

Session 1 'How to break the isolation of the sculptural object?'

<u>Speakers:</u>	<u>Identified as:</u>
Charles Hewlings	CH
Bernice Donszelmann	BD
Jo Melvin	JM
Brendan Prendeville	BP
Audience (Rest of Attendees)	AQ (Audience Questions)

Charles Hewlings

My name is Charles Hewlings and I'm a sculptor.

Sculpture as a world-entire-unto-itself is one essential and non-negotiable part of its nature. And to that extent, its home is anywhere or nowhere except in the imagination of the viewer.

But we are complicated beings.

The homelessness of sculpture has bothered me since 1976, when, after this sculpture was acquired by the Arts Council, I felt the need and the lack of a home in which it could be housed in ways appropriate to its physical and (I can only say) metaphysical nature.

More recently, a rare opportunity arose to engage with architecture, in which I wanted the sculpture both to belong and to interfere - that is to say not a passive, or even subservient, partner. If this [*indicating screen image*] is a little confusing, what I was asked to do was build a sculpture for this little alcove. I reproduced the corner of the room; built the sculpture which "leaked through the walls" - is the phrase I would use; and this is it installed in the house, in which the sculpture ended up penetrating every space in the lower part of the house one way or another.

David Smith, the sculptor, as cited by Alex Potts (who is here today) in his wonderful book *The Sculptural Imagination* - David Smith came to see sculpture and architecture as different and incompatible "aesthetic structures". But I feel it, interaction such as one like this, as one way – one way - to begin to break the isolation of the sculptural object.

We cannot return to the kind of integration between sculpture and the shared built and ideological environment as represented in two works on the side (the drawing and the relief), a loss of context for sculpture that in the 19th Century Baudelaire lamented and which Rodin struggled to overcome.

For a hundred and fifty years, with no natural home other than the museum; sculpture has been continuously re-negotiating its place in the world. The by now almost universally celebrated autonomy of sculpture, self-sufficient, free of outside demands, can also be seen as perpetual disconnect - as inflicted on the whirling wind-borne figures in the second circle of Dante's Inferno: on

the one hand an image of freedom, floating free and flying, and on the other hand an image of always no commitment, always separation.

I imagine an exhibition which makes tangible a thread running through modern/postmodern/contemporary art, a thread which criticizes the autonomous object, and which demonstrates a pressure to reconnect with society from within modern art and especially from within the tradition of object sculpture.

Medardo Rosso, 1893, and Giacometti, 1949 - both trying to engage with the space around and beyond the subject.

Hepworth, on the left, *Pierced Form*, 1932, about which Lucy Kent says (and this is from the catalogue for the 2015 Tate show) "By piercing the form, Hepworth allowed the 'spiritual inner life' of her sculptures to expand limitlessly beyond their physical proportions. Penetrating the stone forced the viewer to consider matter and space as one. If the air and light breaking through the marble is perceived as integral to the composition, so too is the environment beyond the form. The sculpture becomes a keystone, locking into and referencing the universe of which it is a part."

Mike Nelson, *The Coral Reef*, a detail, 2000. It consists of a series of interior rooms and corridors. It has no 'outside', no edge or shape, which defines a 'thing' - it is only 'inside', so perhaps in purest contrast to the autonomous object.

Other artists I envisage as represented in this exhibition would include: Theaster Gates, Phyllida Barlow, Phillip King (specifically *Cross-Bend*, 1980, which straddles part of the European Patent Office in Munich - I haven't seen it, I've seen images; it looks very exhilarating), Caro, Serra, Judd, Beuys, Smithson, David Smith, Mondrian, Tatlin, Rodin, and Donatello (who is from outside the period but, I would argue, relevant).

Now I'd like to invite Bernice Donszelmann, Jo Melvin, and Brendan Prendeville to offer their ideas on Homeless Sculpture and their suggested contributions to this 'ideal' exhibition.

Bernice Donszelmann

If we're talking about homeless I thought it would be good to start by what we mean by homelessness as an idea in the first place. I wanted to open with a section of Edward S. Casey's *The Fate of Place* where he is discussing Aristotle's conception of place and what he calls the reciprocal belonging of place, and I like using it as an example because I think it's such a forceful presentation of the idea of an interrelationship between thing and place. "Place has the power to make things be somewhere and to hold and guard them once they are there. Without place they would not only fail to be located, they would not even be things. They would have no place to be the things they are. The loss would be ontological and not only cosmological. It would be to lose a kind of being and not merely the number of beings that exist."

So with this idea, with this presentation of the notion of place, an idea of homelessness would be the idea of having no place to be the things that

things are. And with this idea, I want to look at the work of the Georgian artist Thea Djordjadze. This was a piece that she showed at the last Documenta in 2012. I want to look at her work to consider how it might pose an alternative in a way to the model of place that Casey is putting forward by Aristotle there; and my aim isn't to look at her work as a complete refutation of that model, but to think about how it might rethink the conception of what place or site might actually be. So if we're talking about homelessness, we're obviously talking about a kind of unhinging of site and object. And what I want to suggest with Djordjadze's work is that I think that in much of her work, the object has a way of operating as both an object and a site at the same time; I think it hinges on that relationship between those two.

So to talk about this, I want to do a bit of a detour through Japanese architecture; in particular it's some writing by Arata Isozaki, *Japan-ness in Architecture*. Isozaki was part of a research group called Japanese Urban Space, and that group did analysis of both Western and Japanese cities to look at how the construction of space and the organisation of space and place within cities had different tendencies between the West and Japanese. And what he puts forward is the idea that Japanese cities don't traditionally have centres in the way that Western cities do - they don't have piazzas, they don't have plazas, those kind of social and symbolic centres don't exist in the same way. And he draws on Hamaguchi, who makes a distinction between what he calls "The material constructive space-making of the West and the spatial performative Japanese style space-making". He also talks about it as a kind of a virtual or a temporal tendency in terms of making space.

So what Isozaki talks about is the idea that there are points of focus within Japanese cities. He refers to them as *kawaii*. But what these kind of territorial groundings are is that they are never fixed; they have temporary markers but they're never actually fixed points within the cities. So they're loose markers and there are common understandings of approximately where these might be, but they're never exact, so you would never be able to pinpoint them on the map; he discusses them as vague areas. But what he says about them is that what allows them to become differentiated and become precise and specific as sites within a city is always a ritualistic device; it always involves some kind of a ritualist move. And he says that that idea has its origins in Japan with sacred rituals. He relates it to the Shinto ritual; so he says "During the sacred *sakaki*, an evergreen tree favoured by Shinto into which the gods are invited is set up; but when, after the ritual, the tree or branches are removed, the gods are gone; their visit is only temporary. This kind of space can be created anywhere and it is designed virtually, so to speak." So what he's saying is that each time a space is made for the gods and each time it's described again, so it has to be done anew each time. So it's an idea of space that always entails a preparation of a place, and it never is without that idea of a ritual preparation, so there's no permanent architectural housing that pre-exists that preparatory act.

So I thought this was an interesting way to maybe reframe that idea of homelessness, because what Isozaki argues is that the God does require a place - there is some kind of a notion of a reciprocal relationship between place - but what constitutes that place is something quite different and it is

performative and gestural. And I think that's what I want to look at in terms of Djordjadze's work.

This was a piece that she had at the South London Gallery last year. I think it was for me the piece that twigged this connection between the idea of a Japanese space, because apparently this platform that she sets up originally draws reference from the Georgian houses in which the domestic space was always demarcated by a raised platform, which of course is something that happens in Japanese houses as well. With Japan you always have the momentary ritual of you have to remove the shoes in order for that space to become prepared as the domestic space. So this was the connection that drew me to it.

There's an article on Djordjadze that I just recently found in Frieze Magazine, which interestingly discusses her work in relationship to an idea of homeless sculpture as well; he frames it in a slightly different way that I'm going to do here. But what he asserts in that essay, which I think is an interesting way of looking at her work, is he says that what's central to the nature of how the work operates is always the question of what's happening; and he opens his article with a line from Dorothea Tanning, the surrealist artist, who is talking about her hometown in Illinois, and she's says "Nothing happens but the wallpaper." So the wallpaper there paradoxically becomes a site where there's potential for something to happen in itself, so it's a kind of a promise of an event.

Now I think in relationship to Djordjadze's work, I think there's a way that she operates with material, with a kind of syntax, a form of material that I think does carry this sense of always readying a site for something; it's kind of a preparation of a site as much as it is an object. Thinking of her work a little bit, I think there is a strong contemporary tradition in sculpture at the moment which is understood and is being read in performative terms, where the material existence of the work...I'm thinking of an example (this was a show at Corvi-Mora last year; I've got no idea how to pronounce his name correctly, Juha Pekka Matias Laakkonen) - it was a piece where there was an entire event, in the sense that the work is very much outside of what you see here within the space. The sculptural work is a kind of a culmination or a remnant of a much bigger action, and it is only like a small slice of this larger piece of action. And I think Djordjadze's work operates in a similar sense, to a degree, but I think with her work, this idea of what's happening is more indicating forward in time, rather than it being a remnant of something that's already happened. I think for me the work sits on a tension of being both an object - we see the work as the work; it is present in the space as an artwork - but there is also with it this sense that something is yet to come. It refers forward temporarily to something yet to happen, and I think it hinges on that relationship between a present object and a yet-to-be thing.

I think, in relationship to a few of the things that Charles was saying... We often find quite banal comments made about her work - her work is discussed as sitting between installation and sculpture, and think that might not necessarily be that informative. But in a sense I think there is a certain precision to that, because I think that, in terms of installation, as Charles was saying about Mike Nelson, it is a kind of a total space; and I think that

Djordjadze's work is always much more porous than that; it opens itself up to the outside, as well as being a kind of installation, so again there's that tension between object and it's outside. It also has a dialogue with the outside; it might be called site specific but it's not entirely; a part of her method of making is to recycle objects and materials from one work to the other, so there is always this idea of a production and then a dismantling and then a regeneration of her work to another space, as well. And, again, I think I relate that to that idea of the work becoming a preparation of a space as much as it is an object in itself.

Thank you.

Jo Melvin

I'm going to talk about artist's instructions and some realisations, and I'm framing this around two number shows that were organised and curated by Lucy Lippard. These are 557,085 in Seattle, and 995,000 in Vancouver. The titles are derived from the population of those cities at the time, which is in itself an indicator of the fluidity of the population and also the fluidity of time.

What I'm going to be focusing on is the idea of the structure and processes that Lippard went through in order to realise these exhibitions - kind of drawing out the networks of connectivity between her gathering of the ideas, and the connections between the artists themselves, with whom she was in correspondence, and also the way that the instructions appeared to her, and particularly those instructions that required three-dimensional processes to be ensued. So I'm interested in the form that these instructions took and how Lippard presents them - whether she takes on the presentation of them herself, or whether she actually uses the artist's written card; so whether they're written instructions, diagrammatic, or oral narrative; and I'd like to think about that in relation to a specific example of Barry Flanagan's, when the spoken word enables a remaking from instructions; and there's those sorts of differences. I'd like to think about the differences between these forms of instructions. Bearing in mind what the work is and where does the work reside once it's liberated in a sense from its instructive form. So this idea of the 'without-ness' of the instruction and its reliance upon the instruction.

Lippard's premise and ideal was to form an exhibition from out of a suitcase; she spoke a lot about this, taking stuff around in this fashion. So, magician like, conjuring with these things that spring almost from nothing. And bearing in mind that, there's a sort of sense of the absent body of the artist, the absent instructions coming from the mouth of the artist or the hand of the artist; and thinking about how these enactments can be in themselves performative, so that Lippard is operating in a performative paradigm following these instructions; and how that function that she takes on sets up a sort of blurring of roles between the artist and the instigator and the conceiver of the work itself, so that the curator becomes a player and interpreter and so does the artist in a sense, and it's all, with Lippard's situation, a form of acting: where is the body?

Lippard's card indexes, as they're called, were the catalogues that she made from these exhibitions. Those catalogues in the index cards were distributed through the mail. And obviously they can be configured and refigured

however one wants with the ideas being realised or conjured in the mind. And each form, each stage, each act is rendered as much as possible transparent in her organisation of the process: so she makes her acknowledgements, she explains what's going on in the work and also presents each of the artists' cards. You will see at the top that Flanagan's card is compiled by her and not by Flanagan. So that raises a sort of speculation as to where those instructions actually came from, those thought processes actually came from, and unless one actually knew that Flanagan has dropped her a line, one wouldn't know where they'd come from. And, as I say, the first incarnation of this exhibition, it was a touring show, and when it went to Vancouver there were additional cards added and works were refigured, and the documentation from that show was included in the second version in Vancouver. So you see documentation from installations in Seattle mixed up amongst it. This is an actual install photo and you see how it figures in the actual construction card itself.

So here we have two different instructions for the two different exhibitions of Sol LeWitt's. Very clear instructions as to what was expected by the installers: "On a wall using a hand pencil, parallel lines about an eighth of an inch apart and twelve inches long are drawn for one minute. Under this row of lines, another row are lines are drawn for ten minutes. Under this row of lines another row of lines are drawn for one hour." So this was Le Witt's Vancouver contribution, which is interesting in the light of what happened with his Seattle contribution, where you see that he's asking for three-dimensional units to be rendered for the exhibition itself; and I'll be coming back to that in a second.

But I'm moving on now to looking at Robert Smithson's contributions to this exhibition. Here we have his instructions for Seattle, and with a prototype photo of what he wanted. He's asking for four hundred square snapshots of Seattle horizons to be displayed in this particular fashion which you see up there documented in the Vancouver part of the catalogue itself. Now, as I said, the catalogue is on index sheets so it can be shuffled in any way, so you encountered Vancouver in the same way that you encountered Seattle; you don't know where it comes. Some people get very anxious and agitated about this, thinking what's 995,000 and what's the other one?

And so again we see another idea for Vancouver, an idea that wasn't materialised, which is this "50 truckloads of mud, 10 truckloads of cement, 10 truckloads of asphalt. Use one of the above materials." So a sort of perpetual idea of possibility, something rather whacky for a curator perhaps to realise if the estate were to allow it.

Now we see again where I was talking about this kind of transparency; Lippard is showing exactly what happened and why. Now I mentioned I'd come back to LeWitt's cards and you can see that she's saying here that "Due to weather, technical problems and less definable snafus, Michael Heizer's piece was not executed....Sol LeWitt's and Jan Dibbets were not completed;" – Sol Le Witt's was actually, and I heard this from speaking to other people who were involved in the show at the time, Sol Le Witt's wasn't realised because they ran out of time – "Carl Andre's and Barry Flanagan's instructions were misunderstood" and the pieces not wholly executed as they should have been in accordance with the artist's wishes.

Now this I find very interesting and quite amusing, because Flanagan...the documentation of that piece is how many people think that that rope should be shown because they've seen it documented in that photograph. So here we have some more install shots; these weren't produced on cards, these were actually from Vancouver of the incarnation in Vancouver itself.

Now I thought it might be interesting just to take a side track around instructions and look very briefly at a particular work of Flanagan's. This wasn't included in either Seattle or Vancouver, but it is a piece that can be realised according to instruction. It's called *one ton corner piece 67*. That's the title and it was first made in the Biennale des Jeunes in 1967 in Paris. Now it's a funny story but when Flannigan got to Paris, the right sand wasn't delivered for the work that he had intended to make, which is the work which is the *4 casb 2'67* with the blue canvas that the Tate Gallery now own. Now that one-ton was supposed to fit into those blue canvas bags. Flannigan had taken the canvas bags with him fully prepared to stuff the sand into those bags, but the sand in Paris was too wet and it was impossible.

He then thought OK I'm going to do a different piece altogether, so he shovelled the sand into this form and it became *one ton corner piece* in the Biennale des Jeunes, which was a space where artists had a kind of booth, a bit like an Art Fair as we would expect, and then this *one ton corner piece* was made on the spot in the light of the difficulties that he faced. This piece, the *one ton corner piece*, so much appealed to his dealer, Alex Gregory-Hood, who ran the Rowan Gallery, that he asked him to remake the piece a year later for his second exhibition at the Rowan Gallery. This time he could choose whatever sand he wanted and he used local builders' sand from London; he didn't use the same sand that he'd used. And then I spoke to Flanagan about installing and whether it would be possible to reinstall that particular work in different circumstances. So we spoke about the processes of its installation, and you see the first time that the work had been installed since 1968, which was in an experimental space in London at the beginning of 2015, and it's with *heap*, which was another work that needed sand but a different type of sand. And here you see some different incarnations just to consider the position of sand and how it shifts in the light of where it is.

Thank you very much.

Brendan Prendeville

The glass uprights comprising Gerhard Richter's *7 Panes (House of Cards)* rest against each other, held as you see by supports at points of contact and at the base. One of a series of such works, it's distinctively architectural in form and bears an adventitious resemblance to the Shard, suggesting as well a possibly deliberate echo of early 20th century utopian projects for a glass architecture. We might then see both Richter's work and Renzo Piano's building design as betraying - perhaps alluding to - a common ancestry. I think of Paul Scheerbart's visionary tract, *Glasarchitektur*, and also Lyonel Feiningers faceted architectural images, in particular his *Cathedral* woodcut for Gropius's Bauhaus manifesto of 1919.

Possibly deliberate, adventitious - it would be wrong to imply vagueness on the part of an artist with nothing vague about him. Uncertainty is another matter, for *7 Panes* has a precision of its own, as we see in the way that this calculated structure shatters into changing configurations of reflection and transparency. In this connection the work's parenthetical title, *House of Cards*, is relevant as it makes an allusion that surely is deliberate, namely to a sculpture made by Richard Serra in 1969 which bears the same parenthetical title, *One Ton Prop (House of Cards)*. Here too, upright components, now of lead antimony, lean against each other in mutual support. The two works contrast with each other both as sculptures (supposing that term to fit in both cases) and with respect of the theme of homelessness - or perhaps I should say the condition of homelessness that defines the situation of sculpture arguably in the present. The condition in question, it must be added, though undeniably of the present, is hardly recent. The fact that sculpture like visual art in general, is typically made for exhibition, hence on the speculative basis and for a specular context, is a circumstance of fairly long historical standing. Critiques of the museological framing of art have become by now so standardized that auto-critique is a curatorial reflex: I recently bumped into a former student now in an educational post in a leading gallery, who assured me that "I'm still into institutional critique".

Assuredly, the questioning of museum display has a considered basis, and might draw for instance on the writing of philosophers as radically divergent as Adorno and Heidegger; the latter writes, for example, Heidegger "Well, then, the works themselves stand and hang in collections and exhibitions. But are they here in themselves as the works they themselves are, or are they not rather here as objects of the art industry?". Such a reflection comes as no surprise today to us, for art-critical debates on the monetary and institutional framing of art practice began decades ago. Both Richter's work and Serra's bear traces of the critical and self-reflexive tendencies that prevailed at the time of their formation as artists, the period of conceptualism – indeed Serra's *House of Cards* itself comes from that time.

Considered as works that critically or self-consciously anticipate the homeless institutional context, Richter and Serra employ opposite strategies. And, in parenthesis, I should stress that I have specifically chosen artists whose work we would associate only with the most impersonal, mega institutional settings. Serra's work is literally self-standing, bearing minimal reference to the artist's action and communicating directly and forcefully with the viewer's bodily awareness, with the evident aim of forestalling a cultivated response. Serra's intention, I imagine, is that his work should outbid its anticipated setting, the gallery space that is dedicated specifically to appearance and viewing (hence to theatricality in the root sense of the word), by withholding its essential properties from sight, these properties being its self-supporting weight, its darkness, its material density. We do need to see the work of course, but in the blunt regularity of its configuration it discloses in an instant all there will ever be to see. Turn the lights off and it stays there with us, as a denser bit of the darkness. Does it succeed, though, in neutralizing or disrupting or subverting the gallery environment, the art industrial complex? Of course not, any more than did the supposedly unsaleable products of conceptualism. In fact, far from neutralizing their destined setting, both the conceptualists' works

and those of Serra actually reflect its impersonal neutrality: the unauthored matches the anonymous; the calculated matches the bureaucratic. It's not clear that this similarity arises by intention or that, if so, it achieves any critical purchase. Richter's work too accords with its anticipated institutional setting, in the impersonality of its manufacture; but now, in place of resistance, we find acknowledgement. We might even say that he frames and reflects back to us our very situation, there in the gallery. Standing in front of another of his glass pieces, at the Tate retrospective, I was able to catch sight of myself as one of what Heidegger called "das Man", translated as 'the they', one among others: to quote Heidegger, "In utilizing public means of transportation and in making use of information services such as the newspaper, every other is like the next.... We take pleasure and enjoy ourselves as 'they' ("das man") take pleasure; we read, see and judge literature and art as 'they' see and judge.... The "they", which is nothing definite and which all are, though not as a sum, prescribes the kind of being of everydayness".

While there is certainly no kinship between Richter's work and Heidegger's philosophy, they each acknowledge the same reality of homeless, anonymous 'everydayness'. This is a condition that is particularly telling for sculpture, if we think of Heidegger's archaising evocation of the setting-up of a work as the setting up of a world, that of a people - a historical people, as he disturbingly has it. When the sculpture has no given place, it's therefore necessarily intended for nobody in particular. Richter is distinctive in taking this ostensible predicament as actually furnishing him with his means and materials, just as the prisoner in Robert Bresson's *A condemned man escapes* uses the furniture of his cell to free himself. Except that here there is no question of escape, but rather of inviting us into awareness of a resource we have at our disposal, namely the capacity to give free and deliberate attention. In aid of which, Richter forestalls any grandiose expectations - even if, or rather perhaps because, his structure brings to mind those utopian visions and towering buildings I referred to earlier. Panes of glass that we have come to associate with corporate sky scrapers stand here at bodily scale, at a level with myself and others, and they, along with me, are afforded, in the midst of the everyday, intimate glimpses - for whoever among us cares to look, that is. Here is a piece of work that brings us precisely to where we stand, but perhaps with a new lucidity. We the viewers are gathered into a temporary community, as we glimpse each other through the prism of the work, in our fleeting acts of attention and inattention. Whereas Serra's House of Cards invokes the peril of collapse, Richter's invites us to take as somehow our own this insecure home in our midst, this House of Cards, as if our very acts of attention sustained it.

Discussion and Q & A

CH I would certainly like to see this so called exhibition so far - it would be pretty interesting. One thing that strikes me from all that you guys have said is the condition of homelessness, which we might take to be very much more general than to do only with sculpture, but the condition of homelessness - is it something to go with or resist? This I feel as a tension in my mind. I think a lot of the work that you've been showing, the Flanagan, for instance, is going with and finding areas of meaning

in homelessness; and another way might be to resist it, which I suppose is where I feel I am more. I don't know if you feel there is this tension.

[Interruption for fire alarm]

- JM I wanted to ask you a question - and it's tangential to what you were talking about - about the countering between the fluidity of situation that Flanagan might represent within the realisation in particular spaces following instructions or working with materials, and your position. I wanted to do this by going to one of your examples, and I wonder if you could say something more about your selection of Donatello in your imaginary exhibition.
- CH On a trip to Florence many years ago, I found myself running between Donatello sculptures and Michelangelo sculptures and one thing that struck me was - how to put this? - this is not true of all the Michelangelo's, but a lot of them are so self-answering formally. I imagine you having a bit of rope and you tie a knot, and this knot, if you threw it in the air, would remain exactly the same. I then imagined picking up a Donatello, which becomes a real figure, turning it upside down and everything would alter. In other words, the Donatello was grounded. It involved the same ground you're on. It just somehow brought you into it in a way that is not true of many Michelangelo's, which are so autonomous; and I felt there was a major difference between the two in that way. So I felt Donatello opened itself up literally to the environment around it, including you, the viewer, in a way that many Michelangelo's didn't.
- JM The Donatello - because obviously we haven't spoken about this at all, but - the Donatello that came into my mind is that one of an archbishop, which is in the Palace beside Santa Croce, and he's got his mitre on and he's got these extremely large gloves; I mean they look too big for him, as if he's wearing borrowed gloves, and I wondered if there was something about that sort of observation of our physicality, that is almost something that could be overlooked, that was what you were driving at.
- CH I think the response physically, and the identification with them, is incredibly direct and strong. Interesting point. I was really thinking, in relation to both the Merdardo Rosso and the Giacometti, about the way that it opened up to the space and environment around it. But the physicality is so much in Donatello - every hand and foot is clutching and holding and doing and affecting the thing it's clutching, holding and acting on. So the physicality runs absolutely throughout, yes. That certainly is a strong aspect.
- BD I wanted also to raise one thing, coming back to that question of an opposition of countering and.... I thought you raised something important, Brendan, when you were talking about the Richter in terms of the "they" and the question of a homelessness pertaining to a social space rather than necessarily a kind of a physical space, because I think that's a little bit what maybe I'd indicated with the Japanese

example I was looking at, that in a sense there's no such thing as being grounded or at home other than through some kind of performative activity.

BP It's interesting to evoke cultural differences here, because we have, let's say, European inheritance of cultural expectation of centrality, like the Civic Square or the great thing set up or the great monument, and I think the great museum inherits that and the expectation of the great work, the great artist, the major figure, all of these kinds of things. And in both of your cases, you showed instances that work against that in a kind of way, that move to improvisation, the temporary, the peripheral, the unexpected, these kinds of things. I set it up within the cathedral, as it were! But yes, it's a social space, and a set of expectations of a certain kind. But if we're thinking about homelessness, we're thinking about belonging. It's not a place; it's what we expect and who it might belong to, what we might expect in relation to it. I remember going to the Dia Foundation and coming out after having looked at the work there, and there was a group of younger people there, and one turned to the other after coming out and said "Well what do you make of that?" The other said "What is it that is for me?" Is this for me, in some kind of way? So, what am I there to do? What is my role in this? What is my place here? That kind of thing.

AQ It's a marvel, isn't it? The Dia Foundation.

BP The Dia Foundation, yes, I found there plenty for myself to engage with, and some very good and quite differentiated displays. But I'm a specialist, as it were; I'm used to looking at these things.

BD That's what I was thinking; it's interesting now because you get such a tendency in so many museums now of looking for the kind of spectacular as a way of making things more accessible, and is that the same thing as belonging or is that something quite different?

JM There's a big difference between the spectacle and the performative, which you have in the nature of any experience of those works in Seattle or Vancouver that were being produced under instruction, and what those kinds of instructions enabled, how much flexibility it enabled, how much interpretive-ness could come into the realisation of the work. But then also where the work itself resides; and then does it reside as a set of instructions which can be enacted in one's head rather than performed, which is quite different.

BD The Spectacle is something that is completely prefabricated and doesn't leave that kind of sense of openness, which I think that performative and the instruction context is completely different from.

JM It sort of enables an interiorisation of it, so that it becomes absorbed by the person who is doing it, who is making it, and they actually take it on and realise that.

BP What was that first image you showed with a bag?

JM That is one ton of sand, and that was what I needed to make its first incarnation after 1968. So I got a ton of builders' sand delivered.

BP So this is documentation of your project?

JM Yes indeed.

BP I thought it was an actual work.

JM No, it's one ton of sand in a builder's sack, before it became the work.

CH I am curious though, as a maker, what the effect on sculpture might be if it got more involved with actual social spaces, I mean architectural, and all architecture has necessarily a function socially. I'm just curious as to how that would affect sculpture and in what way, if it actually had a different relationship with already set up, built, made social spaces.

BP We've got a lot of bad examples.

CH Indeed.

BP Including Barry Flannigan unfortunately, the piece that's in Lincoln's Inn Fields.

JM Camdonian.

BP Not one of his best. But there are some atrocious things.

CH I think this is maybe one place to say I think the difference between homeless and belonging is absolutely not the same as the difference between public and private. I mean, as much public art could be called homeless as anything else. So I think it's useful to get that sort of comparison out the way really.

BP So you're thinking of an analogy with the piece of yours that you showed which was done in somebody's house, and other opportunities of that kind as possible for interaction.

CH That was a one-off, but how that might in the longer term or the broader term affect sculpture, I don't know.

JM You think about it as plastic realisation of space, as with that work; and that the architecture drives a different way of thinking about sculpture?

CH Possibly. Or the involvement of a sculptor or an artist with that architecture.

JM As part of a team.

CH Yes.

BD Rather than a piece of work plonked into a space.

CH Exactly. I mean, I can't say what effect, but it makes me curious. As I say, as makers you're always thinking about what next? What might happen next?

JM Clearly a lot of buildings are sculptural in how we experience them.

CH This rather reinforces what David Smith said, which, as I say, I read in Alex's book - he came to the conclusion that they are two autonomous disciplines. So I'm wondering how that might be questioned, challenged.

Bernice, Jo, Brendan, thank you very much.

Audience Applause

End of Session 1