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May (Mirror)
2013
Giclée print, bible paper, graphite, household gloss paint, card
60 × 80 cm
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**May (Segue)**
2014
Paper, graphite, giclée print
134 × 222 cm
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**May (Drinking Glass. Fire)**
2013
Paper, graphite, household gloss paint, giclée print
26.6 × 53 cm
May (Impossibly Now)
2013
Paper, graphite, giclée print
190 × 122 cm
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May (Morel)
2014
Graphite, resin, giclée print, household gloss paint
90 × 45 × 72 cm
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May (Morel) (Detail)
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**May (Calendar)**

2013

Airmail envelope,
LP cover, string, pins,
household gloss paint
85 × 40 cm
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**May (A...)**

2014

Paper, graphite,
lithographic plate, resin,
giclée print, card,
household gloss paint
84 × 221 × 202 cm
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April (Segue)
2014
Paper, graphite, giclée print, process yellow ink
134 × 222 cm
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May (MacGuffin)
2013
Graphite, resin, brass, string, red gloss enamel, giclée print
20 × 19 × 11 cm
May
*(Drinking Glass. Tornado)*
2013
Paper, graphite, household gloss paint, giclée print
26.6 × 53 cm
May
(Reverses Nature)
2014
Paper, graphite,
lithographic plate, resin,
giclée print, card,
household gloss paint
32 × 140 × 32 cm
'The Act of the Cut'
Laurence Kavanagh and Cliff Lauson in conversation

Cliff Lauson
Let’s start with the exhibition’s title ‘May’. Following on from ‘April’, this is your second body of work to use the calendar month as a unifying motif, and both series include a collage work made out of a modified calendar. How does this unit of time frame the new body of work?

Laurence Kavanagh
The motif of the Gregorian calendar is at once an object, an image and also a marker of time. As a marker of time the calendar is purely representational, it is never able to absolutely indicate a precise moment of the here and now because a slippage of time is inherent to its system. Once every four years is a leap year; time is adjusted to be in the present. I am interested in exploring this slippage of time within an overall body of work I have titled ‘The Calendar Series’.

I was interested in creating sculptures and wall-based works that reflected what was immediately surrounding me in my studio, to my mind trying to explore the complexities of representing the ‘here and now’; slippages in perception between hand and eye; cinematic image and sculptural object; imagined and real.

CL
The unit of time is also made visible by the use of a predominant colour that runs through the sculptures and collages – yellow in ‘April’ and red in ‘May’.
LK
A single, unmixed stock colour was selected for each month. I liked the idea that in the case of ‘April’, the name of the colour of ink, ‘Process Yellow’, could represent a time of day – in this case for me the light from my studio at 4pm in April; and also indicate through its name the importance of specific processes used within my work. Throughout the sculptures and collages in ‘May’, I selected the colour ‘Traffic Red’ in household gloss paint. Held within this colour and paint type are ideas of the interior space, and a signal of alarm. The colour red also has a long-standing use within my earlier work as a representation of transformation, including The Lonely House and Jealousy, and in this case, as a symbol of fire.

CL
Your work always begins with cutting, with taking apart the object or surface, before reconstructing it. The method is collage, but rather than use this technique to create visually jarring effects, the works appear to be more coherent in their new forms. Can you elaborate on the relationship between deconstruction and reconstruction in your practice?

LK
As a genre, collage often brings together juxtaposing elements taken from a constellation of pre-existing objects and images found within the world to create something other, something that speaks through the codes and the values that we attach to these objects and images.

For the duration of the making of any one work, an element that contributes towards the final collage or sculpture – an eclipse, for example – could have existed as a temporal shadow sculpture that is photographed, digitally manipulated, printed, cut, folded and reprinted or cast. The act of the cut is the one singular constant that happens at every stage in the making of an artwork, as the selected element passes between the constructs of these illusionistic and material realities. The cut at once de-stabilises and unifies: the sculptural object into image, the projected image into object.

CL
You just mentioned some of your techniques and processes, and your works are often made up of layers and layers of different processes and materials, some which are not always evident. In the collages, for example, you cut, draw, rub, and fold, but also photograph the results and digitally print before cutting again. The sculptures often involve quite laborious casting techniques using Jesmonite or graphite which is then painted over, concealing the substrate.

LK
I recently moved into a studio within a still functioning print works that started up their business in 1903. The idea of using the printing process developed alongside my existing casting process that was attempting to petrify a moment in time through material and image. The fabric of my studio building, purpose-built for printing and largely unchanged in over 100 years, took on a great importance as marks accrued during the process of making the artwork fused with the studio itself: score marks created during the cutting of materials to make artwork, drips of paint /Jesmonite/resin etc. on the floor, graphite marks left over from wall rubbings...

CL
Those accumulated traces of production combined with the meticulous attempts to replicate entropic states –
the drip, the spill, the shatter – give your works the look as though they have been frozen in time.

**LK**

What developed with the floor based sculptures such as *May (Reverses Nature)* and *May (Morel)* is a way to control the value of time on an individual element e.g. a drinking glass, a letter, a chair or an eclipse. The relative time that an element is held in stasis within the work can be controlled and its value consequently either compressed or expanded. A recurrent motif used throughout the exhibition is the smashed drinking glass initially made by me in card. This stage of making happens very quickly in order to keep the period of time between my memory of a drinking glass (something seen in a film) and its physical manifestation as short as possible. From this point onwards I can then choose various processes of petrification in order to capture the drinking glass; an exacting duplicate by casting and making a still life object; capturing the drink itself spilling and dripping to imply movement in the present time; providing a fixed POV (point of view) and lighting through photography, print and collage.

**CL**

All those steps to toward petrification seem to me to be analogous to slowing down a film in order to achieve something like a composite still. Much of your previous work has explicitly referred to mid-century cinema, for example to films by Alain Robbe-Grillet, Roberto Rossellini, and Michelangelo Antonioni. They have also been installations, almost life-size sets, whereas this body of work does not have a specific filmic reference and is comprised of independent but related sculptures and wall-based work. Yet ‘May’ clearly makes use of cinematic devices: cutting, cropping, lighting, framing, and film aspect ratios, to name a few. How does the cinematic figure in your current work?

**LK**

It can take various forms in my work, however over time I have found that there are three constants: the parallels between phenomenological perception in film and sculpture; the role of time and symbolism within objects and images; and spacial constructs of interiors and landscapes.

My specific interest in Robbe-Grillet’s work in film and literature has been the phenomenological construct created by very sculptural means: surface, light, architecture, overlapping multiple POV, object. In an interview with Daniel Soar in 2011 at the French Institute in London, Tom McCarthy describes of Robbe-Grillet’s work *Jealousy*: ‘He wants to see the mechanism behind the real.’ Events are objectified and layered to create a memory within the mind of its audience. McCarthy in his essay ‘The Geometry of the Pressant’, states that ‘the ultimate blind spot just might be the reader.’ ‘May’ compresses visual frames of information; the sculptures and collages work as opposites and equals. The collages offer a singular viewpoint of a constructed environment (interiors or landscape), which upon inspection de-compresses, indicating that the overall image is an illusion comprised of sculptural objects I make, residual marks made in the studio from sculptural processes, and sculptures used to create shadow projections. I use the cinematic cut literally, physically cutting my own sculptural objects and turning them into fire, manipulating them towards self-destruction.
A lot of the objects in ‘May’, both real and depicted, do imply a history or story beyond their stasis. These objects seem allegorical or metaphorical, but are silent witnesses, enigmas without frames of reference to anchor their narratological significance.

The first work made for the exhibition was *May (MacGuffin)*. The sculpture consists of two interlocking filmic devices: a drinking glass often used as a social prop and also when smashed as representation of memory, and a bar of soap cast in brass that represents the act of cleansing of the soul. ‘MacGuffin’ is a word coined by Alfred Hitchcock and used in a story to illustrate the power of the filmic drive specifically relating to objects. I felt a parallel with his belief that an object does not need any other rationale to exist in narrative other than for its own sake. A non-humanist perspective. A character’s irrational compulsive drive to a given object takes us – the viewers – with them.

Countering that non-humanism is a dark and brooding emotional atmosphere running through the works. This is generated by the way that you use light in relation to interior spaces and also through the recurring symbols of the sub-conscious: fire, destruction, the colour red, the eclipse. How much are the works a collective psychodrama; does the viewer become the actor or protagonist?

The potency or potential of a work of art on a viewer resides in the relationship between both the formal language and sub-conscious elements of a piece being held in a state of flux. The intention is that neither dominates. In a number of projects I have been testing out how the viewer can be positioned as voyeur, protagonist, or as the ‘I’ of the camera (to use a cinematic term) as ways of perceiving sculpture.

The positioning of the works within the gallery implies an interior space populated by objects and symbols associated with the domestic and the sub-conscious. These works are formatted as landscape, portraiture and still life. A set of geometric and perspectival relations (visible and non-visible) exists between the works in the gallery space and also within each of the individual works. The constant of this geometric mapping is the use of the cut, physically and metaphorically. Within my language, the cut is a passive-aggressive act: a means of unifying surfaces and spaces but also rupturing a surface to expose what is behind ie. a window and beyond. There is a conscious transference of this passive-aggressive state into the atmosphere of the work through raking light and cast shadows (two opposing forces reliant on each other); lack of explicit reason for the cause of an action (ie. a broken object); use of natural phenomena (such as the tornado or eclipse) as a representation of a force inverting perception.

Positioned within this formal structure are trigger points for the viewer: symbols of the sub-conscious (the window, the shattered mirror, the fire, the eclipse etc.) often taken from my memory of a turning point in a film. My work investigates the connections we have with these symbols and utilises them as vehicles to explore our relationship to consciousness through material and process. These props, being neither functioning objects nor purely sculptural objects, exist more as an illusion, an outline of a symbol.
CL
Not only are the collages cinema-format – they are also physically very large. In viewing, their scale encourages a 'window to the world' illusionism (also implied through the depiction of drawn curtains) shared by both cinema and history painting. This immersion into depicted space is frustrated by the spatial inconsistencies introduced by your collage techniques. A kind of withholding or deferral seems to be at work in ‘May’, perhaps related to the petrification discussed earlier.

LK
I was interested in inverting the traditional relationship of collage to material, that is to say that the source material is usually designed to be held in the hand and therefore the scale is that of miniaturisation of real worlds. By setting a cinematic landscape frame of 1:1.66 to these collages, I enter into a pre-existing and accepted POV logic to the reading of what is held within. The sizes of the collages are then adjusted and scaled up or down, as in the small interior still lives including May (Drinking Glass. Fire); in the monumental landscapes April (Segue), May (Segue); and in May (Impossibly Now) – a portrait format work.

May (Impossibly Now) is the final piece made for the exhibition. At the centre of the image is an empty plinth housed within an interior space. A representation of an eclipse floats in the middle of the collage. A lens flare indicates that the eclipse is a projection onto a window that is sitting between the illusionary space of the artwork and the real space of the viewer, in this case the gallery. The plinth and the space around it were constructed out of the pin board that I found on the wall of my studio – a board previously used by the printing company and an architect’s office. Score marks from the scalpel and pin marks created in the making of every work in the exhibition can be seen on this pin board. The role of the physical object of the plinth and interior is inverted; real space and illusionary space passing over one another to create the floating image of an eclipse.
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