all the revolutions in art, the attention to the day-to-day defines how solid an artist's foundation will be. Sometimes a creative mind just needs a fish, and the lesson isn't about fishing but about exchange. And trust.

The relationship between artist and managing agent has matured, and Colchin-Carter's Isis Phoenix Arts (founded 2009) is ever expanding it. That role that now includes curating shows for a global audience, social media, marketing, and travel arrangements; as well as the organisational macro and micro (which reduces risk and increases growth). Moreover, where some agents might be specialist in a singular area of the arts, for Colchin-Carter diversity and new frontiers are as important as older forms and connections.

What do facilitators such as Isis Phoenix Arts offer? For the talented artist it might be that the key to their survival is money, access and growth. Jason Colchin-Carter explains.

JC-C: Isis Phoenix Arts has been going since 2009. We started off just managing four London-based artists. We've now moved to direct management with forty artists, and we now have a close relationship with another fifty.

Most of them are emerging but have seen the biggest growth over the last two years. We've gone into mid-career artists as well, which helped to raise our profile and brings in both stronger quality younger artists, as well as some very exciting mid-career artists who tend to have not shown in England before.

When we first started we were only focusing on doing London shows, and that's now changed as we've found different artists. So we did our first show in New York during the first two weeks of November 2014, which I was

very excited about. Then, going back we did some shows in Germany, which is one reason I was in Berlin this weekend. So, Berlin maybe, but definitely some of the other cities like Dusseldorf, Munich. Especially Munich, which is quite a big city at the moment for galleries. We have artists now who have studios in Germany and Switzerland, and it therefore makes sense to stop shipping the art back to London and limiting ourselves to one city. At this stage we try to expand a little organically.

Most of the artists are sourced from some of the world class London-based arts institutions, but we've got other fields outside of London, up in Nottingham and Derby and then to Wales as well. It seems that there's an untapped market at the moment, which I've been researching for about twelve months. Scotland and also Brighton has quite a vibrant art market as well, there are a lot of artist studios down there. It's quite fun to go down for the weekend and try to pack in as many studios in two days as possible. It'll not be 'down time'.

Having artists in different countries allows you to bring others across from other countries? Yeah, I mean, we try to do reciprocal agreements, so we just met a banker in Berlin who is Basel-based, and Basel art fair is coming up in June. As a private bank they have an art management department, so they're able to collect and support a young emerging art society. I happened to have a young Swiss emerging artist with me at the dinners, we introduced them. He's a painter, he's ticked all their criteria quite well so they are having to do a studio visit, and then maybe a show in Basel in a small space, bring in a couple of English artists who complement him. So yes, we're trying to bring artists into different cities where they might not normally have had the opportunity to do so. It's just looking where the support is, somebody who is invited there or maybe even sometimes a collector.

The current situation with patronage (and used to be hundred years ago, I believe) that the big collector families, they tended to support an artist by directly buying two or

three pieces from every collection. Whereas these days, people like to collect, and stage a dinner for an artist they're collecting. Or they like to help find us more space within the city that they're currently residing in. And sometimes they give a part of their personal collection to a museum/private collection facility.

So the link to Berlin this last weekend was quite interesting because you have a city full of lots of empty spaces, not like London. In Berlin a lot of people have private viewing facilities where they exhibit their collections on a weekly basis. So it could be open for two or three days a week. Something they're also doing in Asia and especially in mainland China.

American collectors primarily would put money towards a museum where they'd have a private wing, and they have many other facilities. There's a couple of big foundations and development organisations in Europe, etc, but that's not really a similar case. Asia has a lot of diffuse support working for art at the moment. A lot of Russian clients have their collections privately held and they don't have a viewing facility. So it's always very exciting when you get a new client who has that possibility as well, and not just for myself being able to have the shows, but for the artists themselves.

You work with both the patrons and the artists? Yes, exactly. I'm in the middle of writing a PhD proposal on the future of patronage. I'm keen because it will give me another avenue to be spending four or five days on when I travel to the different art fairs. If you're just going to the art fair to buy that can be fun for the first day or two, but after five or six days it can become quite samey. And then also the art fairs tend to not be so relevant to your younger artists or with people you've only had for four or five years, and so in those cases, partnering with a gallery can be particularly good, and works out quite well.

But in terms of the area of study and the research, it's just that last missing part, so it's taken me a couple of years to think about where the area of focus might be. It doesn't seem to make sense to me to have, and my current business model is very much the 2.0 version of, an art gallery: we don't have our own physical space and we don't really have any intention to find one.

We tend to partner with higher-end galleries when our artists have got to that stage where they've had the good sales and hence got the right set of collectors behind

them to be able to show at those. And we also rent spaces ourselves. We put art into private members clubs in London, Europe (such as this one! The Royal Arts Club) and others quite like it. We worked with Home House last year. And then also other unique venues and event spaces where we find that there's a little bit of fatigue. When you go to a lot of fairs and you make a name in the bidding industry, you call it 'fair-tigue' because you get so knackered walking around. And I think that clients can also get gallery fatigue.

You know, people enjoy coming to see new artists as much as visiting a new venue. When we started off, we decided to put our money back into the artist, materials, studio costs and things like that, rather than a studio. Also when you start off, unless you've got a very large six- or seven-figure sum behind you, galleries are tough. Plus it's difficult to find gallery spots in London anyway. At this stage we're finding that we can work with more artists at the same time by not having a physical space.

For example, last year we reached an average of four shows per month, primarily in England. This year it looks like we are coming in around the same. So not trying to expand too much, but these shows weren't just solo shows, some were dual shows, and even larger group shows. If I'd had one specific gallery space I would have been limited to five or six. Even if a couple of shows had had two or three artists I would have never been able to show as many artists as I've managed to do last year. When you work with younger emerging artists it's much more exciting to be able to show more. There's a lot of talent out there and it's very rewarding to be able to give people that platform.

So we are one of the few companies doing it. I'm in my forties so I've made some strong connections with some of the galleries, which some of the people in their twenties or thirties have started mimicking in their business models. But I was one of the first people to start doing it (non-location based patronage, representative, and agent work) so I've a head start and they have less access to some of the galleries and spaces. However, at the end of the day, talent always rises to the top. You could be aged fifteen or twenty and if your artist makes phenomenally good work you'll still do well.

What governs your aesthetic choices? When you're thinking about curating a show do you govern it towards your client base or around your artists? It's all about the medium. You find that once you start to curate a show that

**Sales of art and
antiques increased
eight per cent
from last year,
to €47.4 billion.**





**40 million people
visit the UK's galleries
and museums every
year, including more
than 7 million overseas
tourists. There are
37,000 artists in the UK.**

the work naturally falls together quite well. For example, 3D prints and sculptures like Tobias Klein, whose aesthetic fits quite nicely with some of the other sculptors we have, and also some of the drawers, photo realists, artists using pencil, paper, charcoal on paper, and so that aesthetic goes together quite well.

Obviously, figurative painters fit together quite easily as well. Photographers will sometimes need their own show and it's one medium that I personally find benefits from having its own shows. I try not intermingle photography with a photo realist because they look too close and people tend not to understand when the mediums become a little bit diluted. It's important that every piece in the show is understandable by our clients who are quite diverse.

That's one of the benefits of working different venues: that we can cultivate a number of different sets of clients, and working in new cities introduces us to new patrons and collectors that brings in a new group of friends around them as well. We find that we have something for most collectors, even if it's for works five to ten thousand pounds. Most of the people these days are very savvy about art. It's important to try to give each medium its own voice and I suppose that's one of the ways that we 'filter' our shows together.

People talk about art as an investment. Do you think that it devalues art in some respects? It's a good question.

Even the big galleries are fully aware that some of their clients are buying to hold a couple of years and then to flip. Which is something that everybody is constantly fighting against. So if you've ever had an experience that somebody says that they're planning to hold, and they go ahead but then immediately flip a work, then you would tend to not work with that person again. It changes the dynamic of the market, especially as some artists can quickly grow, and then when the flipping starts it's a real turn-off for the actual overall marketplace as a whole. Oscar Murillo is an example of somebody who has grown really quickly and already he's gone to auction. So you might argue that some of the people who are placing works into auction that they bought in 2011, 2010, 2012 are flipping the works by most standards. So, we do we try to avoid that.

What's the danger of flipping an artwork quickly?

Isn't that a sign of an artist's growth? Well, it could be artificially inflating it. So you want to ensure slow and

steady growth by placing it into the right collections and ensuring that it stays in collections for a longer period of time. It shows that people are really enjoying the work of the artist and they're buying it to display it. Big collections tend to rotate their collections anyway, as not everything is (or could be) exhibited at the same time. But there's a difference between doing that and buying and then just flipping it after a couple of years.

I think the market place likes people to buy art and to hold on to it because they're actually buying it for the enjoyment of it. It's an unwritten rule that good work does increase in value but it should always be seen as secondary. So when I'm asked to lecture on what and why people buy art I emphasise that you should always buy art for the reasons that you like it, enjoy it and you want to keep it. You know, if circumstances change, and you need finances quickly then art is good because it's more liquid, but then it can be somewhat ruined (devalued) by people flipping art too quickly. So I think that's probably where the sentiment comes from and why it's a negative influence for those two reasons.

We would like our clients to interpret and enjoy the work, and when which is important when you've a younger artist now forging a new career. We're doing it for longevity. I'm not just trying to do it show by show and then turn a blind eye to what happens to their work in a couple of years' time. We want them to grow and to continue to be a full-time working artist supporting themselves by selling art and not having to do anything else. So we want to try to help and manage and ensure that their careers exist long-term.

Does technological innovation have a special appeal for contemporary collectors?

One of the things that most people comment on is the diversity of our artists. I wouldn't knowingly want to work with (directly manage) two artists whose works are very similar. Mostly because nine times out of ten we have one client who wants a piece of art and that means one of my artists would definitely lose out. So it makes sense to have diversity so that our clients are able to enjoy and purchase and not clash with some of the different artists that we have.

So the diversity is really out of a necessity, but I won't work with an artist without having a chance of selling. I actively look for somebody who will complement the existing set of artists we work with without clashing. So new technology does come into it, and I suppose that's



Images: IPA / Bouke De Vries © 2016 / 2012



Left: Bouke De Vries,
Gold AK47, 2016;
Above: Bouke De Vries,
Cloud, 2012

why the 3D print artist Tobias Klein is so very appealing to me.

When considering an artist my first test is: would I buy a piece, do I already have friends who would buy the piece, do I understand the technology? I understand most of the technology with Tobias, but when you meet him you realise he's so ahead of his time. Which is why he'd already been in three museum shows within the first 18 months we worked with him. And if sales are taking a little bit longer to pick up, it's just because we need to convert people to understand that 3D print really is fine art. But this comes with understanding the processes behind the work, which is starting to come across by being in museums, and lecturing and travelling.

He's been in Hong Kong this year and New York. Soon he'll be in the west coast of America. He's in London Science Museum already. Last year his show was in London Science Museum; and he had a couple of solo shows in London (Victoria & Albert Museum); a solo show in Washington, which is a not an obvious city to break an artist but the gallery we work with is a very forward-thinking, design-led gallery. Speaking of the US, we're just about to confirm doing something with the Rubells from South Beach Miami, who are some of America's largest collectors. They're about to build a new private museum there in Washington which is going to be design-focused. So we want to be part of the growth that Washington will see over the next couple of years: a museum to be designed to come to the forefront of art.

At the moment we're looking at LA, which has been quite nascent for such a long time, it's quite surprising when you think about the other creative arts there. But then maybe it's not so surprising because all those other creative arts have taken the lead, like movies for example, but there's clearly lots of interest in fine art as well. There are a lot of existing collectors and wealth, so photography has had a bit of a scene there. Banksy has a bit of scene there and Charming Baker had a very successful show: he chose New York for the first show and LA for the second one. So LA is a growing scene and we're looking at working our way towards over to the West Coast soon as well.

Talking about expansion and doing shows at various places around the world, how do you delegate the show when so much is based on who you know and your own contacts? Once I have the vision of the show and the relation with the artist, the actual admin of it I'm quite

happy to delegate. I can steer the team towards different PR agencies per city, the different clients' base per city, finding a venue, going out to our existing set of friends, or maybe sometimes hiring an external consultant where necessary.

We don't have teams based all over the place, and in general our team travels for the different shows, but as this year goes on it's proving that we need to have more feet on the ground in the States. It's much more difficult to do a show in New York from London. You think it's just a hop skip and jump on a flight, but there's a lot more logistics involved, especially if it's a two-week show.

That said, it helps when the artist is based there because the studio is already there, so it's just us doing the admin side of things. It's relatively easy to delegate, and when you work with people for long enough they tend to know how I'd like to work.

You talked about international growth and, as you said, artists mature over time. Sure I think talent always rises up to the top, it's just a matter of how long it takes to do so. I hope that one of the reasons that people like to work with me and my company is because we have a track record of helping that process accelerate slightly. That's by hard work, and by finding the right set of collectors per artist, and having a good management structure in place. There's nothing else that's more unique than that, but it's just trying to be as efficient as possible; placing the right collectors, the right venue, with the right artist. Which takes time.

You find that with a lot of young artists, the one thing they've been missing from all the different university courses is even one course on business management: how to set up studio, run your budgets, sorting out stuff, read a contract etc. The reason that I'd like to work with an artist for three years is because it takes up to eighteen months to get things in order where it's possible to start to show the work to clients and collectors.

Getting things ready for your first group or solo show, it's probably up to two years into it and then you have one year left. It sounds like it's a long period of time, but when you're actually in the position of the artist I think most of them will agree that it can go quite quickly. Then if you're doing your job well lots of opportunities tend to come in between eighteen months and two and half years, and then all those opportunities are such that you can't take them all up in one year. So you then spread them out, and then that naturally goes through to a third or fourth year.



Top: Guillermo Lorca,
La Vida Eterna, 2013
Bottom: Iguapomi,
Frightening freedom, 2015



**The Wall Street
Journal estimates
that there are more
than 200 large-scale
art fairs worldwide.**

What's the nature of the relationships that you have with the artists? I think with most of them I start off because I mentor them and I have a certain level of friendship with them. Then comes a discussion. I offer to bring them in and manage them. So I think it's becoming friends first, and it's inviting them along to a couple of other shows to see what we do so there's no hard sell there at all. It's giving them examples and showing them what we've done with a lot of people and other artists, and let them make up their own mind.

Some people don't like to be limited by a sole exclusive contract, and that's fine, but it's much more difficult working with an artist like that because you spend so much time setting up the scene, and working into your set of collectors and contacts to try to raise their profile. If they're working with other people then the work has then been given publicly and benefiting from myself, and I find that to be somewhat frustrating. I think it's a better conversation to have with a collector when I'm offering a set of work which nobody else has and then focusing on the right collectors, the right collections, and the right time of the year.

A lot of the artists don't know that the art world has circuits. It starts in January with Art Stage, which has been going strong for years, and then it goes through to a couple of European art fairs and then we get through to March which is an Asian fair and also Armoury in New York. Then April, we just come back from Gallery Weekend Berlin and then it's Frieze New York and then Hong Kong Basel [Art Basel in Hong Kong] and then in June it's Basel Basel [Art Basel in Basel]. And in the first months of business, many other European fairs; and Sao Paulo is February or March as well, which is a new growth area; plus there are a couple of fairs in India now.

So what you're trying to do when an artist gets to a certain level is trying to hold an exhibition when you know the clients are going to be in the same city, but that they're not going to be travelling to the art fairs. For example, you'd never do a show during Art Basel in those two weeks in June, because nobody is here, so it wouldn't make any sense. Similarly, trying to do something in October in London Frieze, that's about two weeks' worth of events, and if you're an emerging artist doing a show during that period of time why would you want to try to compete against all of the big galleries? They've got much larger budgets, private dinners, drivers to take people around London. So you have to try

and pick your weeks very carefully with that. You know that certain collectors will be around and certain collectors won't be there. And that's also part of the management services, you know, finding the right time and the right fit for the work as well.

Some of the things you mentioned - like drivers, private dinners, functions - it sounds like broad-ranging activities, really... Yeah, quite expensive as well. That's again why you want try to work with an artist one on one, so that you know that when you're covering all these extra costs in the first couple of shows you know can keep money within the studio. I find that helps the artist with their studio costs, to keep the studio running and materials to be flowing. Finding a studio could be quite difficult in London, we've got some quite good contacts for the different studios in and around London. They're always changing, they're being sold to different developers, they're smashing down to build some new small apartment block there instead, so people are moving further and further out.

What are the areas of innovation in the business itself you've seen over the last few years? I think innovation just grows with the market. There are more people who have switched from the secondary market, especially a lot of former private bankers and investment consultants who had a portfolio of higher-end clients and wealthy clients in general. They always tended to have a very close relationship with their clients. So some people have been downsizing and you know the banks have been in the financial crisis. I know quite a few consultancies set up from being private investment consultants and those private bankers, because they know a lot about what their clients own. I don't know if that's an innovation as such, because they tend not to be so knowledgeable about the works themselves. They mainly know where the works can be sourced from and where they will sold to, which in itself can be a hindrance as well as a help.

It's important to work with people who have both an understanding of the market and the works themselves, not to mention the clients and their individual needs. Whether that's an innovation or just a growth of the market, I don't know.

I think the main innovation is the increasing interest in all levels of the market for new collectors. To the extent that people don't now consider art a risky investment. Although



Left from top: Severija
Inčirauskaitė, *Every Stick
Has Two Ends*, 2012;
*Give us this day our
daily bread*, 2009;
The Path of Roses, 2008

Bottom: Konstantino
Dragos, *LAPSUS* (47)



we always advise people to buy a piece of art because you like it, I think people tend to see that at some stage in the future it's possible to sell it. If you have a financial problem you don't want to sell your house or your car but you can sell a couple of pieces from your art collection. So it's more liquid. In this way the market has just generally grown and the interest is there.

Returning to innovation, I think the main innovation is the art fair, which is just growing from strength to strength and again is another reason why having a gallery as such doesn't have to be a necessity. If look at most sales now, I'd say sixty to seventy per cent of sales come via art fairs. There are so many more art fairs in existence now. Some galleries that we work with, their main model is to only sell through art fairs and stands; they might only have one physical space, which is more like a storage space.

D Zwirner Gallery, White Cube, Gagosian - they sell continually through their fourteen spaces worldwide, and they're in every single art fair, and they always have strong sales at a gallery show, at an art fair, at everything. They're the top end of the market, they're the Goliaths of the industry. So when you're next couple of steps down from that, I think it's probably safer to sell at art fairs.

People now tend to travel; they like going to an art fair for their vacation, for a long weekend. While coming back from Berlin for a Gallery Weekend I was told that three-and-a-half million people live in the city and over five days of the event, there were two million visitors. They were not all there for the art, but you can bet a couple of thousand of them were, and I think that tourism now very much encapsulates arts, aspirational viewing and self-education. We enjoy giving lectures at private dinners and helping people to understand a little bit more about the process, but people can do that themselves by going to the art fairs and being on the programmes. It's the norm to have a lot of different talks and lectures.

The Art16 fair [which picks up again in 2018] held in London in the spring is now the second biggest art fair after Frieze. They had a phenomenal VIP program. When you start to buy you start to being invited to the VIP programs, feel more part of the art market which leads more opportunities and things like that. We participate in all of those things and use the lectures as an indicator of how people are thinking with the aim of trying to find new artists for the secondary market.

Different opportunities and not just meetings. There are always new collectors emerging and there is always a new part of the world that is developing. With Middle-Eastern collectors it's quite conservative and there is certain imagery you can't show. Of course, in their private collections they buy anything as much as anybody else does!

Art Dubai is in March and that's a very big international fair that's growing very well. And lately South America is showing huge growth, for example the Sao Paulo Art Fair. They had phenomenal sales and that was from home-grown talent as well as international artists, with a lot of the international galleries showing. So perhaps the main innovation really is just the inquisitiveness of international collectors, and the fact that they were willing to travel to go to see the fairs. Therefore if you have everybody in one place at one time, then it's a good use of your money to be present if you're promoting something.

Does this mean that the art world is becoming more democratic? On a purchasing front, if you look at the American economy and whenever it's in the slump, they always have a war and they're always going to pick themselves up. In a different train of thought, it has often been the case that when there's an economic slump (primarily in Europe) the creative industries always tend to grow. Because people are disillusioned with money as such and your normal nine-to-five job. So now we're just coming out of eight years of financial crisis, and it's within these last eight years that all the art fairs have grown. It could be because people are looking to put their money into other non-standard trading investments.

We work with one set of lawyers in the high-end secondary market, and there was a stage a couple of years after the financial crisis when they were calling me once a month saying, 'Jason, what are you up to at the moment? All of our clients that are retired in Switzerland, they're calling us every week saying, "What do we do with their money? We were looking for opportunities but we're worried about investing in the stock market."'

Cut to four or five years later you see what's happened within the art market. People who would have traditionally only gone for the blue chip high-end secondary market pieces have come down. Now they're willing to support younger and emerging artists and they've been willing to buy more than one piece. The idea of patronage, originating

The US is the international art market leader, representing 38% of the market by volume, while China accounts for 24%, and the UK places third with 20%.



from the classic collectors, has continued through to a new generation. It has filtered down to lots of people who would have never had any inkling or desire before.

People don't talk about the possible pitfalls of art as investment much, then? There are a couple of good examples where people grew very quickly, almost with the same rate of growth as Murillo has done at the moment. Then the whole market bombed. It's slightly unregulated and you do have market-making.

The art market is the only unregulated market in the world so there is some scope for secondary market players and also the higher-end artists to control the market. Whereas if this was in financial services, it wouldn't be technically possible. Most people don't understand that or don't get involved in that side of things.

When you're looking at the secondary market and the client wants you to try to divest some work for them, you must first ask them if they have a certain type of client in mind that you wouldn't like to sell to. Nine times out of ten most clients who have a big collection usually say they have no interest for their pieces to be sold to an investment fund.

So, there's a natural part of the market which doesn't enjoy art for investment's sake. But if you do your research cleverly and you buy a piece, and if you find something with good provenance you might just have something...

For example, we were offered a Picasso which had been in a collection for 34 years that had never been exhibited outside of the house. They had bought from a Gallery in Basel which is now private museum. So there wouldn't be a collector that wouldn't be interested in a piece like that, and you could say that a piece like that would be a very good investment, give it three or four years. However, the type of person buying that would be the type of person who would also hold on to it at the end as well. It would go into private collection and it wouldn't be seen for a while.

But you never know, there are always going to be people who buy and sell as a necessity. As I say, it's an easy asset to divest when you need to rather than having to sell a big item which may be your house or even a house in the country or even a small apartment in the town, in the centre, you would be better to sell a couple of paintings and keep your property.

Private collectors do amass these wonderful collections over time. In America these seem to be bequeathed to the

public. Is this a general trend? America is different to the rest of the world. Not only do Americans have tax incentives to do that but philanthropy is very much part of the blood in America. It's not so much over here. So where you have huge tax incentives to gift, you have private museums.

Similarly, in mainland China you have a culture where, once you've made your first one to two hundred million dollars, you start collecting art. You establish a large art collection and then you build a museum to store them, which you might keep open for two to three days a week, allowing people to see it.

Whereas, the culture in Russia would be to have the second or third yacht, art would be in your house and not an art collection that was open to the public. There are obviously exceptions to this and I'm talking in general terms.

The difference, why you have less philanthropy in the UK, is because how tax laws work at the moment. The government gives very little money to directly support cultural institutions so they're always fundraising over here.

Part of London's social life revolves around supporting the arts. The Tate, especially the head of the Tate, Nick Serota, did a particularly good job. Tate Britain and especially the new extension was primarily funded by non-doms [a person who lives in a country but is not legally domiciled in it, sometimes obtaining tax advantages in the country of residence such as lower rates of tax] who are living in London.

So the money all came from people who are not English but they all live here. That's very clever, and that's a very good use of benefiting from the growth of this capital city where people say that a lot of English people are being priced out of it. But culturally we're benefiting from it as well, and there are many other institutions that are all fundraising continually - with different annual goals. So at the moment understanding the UK, it's in the cultural climate and the tax laws, whereas in America it's completely different and always has been.

What's the most positive change you think can happen to support the arts in the UK? For collectors I think it's choosing a couple of artists to directly support. Then having that trust in them and following through with your intentions. Even if you only follow one or two careers, do so with conviction. So rather than having ten different artists maybe just focus on a couple and help those young artists by being focused on them specifically.