

Here are some prompts for the round table discussion Saturday 2-3 at Leon Gallery

[Beyond iconophrenzy- image destruction as a tool](#)

Prompt #1

Bruno Latour categorizes 5 types of image destruction and regeneration. The exhibit 'Iconoclashgiftsfeld or the ambiguity of image destruction in a poison field' includes all 5 through the re-representation of previous iconoclastic gestures packaged into a tourist gift shop with voyeuristic documentation of those gestures. In current politics the media focuses on type B iconoclasts or those who prefer *active images* constantly changing to reflect shifting histories.

In a global world with a rapidly dynamic renovation of mediated images, how will a constant change in representations affect our memories, archiving, and/or the manifestations of our heros?

Suggested reading: Definition of Iconoclasm in chapter 'What is Iconoclasm? Or is There a World Beyond the Image Wars?' by Bruno Latour. In the 'On the Modern Cult of Factish Gods' pdf **pages 47-51 and 53-54**. Starting with 'A rough classification of the Iconoclastic gestures' and ending with section 'Art is not to be redeemed.'

Prompt #2

The strategy of remix/sampling art/appropriation art is intertextual and hence, relies on the memory of its reference. It destroys previous narratives but does not completely demolish them; a reorganized text remains in dialogue with the past.

The contemporary iconoclastic movement has left traces of toppled power representations in the form of empty plinths. A reordering is happening in public space as we speak. Some plinths will be completely removed, some are empty and some even replaced by local voices as in the case of the BLM protester Jen Reid sculpture in place of the toppled statue of slave trader Edward Colston. (The Reid sculpture was promptly removed by authorities within 24 hours - <https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2020/dec/18/i-had-a-surge-of-power-the-bristol-woman-whose-statue-replaced-edward-colstons>)

How could remix be an effective or ineffective artistic/political strategy when addressing the empty plinths left behind after the destruction and/or removal of political figures of the past?

Suggested reading:

'Ode to an Empty Plinth- Iconoclasm by other means' by Gene Ray
<https://issue-journal.ch/focus-posts/ode-to-an-empty-plinth/>

Prompt #3

The exhibition 'Iconoclashgiftsfeld' has the subtitle 'or the ambiguity of image destruction in a poison field.' The subtitle borrows from French anthropologist and philosopher, Bruno Latour who points out the complexity of the gesture of image destruction and how it can be

constructive, destructive or simultaneously both. For Eng, the poison field is globalization and its disruption of local identities.

In 'Monuments of the Mind' Lin-Elnan observes how the identity of the hand that destroys when outside of the localized public leaves the iconoclastic gesture ambiguous. With an outsider lens, Beijing artist Pan Xing Lei encounters the passivity of Hong Kong public order when witnessing the persistent imperial symbol of Queen Victoria on the streets. In turn, he makes it the object of political dissonance by vandalizing the statue. His iconoclastic gesture was also interpreted as a Maoist communist action upon neoliberal Hong Kong.

Regarding the persistence of 700 confederate statues left standing in America (87 removed since 1800's) contrasted with the 4000 Lenin statues quickly demolished in the Ukraine in a 14-year span, how can we explain the American passive public order that has recently turned active?

Suggested reading

'Monuments of the Mind' by Phoebe -Lin Elnan

<https://issue-journal.ch/focus-posts/monuments-of-the-mind/>