

## **Session 4 Plenary**

### **Speakers:**

**Julia Kelly**  
**Audience (Rest of Attendees)**

### **Identified as:**

**JK**  
**AQ(Audience Questions)**

**JK** So thank you very much to Clare for inviting me to chair the final part of this session. I want to pull together some of the things that we've been talking about today, so I'm going to start doing that by sharing a couple of examples with you, of things that I have been reading. This is because I was sent this paper by Gunther Stern called Homeless Sculpture which I think quite a few of you have had a look at, a very interesting essay about objects which have lost all relation to humans and have alienated them and so on. It made me think of two luckily very small books I can put in my handbag. One of them was this: "The Place of Sculpture in Daily Life", an essay by Edmund Gosse, a Victorian sculptor from 1895, edited by Martina Droth. I thought this was really good fun because it's about sculpture in the home, the Victorian statuettes small scale, little things to put in niches. It's completely the opposite of your idea of that empty niche, the image on the flyer for today's event.

I was thinking about what is a sculpture that is at home and about small-scale works of art. Why is this the stuff that's at home and not homeless? Is this because this is exactly not modernist avant guard sculpture, because homeless sculpture does seem from our discussions today to be perhaps on some levels synonymous with that concept. This is very unlike that, and the other thing about these small-scale statuettes is that they are also figurative, which also seems to be an interesting strand in thinking about homelessness and our relation to sculpture. Obviously Gunther Stern started off with the example of Rodin, looking at the figure, and obviously when you see the figure in context that maybe has a stronger, more striking relationship to you and the body and so on. I was thinking about the role of figuration in these debates and how might you see that. The figure is also quite interesting in terms of thinking these lost objects in collections. They are lost children aren't they, they're the orphan collections, there's that anthropomorphic relation to the object, which again has to do with figures, bodies, seeing these things somehow as things that are at home and have lost their home.

Another issue around these small-scale statuettes is scale and scale is obviously very important in some of the things that we've been looking at today, with this massive Chillida behind us for example. So obviously homelessness also makes us think about the scale of the domestic, the scale of the gallery space and the scale of encounter. We might also similarly think about materials and techniques in that, so

the difference between bronze casting, modelling, carving, construction and so on. The other book I was thinking about was Carl Einstein's African Sculpture from 1915: one of these classic texts defining and opening up the concept of autonomous modernist sculpture. But it's about African art and this to me was an interesting example because a non-western sculpture in this period absolutely exemplified this idea of something that's homeless: it's absolutely wrenched from its context, isolated, has lost its meaning, is a space of projection onto which any meaning can actually be put during this period. This is something that is very clear in terms of how that sort of material is received. Intended for nobody because nobody know its intentions, but it retains also that sense of a context that is then to be restored. This was also a thread that came out of the presentations today, the idea of perhaps looking to examples from other cultures which then give you an idea of how you might restore that lost context. So you have Borobudur, Japan, you might have other models of engaging with space, which are trying to perhaps somehow get back to this idea of the context that's been lost.

An African sculpture obviously also brings with it that idea of a National identity: that you've lost the original cultural ethnic identity of that artefact, and that was another idea I was thinking about just now. We might suggest a kind of international language of the modernist avant guard, which is without any specific identity. For sculpture to be homeless, does it need to be free of that kind of very obvious national identity? If you saw work that was very specifically of a particular concept and you recognised that it has to be from this particular country because of its style, we might not see that as homelessness in a sense. Already that has an imprint upon it, some kind of very obvious identity. So that sort of idea of what the national identity might mean is interesting in relation to this. Also in terms of non-western material, I was just thinking the idea of a collection of the objects that are lost and obviously the piles and piles of stuff that exist in museum stores, and the question of how we are physically actually going to deal with this in the future when its meaning becomes absolutely lost, and you don't even have any kind of framing mechanism for this sort of material. Like your sculpture that went into a skip, what happens at that point where you can't recuperate it any longer, there is no context and it's actually lost almost for good, because you no longer have an historical context to understand that kind of material. That's also about engagement with the wider public and how you might understand that.

So those are my starting points for thinking about some of the ideas that came through today, and the idea of a possible homelessness of a sculptural object. What we wanted to do here was open this up as a discussion to all of us. Your thoughts about what you've seen, talk about some of these ideas.

**AQ** I think you're absolutely right, our notion of the homeless sculpture is partly an offshoot of modernist notions of what a sculpture would be. I think part of that condition has been around for some time and I think the first instance of it was the collecting and display of famous antique sculptures in the renaissance. Those were looked upon as autonomous sculptures and fairly soon copies and plaster casts were made of them and then that brings up the idea that you often have a sense of homes being created for sculpture. The Belvedere Courtyard was a home for a sculpture that was completely ripped from its context and then restaged, and then could be restaged almost anywhere for people who commissioned copies. There's this split in sculptural practice between architecturally anchored sculptures, but all the way from the renaissance onwards, you have also a production of homeless sculptures that can go anywhere but are autonomous and to be valued for being purely autonomous creations. So there is a sort of long-term discourse around sculpture. I think sculpture is split between sited sculptures on the one hand and sculpture that forms the figure for it, which was this antique sculpture that had this somehow disembodied aesthetic value as a pure representation of something that had no particular place anywhere.

**AQ** If you take that as an example, the Belvedere Torso, it's a case of something being found or taken up which is taken from what its meaning might have been, but then coming to be what then proves to be a density of meanings. So there is a reinvention, the creation of something.

**AQ** Even Michelangelo's sculptures in the Accademia are perhaps originally intended for a tomb in the event of never being other than as they are, autonomous sculptures, even though that was not a particular thing of the time.

**AQ** These are masterpieces independently in terms of commission as it were.

**AQ** Can I say one thing about the figurative that could be an important point that's been brought up. I think in that Stern article, he talks about Rilke, talking about Rodin. Rodin's figures sort of returning to themselves and I think if I've got this right, there's a phrase in there that this is the law of figure sculpture from the past. In other words this isolation of the figure sculpture is a sort of immutable law and I remember feeling reading this that things have so changed since then, with the introduction of non-figurative artists and sculptures of so many kinds, that this law could be muted or whatever the opposite of immutable being. It's not an immutable law and it's partly because sculpture is not the isolated figure. I feel a sort of association there and a connection there somehow that the changing of that law is to do with

the opening up of non-figurative and sculpture of so many kinds. The isolation of sculpture that comes up again and again today, I think Rilke associated with Rodin and with the figure particularly, so I don't know how that plays out, but I think it's good to bring it out.

**QA** Well Rodin works against the isolation through investing the figure with pathos, an area of concern. One can easily think in more recent terms of contemporary figurative and deliberately figurative sculpture which does the opposite and it exploits objectivity to render feelings of estrangement. So this would be true of sculpture instead of made like effigies, conspicuously lifelike. It's also true of what Antony Gormley does. There is the estrangement from the thing that it is non-human.

**QA** I would say that even with some of those of Rodin, when you see the seams of joining, you're confronting that kind of disjuncture between an illusion of flesh and the fact that this is a representation of flesh and it also has an abstraction because of that, which takes it out of that assumption of figuration.

**QA** Yes when you think of taking out I think of torn away because they're always these connotations of failing in Rodin.

**QA** Something else you mentioned to do with scale, which we haven't tackled very much, and it's such an important factor with one's encounter with the sculptural piece, one way in which the raw materiality of the sculpture is offset. Well let's come back to the theme of the encounter: for there to be an encounter that pre-supposes a degree of intimacy or equality of the thing apprehended. Since the model for an encounter is an encounter with another person, scale and large scale could work with and against that, and one can sense the sculptors who are aware of that and sculptors who do not take any account of it. But also perhaps an absence of concern with scale with a loss not only of sculptors whom I see now, but in the design of spaces, of exhibiting spaces where there's a pre-disposition in favour of vastness. Perhaps partly induced by installation, but installation is attuned to space, but I think there is not always a sense of attunement to a space, for a space of encounter. I was saying earlier that a very nice intimate possibility for encounter is one you find at the Rietveld Pavilion outside the Kröller-Müller where there are places where you come upon. To come upon something and to come upon it by surprise, partly what we've been talking about is the possibility of being surprised by something and encounter pre-supposes something new.

**AQ** Since we were talking about Henry Moore, that's actually a very nice example of a scale and whether it works or not. With some of his sculpture you get the feeling about scale because of a commercial interest and it clearly doesn't work. Conversely that one for me doesn't

work because it's too small and I don't know, maybe it's the combination of the bowl and the figure, but something is a bit wrong and it's alright at that scale, but it's when you turn it into a huge public commission in a public space and you slap Henry Moore in a picture and you've got to like that, but it doesn't actually work necessarily. We need to be aware that when it comes to public spaces, there is a lot of other sorts of ashes around which have got very little to do with the aesthetics in a sense.

**AQ** The idea of a small scale and everyone thinking about maquettes in the studio and the smaller things that are actually the things the artist is engaging with and you get him looking after them rather than being out in the world where they are then blown up by the team of assistants. So there is something in sculpture that may be related to this idea of scale.

**AQ** Henry Moore's idea of the stone, the bone, picking up these objects putting them in the pocket. I like this idea of the portable sculpture that is not homeless but it's something that has a very different relationship to the body and place, an object that you carry around with you.

**AQ** When you think of the figure on a shelf, it actually works rather well. You've got to work in different modes, a sculptor can work in an intimate mode, but there can also be a way of thinking of something and it can also be quite an exciting experiment, to take something very small, which Oldenburg did very successfully on a couple of occasions, and you make it very big. Something goes on there which is really quite interesting. I think actually the two forms by Henry Moore, the little ones are kind of intriguing, and he's blown it up and I think it does sort of work on that huge scale. Sometimes it works and sometimes it doesn't, it's not necessary becoming more of the base, it's a different kind of project, a bit more kind of architectural. I was thinking with scale, when a figure does something and it ties up with what you were saying, I think there is a shift, something happens when you abandon the figure. I think what's interesting is if a figure is within a certain sort of range, nobody thinks of *The Thinker* as massively over life size, you see it just as a figure. So there's a way in which the figure invites a kind of direct correspondence between you and the figure. It can be rather smaller than life size, it can be bigger but it creates some kind of very vague sense of human scale and I suppose it's not that abstract work is inhuman but it doesn't have that inbuilt sense of projecting a sense of scale of encounter that a figure has built into it to a certain degree.

**AQ** Didn't Ruskin say that the figures in the cathedral give this huge edifice human scale visually, whatever size the figures were.

**AQ** Then you can go over the top I just saw a film recently that was a fascinating about North Korea and there was a shot of the statues of

the three great dictators which are about 75 feet high and those are just horrible and massive, there is no humanity to them at all.

**AQ** I was talking to Mike Nelson about an issue very similar to this in regard to A Psychic Vacuum and the idea of human scale installation art. He had this humongous space which was 15,000 sq. ft. and I was asking about the difference between the scale and the spectacle and is this spectacular with thousands of tons of sand in it, what does this do? He said no it's not because I've broken it down deliberately into human scale pieces, so that every space in there is human scale and the whole thing was enormous, but it was incredibly important that people could relate to it bodily, physically on a human scale.

**AQ** It's like that Ilya Kabokov building which is a huge construction, that's an interesting point of wavering between the monumental and the intimate.

**AQ** But both these positions imply a moving through, but the encounter isn't a static encounter, it has a temporality and emotion driven situation.

**AQ** I think scale does that temporality, it imposes temporality onto it because you have to experience the thing physically and temporarily. The larger it is you have to engage with it in that way. The bigger the object, the further away it gets from human scale.

**AQ** I think with the Mike Nelson that you were talking about was the fact that you have to pass through.

**AQ** Through the different parts, yes.

**AQ** There a number of sculptors in the room, I wonder as practitioners, what some responses might be to some of the things of today.

**AQ** Human scale to me in making sculpture is important in that I might make a small sculpture but I don't think I ever made one which was bigger than a couple of feet higher than I could reach. I think it's important to have that relatively intimate relationship with the sculpture rather than working on the gigantic scale.

**AQ** I was thinking more generally about the whole idea of homelessness, it feels to me like an essential motivation behind a passionate sculptors work forever, what is the relation between human and place. When you think of Donatello for instance, you think of the pushing beyond the surface, or you think of the presence of the Mary Magdalena of Donatello. Some of the works that we've seen here where there's this question of parameters and pushing through the barrier of our interior self isn't a part of our motivation, both formally looking at the field of sculpture, but also internally and with regard to our experience.

**AQ** There's a social aspect isn't there, to that motivation, connecting.

- AQ** Connecting with place yes.
- AQ** However privately it's done, the work.
- AQ** Brendan mentioned the Reitveld pavilion at the Kröller-Müller. That's something that impressed me when I first saw it, because I always felt ideally I would like to make sculpture for architectural spaces or formal outside spaces like gardens, or where there was some sense of enclosure of the sculpture and the Kröller-Müller has both. It's partly open to the sky because of the dividing walls but has a certain amount of roof and is artificially created for a sculpture. That seems an ideal to me.
- AQ** I wonder whether these might be geographically specific. I grew up in Canada where the space is huge. I think in a way the Kröller-Müller is still really quite a small space. I might have a very different sense of what might be too large and that kind of idea is almost too expensive. There's something very specifically British and Dutch, it may vary geographically, our sense of what does still does relate to the human body and what starts to alienate the human body.
- AQ** There's a tipping point where you work on a small scale in a sculpture and work on a large scale. I don't think there are any rules anyway, but there's a point where to me it expands and it's either got to that scale, or it's got to stay. There's a point where suddenly it changes and you're in control of it at this scale and suddenly you're in a completely different ball game making something larger.
- AQ** It's not a gradual continuum.
- AQ** No. I always remember that great image of Zadkine working on the sculpture and you're looking for him and he's right at the top of this huge sculpture and you think: how do you make that? The will that it's got to take to do that is unbelievable. So you've got the scale, making something work at this scale and the intimacy you need. You need that same intimacy. In my view you need it at that large scale as well, but you just have to work that. If you look at the touch and the feel of a large scale sculpture, you can't have the finger marks on it, you can't manipulate it in a way you can a small sculpture in whatever material you work in, but you can make it with just the drawing in it. Then you get some work come together very easily and in some ways you work harder. I've just realised I've got a homeless sculpture and I'm trying to think what it is and I've just realised now, we did a sculpture on the Thames seventeen years ago now in 98, and it's in the middle of the Thames in Deptford. A big sort of sphere and we're trying to get it restored, parts are corroding, but no one is owning up to owning it. We don't want to say we own it because it's a hazard to shipping, so we've got this situation where we really don't want to get the London Authority involved in it, we don't want to get Lewisham involved. We're going to

contact the Monuments Commission and see if they can see who it is registered to and we're just going to sneak on there one day and try and repair it, otherwise bits of it are going to start falling off and it really will be hazardous to shipping. This discussion has reminded me that we've really got to get started on it.

**AQ** That's an interesting strand in the discussions today, to do with helping define a sculpture in terms of its relationship to its makers and its users or its viewers because while it still has that relationship to the maker, it's not homeless in a sense that it still has those kinds of relations in place. So does it have to be then divorced from that and in the realm purely of reception to be considered homeless, or is that a simplification?

**AQ** Certainly in relation to sculptures on water, maybe if you introduce the barge project, it was this huge barge construction and you had this idea of sculptures on barges which had a place but a moveable place. Do you want to say anything more about that?

**AQ** In terms of scale, one of the inspirations for that actually was because the idea was a kind of platform for where architecture and sculpture overlapped and that on the waters, on the ocean side, the sense of scale changes dramatically for something that's water bound. Up close it can be of an architectural scale and then as it gets further out it will become within sight just a few inches high. So suddenly this transformation from being something overwhelming physically to something of a small object size, that was a kind of interesting challenge and merging between an architectural scale to a small object scale within the eye. So that was of interest in the horizontality of the water and the element of liquid and steel and air were so kind of pure that it seemed a good set of elements.

**AQ** Yes this combination too where it sort of belonged but that place itself being mobile.

**AQ** Yes and I discouraged the belonging: it was more somewhat not belonging, in a sense that the barge was integral to itself and disconnected. Like an island and so it was the ideas that would be taken on would take on a barge object as integral to its idea as well as its form.

**AQ** Doesn't that raise a very important issue which has been touched on, that once the sculpture is put up into an open space, there isn't the same control, there's many different spaces of encounter, very obviously from a great distance or from up close. What is the address of a sculpture that's put in a big open space? Is it for somebody who is standing up close or is it somebody seeing it in a distance or is it actually forming up of the same rubric of architecture where it's got to withstand all these perspectives on notes of encounter. It's got to work



as this tiny thing that you see in the distance, but then when you get up close to it, it's probably going to become something quite different really when you get up close to it or imagine yourself close to it.

**AQ** Just a completely different tangent but going back to what you were saying around the classical sculpture and that essentially becoming mobile, I think there's something interesting there also if you think back to the debates around polychromy and sculpture, because there is in that example where it was decided it had to be white. It also meant that it became homeless but it became universal, it became something that belonged everywhere. Had we seen those sculptures in their polychromatic mode, I wonder if they would have had the same kind of cultural mobility that they developed over time? Going back to the question of perception of objects and production of objects, there is something about that question: when is it homeless? Or is it actually at home everywhere; that it's understood to be a universal object.

**AQ** I wonder about the shift from the handmade and the romanticism around the subjectivity both for the artist and the viewer of the hand wrought to the colder environment. As you look at the Foster building, very carefully the Chillida I think resides between those two worlds of being manufactured and being hand wrought and I think that's a very careful decision on the sculptor in that situation. There's something conceptual and about our emphatic experience and a great profound shift that happened, and I think that part of the big question here is our passion. I can't really express it, but something about the nucleus of our passion and how we've lost it: where is it and are we just trying to get at it and not finding it?

**AQ** With most pieces that have been conceived IN a space that is a studio or any object that has been conceived in a space that's designed for that person, the individual artist and then the challenge of leaving that space which was its home and then putting it anywhere else, it's trying to keep the energy that was integral when it was being made in a completely different setting. I was at Chillida's studio not very long ago and I saw the small scale model of a hand and a replica outside, and the difference is quite extreme: it definitely looked much more at home in the studio. For me that looks quite disturbing of that image there. Maybe it's quite an obvious thing to say just as a sculptor, I guess that's a challenge isn't it to make a un-homely place appear like it's your own even though it wasn't made there.

**AQ** What scale was the studio version?

**AQ** It was a very small maquette, which was probably about that size, and I'm struggling to work out the scale of that piece, I suspect the piece outside was probably the same size

**AQ** It weighs 76 tons.

- AQ** You couldn't design a scenario as bad as that for sculpture, you've got a child's design for grass and you've got some silly, I know it's by Foster but it looks like a Terry Farrell monstrosity. You talk about the Kröller-Müller which, correct me if I'm wrong, was designed in the thirties when the Dutch were at the height of their design, when their buildings were a centimetre bigger than ours for instance and yet everything sat in the right place. They were so good at the design and the pavilion, everything they did in architecture for that short period, was just so beautifully pitched. So things are going to look good in that situation. The Kröller-Müller was a perfectly pitched, beautifully scaled park, it's not big, it's not huge, but it's really nicely proportioned. Dutch architectural at the time was at the forefront and the result is you get a beautiful place to show good work. You know if you're going to show that, you've got no idea of scale and no disrespect to the photographer, we could do with a nun in there. You need a beautiful palatial scale, something that you can get a sense of the scale of it without those buildings cluttering it up.
- AQ** I agree with you about the grass Alex the way you described it the juxtaposition and the difference between those two structures, I don't entirely agree.
- AQ** I don't disagree with Alex and I think it's right but I'd really like to see the sculpture without the building behind it.
- AQ** Charles can we just go back to the beginning of the day when you spoke about your ideal exhibition, the works that address the disconnectedness of object sculpture. Today we've learnt about sculptures that are site specific and performative, subversive in the spaces that they're in, temporal, radically self-sufficient and of huge scale. If we go from makers to curators, we've got some curators here. Is a curator's consideration of how an exhibition is organised within a space, inflected by the concern for the desire to provide art works with this home that we're talking about? So you Steve for instance have said, that doesn't look at home there, so what do curators do? What's their sort of contribution to making artworks at home or feel at home or give them the temporary home, or is that not a concern at all? Is it a conscious or unconscious thing?
- AQ** I don't know what anyone else would say, but as far as I'm concerned, the purpose of the show would not be it make any sculpture feel at home, but would actually be to demonstrate ways in which homeless sculpture, which is very much the characteristic of the last hundred and fifty years or more, how homeless sculptures have dealt with or contested, or maybe celebrated their homelessness. I don't myself feel that making an exhibition of it would be a solution, giving it a home.
- AQ** To be honest I've been sitting here just trying to get a handle of what we're talking about at the moment, trying to make sense of it and it's

very useful to go back this idea of an exhibition. Because I've been thinking, certainly over the last two minutes, that a lot of the work, in fact the majority of the work we've been talking about is outside, it's in the public realm and I'm sort of thinking how do you make an exhibition? We've discussed some aspects of a sculpture being in an interior space, but in particular in terms of its site of production rather than its site of exhibition. Its (sculptures) site of exhibition when it's shown inside is really different, and in a way it seems that that is more where this idea of being homeless, or being out of place, perhaps becomes more apparent. I'm just trying to make sense of where we're going with this. How do you make sense of this idea of being homeless in terms of work that has been specifically made? I just wonder whether it's possible. When I was thinking about it I was thinking about the Paolozzi because that to me was something that really exemplified this idea of being homeless and as I was just saying now, a lot of the things you've been talking about is sculpture that is outside, but we've talked less about work that is inside

**AQ** I wonder if that's been because of this idea of sculpture maybe from the last few centuries, a public sculpture as marking a site, as having some sort of place marking, function, so maybe that's why it hasn't been brought to the public's view. I think it is an interesting question because the moment somebody is inside, there is an idea that it should be at home in that space and maybe that's what gets thrown as well.

**AQ** One of the phrases that struck me throughout the day was yours right at the very end of your presentation when you talked of the insecure home and I think maybe could you just kind of unpick that, because maybe this is connected to what you were saying.

**AQ** Well I wanted simply to look at a limited case which is of the most impersonal kind of work and the most impersonal kind of setting where it's as far as you can get from having the work as it were, received and dedicated by the people for whom it is, whose wishes it expresses. It's more like why am I now looking at this and what is it? So the reason I selected those pieces or the Richter piece is that it evokes a kind of hope. So it reflects a condition of modernity that there isn't a place for something or an expectation for something to be set up as it were, but it evokes the early 20<sup>th</sup> century hope, the sort of utopian hope that the world can be reformed in some way. So this is the image you get, of the Gropius Bauhaus prospectus with the Feininger image and the idea of a glass architecture, and of recent skyscrapers covered in glass, the Shard is nearest to evoking those. These are visions of the future and we are living in the future and we're not wearing futuristic onesies and not having to work, or doing any of those things that the future meant or is supposed to be. We are within the corporate domain and Richter's work is such that his works are very simple and they have the capacity for drawing to them a lot of references, as if they gather from

things that are in the air culturally or something like that. It seems to me this piece does that, but it's not entirely fortuitous that plate glass is what plate glass is and what it means and what it is and what it might be. So it summons a visionary hope for a community in the context where I find myself in as desolate a space as Tate Modern, where I see glass pieces and see other people and myself through and around it and indeed we are not a community, but then that's what we have, that's what the piece says, that's why I used the example from Bresson. The man escaped, he uses the bits of furniture in the prison cell to escape from it, so he transforms it and it is insecure. The House of Cards is something insecure, so we look at the peril of that. Unlike the Serra House of Cards, it's transparent, so we see through it, we see ourselves and we see the others. But that was the insecurity I was evoking, it reflected the condition, the present and so as if it were saying "Own this, this is the material we are using, this is what we have to have." It's this particular gesture as it were, but it seems to me I wouldn't want to present that as epitomising something or other because there are so many different possibilities and extremes. One thing we haven't mentioned so much is, we've touched on materiality and the sculpture as something made. An exhibition I saw which was quite moving was the exhibition by Gego where you cannot but be moved by the making of the thing and your apprehension of it and here you feel as if you're looking, keeping it in being, you have a very personal and intimate relationship to it and that is a possibility too. Somehow she is triumphing over this condition in quite a different sort of way. At another extreme is Jeff Koons, an exhibition I haven't seen yet, where making materiality, scale, all of these things are absolutely denied. These are all part of our world.

**AQ** Well you can go one more, the Tony Cragg Show that is the most impersonal thing I've ever seen, it's just awful.

**AQ** Well his works have the character of being computer generated.

**AQ** Well they have been computer generated and not only that, somebody else designed them I think. So somebody else designed them with a little bit of input from him and then they've been manufactured by C & C Cutters, so you don't get any feeling of any persons ever been involved with them, which is obviously something he's interested in, but the overall effect is very depressing.

**AQ** There's that self-portrait.

**AQ** I actually think that although it was horrible, at least had him in it. It's like something at the end of Terminator 2 where the robot falls in to the pot of iron and its going whirl and whirl, that's what it was like.

**AQ** I think this suspicion about the input of the artist's hands is quite interesting in relation to the Gunther Stern text you were looking at

because he's using Rodin as an example of someone where the homelessness is also about frustration, it's about the loss. It's about in a sense the loss of that kind of contact, because when I was reading it, I was thinking could a Duchamp be a homeless sculpture because it's already a commodity and a reproduction and it sort of doesn't have a relationship to that particularly, it doesn't have the same melancholy thing built into it as the Rodin. Fragment does because that informs us somehow of the loss that you're trying to put back into its context, whereas with Duchamp you couldn't care less about putting it back into its context.

**AQ** The key thing about Duchamp is his idea about indifference, about being indifferent.

**AQ** So in a sense that can't be homeless.

**AQ** With Rodin it's not entirely straightforward because there's a huge amount of external manufacturing. He didn't give a damn about bronze casting. The large-scale sculptures were magnified, fabricated, so there are all sorts of interposing status. But I think there isn't a clear-cut difference. Because after all the traditional sculptural studio was working on two levels, one was handmade works by the artist, but you know a sculptor would get big commissions where it had to be outsourced to the extent where they got the cooperation of an architect, and most of it would have to be executed by studio assistants. I think that without getting too melancholy about the decline of the handcrafted, one has to recognise that there are two different kinds of sculpture projects. There's the intimate handmade kind and there's a studio architectural kind of work which sculptors have been involved in ever since sculpture was made and they have to operate in different registers. You don't walk up to a vastly expanded sculpture and expect the same refinement and handmade qualities. I mean Brancusi did that: I've never been to Tirgu Jiu; I think it's a very brilliant creation, but his hand never got near it. He created very effective work as a kind of marker for that particular space. So one is slightly more conceptual and distanced, but I think one has got to recognise that there's these two different modes. I think also on interior, John I think we come back to your point. I think one reason that we haven't discussed it so much is that the outside sculpture has two problems. With the interior space, you're given a space and the idea is that at least there's an adequate enough space to have a reasonably uninterrupted sort of personal encounter with the work. The outside space doesn't have that; there isn't that moment of control. So there's already a kind of framing in the inside and the issue of homelessness, that in most exhibitions the sculpture is not meant to be for that space: you have an adequate space and it's works that are designed to be seen in any space that is reasonably adequate to its display. So it doesn't raise the issues of homelessness in quite the same way.

- AQ** It also implies that if it's an interior space, you're going to look at it in a certain way, whereas an exterior sculpture you might just walk past.
- AQ** Also with outside sculpture is the effect of weather and the time of day according to the sun and seasons, which interest me very much. But of course if you simply encounter a sculpture just walking past or spending five minutes with it on one day, you don't get any of those qualities that the sculpture has.
- AQ** Can't you argue that Duchamp, in a kind of obviously kind of subversive way, saw the gallery as a home and was very much about finding a home? It wouldn't have been a sculpture without having found that home and that that's a home that has become very comfortable, very much abused and used, which we're extremely hyperconscious of to the point of almost confusion at this point.
- AQ** Well its home isn't it in its photograph isn't it.
- AQ** Sure, that's true too, but I think that's less of an issue here that is it's very provocative without the gallery, being the found object becoming rarefied.
- AQ** It's interesting because I actually see Duchamp and they look dumped there in this space, where as a staged unit, where you're reading a book and you see a photograph or the image of a sculpture, so I think there's a radical homelessness there in a sense that they're not really designed as gallery sculptures. The Tate Fountain is kind of stupid I think. It's ok but you wouldn't have any great experience in front of it would you.
- AQ** Well it's certainly the case with surrealist subjects like the Meret Oppenheim pieces. When you see them themselves, you're aware of their tackiness. In the Man Ray photographs, they look superb. They then can become virtual and unsettling.
- AQ** I've still in mind the question of what this exhibition might do if not give the home, which is not the purpose in my mind of the show. What I'm getting at is a lot of artists and sculptors have worked more or less aware and it's evident in work, this greater or lesser awareness of the homelessness of what they're doing. I mean Beuys is on the list of people I would consider. He makes a lot of his work, if not autonomous objects, they're objects in anonymous gallery space, but I think he was more or less deliberately trying, not in a formal way necessarily, to tap into a kind of conscious or national consciousness. There was an effort there to reach out or to connect, but it was still a very contained if not autonomous object. Another example I would be connected with is the image of the skip, is Phyllida Barlow I think whom again whose work acknowledges its temporary nature, which is an aspect of homelessness. That's one we haven't touched on, so I think it would be a show of a lot of, I mean like the Giacometti too it's an object, it's

pretty contained, but I think it, there was a phrase you just used Brendan, it fights against, so it overcomes this condition of that. I think that for me is what the purpose of this show would be.

**AQ** I thought there was an interesting correlation somebody made, I can't remember who it was between fragments of classical sculpture, without their paint on or out of their architectural context and the idea of the autonomous object from renaissance times. They were digging these objects up then somehow reproduce this idea along with lots of other political and religious messages. The autonomy of this moveable object and at some point, past the last century at the advent of modernism, all those other meanings were stripped away from the object to leave just its autonomous-ness. The quality of autonomy and that's the only thing they were left with in a lot of modernist work and I was wondering how much of a concern that is to curators and those who organise exhibitions and distribute those objects within a gallery space like this to overcome that kind of emptiness in a way.

**AQ** I think that very autonomy as you say, is the contradiction but it's also almost deliberately intending to be generalised and therefore universally accessible, I mean that's a complete contradiction, which I think is based on the body.

**AQ** The trouble with the autonomous, it suggests something congealing, solidifying in some way and that again is perhaps a struggle for the sculptor working with something material which will then become an object, but it shouldn't really be an object. It's actually somehow sustaining a creative impetus that will go on happening in some way so that could be retrieved, and it's maybe just simply the given intention, like these two opposite dimensions that the sculptor is engaged with. There's a famous article by Rodin that has been blown up and there's the industrial aspect and a moving article by Leo Steinburg about looking in Rodin's studio and opening drawers and finding things that he played with, those fragments he played around with. The Louw piece that you showed, the Flannigan pieces, these have this improvisational quality which was partly sparked off by early Caro, you can imagine like Louw, Flannigan and others going to St Martins because they thought the implications they saw in those Caro pieces was that you could go on like that, that you would have that lightness and you could open it up and then Caro wanted to close it in. But yes it's that, but it's a struggle isn't it, its conflict.

**AQ** I think that's a very interesting point, because coming back to the skip, that piece that sort of exploded cucumber shape, that when its shown at the Tetley in Leeds was shown in relationship to the flatworks on the wall in relationship to pumpkin shapes and the whole thing was incredibly playful and it was almost like you rearranging the fruit bowl in the kitchen. Kind of saying: what happens now with the apple, the

banana, because it's going to sit there and I won't eat it until the weekend because I like to enjoy it. In a way it's kind of a sad reveal of that, because I don't know Jonathan Trait but I suspect that the disposability is absolutely inherent and it is exactly that. It's what Briony Fer was writing about when she was writing about Hesse: those things that are found in the pocket, Edmund de Waal, it's this sort of wonderful thought captured moment and then suddenly when he does this thing, it was a bit bombastic to scale it up to that extent, but then we're then forced to judge it in the same terms as the Chillida because it's so big it needs a skip, whereas the equivalent would be the Louise Bourgeois's piece where she made with the tangerine skin. It's almost unfolded like an animal sort of experiment and the modesty of it that allows that to be sustained.

**AQ** The depressing aspect of it as well, is I'm not sure Jonathan would want to throw away his work if he had storage base, and his partner works in much the same way on a huge scale. They never keep anything and it's because they have a small studio in London.

**AQ** He's actually doing a lot of bronzes and things that are done and you discard.

**AQ** Playfulness can be difficult to do deliberately. It suddenly made me think of the Paolozzi again: Paolozzi made a piece for the skip and a lot of Paolozzi's work has to do with the playful and the toy like, but does he really capture that? Another famous exhibition he did in the Museum of Mankind where he found things that were in the basement which had been put together in Africa and other places, and he put his own pieces in there as well, his own pieces were just kicked out, they just looked useless in comparison. He couldn't do what these pieces he found did, but there is a way in which in a moment where you tried to make something or do something or you have this great monumental project and you invest everything in it and it's dying all the time. But you do something on the side that you have no intention to like the orange peel, it's full of life. This is not guaranteed.

**AQ** I suspect we haven't fully discussed today the relationship between the observer and the sculpture and how much easier it is outside to go up to it in general and touch it and kids play on it and all that sort of thing. There's that sort of connection which you don't often find in a gallery but that seems to me just another sense in which we could explore what's been a really interesting theme because I think we got so many contradictions and concepts running through when we think about it in terms of spatial, temporal, you can be on the inside outside, you can go on and on and actually its often the surprises which are most interesting.



- AQ** When you came up with Mike Nelson and his case in point that you could not but feel playfully involved and there is all this materiality there, there are feelings of disgust and things like this and surprises.
- AQ** There was this interesting point that you brought up Brendan that the sculpture isn't just an object and a thing, its staging and an encounter. These two things need to be taken into account, and that relates to this business of autonomy, the sculpture as autonomous. The sculpture has to be created and presented in a certain sort of encounter and it's interesting that Brancusi was so focused on trying to create a particular kind of encounter, and he often didn't just give you the object, he actually created the staging for it as well. But I think as there are different attitudes to the fabrication, there are different modes of encounter and I suppose the difficult thing is, how does a sculptor then build it? I mean a painter has got it slightly easier in so much as format; the basic format as an encounter is defined, but with sculpture, there are all sorts of variables to take into account. I would say sculptural skill is partly about the staging of the encounter and partly about making the object. There is this inevitable social dimension to what the sculpture is and how its effectiveness has been generated.
- AQ** Exactly so and I think my feeling is that it could, possibly should, could be taking more account of it, at least I feel so, the necessarily inevitable social dimension.
- AQ** I think that's an interesting thing. One of the related issues is the resistance to mediation through photography, which is an interesting issue, for example in the work of Phyllida Barlow. It's something that has come up in some of the images today about how to stage and mediate, how to photograph sculpture because obviously we've been talking a lot about issues which are broadly speaking phenomenological, as in the Gunther Stern text which is about the real time encounter. I guess this is a good place to conclude with that, and to think about the energy of an exhibition project in relation to that which would be exactly producing some kind of encounter which these objects and the visitor for the project. So I'd just like to thank you for taking part today and thank you to all our presenters and to our audience, thank you.