

NEWSletter 2012

From the President

Whenever I sit down to write to the Group I always have a long list of people to thank and often it takes up a lot of my piece. This surely has a great deal to say about how much the Group achieves. It would be unthinkable for me not to say any thank-yous but I will keep my list short, concentrate on the Open and give apologies to those I don't mention. First of all what would we do without Mike Liggins? Thank you for everything. Thank you also to Tommy Seaward for doing so much for the Open and to Jane Humphrey for the excellent catalogue, PV cards, flyers and posters. I would also like to thank Jeff Lowe, Ece Clarke and her husband, Gill Ingham and the Hanging Teams and their leaders, Tom Scase, Ian Parker and Annie Johns.

The wonderful success of the Open precipitated the timing of this newsletter. With our proposed change to the date of the AGM (see my note on this) we wouldn't be producing a newsletter for many months, which initially seemed thoroughly convenient but as there is so much to say about the Open we would like to celebrate it now and not when we have forgotten about it.

What a triumph the Open was, with nearly the whole Group showing, an excellent open-submission of 735 entries, a very high calibre of non-members' work, the terrific line up of nine prizes, the added stimulation of our Guest exhibitors and knock-out Private Views. The slide-show was hugely popular, the two artists' talks were very special and a privilege to attend. The number of sales was hugely improved and it was great having Jeff's piece as a landmark. There were several occasions with numerous visitors present when the atmosphere in the gallery was electrifying. Congratulations to all involved!

We had a good crowd for The London Group Christmas Party in The Cello Factory and it was a tremendously enjoyable evening. Thank you to everyone for all the wonderful food you generously brought.

We have an exciting future to look forward to, particularly with all our Centenary celebrations - details are listed at the end of the newsletter up to the end of 2013. Congratulations to the



Arthur Wilson at Part 1 Private View



Part 2 Private View

Ben Uri curators Sarah MacDougall and Rachel Dickson for recently having been awarded a grant to fund the curatorial aspect of the historic exhibition from the Paul Mellon Center for the Study of British Art. This is prestigious and will provide some publicity as well as money.

I would like to say a last word of thanks to Jane Humphrey and Tommy Seaward for this wonderful newsletter and I hope you all respond well to our new logo and join me in trusting that it will help us to build on our already significantly raised profile empowering us to continue successfully on our trajectory towards an enriching, enlivening and stimulating Centenary. I am delighted, at last, to be able to say that it is next year.

Susan Haire

The London Group Open Exhibition 2011

Preparations for the The London Group Open Exhibition 2011 began many months in advance and all those members who contributed towards it must be congratulated and thanked for their efforts. The commonly used metaphor of 'the tip of the iceberg' is definitely apt when describing what one encountered on walking into the exhibitions. The undertaking of shared labour by a number of willing members to put on the Open was immense. Only members who have thrown themselves into the thick of organising and helping with an LG Open can grasp the truth of it - I certainly couldn't in the years before I got involved. The list of those to thank is too long for the space here allowed. Nevertheless, I have to make two exceptions, firstly to Mike Liggins, who on some nights at the peak of the frenzy, was getting barely three hours sleep, such was his workload. Secondly, to Susan Haire, who very kindly gave the Group free use of The Cello Factory. This allowed us not only a splendid exhibiting space but left our finances in a perky state and to her we extend our collective thanks.

There follow below two short reviews of The Open. Eric Moody gives his take on Part One and Judith Jones, a non-member who was selected to exhibit and who then won the student prize, writes enthusiastically about Part Two.

Tommy Seaward

Review Part 1

I'm glad I scrutinized my diary this autumn. The 'reinstated' London Group Open, even with an exhibiting artist's motivation, could have easily been missed. This biennial had two parts each lasting ten days with a Private View and Artists' Talks. Although I saw both exhibitions I have to admit I overlooked the Talks and what I understand was another equally public Private View.

We happy six arrived at the first PV in good time only to find The Cello Factory 'rammed' - in the parlance of my attentive nephew who cautioned against entry. Sinews stiffened by the prospect of a 'free' drink and my thirst to see where and how my art was hung I bravely entered, secured a drink only to have it knocked out of my hand by a demonstrative art lover who generously and promptly provided a replacement. Onward and inward, I spoke to all those I recognised and many I didn't with medium jinks on the stairs as a photographer friend had me simulate Duchamp's nude descending past my post-cubist piece. Inevitably, I received a rebuke from my wife and daughter who reminded me that 'some of us have to work tomorrow.'

We left and I resolved to return under more auspicious circumstances.

Managed by Mike, I agreed to invigilate for seven hours on the last day with the promise that I could take my work at 7pm (but not a moment before). I wasn't lonely as I had a past and incumbent President as well as an inquisitive OSA; another member and father of a GEA; a scientist and a few visitors for company. There was space and time to watch the slide show (still a great idea) and scrutinize the exhibits. I am happy to agree with William Feaver and extend his compliment of

'liveliness and distinction' to include the LG members. It was a pleasure to recollect previous exhibitions and see the progress of colleagues' work in a coherent exhibition made by artists committed to making - a post-conceptual renaissance with plenty of ideas for developing small group exhibitions guided by Tony Carter and Wendy Smith's list of 'contemporary genres'.



Again I realise that in organising an Open Exhibition, without any public subsidy, The London Group provides a much needed service for the art community in London. A public service which for too long has been woefully lacking from the publicly funded venues of central London. Imagine my surprise when browsing the Arts Council's Artsjobs website I found, The London Open-Call for Entries, Whitechapel Gallery, July 2012. Is this an outbreak of conscience, a belated awareness of a public obligation to majority stakeholders (artists) or just fiscal opportunism? My 2012 diary contains a reminder from the mayor to 'work at home' and, lest we forget, there will be the posters designed by the usual suspects under the public patronage of the Cultural Olympiad.

According to the Guardian, we need to be in that contact book.

© Eric Moody 2011

Review Part 2

There was a packed crowd for the private view on 2 November at Part Two of this very popular and prestigious exhibition. Bodies filled every available corner, huddled into each stairway and spilled out into the street such was the enthusiasm of the crowd to view the images and mingle with such creative minds.

The London Group are a select group of extremely accomplished and diverse visual artists. Membership is through a democratic system of nominations and subsequent selection. Formed in 1913 as a reaction to the power of The Royal Academy, the Group has been meeting and exhibiting contemporary innovative work ever since. Every two years their annual show is open to submissions from outside the Group, those selected enjoy the honour to have their work hung alongside various forms of diverse works ranging from small watercolours to sculptures of awe inspiring stature and concept, from this very friendly band of creative people. The outside selectors for the open submissions this year were William Feaver, writer artist and critic, and Jenni Lomax, Director of Camden Arts Centre. The show runs for two ten day periods and I was lucky enough to have had one image selected for Part Two.

The Cello Factory is more than a simple white cube space; it has a gallery where work was also hung, this is reached by a small flight of stairs and also gives a different perspective from which to view the work below. An intimate room up another small flight of stairs shows a continuous digital loop of further work from each exhibitor.

This room remained amazingly quiet, even at this busy private view here was a space to sit comfortably and reflect on the work being shown on the screen; yes, as often is the case images viewed digitally don't always appear as they do in reality: that is as they are viewed in the gallery below. Later in the week when I was taking a turn at invigilation one particular visitor explained to me that he enjoyed watching the projected images and then went down to explore the work further; which seemed to me to be an interesting way to disseminate the variety of work on show.



The format of this gallery creates spaces to discover and be amazed by the multifaceted visual creations. As is my preference the works were titled, some giving away hints of their meaning and context, however most interpretation was left to the viewer to decipher and contemplate.

Three works I found particularly inspiring:

The small intimate series of images by Anieszka Kolek which appear with a cursory glance to be calm beautiful gentle

Group Spirit

Given its distinguished 98 year history as the only surviving democratically-run group from the early years of British avant-garde art (look at the list of members on their website for a virtual Who's Who of British art – Epstein, Moore, Sickert, Hepworth, Spencer, Bomberg, Sutherland for starters), I am always somewhat surprised as to how little a younger generation seems to know about The London Group and its enormous usefulness and importance. Too many galleries

Have you read this book?

During the last year I read Jim Faure Walker's book *Painting the Digital River*. I found it deeply interesting and a privilege to be taken into Jim's life. He generously offers the reader a multitude of insights into his practice and shares his inner world, with his very particular relationship between painting and digital art and his experience of the territory where they meet. Always

watercolours in soft pastel hues of blues and greys; however look further into the images and played out are scenes of utter sadness and despair. Where I felt a helpless onlooker; the works are entitled *Stoned to death*, *Village of Mullah Quilli*, *Afghanistan*, 2010.

By contrast in the centre of the main room was a huge contraption of bottles, pipes and wooden keys topped with a huge air filled balloon by Daniel Knight entitled *Prototype Number Two*. This playful piece encouraged the viewer to interact. Pressing the keys resulted in deep notes that boomed out to fill the room; not only a sculptural piece of work reminiscent of a mad scientist's experimental contraption but a sculpture where every individual viewing it could create their own sound performance. As the wine flowed and spirits grew these sounds filled the room as people clamoured to perform.

A third piece of work I was drawn to was that of Linda Litchfield, entitled *Dated Paper and Stitch*. Train tickets and travel cards are pinned within a frame in lines of date order. These were then hand stitched with the memories of that journey and subsequent encounters of the day. One had taken her to visit the dentist, another - drinks with friends, yet another ticket tells us a funeral had been attended. The combination of the banal cards and the carefully stitched memories entwined within them produces a work that holds your attention. The task of tying together with thread a disposable ticket and the long held memories are echoed in the length of time it must have taken to embroider these simple everyday pieces of printed paper. The viewer begins to feel they have been allowed into this individual's personal diary and you cannot help but build up a narrative of her character and life.

Like many other mixed shows I have viewed recently the photographic, oils, pastels and many other processes sat comfortably together; an excellent curatorial couple composed a harmonious group of works that flowed in content and context.

© Judith Jones 2011

and exhibition opportunities these days perhaps, but then also many more artists out there. A puzzle, though a moment also to put things right and to see for yourself at the Group's biennial Open show this month at The Cello Factory, where members and outsiders combine in an always wide-ranging and un-style conscious display.

© Nicholas Usherwood, published in Galleries, October 2011

Future of LG Shows Discussion

At the beginning of January I found myself co hosting an open meeting with Tony Carter, considering the possibilities for future London Group exhibitions. The impetus for the discussion came after I brought up the idea of a themed group exhibition, taking place in a temporary space, possibly using an external curator.

Since the discussion over a year has passed, and as I was doing a lot of the talking I didn't take any notes, so I find myself wondering what exactly we talked about. Consequently, what follows is certainly not the minute of the meeting but more a sense of what I took away from that night - I am sure others will have different memories.

Certainly there was some discussion about the pros and cons of using temporary spaces, particularly 'raw' spaces. Worries and anxieties about how the Group's work would be read within a non white cube context. The idea that it could look like a student show and be unprofessional. But equally I seem to remember excitement at the energy such a context could bring to the work and the possibilities opened up by the opportunity to respond to a space. Concerns about the practical implications of using a non art space - the cost of invigilating, marketing and insurance - but an acknowledgement that by using a free space costs could be kept down thereby ensuring more frequent exhibitions.

The idea of using external curators met with a strong sense that 'we should be able to do this ourselves'. I remember finding myself having to make clear that in no way did my

suggestion stem from dissatisfaction with the existing curation of London Group shows. Explaining instead, how my motivation came about from an idea that working with an emerging professional curator could expose The London Group to new audiences, and possibly increase our relevance to the contemporary art scene. Not all were sure this was desirable and concerns were raised over the loss of control and mis-interpretation.

The 'Drawing - Act and Artefact' exhibition at Morley Gallery was generally seen to have been a successful 'themed' open exhibition. Agreement that having a theme provides coherence within a show, which can otherwise be difficult, given the disparate nature of the Group's work. But also an acknowledgement that by its very nature a theme can be restrictive and exclusive. A sense of the importance of having a variety of different types of exhibitions within the Group - all exhibitions, from the Open to Small Group Exhibitions, having their role to play. And a need for more shows, creating more opportunities to exhibit.

In conclusion, I think I can say that the evening was well attended, that the event provoked lively debate and if nothing else proved there is an appetite for discussion within the Group. As to whether we are any closer to finding the future direction of exhibitions within The London Group - that is not for me to say. Personally, I hope more members come forward to propose exhibitions that they are willing to put their time and energy into.

Amanda Loomes

Small Group Exhibitions

Introduction to Small Group Exhibitions Document

Meetings of The London Group Working Committee in recent years have been much exercised by the desirability and/or feasibility of Small Group Exhibitions (hereafter SGEs), whose selection policy should be seen to satisfy reasonable standards of fairness. Determining such standards has been harder than might have been expected.

Essentially, the stumbling block has been the requirement to ensure equal showing opportunity for all Group members and the constraints this places on individual curatorial freedom. What had once promised to be a rolling programme of SGEs, conceived and curated by individual London Group members, now looks to be more hypothetical than real. Given the limited resources of The London Group, one way out of the present impasse might be that any SGE initiative approved by the Working Committee would fly under the flag of The London Group but that all, or at least a proportion of, the costs involved would be covered by actual participants. This proposal is not without difficulty but it might provide the basis

for a more dynamic Group structure with a less centralized management of creative flair and imagination.

In 2007 Wendy Smith and I produced a short paper on the topic of SGEs which is appended in revised form as a reference for any members who did not read it first time round. The original paper was not intended to be prescriptive but to stimulate discussion and debate within the Group.

Tony Carter

Thoughts on the purpose and formulation of Small Group Exhibitions

If the only visible function of The London Group was an annual exhibition of work by all its members, it would be of very little cultural significance, whether or not it was gratifying for members themselves. As with the Royal Academy Summer Show, from a critical point of view, it would be pretty much a non-event, a novelty within which the work would be too diverse to make any collective point, however good individual examples might be.

Small Group shows should be an opportunity to learn more

about the makeup and capacity of the Group as a whole and the positions that individuals occupy within it. They should also facilitate some more focused reflection on the cultural context in which we operate which, in turn, would make us more a part of that context. But we do need a basis for curatorial policy which is as fair and democratic as it can be; we need some criteria.

In the second (1984-85) of what was then the Arts Council of Great Britain's periodic British Art Shows, the curators evidently recognized a need to structure their selections by category or what might then have been termed 'contemporary genres'. Presumably the selectors' aims were:

- to identify innovative or otherwise distinguished forms of art practice according to specific frames of reference and within these
- to make choices based on relevant criteria, rather than relying on taste alone

Categories were formulated around concepts which linked particular aims and projects to philosophical or political spheres of interpretation, these were:

- 1 Reinventing the Real World
- 2 Origins
- 3 Critical Attitudes
- 4 Visual Poetry
- 5 Signs of Language
- 6 Representing Reality
- 7 Retrieving the Image

Whatever one might think now of the precise nature of these categories, this method was perhaps the only way of bringing a degree of transparency to the vagaries of selection and curating, given the scale of the project overall.

In the past we have suggested that The London Group might perhaps benefit from trying to clarify its own *raison d'être* and appraise its attributes or traits. Such an exercise might also have the effect of revealing various sub-groups within the Group as a whole that are not necessarily defined by style or medium. This should in no way threaten the integrity of the Group *per se* since, regardless of sub-groups, we all have

Annual General Meeting

The three recent past London Group Open Exhibitions have had a closing date for submissions at the beginning September. With August being a dead month, this has always caused a lot of complications with publicity for open submissions and for administration in general.

The WC has decided that in future the Open should be held in May/June and it has therefore also decided to move the AGM because it would be impossible to handle the workload of both at once and so we plan to hold the AGM towards the end of the year from now on. The constitution states that the AGM should be held in the first three months of the year and so in time the constitution would need to be amended but

something fundamental in common. For instance, most of us were professionally active before postmodernism raised questions about the status and/or viability of an ongoing art-historical tradition. Consciously or not, most of us still serve a version of the tradition that we conceive to be dynamic and, in some sense at least, 'progressive'. From some critical points of view, such a position might look to be naïve or regressive; from our perspective, it is simply what we regard as our responsibility as artists.

In summary, we think that the curating of small group shows with intelligence and discrimination should be part of the Group's responsibility to cast new light on the historical past, provide insight into the pluralism of the present and to raise the question, basic now as it ever was, where next?

This constitutes a worthy project if implemented imaginatively and professionally. We are not obliged to adopt the categories listed above, of course; however, something like the following might be helpful to our curatorial efforts:

- 1 Expressionism/Gestural Abstraction
- 2 Formal Abstraction/Constructivism
- 3 Figuration and Narrative
- 4 Visual Poetics
- 5 Appearance and Depiction
- 6 Representation and Visual Perception
- 7 Political/Critical Attitudes

These are suggestions only. It should not be assumed that members would fit neatly into a single category; some might see themselves under several headings, either all at once or at different times. As far as funds and venues allow, it should be Group policy that all members have an equal chance to present work to best advantage in the most sympathetic and/or enlightening company.

At its inception, the Group was concerned 'to advance public awareness of contemporary visual art by holding exhibitions annually'. We think that after almost a century this needs to be rethought along the lines outlined above.

Wendy Smith, Tony Carter 2011

the change has been formally ratified by the WC subject to no objections from the membership.

The Membership Committee will continue to meet at about the same time of year as before and this year it will be held on 11 June. In the years of an Open the MC meeting would then take place after it. Nominees would need to show in the Open enabling the MC to assess their work.

If there are any objections to moving the AGM please inform Mike but otherwise the next one will be held on 27 November 2012.

Susan Haire

The London Group and its ‘Object’ 99 years on: A response to the open meeting on ‘Members’

To consider issues pertaining to the Group’s ‘membership’ now, as we were invited to do at a recent ‘open’ meeting on that topic (20 Sept 2011), is to confront ourselves inevitably with questions that bear directly on the Group’s ‘reason-for-being’. For The London Group, being propertyless and effectively rootless within a now unboundaryable ‘London’ (you can be ‘in London’ anywhere now at the click of a button courtesy of www.), is nothing more than the Group-dedicated activities of its current members. In addition, in spite of the Group’s longevity, these activities are still organised around a very elusive, perhaps even absent and indefinable, ‘centre’. As we discovered at the meeting, in questioning ourselves about ‘membership’ we quickly come up against awkward and simply unanswerable (partly, perhaps, because rarely asked...) questions about the Group’s ‘identity’ and current ‘role’, about what it ‘is’, ‘does’, ‘might be’, and ‘might do’. Such self-questioning thus plunges us simultaneously backwards (to the Group’s very beginning and history) and forwards (to our future possibilities). And surely, a century on, we need to consider whether the extraordinary changes to the everyday life of art-making since that beginning have implications for the Group’s current and future relations to this now all-permeating cultural context.

For we still operate routinely within and under a founding constitution that, however succinctly and apparently flexibly, sets the rules for our activities. Not that I am proposing some kind of constitutional change. Far from it! But, at the least, it may now be timely, to consider whether *implicit in it* there are still challenges with which, belatedly perhaps, we may need to come to terms, especially in relation to the broached question of ‘membership’. For, every time we renew our membership-subscriptions are we not performing an act of re-memoration, one that silently seeks to re-member and to affirm its affinity with what the Group sought to do and be (and be *for*) at its inception and subsequently? Perhaps the Group’s activities are performances of acts of remembrance that hope to restate (silently) something that was stated explicitly in and as that inception. It is as if the act of exhibiting, gathered under the words ‘The London Group’, is itself performing something – trying, perhaps, to remember and show something quite independently of the specific pieces constituting each exhibition. Yet this ‘something’ may now be so elusive (and perhaps so daunting...) that it is easier simply to pass over it and get on with the business, complex enough as it is, of ‘just’ exhibiting. But what could that elusive extra ‘something’ be? What does the act of exhibiting as ‘The London Group’ seek to represent about itself?

Perhaps the relatively small turn-out for the recent open meeting indicates that for most members ‘membership’ is not currently a pressing or controversial issue; we simply take it in our stride and get on with the always time-consuming matters of exhibiting at whatever occasional venues we can find and afford. Yet, in spite of the meeting’s meandering by-chance exchanges (almost inevitable in an agenda-less and un-min-

uted get-together...), it did provide the opportunity to initiate a consideration of the relation between the Group’s current ‘shape’ and its future developmental possibilities. It seems to me that all the questions about ‘membership’ touched on in the meeting (size, recruitment aims and methods, sources of new members, range of members’ making-interests and -commitments) turn on and around, and indeed already assume, tacit agreement on a prior question: *how do we as individual members relate what we ‘get out of’ and ‘put into’ membership to the Group’s sole constitutionally defined ‘Object’?* In other words, has this ‘Object’, inevitably perhaps in the light of art’s cultural fate over the last hundred years, simply faded from the Group’s ‘sight’? Are we in our various current Group activities turning an already ‘blind eye’ steadily further away from the Group’s founding, *and now perhaps unrealisable*, reason-for-being? If so, what might the consequences be for all the questions relating to ‘membership’, for what the Group, in and as its current members’ activities, might be trying to re-member and thus display and perform (about ‘The London Group’ and its relation to the now global ‘contemporary art world’)?

The succinct second clause of the Group’s constitution enshrines its only and unequivocal ‘Object’ (unchanged in 99 years...): ‘to advance public awareness of contemporary visual art by holding exhibitions annually’. If we now interpret ‘contemporary’ as including all current practice that seeks to place itself somewhere within a fold of the ‘modern’ and its ‘afterwards’, then in 1913 such ‘public awareness’ was effectively non-existent; ‘contemporary art’ (‘visual’ and otherwise) was of interest to minuscule and scattered coteries quite aside from the institutions embedding cultural power. It was almost invisible.

Perhaps, then, the Group’s up-coming centenary should act as a timely goad both to remind ourselves of the obvious radical transformations in the everyday life of ‘contemporary visual art’ since its inception and to assess their possible consequences for its role within that everyday life. For, a hundred years on, the ‘contemporary’ arts have been absorbed into and are themselves routine contributors to late-modern culture’s everyday living conditions. ‘Contemporary’ art is now represented, maintained and distributed *as itself an institution*. It is mediated by a complex state/market machinery of intertwined organisations and processes whose very point is to ensure that machinery’s own survival through the constant construction and regeneration of precisely this ‘public awareness’! And of course this machinery includes all those educational organisations that produce annually thousands of state-certificated ‘contemporary visual artists’.

Indeed most of the Group’s members will have had extensive involvement with these organisations as both recipients of and contributors to their productive work. As, *in part*, knowing and experienced ‘insiders’, we thus know a good deal about the construction of ‘public awareness’. We know from the inside how it is mounted institutionally. We know not only that such

‘awareness’ has now become the responsibility of the global culture-mounting machine but also that, as a complement to this take-over, the ‘life’ of the ‘contemporary arts’ *has had to become an ‘object of knowledge’*. Through its universal insertion into state educational programmes it is treated as a bounded knowable object with definable measurable characteristics enabling ‘rational’ assessment and classification. For the Group to seek to ‘advance public awareness’ of the very thing that is now so carefully institutionally managed seems both problematic and paradoxical.

Yet, as members of a homeless Group (in effect a tiny vagrant co-operative...) that has always avoided any institutional affiliation, are we not in some sense, *in part*, also ‘outsiders’? To exhibit with and ‘under’ ‘The London Group’ now is to acknowledge (however tacitly) and to seek to display some kind of relation of *difference* to the machinery that mounts and represents ‘contemporary visual art’ to and for the culture. Might, then, whatever it is that constitutes members’ senses of the Group’s ‘difference’ bear directly on how we relate to our singular constitutional ‘Object’ – ‘to advance public awareness’? If so we may have to recognise the paradox that we now face in interpreting and trying to hold to this ‘Object’. If the Group could still be a site for performing its ‘difference’ then what we would have ‘to advance’ (to offer to some ‘public’ (always unknowable in advance of any exhibition) and to show as the very point of our exhibiting) is *precisely what constitutes this ‘difference’ now*.

Could we as ‘insiders’, for example, begin by agreeing that, in some strong sense, over the course of the Group’s existence *the real condition, the living substance, of its defining ‘Object’ – ‘public awareness’ – has been radically inverted?* From being culturally nowhere it is now globally everywhere, continuously being re-formed and moved on under the authority and discourses of a professionally-controlled art-representing machinery. And is it not this latter machinery that now inevitably sets the context for The London Group’s activities and institutional marginality, defining both its ‘site’ and present predicament? If so, as both ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’, members’ relation to this now inverted cultural ‘awareness’ of ‘contemporary visual art’ is likely to be at the least ambivalent. For whilst we have come to ‘contemporary visual art’ through our participation in this very same machinery (there is after all nowhere else to go), under the aegis of the Group we nevertheless seek to effect some kind of self-distancing from it by holding to some (as yet implicit...) sense of the Group’s ‘difference’.

So what of our ‘Object’ now? Is the injunction ‘to advance public awareness’ itself fatally flawed? For surely ‘to advance’ carries a clear overtone of a supposedly progressive avant-garde? Perhaps at the Group’s inception it sought to place itself as already up-ahead, in advance of a ‘public’ that had to be drawn forward (through its exhibitions...) to the Group’s ‘advanced’ position! Intrinsic to our ‘Object’ is, it seems, a responsibility to lead an as yet unknowing deprived public ‘forward’ into the light of the ‘contemporary’. Yet if, under the suggested inversion, ‘public awareness’ of the ‘contemporary’ in art and everyday life is now institutionally promoted, then the Group might need to re-think its relation to the terms of its ‘Object’. Perhaps we should consider gathering our

activities around terms that propose alternative tactics of ‘retreat’, ‘moving aside’, ‘declining/avoiding’, ‘by-passing/detouring’, or ‘detaching’? Might the challenge be to turn our ‘Object’ inside-out, to invert it perhaps, by trying to find and display how (and why...) the Group’s ‘difference’ performs something that is quite aside from the interests of the institutional machinery (e.g. cooperative trust, mutual support, a critically affirmative relation to ‘tradition’)? Or should we just ignore our founding ‘Object’ and get on with the occasional business of exhibiting without giving another thought to the point of it all?

Surely ‘Object’ and ‘membership’ are so intimately intertwined that any questions relating to ‘membership’ (such as those raised at the recent meeting) will be based on some largely tacit assumptions about our ‘Object’, about how what we ‘do’ attempts to show what we are ‘for’? Unless we make explicit how we stand in relation to our ‘Object’, to what we stand for, we cannot know either what we might be seeking from members or what we are trying to offer to some ‘public-to-come’. Perhaps some attempt to establish broad agreement on our ‘Object’ is a prerequisite for any address of membership issues. If we can find ways of uncovering or establishing, however tentatively, a common sense of the ‘difference’ around which we construct our Group activities now (rather than what set us going in 1913) then this would necessarily guide our responses to matters of membership. Perhaps we do cohere around activity-defining common interests. If so they need to be made explicit. Perhaps the Group needs to get to ‘know itself’ better! If some version of ‘public awareness’ is to remain our ‘goal’ then we need first of all to turn ourselves into a knowable ‘public’; we have to become ‘publically aware’ of what we are organising ourselves around and striving to show about our assumed ‘difference(s)’.

In this context the suggestions in earlier papers (‘What is the Purpose of The London Group’, and ‘Thoughts on the Purpose and Formulation of Small Group Shows’) by Tony Carter and Wendy Smith could be very helpful in pointing to the kind of self-knowledge necessary in informing discussion about membership. Discussing the question of the equitable curating of small group shows, they point to the way that contemporary art practice could be described through the range of ‘genres’ that seem to constitute its broad field. We may know loosely how Group members might dispose themselves across a range of practice-categories but, as far as I am aware, we have made no attempt to describe or present the Group in terms of members’ making-foci. They also suggest that most members probably orient their making to a dynamic, possibly ‘progressive’ version of the tradition, thus posing the question of what we as members are responsible to and for. Perhaps such self-description could aid us in re-assessing our relation to our ‘Object’ (the ‘difference(s)’ we ‘stand for’ each time we exhibit) and thus open onto and inform decisions we make about ‘membership’. To profile ourselves would be to make public for ourselves the affinities between our individual making activities and our Group membership. We might then be clearer about the kind of intervention in the world of managed art-representation, the world of ‘public awareness of contemporary visual art’ such a Group could hope for.

A High Octane Year in Formula 1

Tommy Seaward interviews Mark Dickens

TS: Mark Dickens, you were appointed as the Official Formula 1 artist for the 2011 season. How did this come about?

MD: In 2009 I was commissioned by Abu Dhabi Motor Sport Management to make ten paintings to commemorate the opening of the new Yas Marina Circuit. Mr Ecclestone saw the paintings at the unveiling during the race and then Mr Ecclestone and I spoke about a new commission, which we shaped together.

TS: What was the remit of your commission?

MD: To make one painting for each race. Each panel was about the race, the circuit and host city. The idea was to create a visual diary capturing the spirit, by blending the unique world of Formula 1 with the cultural and architectural dynamism of each city. Also, to collaborate with all the executives of the circuits, for example, the CEO or chairman, city mayor, city governors, on occasion the president or prime minister of a particular country, also the Formula 1 team principals. I invited them to hand-write a text in their own words, expressing what Formula 1 meant to each of them and why it was so special to their lives. They all wrote in a special book and their words were then transferred into the final painting.

TS: You have had involvement with Formula 1 before, but when Bernie Ecclestone shook hands on the deal, how did it feel to suddenly be the first artist to be asked to create such a unique series of artworks?

MD: His words were, "Let's do it!" and we shook hands. I was beaming, I still couldn't quite believe it, but people always said his word is his bond.

TS: Rather than asking about your favourite circuits etc, I think it would be more interesting to members of The London Group to get a feel for what it is like to be an artist in an environment about as far as away from your Space Studios in Vauxhall as it is possible to get. Did it take a while to fit in?

MD: 'Fit in' is not the right phrase. I was aware of being an outsider coming into a tight community. As an artist I felt I was very well respected, as I had been given the commission directly by Bernie Ecclestone, which gave me a lot of latitude, together with genuine interest from the Formula 1 personnel. They were curious as to how I would approach the project, as I was perceived as being different to a journalist or a reporter.

TS: In each country you spent a day taking photographs documenting the city nearest to each of the circuits and the experiences you shared online in your Blog. Was the world as you expected?

MD: Good question, I must say, I have been a little spoilt as I had a car and driver at each race, to collect and deliver to the airport and to drive me around each city. Spending a full day and often an evening in each city has been such a treat. I was all too aware that the Formula 1 community spend all their time within the confines of the circuit. I was being paid to

photograph the cities in all their aspects and I loved it.

TS: I was fortunate to be able to join you at Barcelona for the Spanish Grand Prix. It is a city I know well and your driver took us, in four hours, to as many sights as many people would manage in a week. Did it sometimes feel like sensory overdrive across the course of the year?

MD: Because I had time to spare during each race week, my



Mark Dickens - work in progress

ventures into the nearest city provided the natural starting point. Travelling has always been important for me and to see the world is a special experience.

TS: At one stage you arranged for several F1 drivers to roll freshly inked tyres over paper. Tell us about that.

MD: I had this idea that I put to Mr E, initially which was to incorporate print marks from Pirelli tyres into one of the paintings. That led me to creating this art event in the paddock in Monza, Italy, which was to work with five drivers using five Pirelli tyres. The inters and wets give the best treads for inking up. I invited the drivers to hand roll a tyre on a fifteen metre sheet of paper, thereby creating an art piece with beautiful abstract decorative marks. Pirelli were delighted to have been invited to collaborate and there was much media attention. People began to realise who I was around the paddock and what I was doing.

TS: What happens next with the project?

MD: Mr E will present each painting back to the host city next year, with a special limited edition box set of prints made from the nineteen paintings. Nineteen, because we lost the Bahrain race.

TS: Bahrain brings me on to another question. I have on a number of occasions had people express anger at my enthusiasm for the sport. Criticism has included, of course, that it is dangerous to human life, that it is environmentally unfriendly, super-elitist, too many connections to unsavoury global business conglomerates, too cosy with repressive regimes and that old chestnut, wasteful of good champagne by spraying it around at the end of the race. Do you find your involvement with Formula 1 sits uncomfortably with the earnest high-mindedness often expected of artists?

MD: .. sounds like an opening at Tate Modern to me. Some people consider this a waste of good champagne also.

TS: [Laughing] You have visited nineteen countries in nine months and you have clocked up over 80,000 thousand air miles. You have shared elevators with the top drivers in some of the finest hotels. You have met presidents and prime ministers and rubbed shoulders with celebrities from many different fields. At times you must have been pinching yourself. From this wealth of experiences, can you pinpoint a single highlight?

MD: Actually, eighteen countries, there were two races in Spain remember, but yes, there are so many memories, for instance, at the last race of the season meeting Ayrton

100 Years Ago

As part of our build up towards our Centenary in 2013 I thought a little background information might help members understand and shed more light on events from one hundred years ago. In 1911 Germany was continuing to expand its army and navy and European tensions were high. The Suffragette movement was gathering strength in the UK. There had been violent confrontation with the police outside Parliament the year before. Women were not enfranchised until 1918 in the UK, and even then the right to vote was limited to the over 30s and those 'with property'. An armed confrontation between the London police and a criminal gang of Latvian anarchists became known as "The Siege of Sidney Street". King George V's coronation took place. The Russian Prime Minister was assassinated. In December Amundsen reached the South Pole ahead of Scott. London's population hit seven million.

In Paris the Cubists showed together for the first time at the Salon des Indépendants. Exhibitors were Léger, Robert Delaunay, Le Fauconnier, Metzinger and Gleizes, although Braque and Picasso did not take part. Marc and Kandinsky presented the first 'Blue Rider' exhibition in Munich (German Expressionism). In December Kandinsky published "Concerning the Spiritual in Art". Between 1911 and 1912 Mondrian was moving from figuration into abstraction by means of his "Flowering Apple Tree" series. Matisse visited Moscow for a major commission and Marc Chagall arrived in Paris. Futurist painters were at work and exhibiting in Italy. Marinetti had lectured in London the year before and published the "Manifesto of Futurist Painters".

In the world of contemporary classical music Sibelius wrote his Symphony No 4. whilst Diaghilev produced 'Petrushka' with the Ballets Russes in Paris. In August Covent Garden hosted

Senna's sister, Viviane. At the first race I met Jack Brabham. Going up in a helicopter over the Interlagos Circuit, flying in the F1 private jet, but saying all that, the emotion and excitement of turning it into the artwork is perhaps the most genuine highlight.

TS: I think it is worth mentioning that a passion for Formula 1 does not necessarily go hand in hand with a love of driving. Besides you and me, I know that Tony Carter and Paul Tecklenberg are also keen enthusiasts and between the four of us, none of us has a driving licence! Whether they are drivers or not, there are likely to be other followers of the sport within The London Group membership and should any of them be interested, will they have an opportunity to see the work you have produced from over the year?

MD: It'll be possible to see the work on the official F1 website after the end of February and also on my own website.

TS: Mark, many thanks for talking to The London Group Newsletter.

Mark Dickens website is www.mark-dickens.com

The blog detailing his year in Formula 1 can still be read online at: <http://official-f1-artist.blogspot.com>

the first performance by Diaghilev and the Ballets Russes in the UK.

In London Roger Fry organised the "Manet and the Post-Impressionists" exhibition from the 8 November 1910 to 15 January 1911. Exhibitors included Van Gogh, Cézanne, Gauguin, Matisse, Picasso, Derain and Vlaminck. French painting was hugely influential at the time and this exhibition stimulated much debate and interest in artists' circles. The influential Fry was being "drawn into the Bloomsbury circle" linking him with Vanessa Bell and Duncan Grant. Gauguin and Cézanne were exhibited at the Stafford Gallery, and Gauguin, Matisse and Picasso were shown at the Grafton Galleries. In January Gaudier-Brzeska arrived in London from Paris where later in the year he was to meet Jacob Epstein. David Bomberg entered the Slade where fellow students included Jakob Kramer, Paul Nash, C.R.W. Nevinson, William Roberts, Stanley Spencer and Edward Wadsworth. Sickert exhibited his "Camden Town Murder" series at the New English Art Club.

The Camden Town Group evolved from the Fitzroy Street Group. To circumvent the New English Art Club's censorship, the Camden Town Group organised their own public art shows, just as The London Group were to do. The name evolved from Sickert's studio in Camden Town where initial meetings took place. Subject matter became more to do with workaday situations and street-life around North London. There were sixteen original members: Walter Bayes, Robert Bevan, Malcolm Drummond, Harold Gilman (who became the first London Group President in 1913), Charles Ginner, Spencer Gore, J.D.Innes, Augustus John, Henry Lamb, Wyndham Lewis, Maxwell Gordon Lightfoot, James Bolivar Manson, Lucien Pissarro, William Ratcliffe, Walter Sickert and Doman

Turner. Women were excluded from membership. Between June 1911 and 1912 three Camden Town Group exhibitions were held in the Carfax Gallery. They were not financially successful which ultimately led to the group, under pressure from the commercial galleries, looking to broaden its artistic and financial horizons by linking with other contemporary artists'

groupings. This, basically, was to be the origin of The London Group.

Further articles will appear in future Newsletters explaining what was happening one hundred years ago.

David Redfern 2011

A Tribute to Trevor Frankland (1931 - 2011)



Trevor was always an active member of The London Group and he gave us all a lot of time, effort and energy, he will be very sadly missed. It was Trevor's trademark hat that I first saw when I spotted him across the crowded floor of a London Group private view, then his friendly smile as he greeted me. As our Treasurer he was a supportive, calming voice when, for

me, the stresses and strains of running the Group were rising to boiling point. I often sought his advice, because he was a good mentor and man I could trust. He always wrote in the upper case, and indeed he was a "capital" individual.

Trevor was a member of many fine art societies and enjoyed getting involved in their organisation and politics; with his

draughtsman-like precision he was a man with a plan. His expansive commitment and talent were such that he could turn his hand to many things. One major moment of achievement came when he was elected President of the Royal Watercolour Society (2003 - 2006), I remember him proudly demonstrating the weight of the chain.

He came from a traditional working Middlesbrough family and married Dorothy in 1957, when rock & roll was king. At one of their celebrated dinner parties, Dorothy recounted how young women would put pointed cardboard cones in their bras to look the fashion! There was always a twinkle in Trevor's eye. Together both he and Dorothy travelled to many exotic parts of the world from which they had a whole range of engaging stories to tell and which also allowed Trevor to gather different influences for his creative work. His art work will live on as an inspiration to many others, optimistic and positive, with an underlying transcendental mystery. He was an intelligent man whose sudden death has shocked and saddened us all.

Peter Clossick

Anne Cloudesley



Anne Cloudesley, who died on the 22 January 2012, was the oldest member of The London Group.

I first met Anne in the mid-seventies when she had a Space studio next door to mine. From that point, we formed a firm friendship, during which time we had many interesting conversations about art.

Anne's work was principally inspired by her time in Sudan in the 1960s, where she observed local people through her

drawings, prints, paintings and photographs, and a book that she wrote called *Women of Omdurman*.

On her return, she continued to study and practice art, always drawing on her travels to various countries. She subsequently worked as a teacher of lithography at The Working Men's College in Camden, and had solo shows at the School of African and Oriental Studies, and most recently at the Highgate Gallery in 2010.

Anne was delighted on becoming a member of The London Group in 2002. In her last years, the LG exhibitions and discussions gave her enormous pleasure. Anne inspired us all with her commitment, enthusiasm and participation, and she will be remembered dearly by all her friends in The London Group.

Stanislas Slawomir Blatton

Forthcoming Exhibitions

2013 Centenary Exhibition at Pitzhanger Manor and Galleries: Call for site specific proposals.

In our evening meeting at Pitzhanger earlier this year we were offered not only the fine gallery spaces for our centenary exhibition (January to March 2013) but also access to the adjoining manor house (designed by and built for Sir John Soane and the first 'home' of Hogarth's 'The Rake's Progress') for the display of site-specific/site-responsive pieces. Following our

subsequent visit to the Sir John Soane Museum we have been invited to submit proposals for possible events to be included in their educational programme for visitors. One possibility for the latter could thus be that members who make site-specific pieces for the exhibition be invited to give short presentations at the Museum about the development of their pieces.

Several members have already expressed an interest in making pieces specifically for the manor house. Other members

who weren't able to attend the introductory meeting might well want to consider this possibility too. To give ourselves time to ensure an equitably negotiated sharing of the available house spaces we thus now need to get a clear idea of both the numbers of such site-responsive pieces and each piece's hoped-for siting in the house. It is thus vital that all those considering such projects should submit proposals (even though the details may be necessarily hazy at this stage!) as soon as possible. When all the proposals are 'in' we may well need to have a 'communal' site visit to sort out allocation of showing-spaces. We suggested 20 February 2012 as a cut-off date for project submission, but that date will have passed when you read this.

Mark Dickens and I will be coordinating arrangements for the exhibition and we will be visiting Pitzhanger for further discussions about exhibition arrangements after the end of January 2012 when he will have completed his current commission. Please send all proposals, however tentative at this stage, to me care of 'enquiries@thelondongroup.com'. Mike Phillipson

Territory & Boundaries

Natural boundaries are defined by rivers, cliffs and coastlines. Territory implies possession. Man-made borders have been made with a loaded pen and a quick flick of a wrist. Continents have been carved up and territories have been imposed. Translating the line on the map into the line in the sand has led to conflict and wars. Maps and charts are topographical interpretations of land and sea and are not always accurate or objective. *Territory & Boundaries* is a rich and diverse interpretation of what maps and mapping could mean to artists within The London Group.

The exhibition will take place at the new gallery at Kensington and Chelsea College, Hortensia Road, SW10 0QS, from 24 April - 3 May 2012. The private view will take place on Thursday 26 April. There will also be an evening with the artists on Thursday 3 May. Between four and six artists will talk about their work and answer questions.

The following artists have expressed an interest: Clive Burton, John Crossley, David Redfern, Annie Johns, Chris Poulton, Eric Moody, Bill Watson, Susan Wilson, Alex Ramsay, Ian Parker, Bryan Bengel, Simon Read, Arthur Wilson, Suzan

The London Group Logo Competition 2011

The recent competition to design a new logo for The London Group attracted a high number of enquiries for the entry pack, the number of resulting submissions was just under 30 and the prize was £500.

The selection committee judged the entries and chose a bold and very contemporary logo by Robin Rutherford of Macy Design as the winner and his design also received the most votes from the public. By offering the visitors to the Open the opportunity to vote for their favourite we have hopefully given them some ownership of the design and created a lasting interest in the Group.

The new logo should lift the image of the Group and will appear on all the posters, flyers and catalogues we produce

Swale, Mark Dickens, Victoria Rance, C. Morey de Morand, Tommy Seaward and of course Jane Humphrey and Paul Tecklenberg.

The screens the work will hang on should have been installed by October but we are still waiting confirmation that they have been installed. This has put the project on hold because we could not say how much space each artist would have. Time is getting on and we need to progress. For this reason, please consider work that would occupy a width of 150 cm and 75 cm. This might include several pieces that could be hung one above another or side by side. If you would like to show floor-based sculpture, please send a small and a larger option with dimensions of the work and the ideal space you would like around the work. We would like to take this exhibition to other venues and having this information will help us to curate the work to fit the space. We also need a short statement of approximately 300 words about your practice in relation to the theme of the show. The text and image will be used in a publication accompanying the exhibition.

If you know of a gallery that might be suitable to tour to, please get in touch.

There will be an exhibiting fee to cover the cost of the fold out map that will also double up as a private view invitation. This is £15 each and please send to Mike.

Send your information to Jane and Paul via enquiries@thelondongroup.com or The London Group, PO Box 61045, London SE1 8RN

The deadline was 30 January 2012, so if you have not yet sent your text and image please do so asap.

Paul Tecklenberg 020 7231 1210 or 077347 30367

Self-Portraiture Show at The Cumberland Hotel

In July/August 2012 Amanda Loomes and Ian Parker will be curating a London Group exhibition on the theme of self-portraiture. The exhibition will be held at The Cumberland Hotel, Marble Arch and will coincide with the Olympic Games. Following the letter they have sent out they hope members have registered an interest in taking part. Please respond immediately if you have not already done so and would like to show.

and on our website.

I would like to extend special thanks David Chalkley for making this possible. He initiated the competition and did all the hard work, over several months.

In the terms of the competition it was stated that the winning logo could be amended. Tim Pickup has very kindly been tweaking some small details which have just been agreed by the WC. We hope you like the outcome. In addition we will be adopting a floating image and/or a watermark of the stylised design of Jacob Epstein's Rock Drill, by Tim, which will be used over the period of our Centenary celebrations in 2013-4. Thank you to Tim for all his help.

Susan Haire

London Group Members' Exhibitions

Tricia Gillman

Solo Exhibitions:

Stepping Stones, A Survey of 30 years work, APT Gallery, London. Sept 2011, Lemon Street Gallery, Truro, Cornwall. Oct 2012

Tricia Gillman, Hilton Fine Art, Bath. May 2012

Group Exhibitions:

Beyond the Shadow, (Six Artists), APT Gallery, London. Feb - March 2012

Marcelle Hanselaar

Prizes:

Ruth Borchard Self Portrait Collection, shortlisted and work acquired, Kings Place Gallery, London. 2011

Birgit Skjold Prize for Pillowbook of Endless Nights, work acquired by V&A National Art Library.

First Prize Winner, *Tabernacle Art Competition*, MOMA, Wales.

Exhibitions:

Wunderkammer, Off-site exhibition of Bo-Lee Gallery, The Octagon Chapel, Bath. Sept - Oct 2011

Loods 6, in de baggage hal, KNSM laan 289, Amsterdam, The Netherlands. Sept - Oct 2011

Drawing connections, Siena Art Institute, Siena, Italy. Oct 2011

5th annual Macmillan De'Longhi Art Auction, Bonhams, London. Sept 2011

Ruth Borchard Self-Portrait Competition and Exhibition, Kings Place Gallery, London. Oct - Nov 2011

New Impressions, artists' readings of books, Chelsea Antiquarian Book Fair, Chelsea Old Town Hall, London. Nov 2011

The Ghost of gone Birds, Rochelle School & Club Row, London. Nov 2011

Concrete Skin, BHVU Gallery, London. Nov 2011

Leonora Carrington, Marcelle Hanselaar, Tilly Losch, Viktor Wynd Fine Art, London. Nov - Dec 2011

3rd Qijiang International Print Festival, Chongqing, SW China. Nov 2011

Portrait/Selfportrait, Quest 21, Brussels, Belgium. Nov - Dec 2011

Small Is Beautiful, Flowers Cork Street, London. Dec 2011 - Jan 2012

Contemporary British Art, 40x40, The Millinery Works, London. Jan 2012

Braided Together: Hair in the Work of Contemporary Women Artists, New Hall Women's Art Collection, New Hall College, Cambridge for a month before continuing to BHVU Gallery and opening there on 17 Feb 2012. The exhibition ends on 18 March 2012.

The Sketchbook Project World Tour 2012, Art House Co-op, Brooklyn, NY, USA. 2012

Amanda Loomes

EMERGENCY5, aspex, Portsmouth. Nov 2011

Th'Owd Towser Show, Holmfirth Arts Festival. May 2011

C. Morey de Morand

Solo Exhibitions:

Buscando (Searching/To Look), Museo Ramon Ma Aller, Lalin, Spain. June - Aug 2011

Words, New Hall Art Collection, Cambridge University. Sept - Oct 2011

Group Exhibitions:

Biennale Galicia - Pintor Laxeiro, Lalin, Spain. May 2011

Antes Y Ahora, (Then and Now), Museo Municipal Ourense, Ourense, Spain. June - Sept 2011

400 Women, Edinburgh Festival. Aug - Sept 2011

CRASH, Charlie Dutton Gallery, Bloomsbury, London. Dec 2011 - Jan 2012

40 x 40 Exhibition, Riverside Studios Gallery, Hammersmith, London. Dec 2011- Jan 2012

Jeff Lowe

United Enemies: The Problem of Sculpture in Britain in the 1960s and 1970s, Henry Moore Institute, Leeds. Dec 2011 - March 2012

Ken Oliver

Ken Oliver and Mark Dolamore, Chateau de la Grange, Emergence Centre for Art and Science, Vivonne, Charente, France. June - July 2011

18th International Salon D' Arts Visuels de Poitiers, Chapelle St-Louis Du College Henry 1V, Poitiers, Charente, France. Sept 2011

David Tebbs

Creekside Open 2011, APT Gallery, London. June 2011

Ruth Borchard Self Portrait Competition, Kings Place Gallery, London. Oct - Nov 2011

Paul Tecklenberg

Re-picturing Dulwich Picture Gallery, Dulwich Picture Gallery grounds, (a collaboration with Mikey Georgeson to coincide with the Cy Twombly exhibition, London). July - Sept 2011

400 Women, Edinburgh Festival. Aug - Sept 2011

'Now You see It... color & the mind's eye', Central Booking, Brooklyn, New York. Sept - Oct 2011

Westminster Arts Open, SW1 Gallery, Victoria, London. Nov 2011

Recent London Group Exhibitions

The London Group Open 2011, The Cello Factory, London. Part 1: 20-29 October (curator Tom Scase)

Part 2: 1-10 November (curators Annie Johns & Ian Parker)

Biennial Open Exhibition, featuring work by Group members and selected non-members

Calendar of London Group Events:

2012

Territories and Boundaries, Kensington and Chelsea College, in their new building, 24 April - 3 May, PV Thurs 26 April, Artists' Talks Thur 3 May, curated by Paul Tecklenberg and Jane Humphrey

Membership Committee, Mon 11 June, deadline 1 May, nominees to deliver one work on 11 June, pick-up 12 June, both 11am - 1pm

Self-portraiture, Cumberland Hotel, Marble Arch, July/Aug during the Olympics, curated by Amanda Loomes and Ian Parker

Members' Annual Exhibition, The Cello Factory, 13 - 24 Nov, PV Tues 13 Nov, deadline for submissions 5 Oct, work delivered Sun 11 Nov, 11.30 - 2, pick-up Sun 25 Nov

AGM, Tues 27 Nov, work from the Annual can be picked up then

Members' Centenary Exhibition, Pitzhanger Manor, deadline for submissions, 23 Nov

Christmas Party, Mon 17 Dec, 6pm (no WC meeting beforehand)

2013

Members' Centenary Exhibition, Pitzhanger Manor, mid Jan to beginning of March

Open Exhibition, The Cello Factory, May/June

+100: The London Group Today, The Cello Factory, PV 15 Nov, to commemorate the coining of The London Group name by Jacob Epstein

'Uproar!': the first 50 years of The London Group, Ben Uri, The London Jewish Museum of Art, St John's Wood, from Oct, likely to be on for three months and to run concurrently with *+100: The London Group Today*.

The following events are also proposed:

We are planning to host a Public Talk chaired by a prestigious speaker, to be organised by the new PR Committee.

One Hundred Plus is to be the name of a draw to be organised by our new Fund-raising Committee. Members and other artists will be invited to donate works to raise funds for the Centenary. Every ticket sold will win a work.