

## Session 2 No Particular Place To Go

### Speakers:

**John Plowman**  
**Joy Sleeman**  
**Catherine George**  
**Audience (Rest of Attendees)**

### Identified as:

**JP**  
**JL**  
**CG**  
**AQ(Audience Questions)**

### John Plowman

Hello there I'm John Plowman I would like to start by saying that unfortunately Robert Burstow is unable to join us today. At the end of this session I'll show his power point presentation and read through his notes so we can get his contribution into the mix today.

It was two years ago that I first came across the term "Homeless Sculpture" and its been preying on mind ever since. It was a term I had never come across in any meaningful way in thirty odd years practicing as an artist. Although re-reading various texts from this period (and earlier) in preparation for today I now understand its relevance to any discussion around sculpture and its histories. I want to talk about three things, of being lost, a notion of perambulation and of being indifferent. Of feeling lost has always been very applicable to me as an artist it's a determining condition of me being a sculptor always trying to find out where I am.

So in order, for me, to make sense of this idea of homeless sculpture, let's start at the beginning. We can trace the terms origins to an essay by Rainer Maria Rilke about Rodin published at the beginning of the last century in which he describes Rodin's work as *'isolated, self-contained things and cut off from the world in a sculpture studio.'* Going on to posit sculpture as a thing, an object, autonomous in the world but not of it lost in the studio this idea of being lost in the studio is something I can really relate to. Applicable not only to the sculpture, a lot of stuff has been chucked away over the years, but also to the sculptor.

Last year I undertook an artist's residency in Linz Austria and so I spent some time there. I like running, a form of perambulation, for my daily run my route would take me along the banks of the River Danube and I'd be confronted with this scene of a busy social space, a faux sandy beach, replete with deckchairs, bar and eatery. Located directly in front of one of Linz's significant pieces of architecture, the Brucknerhaus Concert Hall. After my residency finished I returned to the UK before returning to Linz at the end of the year for an exhibition. I continued with my daily run (perambulation) along the same route as it was now out of season the vista in front of the Brucknerhaus was completely different. The faux beach scene had gone and I was curious as to what that was, what was that lump of rust that I could see there appearing as it were from nowhere. It transpired that it's actually a sculpture by Eduardo Paolozzi commissioned at the same time as the

Brucknerhaus was opened in 1974 and has remained in this location since that time.

Because we'd been working on this event for a couple of years the discovery of this sculpture was like gold dust to me, this sculpture became a paradigm for the topic we are discussing today. It's been beached up on the shoreline; it's stranded on this desert island. Here is a sculpture that encapsulates this idea of being lost it's actually lost in the world. Epitomised by William Tucker's observation that '*The world can evidently do without sculpture, sculpture cannot do without the world*'.

There's another sense of being lost that I want to touch on and this is about this idea of being lost in the museum. The two sculptures that I've selected that are part of the display here are by Jack Waldron the tall one and is titled "The Tower" and the other by Ulrico Schettini entitled "Bridge", the architectural references of each of their titles are pertinent to our discussions today. For it was sculptures traditional relationship (reliance on?) to architecture that provided the backdrop to Rilke's essay on Rodin's sculpture. Which celebrated the divorce of sculpture from architecture the beginning of the last century.

My main interest in these two sculptures was the fact that they have never been exhibited at The Whitworth, so this is the first time they've been available for public viewing since they were acquired by the collection in the 1960's. As an aside, Jack Waldron was a sculptor who was shortlisted for the International Sculpture Competition for the Unknown Political Prisoner in the early 50's and exhibited his entry alongside the other 11 British finalists that included Lynn Chadwick, whose work is also in the display here, Eduardo Paolozzi. In much the same way that the Paolozzi sculpture I showed earlier was lost I've been thinking about the idea of Jack Waldron as a lost sculptor, there's not much, if any information about him, from a cursory research on line. Another interesting point for me is that his sculpture was bought from an exhibition in Manchester at the Manchester Institute of Contemporary Arts and I haven't been able to find any information about this organisation apart from some correspondence I've had with a woman who is ninety years old and she can actually remember going to this exhibition and she used to sit on the committee, but there's nothing else that seems to exist about the Manchester Institute of Contemporary Art.

So these two sculptures are, I would suggest, lost in the museum, in the architecture both in the physical sense and metaphorically and have, like the Paolozzi sculpture, been rescued albeit for a short amount of time today, they have been made visible. Daniel Buren has said that '*the work that ends in a museum is forever both in its place and at the same time in a place which is never its own.*' As today's even bears witness, I am interested in the temporal aspect of how these sculptures have become visible through the bringing together of people (bodies) to congregate in a particular space for a specific

duration. To look, talk and importantly walk around the sculpture and the space they occupy.

I want to briefly explore this notion of perambulation I like it as a word, in particular of people moving through a space. Perambulation is an activity in which the body is an essential component and I want to talk about Richard Serra in this respect. I am interested in Serra because he talks about the importance of topology of place that puts the onus on the viewer to activate a sculptural experience for them. What I see happening today is not dissimilar so I would propose that perhaps the body should be considered as an autonomous object in much the same way as the sculpture.

As we have seen the Paolozzi sculpture was commissioned and sited alongside the Brucknerhaus Concert Hall in Linz creating a somewhat tenuous link to architecture and the tectonic or as Serra has stated about such sculpture, *'it's studio made and site to adjusted'*. In this incarnation it had no regard for topology of place, however in its new incarnation, as part of the faux beach scene it's relationship to architecture and the tectonic is more assured but at the same time disconcerting whereby the surrounding architecture is encroaching on the sculpture.

Bringing to mind a sculpture by Richard Serra 'Gravity' which is at the Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington having a synergy of sorts with the Paolozzi. Serra talks about sculpture *'as a structuring of materials here in order to motivate the body and demarcate a place and it's not a fixed category of autonomous objects but a specific relay between subject in sight that frames the one in terms of the other and transform both at once.'* So the sculpture 'Gravity' is the embodiment of this ideal in the way it functions by directing the viewer to make a decision, to go left or right, up or down.

The question I pose is could perambulation be a way to reconnect sculpture with architecture again. To finish on this idea of indifference with a quote from William Tucker who said that *'There is no public realm in our time to which a public sculpture might get visual purpose. Among the art a sculpture is peculiarly prone because of its literal abjectness to kind of entropy in terms of human habituations and in nurture, both in the artist and the spectator, that is the physical object has a greater immediacy than a painting, but correspondingly tends to lose its presence with time, simply because it's physically there and familiar'* and to paraphrase, sculpture functions to cut things off from the world of objects, it can also I would suggest cut off the world of people.'

### **Joy Sleeman**

It was Rosalind Krauss who perhaps most emphatically wrote of homelessness as the condition of modern sculpture. She set out her ideas about sculptures relationships to landscape and architecture in her famous essay Sculpture in the Expanded Field, which was written in New York in 1978 and published in October Magazine in 1979.

Around the time Krauss began formulating her ideas of Sculpture in the Expanded Field, sculptor Roelof Louw had already developed his sculpture of place, articulated in sculptures and in 1977 in words in an article published in *Tracks*, a journal of artist's writing. *Sites/non-sites*, Smithson's influence on recent landscape projects is ostensibly an essay about the impact of the work of Robert Smithson on his own and others recent sculpture. But it formalised in words aspects of a decade of Louw's sculpture investigation into the genius of place.

Louw's notion of a sculpture of place was both a response to the particularities of a specific place or type of place and in an attempt to render the experience of that place sculpturally. 'Untitled' 1968 is one of a series of works from a transitional stage in Louw's work and it began here in Stockwell Depot a huge ex-brewery building in South London. Louw took up a studio space here in 1967 and showed work in the first two annual exhibitions in 1968 and 1969. So Stockwell Depot was then both a studio and an exhibition space.

Louw made several works like this using sand blasted and painted scaffolding poles. Tate and I say this is possibly a sculpture, possibly a photograph of TO1250. Tate acquired their untitled scaffolding work after Louw showed work in the exhibition "British Sculpture out of the Sixties" at the ICA in 1970. This was an exhibition famously lampooned by Bruce McLean in a review in *Studio International* as not even crumble crumble. It's never been shown. I tried to see it while I've been writing a book on Roelof Louw and I was told that they don't even have a space big enough in the store to assemble it. So this is why we can't know for sure whether this is possibly a photograph of it, because the only photographs that exist are black and white.

So Louw's work of this period was also a direct engagement with William Tucker's ideas that John's already mentioned and particularly his ideas about the conditions of sculpture. Louw was working very closely with Tucker at the time teaching at St Martins and in this work Louw invited viewers to step over the low pole which you see on the right hand side and to be inside the work. This crossed the line both for William Tucker and also for Anthony Caro. For Caro, sculpture is something out of which you are, outside of which you are and through this gesture of stepping into the sculpture, Louw instigates a clearing, a place to stand from which to view the surroundings rather than a thing to be viewed from the outside. He showed how the sculpture could create a site as well as respond to a site.

Here in this image then, the work is in Louw's studio. To quote "*It is in the studio and only in the studio that the work is closest to its own reality.*" This is something that Daniel Buren said and he went on to say "*A reality from which it will continue to distant itself. It is therefore only in the studio that the work may be said to belong.*"

My second example is a sculpture called "Place" by Magdalena Jetelová located in the Forest of Dean. It's a work that became popular and iconic. It

became The Giant Chair. You can see here it was the work that was on the guidebook to the forest trail and on the right hand side this is me and my mum visiting it in 1992 when I'd just begun my PhD on Landscape and Land Art. It was commissioned in 1985, installed in 1986 and decommissioned last year when it became unsafe. Some of the timber from the sculpture was turned into charcoal and here's the burn with it being turned into charcoal fulfilling part of the artist's original intention for the work when she first made it, to be charred onsite. You see her here, this is Magdalena Jetelová on the left hand side and standing next to her Onya McCausland who turned some of the charcoal from the burn into a new work on the site which is called "Coal Measures" and this is a work that traces on the ground, the coal seams that exist beneath the ground.

So now place is just a site. A home without a sculpture or perhaps a sculpture less home. Heidegger a thinker who has already been referred to by Brendan, wrote in his essay, "Building, Dwelling, Thinking" about how instead of connecting the banks of a river, the bridge causes the banks of the river to lie across from one another. The bridge calls the river crossing into being, it creates a milieu, a place for dwelling and it's interesting that Heidegger first presented this in a lecture on the housing crisis in Germany in the early 1950's. Dwelling then for Heidegger is not just about homes and houses, but other structures that are part of human's dwelling on earth, bridges, airport terminals, factories, studios.

Jetelová's place is still a place of dwelling, even if the sculpture that called it into being is no longer there and this is a group of people from the Forestry Commission of England standing on the site last month at a sculpture conference in the Forest of Dean.

In Krauss's Sculpture In the Expanded Field, sculpture is a negative condition, not landscape, not architecture. By being both a response to and the making of a place, Louw's and Jetelová's sculptures generate a sculptural place that can be entered into and from which to view the world, perhaps a place to go when there's no place to go. A place that particularly in Jetelová's case can continue to exist, even when the sculpture no longer exists.

### **Catherine George**

Hello I'm Catherine George and I think that notion is exactly what I was thinking of when this notion of No Particular Place To Go that is the title of this session. This question of the place, what happens when the sculpture's gone before the sculpture, was really what I was thinking when I thought these slides would be interesting to look at which are possibly not really sculptures at all.

So I want to start off with the fourth plinth as one of three propositions around this question of no particular place to go. This is part of the classical architecture space of Trafalgar Square and since 1840 has stopped being used and then 1999 obviously became a series of installed sculptures that are

then moved onto other things. A constant through flow of sculptures whose origins are in thinking about this place but don't remain here which then become homeless by necessity because of the nature of the commission. So that was my first thought and then obviously around that and that one reflecting the shape of it and it's kind of blankness has always struck me as a very interesting installation in that respect and that perhaps there remains a connection there, a call between wherever that piece is and its instantiation on that site.

So this struck me very much very literally this question of architecture with a niche in the image for today's event and that takes me onto something else and I think with all of these three suggestions that I'm putting forth today, they're very familiar, we're very used to looking at these and I think I'm suggesting that perhaps if we look at these in another way in relationship to this question of where we're going and place and looking and particularly in this one, when you were discussing earlier about the performative and the act of the performative and this is an extraordinary height. It's an extraordinary height of an object, obviously Luytens 1919 commissioned as a catafalque to be paraded past both in mourning and in celebration at the end of the conflict and something that I think is most activated at that Sunday event every year and a tremendously powerful marker of a place and I think that's one of the things about it that perhaps connects it to the fourth plinth, how it marks a place and something that often comes to my mind when I'm visiting like megaliths and how they mark a place and how our understandings of those very simple forms and ancient history informs our notion of rights of gathering, rights of coming together and again this made me think again of your wonderful beach photo and that Paolozzi and that strange gathering looking beyond it of which it is being ignored.

So there's something about the physicality and the scale of this, it actually does have the wreaths carved on the top, but obviously at height we can't really see. This is slightly at one remove to the absence, the absolute absence of the plinth in Trafalgar Square and that takes me onto the final one which is actually a feature of the work of William Wilkins, a Victorian architect and this is the Grange in Northington. But it was Wilkins that designed the National Gallery so we've got this blank of the pediment, this very pure Greek revival architecture that Wilkins championed after his own travels in the Mediterranean. With this blank pediment which of course is where the sculptures have fallen out of, where the sculptures have been lost from if we're thinking about the Parthenon and the Acropolis and those sorts of places and yet in his career he was putting this forward as a closed and complete architectural resolution.

So we've got that and then at UCL as well and I studied at UCL with Joy and when I found that image which is so different to the now, the business of Gower Street of the hospital and everything around Euston Station and what struck me is the conception of that as a university, a university without a religious background to it, a university for everyman and this sort of

extraordinarily bold architectural design and yet with this blank, working completely against many of the other Victorian intonations of values of science and industry and all sorts of things through those types of pediment sculpture that Wilkins put forward, the blank and that's it. I wanted to introduce those to the conversation today.

### **John Plowman**

Ok so in the absence of Robert Burstow, I'm just going to run through his slides and read from his notes. I think some of his notes are pertinent to what has been brought up thus far.

So Robert's slides are about the Festival of Britain and the Exhibition of Sculpture on the South Bank. That's an aerial view and these are David McFall, Karen Johnson, Sikhfish Saroo, Carol Vogel and students and Daphne Hardy Henrian. These are all arts council commissions, that's Epstein, that's Moore, that's Hepworth.

Robert has mentioned here the legacy of the programmed of sculptures that Henry Moore is in Harlow, the Ralph Brown is also in Harlow, lucky Harlow, and Franta Belsky is in Stevenage and Sikhfish Sharoo is in High Bressington on the Quadrant Estate.

So in his notes he's talking about the conventional wisdom of modern sculpture being homeless and he will talk about Greenburg and modernism asserted the autonomy of art, its homelessness. He would have referenced Rosalind Krauss, the same passage that Joy referred to earlier this idea of sitelessness. So he would talk about removing sculpture a from the social political economics sphere. Public sculpture and early post-war Britain undermines these claims, continues into more modern movements of support for unity, integration of the arts. Unity of the arts is one what in which sculpture can require a home. So he would have cited the South Bank Exhibition of sculptures as an example of that.

He said that the Arts Council of Commission offered sculptures autonomy. There are three major modern sculptors, Epstein, Moore and Hepworth. They imposed themes to sculptures, family/discovery but did not insist on the artist carrying those out.

The director of the art department told Hepworth, we want our sculptors to do what they are moved to do and not necessarily to accommodate their ideas to the temporary surroundings of the festival. He is saying that Henry Moore played down the relationship of his sculpture to site, more stressed its autonomy, its homelessness, claimed not to care where the sculpture was sited. *'I don't worry about where it was placed, if I had studied the Festival Site too carefully, the figure might never have been at home anywhere else. As it was I made the figure and then found the best position I could.'* But he's saying that this was a retrospective view after he'd actually finished the commission and it's consistent with other views that Moore espoused. The best architects of my generation were persuaded not to have sculpture on a

building but outside it in a spatial relationship to it and the beauty of this idea of spatial relationship is that the sculpture must have its own strong separate identity. But Moore only said this when the sculpture had to be moved from a temporary home in the grounds of Temple Newham House.

There are some quotes from Barbara Hepworth here that she's stating that she was pleased to work for specific site and reply took to the officer of the commissioner is particularly the nature of sculpture to be inspired by the site, the site conditions the form. She also went on to say, "For the sculpture it was almost the very reason for their being and I shall be especially delighted". Too many years have passed working in a vacuum, endlessly working for hypothetical sites. So I suppose that's this idea of art as a sculptor, lost in the studio and being lost in the studio so there's something to be said for that.

Let me just read his conclusion.

British modern sculptors in the 1950's were willing to make sculptures on a given theme and for a given site. The unity of the arts gave sculpture a home. That unity has a political dimension. The extent to which modern sculpture was sometimes a specific response to a site/home obscured by later retitling ignorance of the original commissioning and exhibiting detail. He was saying that Epstein, Moore and Hepworth do not conform to the idea that modern sculpture is nomadic. He's questioning whether they were modernist and asking whether Kraus was mistaken or limited in her perspective when she was writing about the idea of the homeless sculpture.

### ***Discussion and Q & A***

JS I have had a question for both of you and Robert if he had been here, which is just thinking about how a lot of our discussion was about space and place, but actually all of us ended up talking about the temporary and time. Your Luytens work is activated on that particular event isn't it, it has a kind of gathering and John, your great photograph of the Paolozzi is a kind of gathering place and the temporal event and in Robert's *The Festival*, is the sculpture brings that gathering together as well and in 'Place', even in the absence of that sculpture being there in the Forest of Dean, it's still this collective gathering place, so they have a kind of temporal nature, they exist for maybe quite short periods of time rather than the idea of a sculpture is sort of permanent, which is a lot of what I think Tucker and drawing on what Rilke was talking about, this eternal sense of sculpture, it's a very temporal.

JP Yes. I think Charles's last comment or question was about sculpture in a social place and when you were saying that I was thinking about that Paolozzi on the seaside there. When you're all talking about this sort of absence with sculpture going where, I was also thinking about Rachel Whiteread's house, there's no sense of where that is except in



people's memories, people actually went and saw that. As far as I'm aware, there's no marker and no evidence.

CG Yes, again because it's all been built over hasn't it.

JP Yes, there's nothing really left there now.

CG I think the temporal was underpinning a lot when I was putting those images together and as I say, that's quite a literal way in terms of a commission. That kind of constant ceaseless almost commissioning something and I don't live in London any more, but when I lived there, it was not that that was empty, which is why again there was always a relationship for me between the plinth and the cenotaph, because the plinth has never felt empty. The absence of it speaks I think to the militaristic nature of that site and in terms of what's memorialised on that site and almost again in the blankness of the Serra, when you showed the Serra at the Holocaust memorial, again there's a blankness that struck me in relationship to these very complex relation around life and death and war and things and the temporality of existence that's going on as well.

JS That would fit very well with Magdalena Jetelová's original intention for 'Place', because her idea was that this piece would exist for a short period of time and then it would be burned on site like a funerary right and that articulates her kind of political sense at that time. She made it in the mid to late 1980's, she'd moved from what was then Czechoslovakia to Germany and she's very much reflecting on what was happening and I guess led to those events in 1989 and the changes in Europe at that point. It has a kind of temporal moment and I think yes very much about death and destruction and a change of order or a change of resume.

CG I have a question actually and it comes from your reading just then from Robert Burstow as he was closing then. Since you discuss Krauss as well, was Krauss mistaken?

JP In what way?

JS In saying that modern sculpture was homeless, that was its condition?

CG Yes.

JS I think she sets it up as a straw man doesn't she to be able to say that now that there's a reconnection. We know very well what sculpture is, it's monumental, it sits in a particular place, it talks in an allegorical tongue about the meaning and use of that place and then it breaks down and Rodin's her classic example and then we have this new articulation of where sculpture relates to place in the expanded field. So in a way it's almost like it's a rhetorical device in order to make that transition. So I think it is a bit of a straw man.

- JP I was interested in the Louw sculpture you were talking about and Tucker's reaction to people stepping over. Was it a step too far?
- JS It was definitely a step too far.
- JP I was thinking also about Philip King's sculpture because what Louw was doing, they're sort of enclosures aren't they. It's an act of enclosure of space but allowing the body, the viewer to enter into that space, but Philip King also made some mesh type sculptures, sort of enclosures of an interior. I'm not sure if they were made around the same time.
- AQ A bit later.
- CG I think at around the same time that Tucker made the pieces, when he was in the Venice Biennale which are again like tent shapes and things, but again you can enter into imaginatively but not physically. But I was just thinking even before that, one of Philip King's breakthrough sculptures was a sculpture called "The Window" which is not unlike the bridge sculpture; it's just a very simple window shape. So I think they articulate this sense of moving through them or there is an interior to them but you're not physically invited to step into it.
- JP But who else was working with Louw at Stockwell depot? Who was next door?
- JS Peter Hide or Roland Brenner, Roger Fagan. Most of the sculptors who were working there at that initial stage, were making large scale constructed sculpture and you can see Louw doing that with those scaffolding pieces, but at the same time he's beginning to make works that are outside, in the city as well as in that space.
- JP It seems like a deliberate act of provocation on his part. A to actually site the piece in the studio with these other sculptors working there because perhaps it was a provocative act and again perhaps it only existed in the temporal moment of its making.
- JS As it happens, that is all because some of them he just disassembled and they disappeared, but that piece exists, it's in a major collection but it hasn't been shared.
- AQ He did do various incarnations.
- CG They also travelled to Norway and Sweden and in New York. So they travelled quite widely at the time, so they were kind of visible at a particular moment and then they're not shown after that.
- AQ All those sculptors at that time were using space, expanding, they weren't working with a tight core. All that group of sculptors were all making quite open sculpture and I know they were all influencing each other at that time, from what I can remember. It didn't last for long.

AQ There's another way in which the Festival of Britain's Sculptures had an attachment to time. It's the inheritance of the South Bank and a certain ethos of what is taken to be and what aspires to be collective. It's as if you've got a kind of archaeology of ideas of the collective which in 1951 has this kind of social democratic ethos and of course it embodies modernity and sculptors can be seen retrospectively as belonging to it, but through different traditions like the Sharoon. There is the kind of social realist family, the mother, father and the child, the heroic mother, father and son and so forth and this is kind of aspiring, straining, a future facing pose and so on and so forth. But it's interesting that they should go to new towns some of them, which are kind of instalments of modernity with these kinds of connotations. But then the South Bank now is invested with other ideas of the popular with a kind of commercial exploitation as if kind of desecration, a sort of systematic rubbishing.

JP Also, it's a social space isn't it now, even more so.

AQ Yes a conception of a social space where this isn't some kind of way implicitly imbued with a kind of value or set of ideas, something is to be disseminated from it. Not as a sort of deliberate project because you were talking about there are instructions, but they're sort of open liberal instructions. It's not as if we're telling you what to do, but there is a certain common ethos which of course is embodied in Coventry Cathedral in another kind of way, gets transplanted there.

AQ I think Brendan's point raises an interesting issue about the sort of common assumptions around the nature and function of sculpture in public places like social democracies or a humanist notion which I suppose could be seen in two ways, one is the idea that sculpture in the sense humanises a space and also is a sort of participant in the creation of a kind of relatively traditional notion of a public space and that is something that really has disappeared I think and I mean Joy, I think you put it rather nicely, wasn't it Kraus put the most polemical case against that in a way by saying anything like that is going to have pretensions to significance and monumentality which just are completely against the ethos of any kind of critical sculptural practice and this made me think. What's sort of odd looking back on that nowadays is that we're now in a situation where there are lots of quite significant works that are being created as relatively traditional markers of place and memorials like the Rachel Whiteread Holocaust Memorial and that sort of thing.

So we can see three phrases here of a sort of social democratic notion, this kind of radical deconstructed moment that moves sculpture out more into the field of land, art and so on and so forth and now where there doesn't seem to be the same worry about creating works that have that sort of weight and I think also what one has is that sort of

middle moment was very much something that privileged the idea of sculpture as an intervention and a performance and that still continues in a big way. That's a sort of ongoing practice. But there's the sort of notion, well a sculpture is also a thing that's permanently there and it operates in a different way, or it's a little bit more like architecture or it has to accept the fact that it's just going to be used like architecture become a general part of the landscape. But I don't think we have the same sense that there's something deeply inauthentic about sculpture attempting to do that nowadays and there I think there has been quite a big shift since the Rosalind Krauss moment.

JS I think the moment that she leads us to at the beginning at that essay, when she says "Towards the centre of a field there's a hole", she leaves you on the edge of that Mary Miss sculpture which is the kind of the hole in the ground and the ladder going down into it. I don't think that has the same kind of troubling sense for us now that it did for her readers. She tries to really bring them to this point of teaching on the edge of an abyss and I don't think that's an abyss that we've experienced and I know when I read that essay with my students, that there is an acceptance of that mode of spectral experience that is not one of an anxious feeling, it's of a quite accepting feeling of that as being a sculpture and a marker of place,

CG Like an empty plinth being not empty.

AQ I have a question to take it completely off track that relates back to the being lost idea and of then the notion of these sculptures being lost in collections and it's to do with them being discovered through that kind of rummage or that idea of going to find something that has been lost, that's away from the familiar or away from something that's known. I guess that from your standpoint of it, is there something there actually that there's a value in something having had this length of time away from public view, that actually that becomes something that makes it more noticeable because of its absence?

JP I think it possibly has other layers and meanings and I say this in response with reference to the project which I work with Charles, when I did some research on the Henry Moore issue into 1970's Sculpture and focused on a sculpture that Charles made in 1976 called "At the Foot of Borobudur" and as part of that project we brought it out of the Arts Council Collection, in which it had been languishing since it was bought in 1976. I think it was shown once or twice, but for thirty years or so it had actually been in the collection and I know that my point of view and it was a similar sort of situation, there was this interest in bringing people together around this particular sculpture and really talking about the sculpture and it did add or added new layers of meaning, certainly from the people that attended, people who can

remember seeing it in 1976 and people that were actually new to the piece.

So I think even these two pieces, well even all of these pieces, but certainly from my point of view the two pieces that I've selected, it's really sort of wetted my appetite to actually find out more about these two sculptors. Jack Waldron fascinates me because he is almost like invisible. There is some paper documentation in the archives here of a letter that he wrote in response to some questions after it was purchased and also to the Manchester Institute of Contemporary Art, what was that all about and is the Whitworth aware of this organisation that was having these seemingly sort of radical exhibitions in the fifties or whatever, what was going on? So it's like a history that's sort of hidden, it's invisible at the moment and I suppose it's through delving, although you can't literally rummage. Obviously we would love to rummage along the racks in the storeroom here to actually peek under the bubble wrap and the tissue to see what there is there.

AQ Does it make it more noticeable because it's been absent?

JP I think it does because 'At the Foot of Borobudur' is a case in point when it was installed at the Longside Gallery, at the Yorkshire Sculpture Park it was photographed and now that photograph, it was used in that exhibition, "Making it Sculpture In Britain 1977-1986". So it's the image in the archive now, so it's only through that incarnation, that sort of remaking if you like, that re-installation of the piece. So the answer is yes.

AQ I'd be worried if any sculpture that had been hidden from view was the fact that it has been hidden from view. I mean there's got to be more reason to look at it.

JP But that would be the reason you want to look at it isn't it is because it's been hidden from view.

AQ That's what I'm questioning, I mean there's got to be some interest in these sculpture behind otherwise it's a sort of purely academic exercise which we're not engaged with actually. In other words, if the interest, the meaning is because it's been hidden from view.

AQ It's the converse of the classic situation where a monument is put out to somebody in order that the person wouldn't be forgotten. So it's the opposite of that. If something that hasn't been seen is brought forward, then we look at it afresh because we haven't got a set of standard expectations that make us ignore the thing that's been there all the time. It hasn't been there or it's been there all the time, but this is not like anything else. It's like how do I take this so we're back at the beginning with it and that's what's so difficult to achieve is the thing that's always in front of us in the public space like of course the Paolozzi piece which is a classic case, that everybody is ignoring and

there it is. It's a bit of the furniture, so it's the bringing something to light.

JP Also bringing it to life, it's that bit and I think it's that interaction with bodies, with us here today.

AQ To come to that, then obviously Serra's strategy is that we can't ignore it because we are disturbed and disoriented in our encounter with it.

JM I think were we seem to be going at the moment is towards something which is not an academic exercise, but a sense of responsibility enabling things to come out of sync and be re-perambulated with, so this out of syncness to create a new dialog with something that has been overlooked or forgotten for whatever reasons. So one can be driven by holy grail quests for something particular and hope to find something in an archive which one has a sense about or in terms of speaking to somebody who was around at the time and what they might have seen and how some of these things obviously become extremely important in the immediate but are then forgotten about and it's this forgetting about those things and where that memory or trace of it actually resides that becomes another form maybe of social practice and social sculpture. So the traces of that enactment are something.

JP Yes I think that's really important, that idea of memory is remembering, because the events alongside, a lot of that, certainly from my point of view is all about memory. It's about my memory of seeing that piece in 1976, as were a lot of the people who actually came to the event.

AQ I wonder John if you could elaborate more on the consciousness, the different in consciousness between the Paolozzi and the Serra in their placement or being and formation within a space. The last comment by Jo about forgetting and remembering, there's certainly an inertia that becomes part of perhaps the Paolozzi piece for its length of time and permanence there and visibility there. There's a kind of different phenomena that begins to happen but I am hoping that you might develop the difference of consciousness between perhaps the nature of Serra in a place and the nature of how Paolozzi was thinking.

JP Well I think the Paolozzi, it's in a state of abeyance, it's not functioning as a sculpture, where the Serra as Brendan as indicated, is very much in your face and whenever I confront or stand in front or walk around a Serra my body is empathising with it, it's really instructing me it's telling me which way or how to actually move round the piece. It's so sad what's happened to that Paolozzi it's mute.

AQ There's something about its own horizontality that it almost seems that it might have invited that fate and maybe that was partly what he was interested in as that as a possibility because there's something about its horizontal nature that you aren't always going to see it, there's something interesting about that I think.

- JP True, very true, but along the banks of the Danube though, there's a series of big constructed metal sculptures, I can't remember how many are there but when I was there they were all covered in graffiti, so there's another story to be told about the fate. When should a sculpture on common ground be decommissioned? Does sculpture have a lifespan? Does it need to have a specific lifespan? Should it be taken away?
- AQ If the people who run the place actually had some concern for having this sculpture and didn't built a walkway around it. They could frame it in a better way.
- JP They'd obviously thought about framing it because the decking was really well done.
- AQ I think this business about rediscovery or reactivation can happen as much for sculptures that have been around for some time. John, in a sense you did something for the Paolozzi. I actually found that picture of it you reactivated it in a way, you drew attention to it and I think we all have that sense when you're interested in a public sculpture or a work somewhere and you go and see it and it's completely ignored and nobody is looking at it and you know, it's almost kind of fun reactivating it yourself and you create it into your own kind of found art object as it were. So I think the other thing to remember is there were a number of Richard Serra's that have fallen into decrepitude and disuse and are just completely abandoned and that's part of what happened to 'Tilted Arc'. It was graffitied, it was pissed on, it could have been demolished or it could have been reactivated and it happened to be demolished. But I just wanted to ask you one question John and I think it is something specific about sculpture. If you go to an old storeroom and you see lots of paintings, you just think well there are lots of paintings hanging up. If you go into a storeroom, there is this sort of emotional feeling that the sculptures look lost and abandoned and that's an interesting point about sculptures when it's in storerooms.
- JP Yes I agree.
- AQ All wrapped up as well.
- AQ It's almost as though more has to be done to a sculpture, I mean you can bring a painting out, it looks like ready to hang almost, but the sculpture one feels that more has to be done to bring it back.
- JP It needs to be activated in a different way than a painting. It does need a body or bodies.
- JS It needs something to distinguish it from other things in the world. I was just thinking going back to how Jo made the point about how Tucker's sculpture was taken on tour to New York and to Norway and Sweden and on one occasion, the company who were moving it didn't

realise they were sculpture, because obviously they just look like bits of scaffolding, so it was really badly damaged in transit. There's something about sculpture needing to be differentiated from other things in the world and when Louw did try and make scaffolding works outdoors, he found they looked too much like the function that scaffolding always has in our environment, it didn't differentiate itself enough, so he had to find different materials to work with. Sculpture has that difficulty.

AQ What did he use?

CG Well around the same time, the work we probably know better, just before that is the Pyramid of Oranges that he made in Covent Garden, but just after that he made a work called Park Lane which are cast iron wedge shapes that are placed around blocks in the Park Lane area of London and also he made scattered wood in Holland Park which he also got Lucy Lippard to make for the number shows that Jo showed in Seattle and in Vancouver. I think finding that way of something that would be differentiated from its environment that it will both create a space, but also will articulate in a sculptural way, the experience of being in a particular place.

AQ I just wonder whether that place is a studio.

JM Well I think in this case it is and I think that's why it didn't exist outside of the studio, because I'd hazard a guess that that piece is about the experience of being in the studio and that's why it's very difficult for it to work outside the studio.

AG But still Joy, a sculpture has a kind of odd specialness because it looks out of place and disregarded, it doesn't just look like an ordinary object, it looks as if something has been done to it which shouldn't have been done to it. It's sort of as if it would demand a proper public space for itself.

JS The term in my conversations with Roelof Louw that's kept coming back, is he keeps talking about there's got to be something that structures it, that sculpture is a form of structuring and he said he realised when he was working at St Martins making sculpture, and the process of bringing one bit of metal together and welding it to another, he realised that that activity of joining the metal together was sculpture too. That structuring activity, so as you say, something that makes that sculpture