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Throughout the twentieth century and into the present, sculptural values and design imperatives have shifted. Artists have explored the sculptural resonances of industrial and three-dimensional design while designers have appropriated the forms, language and discourse of sculpture. Sculpture has colonised domestic, industrial and social space whereas industrial design and functional objects now occupy the gallery. From the earliest ready-mades to contemporary multiples, the mass-produced has found itself re-located, re-displayed and re-interpreted. In this symposium, we hope to explore some of the connections between sculpture and design and sculptors and designers and to address aspects of education, authorship, making and manufacture, display, consumption and critical reception.
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Barbara Bloemink

Curatorial Director, Cooper-Hewitt, National Design Museum, Smithsonian Institution, New York

Design doesn’t Move You Unless it’s a Bus (with apologies to David Hockney)

Abstract

Minimalism and Post-Minimalism were among the most influential art movements of the 20th century. Through their investigations in painting and sculpture during the 1960s through the 1990s, artists including Donald Judd, Richard Tuttle, Dan Flavin, John Chamberlain, Sol LeWitt, Scott Burton, and Richard Artschwager, transformed the way works of art engaged issues of space, light, materials, and color. During the last decades, Richard Tuttle, Joel Shapiro, Bryan Hunt, Rachel Whiteread, Rosemary Trockel, James Turrell, Robert Wilson, Jorge Pardo, Tom Sachs, Barbara Bloom, Franz West, and others, have expanded the vocabularies of Minimalism to encompass their own, more idiosyncratic aesthetics.

Concurrent to their works in painting and sculpture, each of the artists also conceived and produced a wide range of distinctive design works that are virtually unknown; including furniture, lighting, rugs, and table settings that share the limited palette and elegant, simple forms characteristic of their works of art. The majority of the works have never before been presented in a museum. Moreover, these artists’ design objects have never been examined vis-à-vis their conceptual frameworks and works of art, nor have they been compared to earlier influential examples of Modernist artists-designers’ work.

In the mid-1960s, when asked to design a coffee table, Donald Judd initially tried altering one of his existing works of art. The result was a ‘bad table’ that Judd discarded, realizing that the ‘intent of art is different from that of [design], which must be functional. A work of art exists as itself; a chair exists as a chair itself.’ Judd began again with the ‘intention’ of designing a table, eventually creating a series of graceful tables, chairs, desks, beds, and assorted functional objects. At virtually the same time, Scott Burton declared that all of his work was both furniture and sculpture, and that this merging of the two disciplines should be the future direction for significant work. In the decades since, a number of artists have used the language of minimalism to explore, in their functional design work, the grey area between these two polarizing positions.

During the last few years, a number of artists internationally including Barbara Bloom, Bryan Hunt, Tom Sachs, Rosemary Trockel, Jorge Pardo, Ian Hamilton Finley, Robert Wilson, and Rachel Whiteread, have used the language of minimalism to create works that hover between traditional definitions of art and design. In various beds, lamps, rugs, blankets, chairs, each of these artists’ work demonstrates how many permutations there are on the continuum between Judd’s polarizing statement that design and art are separate, and Burton’s view that all of his furniture was also sculpture. The works share many conceptual and aesthetic qualities.

Today, design is among the most accessible forms of visual culture. The recent public ‘unveiling’ of previously unknown design work by significant artists of the last forty years allow us to explore the nature of both design and art. This dialogue is not a new one, however, the increasing visibility and importance given design today allows us to confront the issue directly, even controversially, at a time when the definition of design itself is expanding to encompass myriad aspects of human creativity. In the 21st Century, the concepts are not considered to be the same, but perhaps now, with the increased ascendance of design, they can be viewed as equally interesting and thought-provoking.

Biography

Dr. Barbara Bloemink began her tenure as Curatorial Director of Cooper Hewitt, National Design Museum, Smithsonian Institution in 2002. As the former Director and Chief Curator of the Hudson River Museum, The Kemper Museum of Contemporary Art and Design, the Contemporary Art Center of Virginia, and, as Managing Director of the Guggenheim Hermitage and Guggenheim Las Vegas Museums, Dr. Bloemink has authored numerous books, including The Impossible Surrealist Landscapes of Nat Herz and Kurt Seligman; Michael Lucero Sculpture, 1976-1995; James Cosek: 20 Years of Sculpture; Comic Release: Negotiating Identity for a New Generation; and The Life and Art of Florine Stettheimer; and has written more than 25 articles and essays for anthologies including Women in Dada, and Decorative Excess and Women Artists in the Early Modernist Era. Bloemink has lectured widely, served on many international panels, and has organized more than eighty museum exhibitions, including, Re-Righting History: Contemporary African-American Art; The Egyptian Movement in American Decorative Arts; Constructing Reality: Contemporary Photography; and the co-organized the Florine Stettheimer Manhattan Fantastica exhibition at the Whitney Museum of American Art. Her first exhibition at the National Design Museum is Design ≠ Art: Functional Objects from Donald Judd to Rachel Whiteread. This will be the first American museum exhibition to include the virtually unknown design work by many of the most significant artists of the last fifty years.

Bloemink earned her doctorate at Yale, specializing in international 20th Century art and design, with minors in African-American and Latin American Art. Her Masters of Philosophy, also taken at Yale, focused upon 17th- through 19th-century American painting and decorative arts. Bloemink also completed a Master’s Degree at the Institute of Fine Arts of New York University, focusing on 17th-, through 19th-century European art; and earned her bachelor of arts degree from Stanford University.

Barbara Bloemink lives in New York City.
Cheryl Buckley

University of Northumbria at Newcastle

Finding the Tap-roots: Ceramic Sculpture in the USA in the 1930s

Abstract
Bernard Leach famously criticized American ceramics for its lack of a ‘tap-root’, however as potter Marguerite Wildenhain put it ‘America has roots too, but they are many and come from all over the world, from all races. In this lies its uniqueness.’ A characteristic of ceramics in the USA in the 1930s was the blurring of boundaries between art/sculpture, industrial design, and craft, and individuals often worked across the range of ceramic practice. This paper concentrates on the emergence of ceramic sculpture, although it explores the important links with ceramic design and craft. It also considers questions of gender in terms of the production, status and critical reception of small-scale ceramic sculpture at the time and subsequently. An important context for the emergence of ceramic sculpture in the USA in the 1930s was the New Deal and the policies introduced following the inauguration of FD Roosevelt in 1933. Clay as a material was significantly cheaper than many other artistic media, and it was a mainstay within the Public Works Art Project (PWAP) funded Community Arts Centers which were promoted within the context of the New Deal as a way of reaching a wider audience.

A primary concern of those working in ceramic sculpture was the nature of clay as an artistic medium. Often small scale, made from assembled parts, or carved out from solid lumps of clay and garishly coloured, it represented a direct challenge to many of the orthodoxies associated with industrial and craft ceramics – rigid functionalism, technical determinism, truth to materials and the idea of a perfect finish. The coarseness of handling developed into an aesthetic stance in the USA, and influences from European modernism and Art Deco, Viennese and Scandinavian design, Native and South American ceramic traditions, as well as British studio pottery, local vernacular forms, techniques and materials, and the residual influence of the Arts and Crafts Movement, all contributed to the emergence of new radical approaches to the use of clay. Cracks, warping, uneven glazes which provoked ‘the viewer to explore the spirit of the piece instead of rejoicing in pure technical virtuosity’ led to a fundamental reassessment of the medium after the Second World War leading to the international pre-eminence of American ceramics when the conventions of ceramics – form, surface, decoration and practice – were challenged as never before.

Biography
Cheryl Buckley is Reader in Design History at Northumbria University in Newcastle-upon-Tyne. She studied the History of Art and Architecture at the University of East Anglia for her first degree followed by research on Iokon architecture and furniture for an M Litt at Newcastle University. She returned to the University of East Anglia to study for a doctorate on ‘Women Designers in the North Staffordshire Pottery Industry 1914-1940’. She has published on various aspects of twentieth-century design history – ceramics, fashion, furniture and architecture – particularly in Britain, but also in the USA with an emphasis on questions of gender. She is currently writing a book on Design Cultures in Britain in the 20th century.

Marion Arnold

Loughborough University School of Art and Design

Beyond the West to South Africa: Sculpture and Design in Rural South Africa

Abstract
‘Sculpture’ and ‘design’ are Western-originated terms that are difficult to apply to indigenous South African artefacts. Nineteenth-century colonialists found no evidence of ‘sculpture’ in the black population and the material culture, described as ‘craft’, was researched from anthropological perspectives. During the apartheid years, black South Africans were denied access to formal art and design training and art museums collected and exhibited art that fulfilled only western expectations of visual creativity. Although a number of black sculptors established themselves professionally in urban centres, the majority of three-dimensional works produced by rural black men and women for the market were considered to be craft and curios. In the 1970s and 80s, with the collapse of modernism, and the emergence of resistance art and feminist research, black ‘art’ lost its anonymity, became visible in the artworld and assumed a politicised dimension. Sculpture, predominantly wood carving and fired clay forms, produced by artists working in rural areas was termed ‘transitional’ an unsatisfactory term that attempted to acknowledge social change and the effect of the market on the production of traditional design and form. Attempting to address the issue of cultural neglect, art exhibitions became more inclusive and art museums actively collected black art. In 1994, South Africa became fully democratic and was readmitted to the world community. Art and design education became available to all (although few black students register for art courses) and the art market was no longer restricted to local demands. After a decade of democracy, the consumerism of global capitalism drives design which bears the hallmark of invented traditions and constructed ‘African’ identity. Artefacts, made for the commercial (largely white, western) market, are produced in many impoverished rural communities and offer routes to financial empowerment, especially for women. While new materials and skills have been learnt, the drive to meet the needs of contemporary western interior design has diminished the production of ‘traditional’ sculptural artefacts. This paper, focusing on the past two decades of black South African rural sculpture and artefactual design, considers the cultural implications of the demise of apartheid and establishment of democracy. After exploring academic debates about sculpture and design, I conclude that these have been rendered largely redundant by commercial imperatives.

Biography
Marion Arnold lived and worked in Zimbabwe and South Africa until 2000 when she settled in Britain. She was a senior lecturer at the University of South Africa and the University of Stellenbosch. She now teaches part-time at the University of Loughborough, the University of East Anglia and the Norwich School of Art and Design. She has published extensively on 19th- and 20th-century southern African art. Books include ‘Zimbabwean Stone Sculpture, The Life and Work of Thomas Baines (with Jane Carruthers)’, Irma Stern: a Biography and ‘Women Designers in the North Staffordshire Pottery Industry 1914-1940’. She has published on various aspects of twentieth-century design history – ceramics, fashion, furniture and architecture – particularly in Britain, but also in the USA with an emphasis on questions of gender. She is currently writing a book on Design Cultures in Britain in the 20th century.
Robert Burstow

University of Derby
Domesticating Modern Sculpture in Postwar Britain

Abstract
This paper examines a brief period in the late 1940s and early 1950s when critical and institutional encouragement was given in Britain to the idea of ‘living with sculpture’, that is, for experiencing it not just occasionally in the public gallery as a luxury object but as ‘something to be enjoyed in the home’ as a part of everyday life. Using both published and archival material, my paper describes in particular how the official, postwar arbiters of ‘good taste’ – above all, the Arts Council and Council of Industrial Design – encouraged postwar homemakers to purchase modern sculpture for display in their modernized homes. It identifies the close associations between sculptors and designers, and the publications and exhibitions which promoted the integration of sculpture and design. More specifically, it focuses on a series of exhibitions on the theme of ‘Sculpture in the Home’, which the Arts Council presented in London and toured to municipal galleries. These exhibitions promoted the suitability of small-scale modern sculptures to the modern domestic interior by displaying them amongst contemporary furnishings and household accessories designed by leading British designers and manufacturers. With the majority of the sculptures for sale at comparatively modest prices, the organizers aimed to bring sculpture ‘within the range of the least affluent collectors’. My paper considers this attempted domestication of modern sculpture within the context of the postwar Labour government’s aspiration to democratize art and culture, and within contemporary discourses on the gendering of Modernist and the home.

Biography
Dr Robert Burstow is Senior Lecturer in History and Theory of Art and Design at the University of Derby in the UK. His interest in sculpture and design in postwar Britain has evolved from research for his doctoral thesis, which examined British sculpture in the contexts of postwar domestic Socialist reform and international Cold War. He has delivered academic papers at national and international conferences, and published essays, exhibition and book reviews, and interviews in journals, including Art History, Artscribe, Frieze, Perspective, Oxford Art Journal, The Sculpture Journal, and The Journal of the Twentieth Century Society. He has contributed chapters to several books, including Herbert Read: A British Vision of World Art (Leeds, 1993), Henry Moore: Critical Essays (London, 2003), Sculpture in 20th-Century Britain (Leeds, 2003), and Sculpture and the Garden (forthcoming London, 2005). In addition, he has acted as a consultant to television documentaries and curated an exhibition of postwar British sculpture for London’s South Bank Centre. In 2003 he was awarded a Postdoctoral Fellowship by the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art.

Dan Cuffaro and Saul Ostrow

Cleveland Institute of Art, Ohio
Redesigning Life/Sculpting Existence

Abstract
Our presentation postulates that design and sculpture in the 20th century have come to share a common aesthetic premise and as such constitute a set of intersecting practices that inform one another. We approach this premise from a perspective informed by the fact that humans can detect almost imperceptible changes in facial expression and body language, and in many cases such perceptions determine our receptivity. A fraction of a millimeter can be the difference between an expression of comfort and happiness, discomfort and anger, invitation or rejection. Often our responses to these non-verbal communications are subconscious and intuitive. This ability to read subtle form, composition, or color, as they relate to facial expression, is indicative of the acuity of human senses and the pervasiveness of visual symbols. If our ability to read the form, composition, or color, as they relate to facial expression, is so acute, then why not approach the design of functional objects and sculpture with a focus on how they address our innate ability to perceive subtlety. The expression of function, value, brand, performance, etc. through visual, tactile and audible symbols can be quiet and intuitive, yet still effective. If such objects are not thought of merely in terms of their most blatant functionality – but as a complex network of signs, functions and opportunities, we have to look to design not as merely anesthetizing or supplying identity to a indifferent product – but as functioning in a similar way to sculpture in that its conception includes its design. This is not the old form follows function logic in which an essentialist and reductivist reasoning determines the look of the product – but instead, as with sculpture, a notion of form as inseparable from content and form as principles of structure and organization.

What comes to functionally and conceptually differentiate the products of design and sculpture then, are their respective commercial or utilitarian functions – that is, similar to Duchamp’s readymades, the difference lies in context. Yet today, as sculpture comes to include public installation and community-oriented projects, sculptural comes to be conceived of in utilitarian terms. This is because sculpture in response to its expanded definition appropriated new modes of presentation and address from the world of design. This condition has re-enforced aesthetic as well as performative art and design ties. For instance in the context of minimalism the art object aesthetically, as well as production-wise, took as its norm the mass-produced object. Performatively, artists cast themselves in the role of the designer whose drawings and models were forwarded to the fabricator/manufacturer of the work. This was a culmination of the Bauhaus and Productivist’s (Constructivist’s) vision of artist as technician and as design’s principle researcher.

The roots of this vision are to be found in the 19th century ‘art into life’ philosophy that countered that of the aesthete’s dictum of turning ‘life into art.’ As such, artists were to redesign life both in terms of aesthetics and functionality. By the 1930s, the graphic designer Paul Rand wrote of good design as being a source of goodwill. He was essentially appropriating Aristotle’s reply to Plato that art was good (moral) because it could teach us about ‘the higher things’ and that in its didactic form it was, in essence, cognitive. This view was taken forward in subsequent decades by educational programs and cultural critics who envisioned a direct relationship between modern sculpture and mass-produced items. Good design and art were important because by improving the quality of everyday life, they envisioned themselves reordering the domestic, social
and cultural fields. Artists and industrial designers have shared this education and implemented its ideology. The result has been sculptors as different from Donald Judd to Andrea Zittel taking up the norms of industrial design – to produce functional objects that stand in the place of furniture, while designers such as Marc Newson ‘Lockheed Lounge’ (www.marc-newson.com/) and Karim Rashid’s (www.karimrashid.com) work for Totem have engaged the aesthetic and conceptual discourses of sculpture to produce objects. In these cases artists and designers view their task as that of critically re-designing their object to have greater effect on our lives in terms of both its aesthetics and its functionality.

Biographies
Dan Cuffaro is the Chair of the Department of Industrial Design at the Cleveland Institute of Art. He is the former Design Director of Altitude, a Boston-based product development firm. He is active in promoting design and innovation as an engine for economic development.

Saul Ostrow is Dean of Visual Arts and Technologies, as well as Chair of Painting at The Cleveland Institute of Art. Since 1995 he has been the Editor of the book series Critical Voices in Art, Theory and Culture now published by Routledge, London. He is also Art Editor for Bomb Magazine (a quarterly magazine of art, literature, theater and film) and Co-Editor of Lusitania Press (which publishes anthologies focusing on contemporary cultural issues) as well as a consulting editor to the University of Minn. Press. Since 1985, he has curated over 60 exhibition in the US and abroad, approximately half of these projects have dealt with the issues of Abstract Art, the remainder with concerns arising from other forms of representation.

Penelope Curtis

Henry Moore Institute, Leeds
Sculpture and Design: Signs of Equivalence

Abstract
I should like to offer a paper which explores the overlap between furniture design and sculpture in the mid-20th century. I am interested not so much in sculptors who occasionally made furniture, or in designers who occasionally made sculpture, but in the overlapping of category, sometimes in terms of form, and sometimes in terms of function. It seems to me that furniture design offered a space in which more could be done than it could in the more traditional field of sculpture. If one thinks of modernist schools, especially those with manifestoes or teaching curricula, such as De Stijl, Bauhaus or even Cranbrook, it is in fact quite apparent (if largely unstated) that sculpture was usually the most traditional department, and that furniture design very probably attracted the more interesting artists who wished to work in three dimensions. These movements all provide good examples of remarkable furniture produced by those of their number who may well have been additionally motivated by sculpture’s very rigidity as a discipline. The fact, moreover, that furniture speaks of the (absent) human figure at a time when sculpture was normally understood in figurative terms must be relevant, and may help to account for the use of furniture to ‘people’ or inhabit modernist spaces. I would anticipate introducing my subject with a look at De Stijl and the Bauhaus, and at furniture (largely through Mies) as a more or less conscious alternative to sculpture in terms of its function. I would then move on to look at the Cranbrook Academy and the position of Eames, and conclude with a discussion about the interchangeability of the two disciplines in terms of their form.

Biography
From a background in the study of French Third Republic statuary, Penelope Curtis has moved in more recent years to study the intersection of sculpture with other areas and disciplines, most notably in the inter-war years, in England, Germany and Italy. Recent publications have included an essay in the V&A Art Deco exhibition catalogue, a paper on Mies van der Rohe’s Barcelona Pavilion (arq: Architectural Research Quarterly), and an essay on the contemporary German artist Tobias Rehberger.
Anja Silke Gerritzen

Heinrich-Heine-University, Dusseldorf
The Missing Link: Late Victorian Sculpture, Modern Abstract Art and 20th Century Design

Abstract
A distinctive gap between Victorian and early modern art has often been noted in art historical research. However, recent investigations began to acknowledge a close connection between 19th and 20th century art, and a continuous development from Victorian to early modern art and design has been suggested. The contribution of 19th century sculpture to art and design in the beginning of the 20th century is crucial, however, this link has yet to be explored in detail.

Lately, a general interest in the formal achievements of late the 19th century New Sculpture was initiated and its fundamental role for late Victorian avantgarde art has since then been stressed. Yet the influence of the New Sculptors and the protagonist Alfred Gilbert on early 20th century art and design is still vastly under investigated.

The New Sculpture was fundamental for both contemporary and early modern artists’ self-confidence, work across traditional art genres, material culture and formal abstraction. Stylistic comparisons of the New Sculpture with the ‘pioneers of modern design’ reveal a similar use of natural forms and increasingly abstract ornamentation. This ornamental purification was essential for early modern sculpture and design. Sculptors like Barbara Hepworth and Henry Moore relied heavily on late Victorian sculpture and were themselves a fundamental inspiration for the 20th century. Their self-conscious work, abstract use of natural forms and introduction of new aesthetic values still exert a large influence on design. More importantly, their conception of the close relationship between sculpture and design is still vital as they initiated the notion of today’s genre interplay.

Biography
Anja Gerritzen graduated from the Heinrich-Heine-University with a MA in History of Art in 2001 with a thesis on Dark Romanticism in Contemporary Photography. She is specialised in 19th and 20th century art and worked freelance giving seminars on a broad variety of topics including Victorian art, Symbolism and early modern art. Currently, she is finishing her PhD thesis ‘Towards a Third Dimension – Painting and Sculpture in the Aesthetic Movement’ and revising a publication for the British Art Journal on Edward Burne-Jones and Sculpture. Her focus of research includes the stylistic transition from the 19th to the 20th century, the interplay of design and sculpture and national identity and art.

Craig Martin

Surrey Institute of Art and Design, University College
Creative Commonality in the Work of N55

Abstract
This paper proposes an investigation into the condition of authorship and creative commonality in the work of the Danish art/design/architecture collective N55. Both the production and distribution of their work, it will be claimed, is governed by a critique of intellectual ownership. Firstly the paper argues that through their reuse of the octet truss structure as one of the key devices in the production of their sculpture they posit ‘disinvention’ as a challenge to the dominance of invention and novelty in art and design practice. Essentially, the octet truss and its ‘recycling’ functions as a critique of authorship, authenticity, and originality in cultural production. Secondly, the group does not declare ownership over the various projects they produce. The distribution of their work, through exhibitions, their website and project manuals, is not generated through traditional forms of reception but is motivated by collectivist goals, notably through the suppression of copyright and the role of copyleft. Both the digital and print manuals offer the reader/audience free instructions on how to construct the works. It will be argued that the critique of authorship and ownership in N55’s work shares important parallels with MP3 file sharing and the wider ‘creative commons’ movement, where the free distribution of aesthetic and intellectual ideas via digital networks stands in contradistinction to that of ideas as property. The commons movement and N55’s practice share the desire for disencumbered exchange. That is, a freedom to copy; freedom to extend; freedom to change.

Biography
Craig Martin is a writer, artist, and lecturer in Contextual Studies in the Faculty of Design at Surrey Institute of Art & Design. His research activities range across a number of cultural fields, but these are linked primarily by an interest in communicative networks and socially engaged cultural practices. To this end his research into the work of Danish art & design collective N55 has investigated the links between ‘critical design’ and contemporary art.

He recently gave a paper at The Politics of Design conference in Belfast on the theory of viral distribution of Gulf War propaganda leaflets. Having contributed to a number of cultural magazines his recent writings have featured in books such as Wonderful Visions of the Near Future, Greyscale/CMYK and N55: Book. He is currently at work on a research project on the distributive nature of topological space in contemporary art.
Nicky Ryan

University of the Arts, London

Fashion and Sculpture: Exploring Parallels and Interactions at FAB
‘Fashion at Belsay sees the world of the fashion designer and the contemporary artist converge’

Abstract
The definition of sculpture has become increasingly complex, as the boundaries of sculptural practice have been broadened to include an ever-wider range of materials and contexts for the expression of ideas in space. Using an interdisciplinary and contextual approach this paper attempts to explore the relationship between fashion and sculpture using the case study of the Fashion at Belsay (FAB) exhibition. Thirteen fashion designers were briefed to ‘respond’ to a specific area of their choice within the site of Belsay Hall, Castle and Gardens in Northumberland and provide a new interpretation of a historical space. Some of the designers chose to collaborate with artists, sculptors, sound artists, architects or art directors, perhaps in an effort to expand the meaning of their work. FAB will be compared to other exhibitions, which have attempted to investigate the parallels and interactions between art and fashion. At the Giorgio Armani Retrospective of 2000 the arrangement of garments was described as achieving the effect of ‘dress as living sculpture’ and at the Art/ Fashion exhibition, part of the Florence Biennale of 1996, a selection of artists and fashion designers such as Tony Cragg and Karl Lagerfeld were paired and asked to jointly create an installation. This paper will analyse the output, display and critical reception of such collaborations and consider how the status and meaning of fashion is challenged and reconfigured by exhibitions that examine the intersection between contemporary fashion and art.

Biography
Nicky Ryan is a senior lecturer in Visual Culture and Theory at the London College of Communication, University of the Arts London where she is VCT subject leader for the design courses in the Marketing School. Nicky’s interest in fashion arises from an earlier career as a fashion buyer and her interest in sculpture from an academic background in art history through her BA, MA and current PhD research activity. Her key area of research interest involves an examination into cultural-commercial collaborations and the interrelationship between corporations, architects, artists, non-profit cultural institutions, governments and audiences. Nicky has delivered a range of conference papers in relation to the above, including papers for the Fashion and the Applied Arts conference at the Courtauld Institute of Art and the State of the Real conference at the Glasgow School of Art. She regularly reviews exhibitions for the Museums Journal and she is currently working on a number of collaborative papers with colleagues from the London College of Fashion that focus on the relationship between fashion and art.

Jennifer Way

University of North Texas

Ikonography, cybernetics, and the designed ‘shell’: Paolozzi’s sculpture, late 1950s

Abstract
‘It is still little more than a century since the idea arose that the design of consumer goods should be the care and responsibility of practitioners and critics of fine arts.’ (Reyner Banham, 1955). Certainly members of the Independent Group and other artists and art writers active in London during the mid to late 1950s considered design in relation to contemporary mass media and consumer cultures. Moreover, this paper proposes that ikonography and cybernetics allowed them to conceive of design as configurations of signs articulating works of culture, the paradigmatic form of which they held to be a flat surface, in response to which Eduardo Paolozzi made examples in sculpture. Ikonography, the study of discrete graphic forms connoting meaning, facilitated analysis of mass media and consumer cultures as a ‘design of the shell.’ (Richard Hamilton, 1960) Cybernetics offered the possibility of grasping the activity of ikons across the ‘shell,’ in horizontal yet horizonless, dynamic networks that constantly registered and adjusted to impacts: ‘Design operates in a communications network where new responses are casually and easily learned.’ (Tony del Rienzo, 1957). As a critical practice, art writers and artists analyzed culture as designed by identifying and mapping the activity of constituent units within and across systems of significance, as their identities became unfixed, then reconstituted. Eduardo Paolozzi employed ikonography and cybernetics prescriptively, to distinguish his work from design of the first machine age, when ‘significant form, design, vision, order, composition, etc., were seen as high level abstraction, floating above the picture like ill-fitting halos’ (Lawrence Alloway, 1957) and promote its affinities with the second, wherein ‘the small things of life have been visibly and audibly revolutionized.’ (Banham, 1960) In plaster, then from ‘roughened surfaced sheets of wax’ (Alloway, 1956) Paolozzi made ‘shells’ or thick ‘surfaced sheets’ that he ‘shaped, cut, bent, torn, abused, welded together and turned directly into sculpture.’ (Paolozzi, 1971). Across the resulting bronze slabs, art writers espied ikons belonging to a ‘symbol system’ (Banham, 1958) or ‘“symbol bank”’ chock full of a ‘common stock of thoughts and feelings expressed in topical*form,’ (Alloway, 1958) having as primary features metamorphosis (Edouard Roditi, 1959) and variability: ‘The organic and the mineral, the floral and the man-made, the human and the animal, are run together, so that distinctions between categories of material, structure, and use are blended.’ (Alloway, 1963)

Biography
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Jane Riches

University of East London

Painter or Decorator? Sculptor or Hewer? Architect or Constructor? : some complexities of design collaboration and authorship, Paris 1913

Abstract
This paper will examine the creation of the Théâtre des Champs-Élysées in Paris, completed in 1913 by the architectural firm of Frères Perret, and the intertwined roles of the artists and architects who took part in the building’s concept, design, and construction.

The history of this building has been written principally by architectural historians, who have mainly focused on the innovations of its concrete structure. There exists, however, a further scenario, involving the original architectural concepts, and Auguste Perret’s collaboration with a number of artists, especially the sculptor Emile Antoine Bourdelle.

The paper will examine the artists’ roles, whose contributions affected the final scheme and to an extent placed the issue of definitive authorship into question. The mutual influences between the sculptor and the architect will also be examined. Perret was defining the methods of monumental-scale concrete construction even as he carried out the building process of the theatre, and his refutation of the intellectual model of the architect in favour of practicality (‘First construct’) was demonstrated through this work.

The building as sculpture, the architect as maker, the sculptor as designer – how did design and sculpture collide, what was the theatre’s critical reception at the time, and what do its multiplicity of meanings reveal today?
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The history of this building has been written principally by architectural historians, who have mainly focused on the innovations of its concrete structure. There exists, however, a further scenario, involving the original architectural concepts, and Auguste Perret’s collaboration with a number of artists, especially the sculptor Emile Antoine Bourdelle.

The building as sculpture, the architect as maker, the sculptor as designer – how did design and sculpture collide, what was the theatre’s critical reception at the time, and what do its multiplicity of meanings reveal today?
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Franziska Uhlig

Independent scholar, Berlin

Art Physiology – standardizing production and experiencing art and industrial objects.

Abstract
Around 1900 the relationship between sculpture and design involved the production of sensational and physiological standards designed both for making art and industrial objects, and for experiencing and using them. This process began with the formulation of theories of colour, was later embodied in publications about the ‘physiology of art’, and ultimately led to different educational programs for artists.

My paper will explore the production of such standards. In doing so, I will draw on the example of the exhibition ‘Linie und Form’ in the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Museum in Krefeld that took place in 1904. Visitors to this exhibition were offered a surprising tour: They first went through rooms full of animal skulls and bones, then into rooms where casts of petals and leaves were displayed alongside stylised plant-drawings by Johann Thorn-Prikker and photos of Greek sculpture paintings and important sculptures in the history of art. Visitors then proceeded into halls with propellers and model ships from the Reichsmarine-Museum in Berlin, as well as into rooms with photos of cranes and modern kitchenware by, among others, Henry van de Veldt. At the end of the exhibition they saw works by contemporary artists such as Auguste Rodin or Vincent van Gogh.

In case visitors felt conceptually lost, the exhibition catalogue provided a list of books from the library of the Museum, including books about the education of artists and consumers, physiologies of arts, machine-design, or artists’ views on problems of formal values.

The tour took visitors from bones, sculptures and industrial design to a library that sought to train the eyes and hands of artists, buyers and consumers. What kind of knowledge about the eye and the hand was implied by the structure of the exhibition?
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Jonathan Woodham

Jonathan Woodham (Director, Centre for Research and Development, University of Brighton)

From Socialist Aspiration to Bourgeois Consumption: Design, Sculpture and the Crafts in Italy 1946-1956

Abstract

This paper is centred on the decade following the end of the Second World War in which attitudes to design in Italy fundamentally changed from the avowedly socialist aspirations embraced by the progressive left in the very early years of the new Republic through to the emergence of the more bourgeois-oriented 'Linea Italiana'. The latter, a stylish industrial aesthetic consumed and promoted in more affluent circles in Italy and overseas in the 1950s, reflected a marked shift away from the architecturally dominated, all-embracing ('dall'oggetto d’uso alla città') pro-standardisation outlook of the Rationalists in the period 1946 to 1948. After the April 1948 election and the emphatic defeat of the political left, greater attention was paid in the late 1940s and early 1950s to the development of an industrial aesthetic in which many designs assumed strongly sculptural characteristics, whether items of furniture, sanitary ware, metal ware, domestic appliances, office equipment, lighting, railway trains, automobiles or countless other accoutrements encountered in everyday life.

The immediate postwar Rationalist perspective had been epitomised by the July 1946 RIMA exhibition (Riunione Italiana Mostre per l’Arredamento) in Milan devoted to the theme of ‘Ricostruzione: dal’Oggetto d’Uso alla Città’ (Reconstruction: from the Functional Object to the City), an outlook also explored at the VIII Milan Triennale Proletaria of 1947. The sculptural qualities of much subsequent Italian design were visible in the exploration of ‘La Forma dell’Utile’ (The Form of the Useful) at the IX Milan Triennale of 1951 as well as approaches to ‘The Production of Art’ theme at the X Triennale of 1954. As Meyrick Rogers had noted in his introduction to Italy at Work: Her Renaissance in Design (1950), a booklet accompanying an important exhibition of the same name that travelled in the United States in 1951: ‘the arts of architecture, painting, sculpture, and of design in all its many material and utilitarian manifestations have neither been canalized into mutually exclusive specialties nor been separated in such a way as to make an exclusive professional aristocracy out of the practitioners of the first three and a commonality out of the remainder.’ Indeed, there was a feeling amongst progressive Italian design commentators that the contemporary, yet individual, forms of Italian industrial design of the 1950s were distinguished by the close relationship between production and culture in Italy rather than the characteristic American affiliation of production and commerce. The significance of this emergent Italian industrial aesthetic was symbolised by the 1954 launch, under the editorship of Alberto Rosselli, of a new design magazine, Stile Industria, its very title signifying a fresh approach to the field. In the same year, the Compasso d’Oro industrial design award scheme was initiated by the La Rinascente department store, evolving from its Estetica del Prodotto (Aesthetics of the Product) exhibition of 1953. Also of contemporary consequence were the Arte e l’Estetica Industriale exhibitions at the Fiera Campionaria di Milano of 1952 and 1953. Further exploration of this new language of industrial design was bolstered by the living heritage of the crafts, artisan traditions and the proliferation of small-scale production units, such as the woodworking shops in Turin, San Maurizio and Brescia that fabricated the almost sculptural furniture forms of Carlo Mollino in the late 1940s and early 1950s. As well as the work of European sculptors such as Jean Arp and Max Bill, the organic, abstract forms of contemporary American designers, such as Charles Eames whose work was published in Domus as early as 1947, and sculptors, such as Alexander Calder, were influential, the latter impacting particularly on the innovative forms of lighting produced by companies such as Gino Sarfatti’s Arteluce. The expressive potential of new materials, such as plastics and foam rubber, also influenced other new forms in contemporary Italian design of the period.
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