

The Monument in Conjunction with its Archive: Historical Narrative and the Dialectics of Experience in a Michael Sandle Archive Exhibition

Eve Kalyva

The eyes of all Britain, and indeed of the whole British Empire, are watching Malta in her struggle day by day. . .¹

On 4 July 2007 the exhibition *The Archive of Michael Sandle's The Malta Siege Bell Memorial (1988-1992): A Dis-Play of Politics?* opened at the Henry Moore Institute in Leeds.² Michael Sandle donated the archive to the Institute in 2003; it consists of five boxes and charts the creative process of *The Malta Siege Bell Memorial* from early conception in 1988 until restoration in 1995, including its model exhibition at the Royal Academy in 1989 and the dedication ceremony by Queen Elizabeth II in 1992. This extensive set of documents comprises technical papers, photographs, and letters from former Prime Minister John Major, Admiral of the Fleet Lord Lewin, and Sir Nicholas Serota amongst other public figures. The memorial draws its historical importance from the siege of Malta between 1941 and 1943 by the Axis forces. "Operation Pedestal" was the last attempt by the Allies to relieve the besieged island, then part of the British Empire. Even though the convoy was attacked and severely damaged, a number of ships managed to enter the Valletta Harbour on 15 August, the celebration day of the Assumption of Virgin Mary. Central to the convoy was *SS Ohio*, owned by the Texas Oil Company and being the larger tanker in the world at that time [PI.1].

The monument consists of a cupola that houses a 13-tonne bell and a bronze figure on a catafalque. Overlooking the Grand Harbour, it incorporates part of the Renaissance walls that surround the capital of Malta, and utilises a First World War gun emplacement [PI.2]. The aim of the exhibition was to bring forth the central debates about the concept, design, and location of the monument; and to draw attention to the financial, political, and technical aspects of its realisation. At the same time, being an archive display, the exhibition was bound to the double role of presenting through letters, pictures, and drawings an absent work that is located in a different time and space while raising, through its own presence, questions regarding the relation between experiencing the documentation of an artwork and experiencing the work itself.

The archive, located in the present but retelling of past events, creates and presents a historical narrative that consequently affects the artwork's identity and value; especially when it comes to a public sculpture that shapes, in conjunction to a system of beliefs and values, a society's memory.³ At an archive display, the past enters the present but cannot permanently form part of it: the archive can only present something that already has been, since what constitutes the archive is precisely the authority to document a series of events that belong to the past. In addition, a gallery exhibition offers a series of visual, spatial, audio and other experiences that in themselves participate in the signification process here and now. For this reason, the layout of an archive presentation can be manipulated in such a way as to allow for a dialectical interplay between historical memory and current experience. In the case of the Michael Sandle archive exhibition, this dialectics of presence and absence can be located in the conjunction between the spatial configuration of the historical monument, which strives to balance the aesthetics of form and the political investment made to its concept, and the structure of the installation of the archive itself, which commands new formal and causal relations across the displayed information. Indeed, association of historical signifiers was the artist's tool in creating *The Malta Siege Bell Memorial*; and coalition of textual and visual information was the curator's tool for the monument's archive exhibition. Conjunction, in effect, problematises such notions of presence and absence, historicity, and conclusion of meaning; and negates the singularity of documentation, allowing for a dialectic experience of art [PI.2].

Michael Sandle (b.1936) was a child during the Second World War and graduated from the Douglas School of Art and Technology in the Isle of Man where, according to the

personal recollection of the artist, one would not even know that a war was going on at all.⁴ Sandle continued his studies in painting and printmaking at the Slade, and in lithography at the “Atelier Paris”. Teaching posts included basic design and print-making at the Leicester College of Art, lithography at the Slade School, and drawing and construction at the Coventry College of Art; while at the time of the Malta commission, Sandle had been professor for sculpture at the Akademie für Bildenden Künste in Karlsruhe, West Germany for almost a decade.

Sandle’s earliest works from his participation in the *Leicester Group* have been characterised as having a romantic nostalgia of the past that, at the same time, the artist wishes to supersede.⁵ Emphasis is given on the concretisation of a concept in form, achieved via the technical manipulation of perspective and proportions in a series of evolving sketches that, as the artist argues, “shortens the faculty of visual imagination”.⁶ In terms of subject matter, Sandle argues to be working from a backlog of personal experience; this experience is visually refined through the drawing process and formally clarified through the making process and thus attains a public appeal.⁷ In *Untergang des Dritten Reiches* (1980) for example, the petrol cans used to elaborate the depicted scene of Hitler’s failed suicide attempt by fire can still be found in Germany today; this schematic connection of the empirical present with the historical past further emphasises the contemporary importance of the work’s historical theme.⁸ By the time of his middle-period monuments, Sandle is described as daring to confront some of the painful issues of our times.⁹ Regarding *Monument for the Twentieth Century* (1971-78) that was originally meant as a critique to the US invasion of Vietnam, the famished Mickey Mouse shooting an exaggerated in proportions yet accurate in detail machine-gun becomes a universal critique to war and media control.¹⁰ Just before the commission for *The Malta Siege Bell Memorial*, John Bird described Sandle’s work as “a critical and ironic commentary upon nationalistic and cultural ideologies of moral authority, immortality and transcendence, with death as the ever-present signifier undermining the order of rationality itself”.¹¹ However, the Malta monument has been ascribed with the specific function of commemorating the island’s struggle during the Second World War – and there is hardly anything more political than war itself, apart from, perhaps, remembering the war dead.

The archive of the monument held at the Henry Moore Institute, a pre-selected corpus of documents as it is, follows a trace of the creative process of this grand-scale public sculpture that translates both a historical view to the past and recollections of private or public memory into aesthetic and contemporary registers. To be precise, the reader/viewer of the archive faces a further spatial reconfiguration of textual evidence of debates about the monument’s development, historical and political significance, and physical composition. These debates cover a long and thus essential, at least in textual terms, part of the archive, and are mainly oriented towards the location and composition of the monument, the utilisation of the Renaissance buttress, and the cast and restoration of the bell. A prominent example of the political importance that the *Malta Siege Bell Memorial* acquired is that when Sandle suggested casting the bell in Germany to resemble the famous *Gloriosa* of the Erfurt Cathedral, the monument officials objected to a German firm making profit out of a Second World War monument.¹² Eventually, an English foundry was selected, even though the German ambassador in Malta was asked to cover the casting costs and contacted again when the bell supporting mechanism broke and needed restoration.

In fact, narrative instability leaks through every telling and re-telling of the initial event. The problem of narration is easily located when inconsistent event descriptions fit equally well into different narrative networks.¹³ Three examples that illustrate the increasing instability of the historical narrative follow; however, it should be made clear that this instability occurs during the process of viewing/reading the archive, an event re-located in spatio-temporal context, and is not essentially linked to the materiality of the archive as such. The most prominent narrative, the direct product of a linear reading of the archive, describes how the British side of the monument’s commission chose to highlight a certain aspect of the event and insisted on referring to the project as the Allies’ “Operation Pedestal”; while the Maltese side chose to highlight another aspect of the event and promoted it in a more

localised, religious (and thus less entangled in external politics) version of a name as “Sta Marija convoy” [*Sta Mary*]. A new dimension to the reading of the archive (and of the work) opens with the artist’s personal recollections on how Malta was divided into the British and the Italian-supporting fractions and how members of the local committee confessed to him having been told to oppose all British suggestions regarding the construction of the monument because of the politics involved.¹⁴

A third narrative layer is generated by the inconsistencies between the linear reading of the archive and the personal recollections of the artist. For example, Michael Sandle vividly describes the first contact regarding the commission of the monument in August 1988 when a former acquaintance of his called John Wain, at the time Vice President of the Merchant Navy represented on the George Cross Island Association National Council,¹⁵ sent him a letter asking whether he would be interested in working on a memorial to mark the anniversary of the August 1942 convoy known as “Operation Pedestal” or “Sta Marija Convoy”. As the story goes, Sandle was “fascinated” with the project, found the location in Malta to be “love at first sight”, and “would have died for” such a commission. However, an even earlier letter exists in the archive at the Henry Moore Institute (which, after all, is only a selected corpus of documents) that dates from May 1988, sent to the artist from Philo Pallucino, then Ambassador of Malta in Rome. Even though this letter was formal and moving along politically correct lines that acknowledged the siege of Malta, *SS Ohio*, and the Assumption of Our Lady event, it is never mentioned as the initiator of *The Malta Siege Bell Memorial*. Archive display has potentially the power to dissolve such a mythopoeia, in this case originating from the artist’s personal choice to retell an amusing story starting a man called John Wain, but not without a cost.

The multiple reading of history is what enables and at the same time what makes historiography impossible. Already treating events from within the historiographical discourse, we are lending speech, as Michel Foucault so eloquently describes, “to those traces which, in themselves, are often not verbal, or which say in silence something other than what they actually say”.¹⁶ This problem is magnified by the display of history, where one is confronted not only by historical moments transformed into signed and dated documents, but also by documents that have already been selected for presentation and allocated in thematic clusters. Depending on how tight or loose these thematic clusters are, the transformative forces of the archive display can be both of identity and of value. Of identity, since the description of the exhibits is not self-evident. It may be that objects hanging on walls have been classified as letters, photographs, and drawings – but what does it mean? Conventionally, a letter signifies a somewhat personal communication of ideas, often charged with emotions and obscure diplomatic manoeuvres; a photograph signifies something traditionally understood as evidential; and finally, a drawing is the manifestation *per se* of artistic licence. For instance, the display of annotated architectural plans where the artist characterises the architect’s revisions of the cupola as “hideous” and as “Disneyland Baroque” can be deemed quite amusing. Indeed, the value of the objects is defined by their use as exhibits, in accord with the purposes of their display be it to celebrate, to illustrate, to challenge. Whereas the initial selection of the documents to be exhibited was based on highlighting the most extensively discussed topics of the archive, a second reading of the archive in conjunction with extra-archival knowledge prioritised material of a newly assigned importance. Thus, events that were initially silent became even more important because of their belated arrival, such as the transport of the catafalque on a UK air force carrier or the monument’s dedication ceremony presided by Queen Elizabeth II while all local Maltese authorities (but the Presidential couple) were amidst the crowd.

Apparently, the hierarchisation of identity and value that is constructed by the selection process is vested in the display. Since some objects were deemed better than the rest to convey what they should (i.e. the political and aesthetic debates that shaped the monument), the selection process, in effect, endorses the exhibits with importance and meaning. While on display, meaning is generated by the logical and historical discourses articulated by the content of the archive exhibition; in addition, the spatial order of the display allows a further visual and textual interplay between the exhibits. Thus, the curator uses specific strategies of

selection and arrangement in order to prioritise importance and to guide experience. These new spatial and temporal conjunctions (of forms, of meanings) are based on, but often superimposed over, the power of the archive to speak and to describe. The arrangement on walls, like the arrangement on paper, creates its own power relations, which one can manipulate as an artist, as a curator, as a writer. But where does one stand in relation to the archive and how does it affect the experience of the artwork?

The archive's acclaimed power to disseminate, in a retrospective display, the experience of *The Malta Siege Bell Memorial* cannot itself transcend time. Even though the archive's monopoly of history is a position that can become ideologically tenable, the experience of a displayed archive can only be in a single moment in time and, by extent, admits to an ephemeral construction. From this point of view, the passing of time destabilises the historical significance of the archive, especially when one further invites "peripheral" knowledge as it were, extra-archival knowledge such as artist's interviews or newspaper articles, to join in the event of the exhibition. At which point the term "archive" reveals its fluid, yet authoritarian, presence always already part of history itself – history here signifying both the topos of the archive and the process of constructing the archive. Of course, archives do exist and can be displayed; institutionalisation and historiographical discourse provide the archive with some strategic autonomy.¹⁷ As for Sandle's work, a public sculpture that combines past and present, tolling every noon to commemorate the war dead, its autonomy resonates in the retrospective balance between aesthetic presence and historical memory.¹⁸

At this point, allow me to start my narrative again, and present the case of *The Malta Siege Bell Memorial* through the reading of its displayed archive as documenting the creative process of a public sculpture and as a work *in-itself*. In the first case, the display of official letters, revised architectural plans, and snapshots of the construction process allows an "inside" view to a completed, yet absent, work and prompts reflection on the relation between content and form, memory and historical representation, and communication of ideas to a public audience. In the second case, the fragmented, in space and time, nature of the display that generates its own logico-semantic clusters of meaning temporarily suspends the loan ability of the archive to retell of a past event. In the act of remembering, there is always a point where one must forget in order to be able to remember, in order to invite the memory of something lost and already in the past to slip into the present. If the recalling process entails a moment of letting go, how can, in terms of art practice, this negative moment of absence of memory be physically reconfigured? Michael Sandle describes working with watercolours on similar grounds: an act of peril, similar to gambling, when one experiments with the medium and cannot wholly control the outcome of every brushstroke that threatens to irreparably destroy the work.¹⁹ Watercolours is, of course, an obvious example where the medium controls at least one aspect of the work-in-progress. In *The Malta Siege Bell Memorial*, the artist worked across different categories of location, signifiers, and medium in order to tune this monumental sculpture in place and time. In turn, its archive exhibition manipulated external constructs of power to establish its own authority, transmitted through the signed and dated official letters and forensic photographs that in turn draw their power from such institutionalised displays.

Yet a critical display of an archive can be described as zooming in an out of history. The elements of the past are seen from within their historical context, while at the same time allowed to be compared to present social and political conditions. This critical engagement with history cannot leave the identity of the exhibited objects unaffected, since experiencing an artwork is a dialectical process; especially through its displayed archive that relates historical memory and aesthetic preferences to the physical presence of a pre-selected material and institutional politics. When visiting such an exhibition, one is pushed into a game of *fort* and *da* where the past, disclosed by the archive, is conjoined with the present, manifested in the gallery halls. By every demand of the archive to speak of a past event, the archive's own material presence is diluted, since one no more sees this drawing or that letter but an undercurrent historical narrative that these objects fabricate. Equally, attention to the

exhibits, to the aesthetics of their textual forms and spatial arrangements, draws one way from *The Malta Siege Bell Memorial* and into its historical remainders, i.e. the letters, photographs, and architectural plans that comprise its archive. Given adequate ideological constructs, the past retold through and by the archive can be homogenised, and the exhibition of and by the archive neutralised. However, effective conjunction (of the archive, of history, of personal memory) can offer a double standpoint from which both the artwork and the institutional treatment of art can be criticised.

At an initial stage, conjunction allows but also dispels claims to universality by a public sculpture such as *The Malta Siege Bell Memorial*. Returning to the creative process once again, the artist has argued that, for him, a private tragic experience can be universal.²⁰ It seems however, that the historical specific can not by conviction alone become universal, especially since, as in the case of the Malta memorial, concrete formal (i.e. location), aesthetic (i.e. the cupola), political (i.e. the bell), and financial (i.e. the catafalque) reasons shaped the artistic outcome. Nor can single narratives transcend time, even though they can equally do or undo impressions such as claiming to evoke universal truths without being nationalistic or militaristic,²¹ or characterising the work as being fascistic.²² Georg Lukács has explained how the particularity [*Besonderheit*] of an artwork oscillates between individuality [*Einzelheit*] and universality [*Allgemeinheit*], and how the artwork is measured by its relation to reality, the immanency of experience, and the extent to which its sublated [*aufgehoben*] individual and universal counterparts offer a new experience of the whole rather than being a mere mimetic reflection of an abstract principle.²³ Thus it seems that the ability of a work of art to convince (or not) is measured by the degree of consistencies and contingencies of the work with its surroundings. In other words, whether one chooses the universal or the ephemeral, experience and value are always underlined by historical significance.

Michael Sandle argues how he uses an “easily recognisable language” in order to communicate to a wider audience.²⁴ A comparison between *A Twentieth Century Memorial*, an ironic commentary to war, and *The Malta Siege Bell Memorial*, a monument of grievous importance, is to the point [PI.3]. Even though different modes of articulation have been applied, both artworks negotiate their/our specific historical standpoints and strive to transcend the finality of presence in at least two ways. First, the artist may have personally and subjectively selected a set of historical signifiers, yet the reciprocity of their signifieds remains a wider and public affair. Second, even though the artist may employ such historical signifiers that have already been formulated in another time and space and thus already owning their own language and aesthetics, their re-use and re-exposure in another context might offer new modes of experience. Whether an artwork succeeds or not in this task, is a value judgement. But it is certain that the more one tries to bound the universal into the singular, the more one has to re-employ already widely-circulated configurations of meaning; and the more historically established a signifier is, the harder it is for an artist to break the mould, as it were, to manipulate the conveyor of that signifier and to liberate/generate meaning. In that respect, and despite the artist’s noble ambition, the commemoration of all of the war dead, friends and foes alike, by a single monument in Malta may be hard to achieve, especially since the artwork itself is chiseled by historical discourses of winners and losers.

For its part, an exhibition of the monument’s archive adds yet another layer of signifying complexity to the negotiation of meaning, now processed through institutional frameworks of power. When organising the exhibition *The Archive of Michael Sandle’s The Malta Siege Bell Memorial (1988-1992): A Dis-Play of Politics?*, my attention was to the political and historical identity of the work, as much as it was to the historiographical discourse of its archive. For this reason, the display did not follow the linear “initial idea – creative process – end-product – comments” narrative; but rather a schematic arrangement of the most prominent debates that shaped the work, flanked by a brief introduction and a set of remaining problems. This was achieved by the juxtaposition of textual and visual information, the corpus of the former often highlighted to attract immediate attention and the latter often clustered together on formal or conceptual grounds – tactics that also reveal the artificiality of the archive [PI.4].

But since neither work or archive can be unequivocally and singularly concluded, it may not really matter that the artist argues that he is not interested in the ideology but in the quality of the work; or that the curator argues in the exhibition's introductory note to be inviting questions on authorship, politics, and the aesthetics of public sculpture.²⁵ Just like the creative process it charts out, the exhibition of the archive can never be singular or neutral, free of concrete political, financial, and aesthetic choices *a priori* made in order to navigate experience [Pl.4]. Equally, the designs of the exhibition, just like the designs of the monument, had to pass through a canonising process of neutralisation and institutional approval. The power (of the artwork, of the archive) to name and to identify structures of power can hardly negate the conditions that enable and reproduce these power relations; however, the experience of presence and absence this display offers confirms the dialectics of our own perspective. *The Malta Siege Bell Memorial* seen as a work, the external contact point between our present and the historical past arrives via the internal organisation of this public sculpture that is already shaped by private, political, and financial reasons. *The Malta Siege Bell Memorial* seen as an archive, it outlines the temporal physicality of our experience of art through a corpus of archival documents, already pre-selected by the artist and the establishment, by time and space.

Artworks can never be singularly defined; and when they are, they become mere historical reflections of the fragmented viewpoints of those who define them. Archives on the contrary, may appear more solid with their fixed dates, signatures, and stamps, even though their use and, moreover, their function in relation to the artwork, remains equally inconclusive. However, it may be that experience is always temporal, yet a historical event can be ascribed with enduring value and meaning. In other words, the historical experience of the work is something that is being constantly negotiated and reestablished, even though concrete examples can be found where power relations that structure identities and generate value resonate, since it is these relations that shape not only the experience, but the work itself. By the same token, it may be easier to identify structures of power in specific examples, but their presentation is neither unproblematic nor neutral. Decisions made on available options (be it of the work or its display) can be personalised, yet apparently not wholly irrelevant to their time and place.

In the case of *The Malta Siege Bell Memorial*, the artist employed redrawing and redrafting techniques to attain conceptual concreteness in aesthetic forms, while working closely with the site's historical configuration. Equally, in the case of *The Archive of Michael Sandle's The Malta Siege Bell Memorial (1988-1992): A Dis-Play of Politics?*, the curator manipulated available information by conjoining mode, tenor, and medium in an effort to make explicit the heteronymous nature of the archive, being both a work *in-itself* and a testimonial act of something absent. Emphasis was given to the play between aesthetics and politics, and the concrete historical conditions that shaped the artwork beyond any theory, aspirations, or investments made to it. As Jacques Derrida explains, "There is no political power without control of the archive, if not memory. Effective democratisation can always be measured by this essential criterion: the participation in and access to the archive, its constitution, and its interpretation."²⁶ Experiencing the monument in conjunction with its archive, and especially following the process of materialisation of an artwork, can offer a hint on how concrete form, despite the best attempts of authors and institutions to transcend spatio-temporal specificity, resists the input of universal ideas. At best, the authority of the exhibition to present *The Malta Siege Bell Memorial* corresponds to the authority of *The Malta Siege Bell Memorial* to retell of the siege of Malta. The exhibition can either try to reproduce standard historical narratives, or can allow the loose ends of its narrative to become standpoints from where one can critique the discursive formulation of history, art, and history of art. The work exists in a process of being experienced, with an identity both reified and fragmented; an identity that can only be presented by the archive if suspended by its historical past. This identity cannot be singularly affirmed, since *The Malta Siege Bell Memorial* cannot only work as the artist wishes or be only experienced as the viewer wishes. It cannot conjoin both the remembrance of its dead and commemorate all the war dead; it

cannot be, at once, both site-specific and universal. *The Malta Siege Bell Memorial* cannot be experienced in isolation yet the very process of interaction between spaces and audiences counters its authority. Likewise, the archive of the *Malta Siege Bell Memorial* allows for a personal experience of the work only when undermining its own authority to present, to retell, to nominate. At the end, the exhibition *The Archive of Michael Sandle's The Malta Siege Bell Memorial (1988-92): A Dis-Play of Politics?* can only offer a play of presence and absence, can only display power structures that have always already been applied in another place and time and by this conceal its own power relations at work.

¹ Winston Churchill, letter to General Sir William Dobbie, Governor of Malta, 21 January 1941; reprinted in *The Malta Siege Bell Memorial*, exh. cat., Malta 1992, n.p.

² The author was the Michael Sandle archive researcher and the organiser of its exhibition at the Henry Moore Institute, Leeds.

³ A. Huyssen, 'Monument and Memory in a Postmodern Age', *Yale Journal of Criticism*, Vol.6, 1993, 259.

⁴ M. Sandle, 'National Life Story Collection: Artists' Lives', interview with Melanie Roberts, 8-9/04/1999, 6 tapes, London 1999, tape 1.

⁵ J. Reichardt, 'The Individuals', in exh. cat., *The Inner Image, Paintings by the Leicester Group*, Grabowski Gallery, London 1964.

⁶ M. Sandle, 'In conversation with John Spurling: "Memorials and Monuments"', London [198?]. Sound recording. Available from the Henry Moore Institute Audio-Visual Library.

⁷ V. Lindsay, 'In discussion with Michael Sandle', *Studio International*, Vol.178, 1969, 80-83 (81).

⁸ M. Sandle, 'Should there be Commemorative Sculpture Today?', Talk at the University of Leeds, 19/02/1992. Available from the Henry Moore Institute Audio-Visual Library.

⁹ D. Petherbridge, 'Disquieting Memorials: Drawings and sculpture of Michael Sandle', *Architectural Review*, Vol.169, No.104, 1981, 374.

¹⁰ Sandle changed his mind after reading about the United Kingdom's involvement in the war and specifically Ellen J. Hammer's *The Struggle for Indochina 1940-1955*. Sandle, 'Commemorative Sculpture Today?'

¹¹ J. Bird, 'The Spectacle of Memory', in N. Serota, M. Livingstone and J. Bird, *Michael Sandle Sculpture and Drawings 1957-88*, exh. cat., London 1988, 34.

¹² Letter, Michael Sandle to Philo Pullicino, 03/10/89. The Henry Moore Institute Archive, [unsorted], Leeds 2003, 18.

¹³ On the myth of the historical evidence see B.C. Hurst, 'The Myth of Historical Evidence', *History and Theory*, Vol.20, No.3, 1981, 278-90.

¹⁴ M. Sandle, 'Interview with Eve Kalyva', 11/04/07. Available from the Henry Moore Institute Audio-Visual Library.

¹⁵ Veteran association founded in 1988, aiming to preserve the friendship between the Maltese and the British who participated in the Siege of Malta, 1941-1943.

¹⁶ M. Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, (trans.) A.M. Sheridan Smith, New York 1972, 7.

¹⁷ On strategic autonomy see H. Foster, 'The Archive without Museums', *October*, Vol.77, 1996, 97-119.

¹⁸ Michael Sandle explains how, in retrospect, the physicality of the work (the Renaissance Walls, the site of a WWI gun emplacement, the view of the Grand Harbour, the bell) incorporates historical memory to the work. Sandle, 'Interview with Eve Kalyva'.

¹⁹ Sandle, 'National Life Story Collection: Artists' Lives', tape 4.

²⁰ Sandle, 'In conversation with John Spurling'.

²¹ M. Sandle, 'The Concept of the Memorial', in Roger Mifsud (ed.), *The Malta Siege Bell Memorial*, Official Catalogue, Malta 1992.

²² S. Herbert, 'Maltese cross as Queen unveils war monument', *Daily Telegraph*, London, 30/05/1992.

²³ See G. Lukács, 'Specific Particularity as the Central Category of Aesthetics', in C. Cazeaux (ed.), *The Continental Aesthetics Reader*, (trans.) Nicholas Walker, London 2000, 220-33. Such terms carry a more precise sense in the German philosophical tradition and are used to designate quantitative judgements – see translator's note, 233.

²⁴ M. Sandle, 'Interview with Clive Langsdale on *St George and the Dragon*', London 1990. Video recording. Available from the Henry Moore Institute Audio-Visual Library.

²⁵ M. Sandle, 'Commemorative Sculpture Today?'

²⁶ J. Derrida, 'Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression', *Diacritics*, Vol.25, No.2, 1995, 11, n.1.

The following images have been removed from the online version of this article for copyright reasons:

Pl. 1. SS *Ohio* entering the Valletta Grand Harbour, Malta on 15 August 1941. The Henry Moore Institute Archive, 2003.18. Leeds Museums & Galleries.

Pl. 2. Michael Sandle, *The Malta Siege Bell Memorial* (1988-1992). Photograph by Richard Waite.

Pl. 3. Michael Sandle, *Monument for the Twentieth Century* (1971-78). Bronze. The Tate Collection

Pl. 4. Fragmented view of the archive display at the Henry Moore Institute.