

Figure It

Recent works by

Julie Rrap

Sally Smart

Brigita Ozolins

Mary Scott

Justine Cooper

## Introduction

In 1979, the artists Marina Abramovich and Ulay visited the School of Art in Hobart as part of the Sydney Biennale's extension program. While in Hobart they discussed a number of their performances and I was struck, at the time, by how much of the photographic documentation could be argued to be a form of self-portraiture.

Three performances come to mind particularly. I remember one work in which they sat back-to-back bound together by their hair. The performance over a period of seventeen hours concluded when their heads finally separated as Marina's uncontrollable shaking, through physical exhaustion, loosened the knot. It was a performance about testing the limits of the body's control but one couldn't help thinking, too, that the binding was a metaphor for their own partnership. Likewise, when Ulay took a bagging needle and twine, pierced both lips and tied his mouth closed after which Marina took his place and continued to answer questions put to Ulay by the audience, it was hard not to regard this as an incisive commentary on the power relations operating in what was obviously an extra-ordinarily intense partnership at the time.

Jonathan Holmes

Recently I was reminded of these performances when reading Frances Borzello's book, *Seeing Ourselves: women's self-portraits*,<sup>1</sup> because she includes a third performance by Abramovich and Ulay that I want to consider. Frances Borzello argues that a great deal of figurative art in the last twenty or so years has, in fact, included representations

of the artist's own body and she makes the point that much of this work should also be seen as self-portraiture, albeit in an expanded version of the genre. The point is not insignificant because we might reasonably argue that whether it is the artist's body or someone else's is often neither here nor there; the body is there as a prop just like any other prop that might be incorporated into a figurative work.

Marina Abramovic and Ulay's work *Imponderabilia* performed in June, 1977 is a case in point. In this performance the artists stood naked, immobile and face to face in the doorway to the exhibition space. The gap between them was too narrow for the audience members to enter the space without having to turn to face and to rub groins with either Marina or Ulay as they passed through. When describing this work in 1979, Marina Abramovich commented that she and Ulay could just see, in their peripheral vision, the facial expressions and body language of visitors at that moment when they had to make the decision about which way to turn. From her point of view it was that confronting moment, where their bodies are props and the visitor is forced to make a sexually charged and ultimately subjective decision about how to enter the space, that was the point of the piece.

The question of self-portraiture/self-representation and the artist's-body-as-prop are the predominant themes behind this exhibition. The concept of the show – to include works by artists using their own bodies as subject matter of their art – started to germinate after it was confirmed that the University would be co-host to one of the National Portrait Gallery's symposia on portraiture in 2001.

The idea took off after seeing Brigita Ozolin's week-long performance, *My Hands are Tied*, in which the artist sat at a desk, surrounded by a wall of books, writing continuously in copperplate, 'My hands are tied,' on the torn out pages of second-hand books. The image of

this artist, her back to the audience, absolutely inundated by words and creating a visual work of art, what's more, is as telling a self-portrait as any and yet it hardly fits the common conception of what a self-portrait might be.

Similarly, one might argue that Mary Scott's beautiful abstracted forms in works such as *Each Drop* and *Every Stitch* have nothing to do with self-portraiture and that she is primarily concerned to use the body as prop. And yet she would be the first to admit that not only are these images of her own body but that the obsessive layering and the attention to detail are autobiographical traits that are central to the works' meaning.

In Julie Rrap's case, I had seen her *Window Dresser #1* in the Hobart Art Prize early in 2001. What intrigues, in the first instance, is the morphing of the glass dress onto her body, dressed only in knickers and photographed in the infamous pose of Marilyn with swirling skirt. Yet there is something intensely personal about photographing oneself in the image of the 'flawless' film icon and with skin and flesh beginning to show its age.

With Justine Cooper's work, there is clearly a different aesthetic and intention. Her interests lie in the discourse between art and science and, in particular with medical science. In *Rapt II* we are privileged to see her anatomised as she subjects her body to seventy-six scans using magnetic resonance imaging. There may be a coolness in the clinical approach but there is also an arresting corporeality about the actual work itself as these slices are reassembled to re-present the whole body.

Finally, it seemed to be drawing a long bow to include Sally Smart, when I first started thinking about asking her to be in the exhibition,

4

but I had seen a photograph of hers called *Self-Portrait with Organs* (1996) some time ago that fitted the theme. Furthermore, I had been struck, by the way in which the presence of the artist seems to press through when she assembles large scale installations such as *Parameters Head: À La Ronde* seen at the Experimental Art Foundation in 2000. It's almost as if we walk inside a representation of the artist's own head, a head filled with strange and beautiful images brought to consciousness and re-assembled for the audience.

And so, here it is – *Figure It*, an exhibition of self-portraiture and self-representation by five artists who have given considerable attention to these themes in their recent work.

Jonathan Holmes

<sup>1</sup> Borzello, Frances *Seeing Ourselves: women's self-portraits*  
London, Thames and Hudson, 1998, p.167

Mary Scott

*Carnival and Lent*, 2001  
Inkjet print  
110.0 cm x 100.0 cm  
(Framed size 133.0 cm x 122.0 cm)





Mary Scott

*Each Drop*, 2001  
Inkjet print  
78.1 cm x 40.0 cm



*Every Stitch*, 2001  
Inkjet print  
78.1 cm x 40.0 cm

Sally Smart's work *Parameters Head: À La Ronde* refers to an eighteenth century house built in Exmouth in the 1790s by two women, the Parminter cousins. The source of Sally Smart's interest in the house was an illustrated article about À La Ronde in an interiors magazine. She filed the item away and it sat in the file for many years, brewing an idea, waiting for its moment, which arrived when she successfully applied for a grant to visit the house.

Had the surrealists known of it, À La Ronde could have recommended England to be put on the surrealist map. Two women, the Parminter cousins had it built for themselves, to be kept in perpetuity for the unmarried women of their family line. The house has been inherited by women for over two hundred years. Its architecture is an extravagant, marvellous folly. Sixteen-sided, it has a central octagon from which all the rooms on one level radiate. Smart described it as "*a hybrid construction, based on the Parminters' ten-year European tour; supposedly a homage to the octagonal basilica of San Vitale at Ravenna, and with the pastoral connections of a dovecote or barn structure. They designed the rooms to follow the sun. Each room enters into the next. Morning through to evening would be spent travelling through the rooms' various functions*"<sup>1</sup>. Sally Smart described another remarkable feature of À La Ronde. The Misses Parminter hand decorated the interior, with bits and pieces they collected locally: "*the feathers of local birds for the feather frieze and the shells collected from the Exmouth estuaries for the shell gallery*"<sup>2</sup>.

There are strong affinities between the Parminters' house, its décor and Sally Smart's oeuvre. Over many years Smart has used cutouts and pastiche. To describe her work, Smart points to the term "femmage" coined by Miriam Schapiro. Schapiro incorporated traditional modes of female production into her own practice. "Femmage" covers activities





Justine Cooper

*RAPT II* (detail), 1998  
Magnetic Resonance Imaging  
scans and architectural film  
100.0 cm x 100.0 cm x 800.0 cm





Brigita Ozolins

*Are you thinking what I'm thinking?*, 2001  
Office furniture and fittings, computer,  
acoustic panels, one way mirror, personal  
and scientific data, medical books  
600.0 cm x 290.0 cm x 220.0 cm approximately



traditionally practised by women - collage, assemblage, découpage and photomontage - and Schapiro sought to elevate their status as passive décor or busywork. These methods were of course also adopted as an avant-garde strategy within cubism, dada and surrealism. Schapiro regarded decoration as a legitimate modernist concern. The modern tradition as she saw it, rested on an essential connection between abstraction and decoration.

In line with the practice of "femme", the creative lives of women have been celebrated in Smart's assemblages. The present work is a personal echo of the architectural space of *À La Ronde*, emblematic of the house. The heads for example, are taken from silhouettes of the Parminster cousins' mothers. The large, bold, dramatic elements of Smart's installations create dynamic psychological spaces: the artist's mind's eye writ large. The works are imposing as installations, but in their provisional nature they are still very much collages. The fabricated elements are a travelling repertoire to be performed anew and, in effect, each installation is its own assemblage. The work is conceived to be seen in different places and to undergo translations by the artist. I cannot help but be reminded by these felt cutouts of the joys and strange surprises of my childhood "Fuzzyfelt" picture construction sets. (As I remember them, the Fuzzyfelt shapes were a variety of simple silhouettes and more detailed elements, some with faces, some without, which stuck temporarily to a scratchier background surface. If items from the Circus set were mixed with Fuzzyfelt Hospital, quirks of scale and mood would occur). The act of installing Smart's assemblages involves a rehearsal process: re-editing the elements; pinning them at arm distance from the wall; standing back; pacing and altering the composition in response to the spatial tensions, the opportunities and limitations offered by the particular space. Like graffiti, the installed work is a signature: she was here.

Mary Scott's imagery is also related to collage, though it may seem that the works belie that heritage. Certainly the imagery seems poles apart from Sally Smart's spatial register. Scott's work seems to have no location, no "here". She has said herself that one of her aims in making them was to create "tactile visual fields, at variance with the singular and detached viewpoint of perspectival pictures"<sup>13</sup>. The spatial attributes of Scott's works are extraordinary. There is a slippage in her figure/ground relationships which goes a long way to demolishing that distinction, and the relation between the image and the picture plane is similarly slippery. The point of view either makes us feel pressed close to the image, or else suggests that the image is straining against its own confines. The paradoxical space within the images can seem at once to be claustrophobic and condensed or else infinitely layered and of indeterminate depth.

The curious space in Scott's work is, to my mind, as much a representation of cyberspace as a product of digital technology. The way she uses digital imaging accomplishes a strange feat, whereby she seems to have envisaged an ether in which collisions of subject and objects can occur and a total fusion can take place. She seems to have replaced the air, like the preserving alcohol in the specimen in a jar; or more extreme still, she has replaced the space. When we speak of cyberspace, we are speaking of a field where information substitutes for space. Scott seems to suspend her figures in a viscous liquid or set them in aspic, yet they can still be animated. Pattern substitutes for space, rather than filling it.

The formal accomplishment here is in having worked through a collage principle and taken it to another remove. In Mary Scott's hands, PhotoShop has become a means of manipulating multiple layers of semi-transparent and opaque imagery. She has written

of using up to twenty digital washes<sup>4</sup>. I like to think of *Porca I* and *Porca II* as self-portraits which celebrate her extraordinary accomplishment. To me, they are commemorations of a madcap cartoon heroine who has vanquished all sorts of symbolic enemies, thrown off the heavy residues of the old scopic drive and come out laughing. When my gaze is met by these images I feel a sense of elation and levity. I don't know this place - where she is - as yet, but she has taken me there.

Brigita Ozolins - let me spruik for a moment - *is a woman unmasked. She is an open book: the subject, the patient, the accused, the defendant, the exhibit. Outed. The evidence is all here, for all to see, the results of a rigorous enquiry. The facts speak for themselves.*

Facts, of course, never speak for themselves. Brigita Ozolins has apparently pursued herself with the alacrity of the stalker, the private eye, or the medical researcher, and the result of the sleuthing seems to be this orderly archive, devoted to the documentation of one individual. Far from revealing all, at least at first blush, the effect of the archive is strangely anonymous. The first impression is that there is no imagery, no narrative, no testament and no portrayal; rather, a collection of personal data waiting for interpretation. The packaged personal papers remind me that we are all called to account often. The job interview, questionnaire, tax return, insurance, superannuation, last will and testament. We order, re-order, construct, deconstruct our documents and memorabilia, our chattels, and shuffle our roles and titles. Shambling through unfamiliar territory, we try to regroup as best we can and present ourselves accordingly. Sometimes the artefacts and the paperwork seem like too much to order in one lifetime. Sometimes you badly wish you had a much better system for managing yourself. On the other hand, life is finite, but there's no end to biography.

*Do I hear Fiction? Science fiction? Autobiography? Do I hear Art? Where, you might ask, or what, is the Art? Realism? New Realism? Old realism?*

The cubicle with the desk, the files and the computer give off a whiff of science. A file of medical tracts sits in the drawer. Though the desk is a "found object" it simply functions here as a desk. Things are labelled in a fine hand and, indeed, there are some images. On the computer screen the woman's head appears with suction cups on her face and what looks to be an electronic dreadlock hairdo, indicating that she is wired to an apparatus. Green squiggles, arranged in an oval against a black background. Black zigzags across white pages. They have some really quite nice formal attributes; they could almost be art. They are EEG scans, taken while Ozolins read an English text, and then one in Latvian, her mother tongue. The displays of mechanical scribbly lines are visibly different for each language, reflecting the different traction the bilingual brain has when using the two languages. One display seems to fall into chaos or spasm. The different patterns raise the eternal question, *Who does one become when one speaks another language?* For Brigita Ozolins the mother tongue has retreated, and the adopted language has gained supremacy.

Ozolins' work is situational in character. The conceptual pivot is the flux of systems and structures that we keep adjusting to, often with bizarre results. It rests in the mimicry of practices and processes just as much as in the assembly of found objects to create something akin to a stage set. How you might apply yourself to considering such a desk depends on your repertoire of habits. It isn't so much through trying to interpret the contemporary, generic furniture that we can gain any real purchase over this work, but by interacting

in the space, like Alice. I am reminded here of some of the ideas of Guy Debord, and the idea, the method of *dérive*. It roughly means to be drawn, to drift, and to respond to the districts of a built environment and to be open and responsive to spaces that can promote chance, surprise encounters: a kind of urban magic. In the cubicle, Ozolins has co-opted the tools of medical imaging and methodologies of psychological interpretation and cognitive science. For me, Ozolin's work suggests the idea of a "bureaucratic marvellous"; the possibilities for magic to occur within the least enchanted of settings.

*Rapt II* consists of 76 prints of axial sections of Justine Cooper's body which she has captured using Magnetic Resonance Imaging equipment. MRI uses a very strong magnetic field. In contrast to X-ray technology, which uses radiation and exposes the skeleton, MRI makes bones disappear. It shows the water content of the body, thus revealing the soft tissue. Her work continues in the lineage of anatomical description. The quest for anatomical detail originally relied on the unholy alliance between the artist's keen observational eye and the vivisectionist's keen blade. At first they were grave robbers working illegally and furtively as their operations on the dead were viewed as ungodly. Beautiful, macabre drawings and etchings were made redundant when the camera colonised the body. Camera-as-probe has now penetrated the living body, with an ever-increasing capacity for displaying its minute, most intimate details.

As I write, I have yet to encounter Justine Cooper's digital anatomy *Rapt II*, except as images on her website and catalogues. From these, and with some anticipation, I can imagine the large hovering presence, a composite form of single images suspended in space. What medical imaging communicates, over and over again, through the simplest media – drawing – to the most hi-tech, is the complexity

and intricacy of the body-as-pattern. As much as a quest for knowledge, the wonder and desire of the anatomical gaze must surely come from a lust for detail and pattern, because strange ghostly poetry, not just data, can erupt from this vision. On Cooper's website I also found a statement which informs the link I have been making between the works in this show through the conventions of collage.

*The 3D digital body is immaterial, a simulation made out of 'information', although this is a problematic statement because nothing can be 'made' out of information – at least not in the traditional sense of the verb, "to make", which concerns the fashioning of existing materials. The computer itself is nothing other than a simulation machine; that is, through its computations and algorithms and its flexible interface it simulates other machines and machine-dependent processes from a typewriter to a photographic lab and an animator's studio. It duplicates their processes and imitates their implements and interfaces<sup>5</sup>.*

Julie Rrap, the Artist-as-pun, could just as well be described as a simulation machine herself, having explored appropriation and deconstruction strategies for decades, frequently using her own body as "found object". In the last decade her work has taken on a decidedly technological edge. Once again, the present works use the computer and her own body to reconfigure recognisable scenes.

Rrap described the process behind these as having begun with some old dress patterns, and the idea of making the patterns up in materials that were in no way associated with fabric. In trying to decide which dress patterns to choose, Rrap worked through a number of film



Sally Smart

L. *Parameters Head (Space)*  
R. *Theos and Stammer*  
From *Parameters Head: Design  
Therapy*, 2000  
Synthetic polymer paint on felt and  
fabric with collage elements  
Size variable





Sally Smart

*Parameters Head: Design Therapy, 2000*  
Synthetic polymer paint on felt and  
fabric with collage elements  
Size variable



icons, arriving at Marilyn Monroe's famous pose in *Seven Year Itch* (1955) and Sharon Stone's in *Basic Instinct* (1992). The ingredients, the logic of the images, sound uncomplicated: take (a) two blondes in white dresses (b) in Hollywood (c) in flashing scenes, and (d) substitute yourself. The aim of the game is to wrap the image of woman, the broad, in the image of the dress.

The game seems simple enough, but use of sophisticated media have upped the ante. The extraordinary effects of the morphed dresses were accomplished by creating the sculptural dress objects in three dimensions. These were then photographed. Rrap photographed herself performing the iconic scenes: Marilyn in ecstasy over the air vent; Sharon seated with her open legs revealing her crutch, and the absence of any underwear. In order to get the facial expression right, Rrap said it helped to utter Stone's line: "Have you ever fucked on cocaine, Nick?"

In *Seven Year Itch* the sauciness of the vent scene played off the coy suggestion that Marilyn's panties might be glimpsed, against the fantasy that she might not be wearing any. Julie Rrap in *Window Dresser #1* is clad in a glass dress which reveals that she is wearing a modest pair of standard fifties high-waisted knickers. As a concept, Rrap's gleaming, georgeous, impossible architectural dress is even less plausible than the idea of a glass slipper but the simulation is a knockout. It beats Hollywood at its own game of being every bit the beautiful, blatant fake. There is a spellbinding connection in these images between the triumph of the special effect dresses, and the texture of the flesh.

We know the limbs could so easily have been enhanced to emulate a pneumatically pumped nubile. Photo enhancement to conceal the normal signs of ageing has become the norm. The naturalism of the flesh, especially juxtaposed with the dress, is a *punctum* in

Barthes' terminology. It is the point which demands our gaze; a concentrated, engaged stare. This can no longer be engendered by falsified, digitally smoothed skin. The fact that the dimpled flesh of a fifty-year-old woman creates this thrall is all the more exciting because it sounds so unlikely. The flesh and dress converge ineluctably into the iconic image of Marilyn.

Maria Kunda July 2001

<sup>1</sup> Smart artist's statement

<sup>2</sup> Ibid

<sup>3</sup> Mary Scott, Unpublished PhD Exigesis, 2001.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid

<sup>5</sup> Patrick Crogan, 'Insides Out: Speculation on the Body in 3D computer Animation', Paper delivered for Animation Studies Conference, August 1999. See <http://justinecooper.com>



Julie Rrap

*Window Dresser #1*, 2000  
Digital colour photograph  
mounted on lexcen  
190 cm x 130 cm.

*Window Dresser #2*, 2000,  
Digital colour photograph  
mounted on lexcen  
190 cm x 130 cm





## Justine Cooper

Since the mid-1990s, Justine Cooper has exhibited her work in over 30 shows in 12 countries across 5 continents. Her work has focused on intersections between art, science, and the body. In 1996 she received a scholarship to undertake a Master of Visual Arts in Electronic Art at Sydney College of the Arts, University of Sydney and currently is the recipient of a 'New Technologies' grant from the Australian Film Commission and a New Media Arts Fund grant from the Australia Council. In 1998 she won first place at the Australian National Digital Art Awards. Between 1996-2000 she has taught new media and netcultures at the University of Western Sydney, the University of Technology Sydney, and the University of Sydney. Concurrently she has also worked within various faculties of the University of Sydney to implement their online museum collections.

She is currently artist-in-residence at the American Museum of Natural History, New York. She will begin a second residency mid-year at the World Trade Center through the Lower Manhattan Cultural Council's World Views program.

Justine Cooper resides in New York.

## Brigita Ozolins

Brigita Ozolins graduated from Monash University in the late 1970s, majoring in Classical Language and Literature and spent several years working as a librarian. She enrolled at the Tasmanian School of Art in the mid-1990s and graduated with a first class honours degree in 1999. She won an Australian Postgraduate Award in early 2000 and is currently enrolled in the PhD program at the Tasmanian School of Art. She has had four solo exhibitions since 1987 and has been exhibiting in group exhibitions since the mid-1990s. She has focused on exhibiting installations and has carried out several performances including a week-long writing performance, *My Hands Are Tied*.

She recently completed a commission for the State Library of Tasmania and she has received an Australia Council London studio residency which she will take up in 2002. She also teaches art and design theory part-time at the Tasmanian School of Art.

Brigita Ozolins lives and works in Hobart.

## Julie Rrap

Since 1982, Julie Rrap has had over 30 solo exhibitions in Australia, France, Belgium, Italy and Switzerland. Her photographs, installations and, more recently, digital prints have also been widely exhibited in Australia and overseas including in three *Australian Perspectives* at the Art Gallery of New South Wales (1983, 1985, 1987) and three *Biennales of Sydney* (1986, 1988, 1992). Her work is represented in all State Galleries and the National Gallery, Canberra. In 2000 she completed a public commission together with the artist, Janet Lawrence, for the Melbourne Catholic University Chapel and another commission, *Power Walker*, for the Powerhouse, Brisbane.

She has received a number of grants from the Australia Council and had studio residencies at Bezozzo, Lombardy, Italy (1982/3) and twice at the Cité Internationale des Arts (1986 and 1997). A monograph on her work, *Julie Rrap* was published by Piper Press in 1998.

Julie Rrap lives and works in Sydney.

## Mary Scott

Mary Scott has been exhibiting since 1986. She graduated with an MFA from the University of Tasmania in 1987 and taught at the Department of Fine Art at the University of Northern Territory in 1989 before returning to Tasmania to take up a teaching position in painting at the Tasmanian School of Art in 1991. She has recently submitted a body of paintings and digital prints for a PhD in Fine Art at the University of Tasmania. She has been involved in the development of the Tasmanian School of Art's Digital Art Research Facility for several years, winning a Large Grant from the Australian Research Council in 1997-1998 with colleagues Bill Hart and Geoff Parr.

She has curated or co-curated several exhibitions for the Plimsoll Gallery including *Re:Search* (1997) and *Rosamond* (1999). In 1991 she was awarded an Australia Council studio residency grant to work at the Verdaccio Studio in Tuscany, Italy.

Mary Scott lives and works in Hobart.

## Sally Smart

Sally Smart has had over a dozen solo shows in the past decade and has exhibited extensively in Australia and overseas in various group exhibitions during the same period. Her installation *Family Tree House* has recently been shown at the Galerie Baro Senna in Sao Paulo, Brazil and her 1999 solo exhibition at Robert Lindsay Gallery, Melbourne, *Femmage* (Shadows and Symptoms) was later shown at Fukuoka Art Museum in Japan. The exhibition was the subject of an extensive catalogue with essays by Helen MacDonald and Rachel Kent. Sally Smart has a PhD from Monash University and her work is represented in many of Australia's most important art collections.

In 1999 she was awarded an Australia Council studio residency in London and *Parameters Head : À La Ronde* was created as a result of visiting the 18th century house A La Ronde in Exeter, England.

Sally Smart lives and works in Melbourne.

## Justine Cooper

*RAPT II*, 1998

Magnetic Resonance Imaging scans and architectural film  
100.0 cm x 100.0 cm x 800.0 cm

## Brigita Ozolins

*Are you thinking what I'm thinking?* 2001

Office furniture and fittings, computer, acoustic panels, one way mirror, personal and scientific data, medical books  
600.0 cm x 290.0 cm x 220.0 cm approximately

## Julie Rrap

*Window Dresser #1*, 2000

Digital colour photograph mounted on lexan  
190 cm x 130 cm.

Wall-mounted glass sculpture consisting of 5 components of variable dimensions with fixings

*Window Dresser #2*, 2000,

Digital colour photograph mounted on lexan  
190 cm x 130 cm

Wall-mounted mirror sculpture consisting of 7 components of variable dimensions with fixings

## Mary Scott

*Folly*, 2001

Inkjet print  
123.0 cm x 80.0 cm

*Hysteric*, 2001

Inkjet print  
140.0 x 60.3

*Each Drop*, 2001

Inkjet print  
78.1 cm x 40.0 cm

*Every Stitch*, 2001

Inkjet print  
78.1 cm x 40.0 cm

*Carnival and Lent*, 2001

Inkjet print  
110.0 cm x 100.0 cm

*Porca I* 2000

Inkjet print  
1200 x 820

*Porca II*, 2000

Inkjet print  
110.0 cm x 118.5 cm

*Riding the Skimmington*, 2001

Inkjet print  
139.0 cm x 90.0 cm

## Sally Smart

*Parameters Head: Design Therapy Head Space #1* 2000

Synthetic polymer paint on felt and fabric with collage elements  
Size variable

*Parameters Head: Design Therapy Head Space #2* 2000

Synthetic polymer paint on felt/fabric with collage elements  
Size variable

*Parameters Head: Design Therapy Abstract (Interior)* 2000

Synthetic polymer paint on felt/fabric with collage elements  
Size variable



## Acknowledgements

This exhibition has been developed to coincide with a Symposium, *Portrait and Place*, presented by the National Portrait Gallery, Canberra, in association with the University of Tasmania on 1st September, 2001 at the Centre for the Arts.

The curator would like to thank the participating artists for their generous support for the exhibition. Thanks also go to Roslyn Oxley 9 (representing Julie Rrap), to Sean Kelly and Michael Edwards at Contemporary Art Services Tasmania for their advice, to Tracey Allen and Kate Bliss for their assistance with the catalogue, to Maria Kunda for her catalogue essay, to the designers, Julia Dineen and Ian Blamey, for the production of the catalogue, invitation and poster, and to Pat Brassington for her great assistance in getting various works to Hobart. Special thanks to Gerard Willems, and to Thomas Simm and the School of Psychology and Andrew Southhorn, Stephen Stuart and Asset Management Services at the University of Tasmania for their valuable help with Brigita Ozolins' installation. Finally, thanks are extended to the Plimsoll Gallery Committee members without whom exhibitions such as this would be all but impossible to mount in Tasmania.

Exhibition curator:	Jonathan Holmes
Catalogue essay:	Maria Kunda
Design:	Julia Dineen and Ian Blamey
Exhibition Co-ordination:	Pat Brassington
Printing:	Monotone Printers, Hobart

© 2001 The authors, artists and the University of Tasmania.  
ISBN 0 85901 960 8

Plimsoll Gallery, Tasmanian School of Art, Hunter Street, Hobart, Tasmania  
Exhibition dates: 10th August – 2nd September, 2001

The University of Tasmania's exhibition program receives generous assistance from the Premier and Minister for State Development through Arts Tasmania.



UNIVERSITY OF TASMANIA



Tasmania  
ARTS TASMANIA

