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FROM THE EDITOR

As the Chairman’s report of the year is now provided at the ULEMHAS AGM, we decided to use this column for an editorial which can introduce the articles and their contributors, and raise matters of interest to the members.

A major exhibition this autumn will be Rembrandt: The Late Works at the National Gallery, and I am pleased that our Vice-President, Clare Ford-Wille, has been able to draw on her wealth of knowledge of Rembrandt and Dutch art to write our leading article to preview the exhibition. In the past year the successful campaign to save for the nation Anthony van Dyck’s final self-portrait has yet again highlighted the invaluable work done by The Art Fund, which Professor Will Vaughan, our President, and himself a Trustee of The Art Fund, discusses in his article. The recent Tate Britain exhibition on the eminent art historian Kenneth Clark has provided a timely opportunity for Dr Jonathan Conlin to reassess his work and reputation, and his influence on the course of twentieth-century British art. In keeping an eye on the contemporary art world, we have an article on the Pangolin Gallery in Kings Place, London, by the Gallery Director, Polly Bielecka, outlining its relationship to the Pangolin Editions sculpture foundry, and its role in promoting cast metal sculpture. And, finally, in this centenary year of the start of the First World War, it seemed appropriate to ask an author who has written extensively about the Great War generation of British artists, David Boyd Haycock, to survey the art of the war, and the visionary government war artists scheme that ensured that there would be a lasting testament to it.

We have introduced two significant changes this year. The Review will have full colour for all the illustrations, which will greatly enhance members’ appreciation of the works of art under discussion. The book list is replaced with a special-themed page, which may differ from year to year. This year we have highlighted some new arts spaces in London.

For members who may like to refer back to articles in previous issues of ULEMHAS Review, either from their own files, or from the website, we are now providing a cumulative index from 2003 to date, arranged by subject, contributors and book reviews on the ULEMHAS website.

I should like to express my appreciation of Liz Newlands for her work as editor over the past few years. She has set a high standard that I hope we can maintain. I am grateful to the National Gallery and the Tate for their help. I should also like to thank all our distinguished contributors for their excellent articles, as well as my fellow members of the Editorial Panel for their sterling work on the Review.

Barrie MacDonald

© English Heritage.
The forthcoming exhibition at the National Gallery promises to be outstanding, with forty paintings, twenty drawings and thirty prints created by Rembrandt during the last two decades of his career from 1650 until his death in 1669. This exhibition is held in conjunction with the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam, and will be opening there after it closes in London. The Rijksmuseum has been most generous with loans of major commissioned works from Rembrandt's late career, such as The Sampling Officers of the Amsterdam Drapers' Guild, known as 'The Syndics' (c.1662). Most remarkable of all, however, will be the loan of the so-called 'The Jewish Bride' (c.1665) (Fig. 1), a magnificent and defining work of tenderness, colour and Rembrandt's technical virtuosity, which so exemplifies the expressive and fresh creativity of Rembrandt's late career. This will be an opportunity to reappraise this mysterious painting, redolent of Rembrandt's interest in the work of Titian and his unwavering concern to continue to create unique 'history' subjects, exploring the depths of the human mind. A loan from Glasgow Museums, A Man in Armour (Alexander the Great?) is an equally unfathomable painting from the 1650s. And, from the Amsterdam Historical Museum, is an important late commissioned work, The Anatomy Lesson of Dr Joan Deyman (1656).

After the success of the early 1640s, Rembrandt's career had entered a period of decline and he experienced great financial difficulties. Saskia, his wife, had died in June 1642, the same year as he completed his important commission of the 'The Night Watch'. Their only surviving child, Titus, was just a baby and Rembrandt employed Geertge Dirx to look after him. However, by 1649 Geertge had been supplanted in unfortunate circumstances by the younger Henrickje Stoffels, who would be Rembrandt's companion and business associate during the last two decades of his life. In 1649 Rembrandt produced no paintings, only etchings, but in the early 1650s he returned to painting, although he faced the
The upheaval of his bankruptcy in 1656, with the sale of his grand house and his not insignificant collections. In 1660 an arrangement was made whereby Rembrandt’s business was transferred into the names of Hendrickje and Titus, with Rembrandt becoming their employee, thus preventing his work from passing into the hands of his creditors. The relief must have been significant for Rembrandt and the decade of the 1660s would represent a period of great productivity, domestic happiness and peace.

Both Titus and Hendrickje were inspirations for Rembrandt in his exploration of the workings of the emotions and the exploration of colour and form in space. By 1652 Rembrandt had also returned to painting portraits of himself. The exhibition has fine examples, such as Titus in Monk’s Habit (1660) and Self-Portrait as the Apostle Paul (1661), both from the Rijksmuseum. Both these paintings would have been known as ‘tronies’, that is, studies of unknown individuals, which were not commissioned and were often exotic or dressed up in some way but certainly intended for sale. It is likely that Rembrandt’s portrayals of himself were painted as ‘tronies’, not only for self-advertisement but also because they enabled Rembrandt to explore the nuances of human emotion. His magisterial Self-Portrait with Two Circles (c. 1665-69) (Front Cover), on loan from Kenwood, shows a man unbowed by personal and financial misfortune, and still defiantly proud of his skill as an artist.

Rembrandt’s misfortunes do not seem to have dimmed his ambitions and, despite the fact that styles of painting in Amsterdam were moving in favour of smooth, highly finished, evenly lit paintings, Rembrandt does seem to have received portrait commissions during these late years. There are fine examples in the exhibition such as the Portrait of Catrina Hooghsaet (1657) from the Penrhyn Settled Estates, or the three-quarter length Portrait of an Old Man (Lodewijk van Ludick?) (1667) (Fig. 2) from the Mauritshuis in The Hague. This last commissioned portrait shows Rembrandt prepared to continue to experiment with his technique, only two years before his death. The vigour of his brushwork, the paint piled on with great swashes of impasto, reinforces the powerful character of the corpulent figure of the benign old man. The brushwork of the sitter’s hands is most telling and serves to push them out towards the spectator, almost through the picture plane itself, anticipating the expressive technique of Rembrandt’s countryman, Vincent van Gogh, over two hundred years later.

Another loan, also from The Hague, is Self-Portrait wearing a Turban (Fig. 3), often referred to as the ‘Last Self-Portrait’, dated 1669, the year of Rembrandt’s death. Here Rembrandt’s posture of head and shoulders only, with the head turning slightly towards the spectator, reveals a vulnerability and almost unbearable sadness, hinting that Titus and Hendrickje have both predeceased him. Technically there are fascinating differences between these two Hague portraits. Glittering, broad sweeps of glowing oranges and whites suggest the luxuriant turban, while the hair is thinly painted and the fragile curls achieved by Rembrandt reversing his paintbrush and swirling the pointed
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**Fig. 2:** Rembrandt van Rijn, Portrait of an Old Man (Lodewijk van Ludick?), 1667. Oil on canvas, 81.9 x 67.7 cm. © Royal Picture Gallery Mauritshuis, The Hague

**Fig. 3:** Rembrandt van Rijn, Self-Portrait wearing a Turban, 1669. Oil on canvas, 63.5 x 57.8 cm. © Royal Picture Gallery Mauritshuis, The Hague
wooden end through the still wet paint to expose the underground and suggest the fluffy lightness of an old man’s hair.

Nevertheless, Rembrandt’s own particular deviation from contemporary taste could prove detrimental to the undertaking of public commissions during these later years, namely his contribution to the decoration of the newly constructed Amsterdam Town Hall, for which Rembrandt’s former pupils Ferdinand Bol and Govaert Flinck were receiving successful commissions. Rembrandt’s own contribution, *The Conspiracy of the Batavians under Claudius Civilis* (1661) was rejected, cut down and removed shortly after it had been put in place. It is exciting that this rarely seen, rejected canvas, together with the outstanding drawing showing Rembrandt’s original intentions, have both been loaned to the exhibition from Stockholm and Munich respectively.

A substantial part of the exhibition will be devoted to Rembrandt’s work as a printmaker and his late prints are as varied and experimental as his paintings. Rembrandt’s etchings had already brought him international fame. By 1652 he was known as far afield as Sicily from where Rembrandt had received an important commission, *Aristotle contemplating the Bust of Homer* (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York) from a Sicilian nobleman, Don Antonio Ruffo da Messina. An interestingly high proportion of the subjects of the etchings are drawn from the New Testament and are unusual subjects in the Protestant climate of the Dutch Republic, such as the *Adoration of the Shepherds at Night*, and episodes from Christ’s Passion, *The Agony in the Garden* (1652), *Christ presented to the People* (1653), *The Entombment* (1654) and *The Three Crosses* (1653) (all British Museum). Even more curious in such a Protestant environment is the print of Saint Francis (1657) (British Museum). Certainly there was a well-established print market and it is more than likely that Rembrandt intended to sell these etchings and collectors would have been interested in prints showing a wide range of Rembrandt’s graphic techniques, such as the *Descent from the Cross by Torchlight or Christ at Emmaus*, both of 1654 (Fitzwilliam Museum) for which Rembrandt combines etching, drypoint and engraving techniques. Most unusual of all for a Protestant audience is the very Catholic subject of St Jerome reading in an Italianate Landscape (c.1653), although the ‘scholar in study’ theme was popular in the work of the contemporary Leiden painters, the most successful of whom was Rembrandt’s first Leiden pupil, Gerrit Dou. Indeed, another example in the exhibition of this theme is Rembrandt’s *Faust in his Study* (1652), the actual subject of which continues to arouse controversy and debate.

Another subject frequently appearing in the late etchings is that of nude women such as the haunting *Seated Woman*, known as *Woman with the Arrow* (1661), *Woman sitting half-dressed beside a Stove* (1658) or *Black Woman lying down* (1658), although the *Jupiter and Antiope* (1659) (Fig. 4) has a definite tongue-in-cheek and mischievous eroticism that the others do not possess. There is also an etching of *Nude Woman beside a Stove* (c. 1661), for which a drawing also exists, illustrating Rembrandt’s insatiable interest in a variety of drawing techniques of black chalk, white body-colour, pen and brush in brown ink, all used here together in the one drawing. Different coloured papers give different effects as can be seen with two drawings on brown paper of the early 1660s, *Recumbent Lion, facing Right* (Fig. 5) and *The Amstelveensweg outside Amsterdam* (both from the Rijksmuseum).

The exhibition will be a chance in a lifetime to study, reappraise and delve into the depths of Rembrandt’s overwhelming genius of his late years.

Fig. 4: Rembrandt van Rijn, *Jupiter and Antiope*, 1659. Etching, drypoint, engraving, surface tone, black carbon ink on Oriental paper, State III, 13.7 x 19.9 cm. © Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge

Fig. 5: Rembrandt van Rijn, *Recumbent Lion, facing Right*, c. 1660-65. Pen in brown ink on brown paper, 12.2 x 21.2 cm. © Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam

Clare Ford-Wille is an independent art historian and lecturer, who has lectured on European art, architecture and sculpture for more than thirty years, for the University of London, Morley College, The City Literary Institute, the V&A and other museums and art galleries. She also regularly leads study tours to Europe. She is a Vice-President of ULEMHAS.
The Art Fund is Britain’s principal independent art charity. Originally known as the National Art Collections Fund (still its official registered name), its main aim is to support and enable the acquisition of works of art for public collections. It has been doing this since its foundation in 1903, a time when there began to be a growing concern about the number of major works of art being sold abroad from private collections in the United Kingdom. It soon made a name for itself by saving great and sometimes controversial masterpieces, such as Velasquez’ *Rokeby Venus* (Fig. 2) for the National Gallery in 1905. Since that date the Art Fund has helped over 700 museums and galleries throughout the UK acquire thousands of works of art from 2,000 BC to the present day for the public to enjoy.

The Art Fund is in the news mostly when some major national asset is at risk. Recent notable examples of works the Art Fund have helped save for the nation have been Sir Anthony van Dyck’s final *Self-Portrait* this year, transferring ownership to the National Portrait Gallery with a special tour of the painting to six UK museums over the next three years, Turner’s splendid late watercolour, *The Blue Rigi, Sunrise* (Fig. 1), which was acquired by Tate in 2006, and The Staffordshire Hoard (Fig. 3), acquired by the Birmingham Museum & Art Gallery and the Potteries Museum & Art Gallery at Stoke-on-Trent in 2010. The Hoard, which comprised over 3,500 items, was the largest and most important collection of Anglo-Saxon gold and silver ever to have been found. These examples demonstrate that the Art Fund is as keen to support museums in the regions as it is those in the metropolis, and also that it supports the acquisition of decorative and applied works of art as well as fine art. The campaigns to save such major works of art are probably the best known aspect of the Art Fund’s activities. However the Art Fund is active in many other areas. It is equally keen to support the acquisition of works of local significance, and is constantly providing small-scale grants to museums and art galleries throughout the country working closely with their communities. Such examples are so numerous that it is hard to select examples, but some that might be cited are the encouragement of the Penlee Art Gallery in Penzance to build up its collection of works by the celebrated Newlyn School, or Buckinghamshire County Museum with its collecting of local views by noted artists such as David Jones. In the cases of these smaller grants the role of the Art Fund can be critical, as many local museums have few other resources to turn to for their acquisitions.

The Art Fund is a private organisation. It is entirely dependent for funds from the revenues from its membership and from legacies. This is limiting in some senses, but it enables an independence of action. It can also act relatively swiftly compared to more official establishments. The main office in London is strongly supported by volunteers throughout the country who are key in raising consciousness of the Art Fund’s activities and also for raising funds. There is a network of 64 volunteer fundraising committees which organise lively and varied programmes of fundraising events, lectures, trips and outings for members. They also have an annual meeting in London and attend the AGM. A recent initiative has been a competition for ‘edible masterpieces’ in which Art Fund members have been encouraged to bake cakes or biscuits that resemble famous works of art, ancient or modern. Further information about these can be found on the Art Fund website.

Quite rightly, the Art Fund expects direct access for its members to the works that it has helped get into public collections. The Art Pass enables members to gain a significant reduction where there is a charge for entry. An additional feature of the pass is that it enables reduced entry to special exhibitions held in the institutions that the Art Fund has helped. In practice this means virtually every significant museum and art gallery in the country.

According to its brief, the Art Fund is not set up to commission works of art. Its role is to support others in their...
attempts to gain works, not to become a patron as such. It can however, support works being commissioned through the request of an institution. A notable example of that was the funding of the major installation, the Deer Park Skyscape by the American sculptor James Turrell for the Yorkshire Sculpture Park in 2007. In recent years the Art Fund has also extended the range of its activities by providing the Art Fund Prize for the Museum of the Year Award, most recent winners being the Royal Albert Museum in Exeter (2012) and the William Morris Gallery in Walthamstow (2013). This amounts to £100,000 and is a valuable stimulus for museums around the country. This is a period in which there has been much welcome innovation in museums and the Art Fund is proud to be able to assist in this exciting development.

People often wonder how the Art Fund makes its choices. Basically, museums and galleries apply to it. The Art Fund is always keen to encourage new applicants to come forward. The very helpful Art Fund staff advise applicants as to whether their application falls within the brief of the Art Fund and how to make the case for a grant. The actual decision to give a grant is made by the Trustees. These meet regularly and the bulk of works for which grants are being applied are considered at the meetings. There are occasions when the work cannot travel to the meeting, then the Trustees (or a representative number of them) will go to it. The Art Fund is careful to make sure that all works are viewed personally – in the vast majority of cases by individual Trustees. Occasionally the Art Fund will commission an independent report from an expert if the necessary expertise required for making a decision is not covered by members of the Board, or if there is limited access to the work being considered. The Trustees are selected on the basis of their appropriate expertise. They include academics covering areas of art and archaeology, former museum staff, those with expertise in different areas of arts administration and management and the financing of artist ventures. Trustees make a careful declaration of interests to ensure strict impartiality in relation to any particular application.

The Art Fund seeks to be as broad as possible in its coverage of works, both ancient and modern. While the majority of its funding goes to older works of art, it is also keen to support contemporary work. We have been going through a particularly vibrant period of art in Britain, one that reflects many of the cultural changes of the modern world. It has been very much the brief of the current Chair and Director – strongly supported by the Trustees – to be highly active in supporting this development. One recent sign of this has been the campaign to raise funds for Nelson’s Ship in a Bottle by the British-Nigerian artist Yinka Shonibare (Fig. 4). This was originally a commission for the fourth plinth in Trafalgar Square and has since been acquired, through the help of the Art Fund, by the National Maritime Museum. This work provides a witty and engaging commentary on the implications of Britain’s imperial past that has great relevance today. It is a highly popular work. I became aware of this when I went to Greenwich to view it and found members of the public posing for their photographs in front of it. For some people funding recent art by the Art Fund might seem questionable. There is always some risk in funding contemporary works. However, the Art Fund’s view is that it is better to take risks here rather than fail to support worthwhile ventures. In these difficult financial times, in particular, this is somewhere the Art Fund can and does make an extremely valuable contribution.

Art Fund Website: www.artfund.org

William Vaughan is an historian of nineteenth-century British art and was, until 2003, Professor of the History of Art at Birkbeck College, University of London. He is President of ULEMHAS, and a Trustee of The Art Fund.
Among the papers of the critic and museum director D. S. MacColl at Glasgow University is the draft of a blunt letter to Jane Clark dating from 1938. MacColl felt himself to have been neglected by Jane's husband Kenneth, who was supposedly too busy schmoozing to write to an old mentor. "Both of you are an arrogant, high-nosed pair," MacColl wrote, "much too fortunate for your deserts." 1938 was indeed the height of what Clark himself called the "Great Clark Boom", which began shortly after his arrival at the National Gallery in 1934, as the Gallery's youngest ever Director (Fig. 1). Having already served as Keeper of the Fine Art Department at the Ashmolean, Clark also picked up the Surveyorship of the King's Pictures and in 1937 made his first appearance on television, prefiguring his later apotheosis as 'Lord Clark of Civilisation' in 1969.

Like many in the art world, therefore, MacColl felt a good deal of Schadenfreude when four panel paintings acquired by Clark as by Giorgione for the Gallery were reattributed by Tancred Borenius to the humble Andrea Previtali. MacColl hoped the Clarks were "a little chastened, by adversity, in your previtalisms or other parts, however sustained by King-Giorgionismus." MacColl had, he reported, been to the Gallery and "had a burrow in the vault to view the well-buried Previtalis. My God what a poop! I am glad, however, that ... he puts up some show of a proper spirit, declining, in spite of the Bore-niuses, and other cattle of that type, to be kicked or 'kicked out'."

Now the Previtalis are out of the vault and were recently on the wall of Tate Britain for an exhibition celebrating Clark as scholar, patron, collector and broadcaster. The question of attribution now seems like a storm in a teacup, a distraction from the panels' gnomically alluring pastoral, which almost insists that the viewer explore their personal mythology for a fitting story.* Even at the time, however, there was a sense that the panels were simply an opportunity for fellow scholars and curators to vent the passionate feelings which Clark inspired in them, feelings which they struggled to articulate fully, feelings inspired as much by Clark’s physical appearance, background and personality as by his lectures, books and approach to gallery management. Almost forty years later the editor of The Burlington Magazine, Benedict Nicolson, noted that it had "become almost a habit, among a very small minority, to sneer at Clark’s life-style, as if the mere presence of private means somehow weakened his claims on our attention". In doing so they overlooked "a sense of public duty, a Victorian desire to serve". Forty years further on, how much has changed?

Clark also encountered resistance for supposedly 'dumbing down', for leaving scholarship behind in order to pander to the uninformed. The battle lines were already drawn at the National Gallery in 1938. Relations between Clark, his Keeper, Isherwood Kay and other curators, notably Martin Davies, had soured to the extent that a Trustee, David Lindsay, was asked to investigate. He held a series of interviews with individual staff members, taking careful notes which reveal much about Clark, Davies and the widening gulf between their very different approaches to art and to the role of the museum.

"Their respect for him as a man and a scholar had at first been high", Davies reported. An apprenticeship with Bernard Berenson at I Tatti outside Florence as well as Clark’s work cataloguing the Royal Collection’s Leonardo drawings were impressive scholarly credentials. More, perhaps, could have been done in this exhibition to highlight Clark’s experience of this species of scholarship, perhaps by showing some of the many glass plate negatives from Clark’s collection, now held by Tate Britain. The poor quality of reproductions then available remind us that Clark’s travels were about real research – he was not a gallivanting Grand Tourist.

But something seemed to have gone wrong, and Clark’s reputation "had sunk to a very low level, and they had no
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*Fig. 1: Gerty Simon, Kenneth Clark (in front of Renoir’s La Baigneuse Blonde), c.1933. Photograph. Private Collection

Jonathan Conlin
respect for his judgment or capacity". Asked to provide concrete examples, however, Davies and Kay struggled: other than the Previtalis, they had no objections to any of the other works Clark had acquired for the Gallery. Clark’s neckties and expenditure of 27s 6d on a stool for the picture restorer Helmut Ruhemann were, however, repeatedly brought up, leaving Lindsay with the impression of umpiring “an hysterical squabble in a girls’ school”. Considered alongside the portraits of young Clark on show in this exhibition, however, such a visceral if incoherent and unfocused reaction is understandable. Such was the power of *Civilisation* that our collective memory of Clark is of the old man, rendered harmless by age. Before the war, however, Clark was icily intimidating: “a polished hawk-god in obsidian”, as Cyril Connolly famously put it.

Among the more articulate complaints made by Kay was that Clark had made Davies write a “popular” introduction to an exhibition of portraits. Temporary exhibitions had never been held at the Gallery before, and were one of a number of initiatives intended to increase visitor numbers, others including evening opening as well as opening the Gallery exceptionally on FA Cup Final day. Kay insisted that “one of the lecturers or a journalist” should have been made to write the introduction, while Davies saw such measures as misguided attempts “to popularise the Gallery, whereas the prestige of the Gallery could only be enhanced by its becoming an institute of scholarship, to which the world would look. The staff should have as their primary purpose a scholarly objective: and publicity and the popularising of the gallery should take second place.”

Happily, the war parted this odd couple. Davies joined the Gallery’s collection and library in a Welsh slate mine far from the Luftwaffe’s reach, where he set about producing school catalogues which would serve as a landmark of the genre, a model of scholarship “to which the world would look”. Clark stayed in London, filling the empty Gallery with concerts, one-picture shows, a canteen (the Gallery’s first restaurant) and temporary exhibitions of contemporary art by Henry Moore (Fig. 2), Graham Sutherland and John Piper, all of them well represented in the Tate show. As Chris Stephens notes in the accompanying catalogue, Clark served as “gatekeeper for government commissions” during the war. Indeed, it was largely down to Clark that there were any commissions at all.

This patronage shaped the course of twentieth-century British art. The Tate exhibition, could, perhaps, have done more to explore Clark’s model of “accessible” art. It was not simply a question of abstraction versus figuration. Like his great ally John Berger, Clark recognised that the “common man” inhabited a visual world of symbols and myths that could be surprisingly “tolerant” of distortion and manipulation. He praised Paul Nash’s work for the War Artists Advisory Committee for having “discovered a way of making symbols out of the events themselves”: railroad tracks or girders, thrown into fantastic shapes by bomb blasts could become snakes (Fig. 3).

As well as coping with his rebellious staff at the National Gallery, 1938 also saw Clark visit Paris, where he encountered the Dali show at Wildenstein’s. Though by no means blind to Surrealism, the show struck him as “degrading – a squalid entertainment pack”. Artists must live, certainly, but they could not live off a blank cheque drawn solely on the bank of their own individuality. Far from aristocratic conservatism or patronising crowd-pleasing, Clark’s patronage was part of a life-long project to revive art as a partnership between artist and society.

* Editor’s Note: The Andrea Previtali panels will now be on display after restoration at the National Gallery from this autumn.

Dr Jonathan Conlin teaches history at the University of Southampton. He has written on Clark as both Director of the National Gallery and broadcaster, in *The Nation’s Mantelpiece: a history of the National Gallery, and in a study of the making and meaning of Civilisation*, commissioned by the British Film Institute for its TV Classics series. In 2009 and 2012 he curated two seasons of events in London and Washington celebrating the 40th anniversaries of *Civilisation* and John Berger’s *Ways of Seeing*. He is currently writing a biography of the art collector and oil magnate Calouste Gulbenkian.
In today’s visual culture where it seems we have been shocked as far as we can be shocked and most of us are familiar with at least one work of modern art, it is easy to overlook sculpture’s stellar development over the past century. For instance, it really wasn’t very long ago that Sir Anthony Caro’s *Early One Morning*, 1962, broke free from the plinth marking a major sculptural step change. Nor was it long ago that new materials other than bronze began to be taken seriously. As one of London’s few galleries dedicated solely to exhibiting sculpture we regularly celebrate this progression often looking back as well as forward.

Pangolin London is closely affiliated with Europe’s largest sculpture foundry, Pangolin Editions, near Stroud. Here over a hundred craftsmen work to cast and fabricate sculpture for a huge range of artists including both well known YBA’s and young emerging sculptors. This unique affiliation means that Pangolin London is uniquely placed to offer a wide ranging exhibition programme that explores both the making process as well as the sculpture itself.

Located in a purpose built gallery within the highly acclaimed ‘arts hub and office space’ Kings Place, which was designed by architects Dixon Jones, the gallery was very much an uninhabitable building site when I was asked to set up the gallery in King’s Cross in January 2008. By the September, however, it was a slick and sparkling new building, a pioneer in what is now one of London’s hottest property development areas.

To tie in with the building’s wider cultural offering (Kings Place also houses two concert halls, another gallery and is home to two resident orchestras), our inaugural exhibition was initiated by a project to the remote island of Lolui in Lake Victoria, Uganda. The expedition was organised to explore the prehistoric Rock Gongs there and their ancient cave paintings. The stone carver, Peter Randall-Page, with members from the London Sinfonietta and a number of Ugandan musicians, spent two weeks on the island where they found inspiration for our first exhibition and the London Sinfonietta and Nigel Osborne’s composition *Rock Music Rock Art* (Fig. 1).

Since 2008 we’ve held over forty exhibitions dedicated to promoting sculpture in all its forms and media and to the wider context of making. Highlights of our contemporary programme have included: *Women Make Sculpture, Sterling Stuff: Seventy Sculptures in Silver, Two and a Half Dimensions* curated by Marcus Harvey and David Bailey, the well known photographer’s first exhibition of sculpture. We’ve also held major survey shows such as *Sculptors’ Drawings and Works on Paper* which took over all three levels of public space and included almost 300 works.

As so much of today’s contemporary sculpture is rooted in the leaps and bounds made in the late 19th and early 20th century it seems only natural that we also endeavour to take a fresh look back at modern British sculpture. Highlights from this part of our programme include *Lynn Chadwick: Out of the Shadows, Exorcising the Fear, Sculpture in the Home* and solo shows of work by recently overlooked sculptors Geoffrey Clarke RA (Fig. 2) and Ralph Brown RA.

Fig. 1: Peter Randall-Page, Rock Music Rock Art. Installation shot of Pangolin London’s inaugural exhibition in 2008. © Pangolin London

Fig. 2: Geoffrey Clarke, Man, 1954. Iron. Courtesy of the artist/ Pangolin London
Exorcising the Fear had a particularly strong art historical context in that it not only celebrated the 60th anniversary of the seminal 1952 Venice Biennale, in which young British sculptors (Kenneth Armitage, Robert Adams, Lynn Chadwick, Geoffrey Clarke, Bernard Meadows, Eduardo Paolozzi and William Turnbull) were launched on to the international stage for sculpture, but it also questioned a phrase coined in Herbert Read’s introduction to the exhibition which led to the group becoming known as the ‘geometry of fear’ sculptors. It was the spikiness of many of their forms and the fragility of their new materials (most were delicately welded pieces rather than the usual cast bronze) and a general post-war unease that gave the term a partially accurate collective description at the time. But, as so often happens in the ‘History of Art’, the term stuck though many of the artists felt it did not apply to much of their later work and that it was misleading to characterise themselves as any kind of coherent group.

Earlier this year, Sculpture in the Home also had a strong art historical backdrop in that it celebrated an innovative series of touring exhibitions of the same name, organised by the Arts Council of England in the 1940s and 1950s to promote British sculpture and design in a domestic setting. The gallery was transformed into three post-war era room settings with works by sculptors, including Lynn Chadwick, Reg Butler and Elisabeth Frink, who originally participated in the exhibitions, alongside furniture and furnishings by well-known British designers Robin Day, Ernest Race and others (Fig. 3).

Forthcoming exhibitions this autumn feature two sculptors: Peter Randall-Page, including his work in cast bronze and iron, sterling silver, ceramics and on paper, as well as his carved stone work; and William Tucker RA, the author of the seminal text, The Language of Sculpture.

Pangolin London also curates a changing exhibition of large-scale sculpture throughout the public spaces and canal-side at Kings Place (Fig. 4).

In addition to our exhibition programme Pangolin London also runs an artist-in-residence programme from a fully equipped sculpture studio in the basement at Kings Place. Once every few years we select an artist to enjoy the studio free of charge for a year, and offer special access to the expertise at the foundry and a small casting budget with the residency culminating in an exhibition and catalogue. Both our resident sculptors Abigail Fallis and Briony Marshall, have taken full advantage of their residencies creating exciting works, many of which would never otherwise have been in a position to bring to fruition. This is our way of fostering new sculptors and tries to make up for the limited foundry facilities in so many sculpture courses nowadays.

So is the future cast? Well, we’ve certainly seen a return to bronze casting following its unfashionable moment in the 70s and 80s, and exciting developments in patination and the opportunities presented by digital 3D printing would indicate that this very ancient sculpture making process still has a long and exciting way to run.

Polly Bielecka is Gallery Director, Pangolin London.

AUTUMN EXHIBITIONS:
Peter Randall-Page: 15 September-4 October 2014
William Tucker: 15 October-29 November, 2014
Pangolin London, Kings Place, 90 York Way, London N1 9AG
Tel: 020 7520 1480; www.pangolinlondon.com
Open Mon-Sat 10am-6pm, closed between exhibitions.
Within a few months of the outbreak of the Great War in July 1914, the young British artist C. R. W. Nevinson had volunteered as a medical orderly and driver with the Friends' Ambulance Unit. In a railway shed in Dunkirk dubbed ‘The Shambles’ (an Old English word meaning meat market), Nevinson and his Quaker companions helped tend some 3,000 French, British and German casualties. Nevinson later recalled how the men lay “on dirty straw, foul with old bandages and filth, those gaunt, bearded men, some white and still with only a faint movement of their chests to distinguish them from the dead by their sides.” After a week, Nevinson's former life seemed ‘years away’. After a month he felt he had been “born in the nightmare. I had seen sights so revolting that man seldom conceives them in his mind.” He returned home, ill and exhausted, in early 1915. He spent much of the rest of the war on the verge of a nervous breakdown; it was in this febrile state that he painted a number of Futurist masterpieces of war art.

They included La Patrie (Fig. 1), a recreation of his experience in ‘The Shambles’. “When war is no more,” one critic wrote in 1916, “this picture will stand, to the astonishment and shame of our descendants, as an example of what civilised man did to civilised man in the first quarter of the 20th century.”

Equally impressive was Nevinson’s painting of a French machine-gun post, La Mitrailleuse (1915) (Fig. 2). What struck (and even horrified) contemporary observers was the way the men operating Nevinson’s gun appeared to have been turned into automatons: man is fused with machine in a murderous combination. One of the gunners stares out of the picture, his eyes concealed in the shadow of his helmet. His disembodied form calls to mind the amputated robotic figure of Jacob Epstein’s Vorticist sculpture, The Rock Drill (1913-15), whilst his scream would be echoed in the riders on The Merry-Go-Round, painted the following year by the British pacifist, Mark Gertler, and now to be seen on display in Tate...
Britain. “Mr Nevinson’s ‘Mitrailleuse’,” wrote the distinguished painter Walter Sickert in 1916, “will probably remain the most authoritative and concentrated utterance on the war in the history of painting.”

It was the machine gun, dealing out blind, mechanised slaughter which, together with advances in long-range artillery, had changed the nature of warfare forever. The individual no longer seemed to matter. As Nevinson’s drawings of columns of marching men revealed, he had been subsumed into the war machine; a tiny cog, an expendable element in war on an industrial scale. A major exhibition of Nevinson’s war paintings in 1916 was a sensation. It made him one of the most famous young painters in the country. The overall impression of the exhibition was summed up by The Manchester Guardian: “Mr Nevinson gives you the black gloom, the horror, the feeling of despair that make even death and mutilation seem trivial incidents in an epoch of horror”. It is not surprising, therefore, that when the British government decided in 1916 to commission a series of artists to record the war, Nevinson would be among the first to be sent to the Western Front. The scheme (which was also taken up by the Canadian government) would prove to be one of the largest and most successful campaigns of officially commissioned art in British history.

The intention was to create both historical records of the conflict and propaganda. Indeed, the entire scheme was operated and run by Wellington House, part of the Propaganda Bureau that had been established at the start of the war and which, in 1917, became part of the Ministry of Information, headed by the politician and novelist, John Buchan (who had just published the book for which he is still famous today, The Thirty-Nine Steps). Wellington House commissioned authors to write books and pamphlets disseminating the British perspective on the war to neutral countries, in particular, the USA. The first official war artist recruited in 1916 was the Scottish printmaker, Muirhead Bone. Over the next three years a number of prominent artists were recruited into the scheme. They included John Singer Sargent, Augustus John, William Orpen, George Clausen, Henry Tonks and Philip Wilson Steer. Perhaps most exciting of all, however, was the number of younger generation artists who were commissioned. These included such rising stars as C. R. W. Nevinson, Stanley Spencer, Percy Wyndham Lewis, Eric Kennington and Paul Nash. The scheme eventually employed dozens of artists producing hundreds of drawings, watercolours and oil paintings. Some were exhibited abroad both during and immediately after the war. Raymond Wyer, Director of the Worcester Art Museum in Massachusetts, wrote in a foreword to the catalogue for the 1919 exhibition, War Paintings and Drawings by British Artists, that he considered it “one of the strongest contemporary exhibitions that has ever crossed the sea”. Furthermore, he observed, the ‘prominence’ of the artists that had been selected “is evidence of the high importance attached by the [British] government to an enterprise for which an occasion of like significance has never before arisen”.

Significantly, given the ostensible propaganda element of the project, the official war artists were left largely to their own devices. As C. F. G. Masterman of the Propaganda Bureau wrote at the time, “Nevinson and Kennington have continually asked me for instructions as to what they should draw, but I have always taken the view that it is not for a Government Department to attempt to regulate artists in their work, art being so largely individual in expression.” Given this freedom, Nevinson floundered. Despite returning to the Western Front, many of his official war paintings in 1917 and 1918 lacked the bite and drama of his earlier work. Other artists from the scheme, however, rose to meet the challenge magnificently, creating some of the finest works of their careers. This was most apparent in the work of Paul Nash, who became an official war artist in 1917, and from first-hand experience produced a series of blistering visions of the nightmare that was Passchendaele (Fig. 3). In 1957, the Tate’s Director, John Rothenstein, would write of them: “I know of no works of art made by any artist working there who saw the splendours and miseries of the greatest of all theatres of war so grandly. Out of infinite horror he distilled a new poetry.” The best of them “will take their place among the finest imaginative works of our time”.

It had been hoped that many of the paintings commissioned or bought from the official war artists would be permanently exhibited in a vast ‘Hall of Remembrance’, a war museum and gallery that it was hoped would purpose-built in Richmond (Fig. 4). Costs meant this would never happen. Instead, following an exhibition at Burlington House, they became part of the permanent collection of the newly-founded Imperial War Museum in Lambeth. Many of them will be on display when the Museum reopens.
on 19 July 2014; they remain some of the finest works of art ever produced in this country, and a testament both to an extraordinary war that changed the world forever, as well as to a remarkably visionary government scheme, that backed artists at a time when it seemed totally committed to all-out war, almost at any cost.

David Boyd Haycock read Modern History at St John’s College, Oxford, and received his PhD from Birkbeck College in 1998. He is the author of Paul Nash (London: Tate Publishing, 2002), and A Crisis of Brilliance: five young British artists and the Great War (London: Old Street Publishing, 2009).

Another Life, Another World, an exhibition of works on paper by Paul Nash spanning his career from 1910 to 1946, and curated by Dr Haycock, will be at the Piano Nobile Gallery, 129 Portland Road, Holland Park, London, from 8 October to 22 November 2014.

Notes
2 C. R. W. Nevinson, ibid. 74, and H. Nevinson, ibid.
3 C. Lewis Hind, Daily Chronicle, 30 September 1916.
4 The Burlington Magazine, April 1916.
5 The Manchester Guardian, 27 September 1916.
8 C. F. G. Masterman to Edward Hudson, 29 October 1917, Imperial War Museum, MS 266A/6, ff. 181–2.
NEW ARCHITECTURE FOR THE ARTS IN LONDON

This is a very brief guide to some interesting architectural developments in London focusing on the art world, which seems to be leading the way in creating new spaces and new art communities. Modern materials are being used to deliver a synthesis of old and new. Light and space are of paramount importance in contemporary design and they are being used to highlight historical architecture which may have been hidden or neglected for years and also to provide more public spaces as well as gallery space. It is interesting to look at the websites for the various architects and to see the breadth of their projects. Organisations are offering walks and talks so that we can see for ourselves what is happening in particular areas. Just a few examples … RIBA (www.architecture.com), NLA, based at the Building Centre (www.newlondonarchitecture.org), and the King’s Cross Visitor Centre (www.kingscross.co.uk). Try them out and report back! 

Susan Richards

Granary Building and Square

This is part of the King’s Cross regeneration project. The listed Granary building designed by Lewis Cubitt in 1851 once stored wheat from Lincolnshire for onward travel by canal to London’s bakers. Central Saint Martins has moved there as the University of the Arts as well as the Art Fund headquarters. The architects of the Granary Building are Stanton Williams who are also responsible for the new King’s Cross Square revealing the arches of Cubitt’s train station (www.stantonwilliams.com/projects). Granary Square is very much a public space as well as a community space for the arts. The architects of the square itself are Towndesh Landscape Architects (www.kingscross.co.uk/open-space-granary-square).

Kings Place

This is a music and art space, including concert halls and the Pangolin Gallery, with its sculpture trail edging the Regent’s Canal, created in 2008 as part of the King’s Cross regeneration project. It is located at 90 York Way, to the rear of King’s Cross Station. The architects are Dixon Jones who have carried out numerous London projects. See www.dixonjones.co.uk and www.kingsplace.co.uk.

Tate Britain

The main entrance facing the river has been renovated providing a connection by new staircases to the principal gallery level and offering more public space by opening up the Rotunda. This is part of a series of transformations of the whole site to be carried out over the next twenty years. The architects are Caruso St John Architects (www.carusostjohn.com/projects/transforming-tate-britain).

Serpentine Sackler Gallery

New gallery and events spaces, café and shop have been created from a renovated former 1805 gunpowder store by Zaha Hadid Architects (www.zaha-hadid.com/architecture/serpentine-sackler-gallery), located on the north side of the Serpentine, near the main gallery in Kensington Gardens.
LECTURES

Wednesday 8 October: Rab MacGibbon
Facing conflict: the portraiture of William Dobson
Rab MacGibbon is Associate Curator at the National Portrait Gallery, where he specialises in portraiture of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Recent research interests include the court culture of Henry, Prince of Wales (1564-1612), carried out in relation to the NPG exhibition, The Lost Prince (2012-13). He was curator of the Gallery’s 2011 William Dobson display marking the 400th anniversary of the artist’s birth.

Saturday 22 November (after the AGM):
Christina Grande will give the first Maria Shirley Lecture
Ancient Roman fresco painting: Roman innovation and Greek inspiration
Christina Grande is Senior Lecturer in Classical Art & Archaeology at the University of Winchester. She has also taught Greek & Roman Art & Architecture, Classical Mythology, and the later reception of Classical art for Birkbeck for many years. Christina has also been a lecturer in Classical Art for the University of Leicester and for the Open University, and has also lectured for the British Museum Education Service, the National Gallery, Morley College, the City Literary Institute. Her main research interest is the architecture of Renaissance Rome. She has led art history tours in Italy and Flanders.

Tuesday 13 January: Alison Chitty
Design for stage and film
Alison Chitty trained at St Martin’s College of Art and Central School of Art and Design. She won an Arts Council bursary to the Victoria Theatre, Stoke-on-Trent. In 1979 she returned to London, eventually becoming resident designer at the National Theatre for eight years. In 2010 the National Theatre hosted a major retrospective of her work, Alison Chitty Design Process 1970-2010. She has also been active in opera, designing productions for the Royal Opera, English National Opera, and many opera houses abroad. Her production designs for film include Mike Leigh’s Life is Sweet and Secrets and Lies. She was awarded an OBE in 2004, and made a Fellow of Birkbeck in 2011.

Wednesday 11 February: Clare Barlow
Jacob Epstein and the human figure
Dr Clare Barlow curated the National Portrait Gallery’s widely-acclaimed 2013 display ‘Jacob Epstein: Portrait Sculptor’. She first joined the Gallery as a PhD student in 2005 and returned as an Assistant Curator for the 18th and 20th Centuries in 2011. She now works as an Assistant Curator at Tate Britain and has made appearances in television arts programmes on BBC2 and BBC4.

Monday 9 March: Lynda Stephens
A neglected Renaissance sculptor: Desiderio da Settignano
Lynda Stephens specialises in Renaissance art, in particular Italian, and was a lecturer at Birkbeck for more than 20 years, as well as a freelance member of the National Gallery education department and the City Literary Institute. Her main research interest is the architecture of Renaissance Rome. She has led art history tours in Italy and Flanders.

Monday 13 April: Zoë Opačić
Peter Paul: the Emperor’s Architect and the creation of Late Gothic style
Zoë Opačić was appointed lecturer in History and Theory of Architecture at Birkbeck in 2004. She received her BA and MA at the Courtauld Institute of Art, where she also completed her PhD in 2003. Her doctoral thesis was on the Emmaus Monastery in Prague. She has taught at Morley College and the Courtauld Institute, and prior to her appointment at Birkbeck, she was a research fellow at the University of Cambridge. She is currently writing a book on the art and architecture of late medieval Prague.

All lectures are at The Art Workers’ Guild, 6 Queen Square, London WC1N 3AT, starting at 6pm, except for the lecture following the AGM on 22 November. Wine is served after evening lectures.