# The Immediate Objects

DELFIM SARDO

In a text by Richard Serra, one several times rewritten by the author—an important detail as we imagine him carefully pondering the weight of each word—the artist recalls the first years of his career: "When I started, we were hand-manipulating pieces. These pieces were not joined in any permanent manner. The only possible means to erect them was with the help of other people who were choreographed in relation to the material."[1] I read this text several times because of this expression: "choreographed in relation to the material". It is comprehensible that the manipulation of the elements composing the balance of Serras works at the time demanded a delicate choreography of collectively articulated actions, a manual management of their weight, and of the intersection of stability and tension points. This is relevant as we consider what seems to be the first of the ideas coming to mind in what concerns the work by Jose Pedro Croft, an artist developing his work in sculpture (but also drawing, and printmaking), based on my observations, over time, of what I have come to believe to be an extremely personal choreography dictated by the specifics of each material. As material we should include not only the different elements of each work, with their particular weight, density and temperature—as marble, iron, glass, and ceramics, to name some of his recurrent materials—but also the components embodied in worldly things that already have names assigned to them: tables, chairs, cabinets, doors, or drawers. Through time, each one of these things has been recombined in different composite solutions, all originating from a constant vertigo of lost or found disequilibrium.

With no intention of violating the intimacy of the artists studio, I believe I can reveal that Jose Pedro Crofts daily and constant work process is based on superposing things until they are converted into another entity, and distorting this new entity through torsions, cuts, or reconfigurations (in an etymological sense, as in the construction of another figure). We start with choreographed actions that set up possible relations between elements, some of which singular units themselves, with their own functionalities lost in the construction of a new entity whose status is in continuous negotiation—even if sometimes these functionalities, and even the history of the object, remain and are incorporated in the work. This is not a building process—because the action of placing something beside or above (or wedged, or joined, or suspended) another does not serve a project, but a process that can be both additive and subtractive.

Let us go back: we had persons choreographed in relation to the material. These are important elements: the choreography of persons and the relation to the materials. In fact, as we talk about actions we tend to lose sight of a key element: actions are made by persons adjusting to the contingencies of the materials. Giving two examples, huge mirrors manipulated with great effort until they are placed in a plan that is progressively adjusted (in relation to what? But I'll come back to this point), or doors hanging in mutual equilibrium, always without a preliminary study. This means that it is the choreography of the persons that physically (and we can give emphasis to the adverb, with all its resonances of exertion and sweat) adapt to materials that ends up generating a determinate set point, provisory or temporary, which will be itself the object of a new definition, usually a subtraction, or a deviation from orthogonality, until it is finally stabilized. This moment is a moment expanded in time. Any given configuration can remain in the artist's studio for a long time until it can be continued, tested, stabilized, or abandoned. At some stage of the process the materials are a kind of provisory

[1] Richard Serra, "Rigging", *Writings and Interviews.* The University of Chicago Press, London and Chicago, 1994, p. 97. It is a version of a text first published in *Cover,* January 1980, which was already a version of an interview of Richard Serra by Gerard Hovagymyan.

solution of physical relations that requires, due to reasons and possibilities indefinite to all but the artist, to be transformed into another solution, finally converted into the tensional presence of the object. All this may be too descriptive, and probably boring to the reader, because text cannot convey the continuous character (but not regular or stable, sometimes spasmodic, and often urgent) of the process through which a sculpture is generated. In this same book, Amador Vega links this transience of the different provisory moments of Croft's sculptures to the notion of "state proof', a technical term used in printmaking to define a proof made before the print is regarded as finished, to make sure that the work, tinted and printed in a particular way, fulfills the ambition of the image. It is a fair comparison, and the metaphor can be applied to Croft's entire work: a permanent "state proof'. It is true that Jose Pedro Croft's work process is based on a permanent reconversion, often of questions and solutions that exist as three-dimensional practices and migrate to two-dimensional practices (and, sometimes, vice-versa), but also of processes he has used in the past and now recovers. It is as if all moments contain the possibility of future moments, or as if the creative process would consist in a permanent loop around a magma of problems, questions, beliefs, convictions, retreats and advances, necessarily related to other choreographies that are, as we have seen, contingent to the materials. The days spent in the studio are like this: a continuous process of changing what cannot be changed, the inevitability of working with things that become other things as they are contaminated by actions that were intended to reveal them. This never happens, because what is revealed will yet be another thing (or many others). And so on.

This process is complex and generates permanent friction, even if its description may seem to convert it into a fluid poetics of continuous metamorphoses. It has many more edges than it may seem, and often much less poetry in its thorough practice of one-thing- after-the-other, or (in what concerns drawings) a cut-after-the-other, a line-after-the-previous, or even in the vernacularity of physical exertion, in the scatological of sweating or, something that happens every day, in repetition.

Artistic work implies the repetition of procedures, but in the case of Jose Pedro Croft, repetitions are one of his first methodologies, even an imperfect tense of the artistic practice.

Language is slippery and it seems we are talking about just one thing—to repeat—but we are talking about many different modes of practicing the methodology we call repetition. If, in the field of printmaking, the repetition of procedures is a constant that exists within the practice itself (to wash, to engrave, to seal, to tint, to print), the remarkable about Croft's artistic practice is that these repetitive processes are conducted as a procedure that encloses the potential of a progression towards a *ignis fatuus* that keeps burning and migrating between different procedures and disciplinary traditions while knowing that, in each one of the cases, the cumulative (and later, subtractive) matrix is a process that involves repetitions.

To be clear: since his earlier pieces, in the period in which he almost only worked with stone, Croft's process was based on building up accumulations which referred to a tradition that was apparently more architectural than sculptural (with the wall and the column as their matrices) and were composed of elements that, by trial and error, eventually found their place and produced an entity. Those entities invoked a precariousness that unveiled their funereal mnemonics, which was defined, however, by a procedure with an anthropological imprint. It was often said that they were traversed by the idea of tomb, of elegy and of vestige, that they possessed a funereal poetics. This is probably all true. But the point now is that they were the result of a repetitive, vital process; an almost childish procedure, diluted in a system of juxtaposition as fragile as allowed by its structural economy. We may think that, in some secluded region of his method, the funereal necessity can only be understood as a vital process, but even more important is the notion that structural precariousness is only interesting as it is always on the verge of collapsing under the force of gravity—falling, crumbling.

This methodology—and this belief—is contrary to a structural notion of sculpture, this is, to the belief in an art

based on structures, constructions, or edifices. To use a term dear to the Russian avant-gardes, it is closer to *Faktura* than to *Konstruksia* or even *Tektonika.* Here the decision process is largely defi ned by the specific characteristics of the material, knowing that the procedure has a methodology that denotes a poetics of transience. Simultaneously, this definition of a poetics of transience developed a criticism of monumentality as the volatile references exuded by the artist's work at the time seemed to indicate a poetics of the fragile monument, a version of the concept of *"pensiero debole*" (weak thought)—widely commented when Croft started his career, in the first years of the 1980's. However, the context of Croft's sculptural thought was already establishing a possibility that somehow contradicted the hermeneutic compulsion and moved towards a state of irreducibility regarding the artwork's interpretative processes. This was achieved with the production of pieces (like a work dating from 1985, a fragmented column, now in the collection of Caixa Geral de Depositos) that, using a lexicon familiar to the sculptural tradition, seemed to be subsumed in an almost scatological dilution while acknowledging typological forms pertaining to sculpture and statuary. Even if it is not possible to say that they contained a criticism of monumental typology, they were presented as melancholic dissolutions—although they never manifested nostalgia. His procedure was a-monumental, producing a friction that would be multiplied through many other of his pieces in the subsequent periods, especially the group of works that—often, but not always, in white painted bronze, and rendering situations that evoked libations, with all their inescapable redemptive echo—translated into a human scale. Variations on the typology of the bowl, and afterwards on the washbowl, not only suggested a human scale, but also generated a proto-anthropology: being there, being immediate in how they echoed hypothetical uses, they seemed to exclude the explanatory word, interpretation, the compulsion of the metaphor. They were transformed into the remnants of a field work based on gathering, collecting.

* * *

In many works he produced throughout the 1990s, Jose Pedro Croft used pieces of furniture, especially tables and chairs, combined with plaster, stone, mirrors and steel structures— common structures, the ones usually used in industrial shelving. In their final form, these sculptures—in which chairs and tables seemed to be mutilated and fused into new composite entities—maintained these building elements (stools, chairs, tables) recognizable as entities to which prostheses and orthoses were added, preserving, in this way, and based in a mnemonic game, the fictional anthropological field. What has always intrigued me—and seems to be relevant—is that these pieces of furniture never appeared between quotation marks. They were not "chairs" or "tables", but always chairs and tables. It was only in this condition, with an identity value that denied distance, that they had their possibility of a life-after-death as elements fused together. In this sense, the summoning of the body embedded in their utilitarian memory preserved their physicality or, to say it differently, suspended their perishability—as we should remember (and it is often good to remember) that one thing is inseparable from the other. Consequently, and already part of composite sculptures, the furniture pieces never lost their capacity to evoke an absent physical body. However, they were never used as metaphors of this body in the construction of an abstract body, or an idea of body, because the coupling of spheres, panels and solids clogged the empty space, rendering it useless while making the spectator aware of it. When we face an entity that provokes an anthropomorphic impression, and this entity has no possibilities of use in its own semantic field, what transpires is the perception of the fragility of the body, this is, its vocation for death.

The survival of the nomenclature of those elements pertaining to the human ideas of *house* and *dwelling* was finally at the service of the acute awareness of the perishability of the body that could eventually have had used them. Suspended in time, the sculptural elements became fragile and temporal and, because of this (I believe that precisely because of this) they were in a limbo between the real image and the reflection in the mirror, between the stability and the precariousness of the equilibrium, between its vernacularity and the architecture of the white wall, a whitewashed plaster. This process was developed in a virtuously repetitive way until it could no longer exist, because it had become stable. I believe that

the question was always on the side of the loss of imbalance, not on the side of the loss of balance—as the goal was maintaining a conflictual process between the elements comprising this curious fiction of immediate object, this is, of an object that does not allow for mediation. This game was obviously self-contradictory, because its nature required a mnemonic mediation, an internal recursiveness, embodied in the haptic character of the contact they requested but was refused by their fragility. One can never touch a sculpture, especially a sculpture existing in a fragile equilibrium. Nevertheless, all the thermic character of the sculptures produced by Croft in that period seems to ask for what could not be given to them: touch.

It may be interesting to introduce here another question, which seems closely connected with this, and that is the relationship of the work by Jose Pedro Croft with (and how he positions himself regarding) an optical paradigm that permeates the universe of the theory of architecture, which defined its own history. This optical paradigm, still present in Siegfried Gideon, views architecture as drawing, a project translated into space. Another approach would be to think space as the secretion of a body. As such, the architectonic space becomes more or less dense depending on the bodies that secrete it. From this point of view, space is not anisotropic and differs in density as it is differently experienced through touch. Extending this line of reasoning a bit further, we discover another division between a space understood as distance and a space of immersion, of *sym-pathos.* It is on this terrain that Croft operates—at least since he started producing those hybrid pieces invested in the game of familiarity and the inseparable strangeness produced (because it is felt in a vertiginous way) in the interior of that same strangeness. Continuing on this path, we could try to understand two important aspects of his sculpture: its alienation toward the several versions of the Modernist theory of distance (from the Brechtian *Verfremdung* to analytical thought), and the importance of memory, of its recursiveness and strangeness, the latter experienced through immersion. Perhaps here we can find the strength that emanates from his sculpture, in this process so close to our body and in its erotically veiled *hapticity.*

* * *

I'll try to forget all I wrote until now in order to produce a statement that apparently contradicts all I've been trying to prove (that the strangeness in Crofts body of work is melancholic, and inherent to the recognition processes). In order to do this, it is necessary to make a retrospective journey. In 1964, the American sculptor Robert Smithson produced two sculptures titled *Enantiomorphic Chambers.*[2] It is a set of two pieces in painted steel and mirrored glass (their first version was lost), preceded by a version in the form of a cardboard model, and already presenting two questions that would be later multiplied in his work: the theme of the mirror that reflects a different reality than the one that can be perceived from the spectator's point of view and the question of the screen as a colored surface. However, the complex fiction represented by the *Enantiomorphic Chambers*—chambers that produce the same reflected image using opposing systems—is based on yet another fiction, (something characteristic of Smithsons work) which revolves around the lost books of an imaginary artist, the author of *The Exhaustion of Sight or How to Go Blind and Yet See*[3], where Smithson supposedly found the complex schematics for enantiomorphia. If, on the one hand, the supposed title has a strong biblical connotation, in line with the interest for Christianity that runs through Smithson's work since the time he spent in Rome in the early 1960 s, on the other hand it raises the problem of the production of a non-optical sculpture using optical mechanisms.

[2] The pieces were first shown in 1966, in the exhibition *Art in Process: The Visual Development of a Structure* at the Finch College Museum of Art.

[3] Robert Smithson, *The Collected Writings* (Jack Flam ed.). University of California Press, Berkeley, 1996, p. 40.

This non-optical character is based on the recognition that the production of images is not retinal, but cerebral. As every image is a production of the body, we are free to dismiss the question of the supposedly passive character of the spectator in the contemplative process.

I believe that the sculptures produced by Jose Pedro Croft since 1998, when he started using *Handy* structures articulated with mirrored surfaces, or iron structures combined with glass and mirrors (and I'm deliberately and necessarily simplifying; the chronology of Crofts work does not obey to this linear timeline), recover the issues raised by Smithson with those works in 1964, moving towards a relationship with both the architectural space and the corporeality of the viewer, diverted by the multiple forms of its verticality. The use of mirrors was not a new element, as we have already seen, and was usually associated to pieces of furniture. This was already visible in his exhibition (with Susana Solano) at the Museu de Serralves[4], in 1997- Nevertheless, intersecting them with cold structures, not related to the affectivity of personal use, but to social use, is a phylogenetic continuation of the procedure of absorbing the space and the spectator into the interior of the sculpture, now converted to the scale of the sociability inherent to the exhibition—something not indifferent to what concerns the status of the artworks as societal machines. Phenomenologically, these sculptures extend over orthogonal axis, prolonging space both parallelly and perpendicularly to the ground, virtually (in the optical sense) sinking into it, or prolonging the visual fields, generating space. I use the verb "to generate" because they functioned exactly like a generator, this is, as a system that produced a spatial energy that was only activated by use and was consumed by it: it is necessary to look into them in order to activate their potential, a methodology certainly close to Sol Lewitt or Larry Bell. Further exploring this "energy" metaphor, they are generators but not capacitors—accumulation is circumscribed to the pieces that followed these first works, and engage, as their starting point, with the open legacy of the pieces produced by Smithson in 1964.

These pieces were to emerge in 2002 and they would be sculptures arising from the distortion of parallelepipeds reduced to a steel tube structure, placed between the wall and the floor, multiplied by irregular or vaguely trapezoidal mirrors, if a nomenclature exists for all these geometrical figures. Here, we face again the question of the name of the thing, it had already manifested itself in the past (it may even be a question that cuts across all of Croft's work[5]), but now it arises from elements that, reminiscent of archetypal geometric solids, seem to have been subjected to distortions that made them alien to Euclidian reason or memory. These space secreting batteries function as mnemonic machines,

[4] Jose Pedro Croft and Susana Solano, *A ceu aberto*, Museu de Ser- ralves, February-April, 1997. Curated by Manuel Castro Caldas and Teresa Blanch.

[5] Manuel Castro Caldas in *Representaçao Portuguese a 19.ª Bienal International de S. Paulo.* Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, Ministério dos Negòcios Estrangeiros e Ministério da Cultura, October 1987, w/ page number.

convoking the memory of entities from the history of art, but also from an everyday universe, simultaneously configured as impossible drawings in space, deceptively empty volumes, as chambers rich with the possibility of negative spaces. As the perceptive problem is affirmed in increasingly stronger ways, transforming the artwork into an operation that swerves the capacity of the spectators to determine a position based on the images of their own body schematics, the contamination of the works by the space where they are installed, made even denser by the problem of their naming, i.e., of their identity, acquires an enormous relevance in the status of the object (only atavistically named as such). The sculptural object, this strange entity— both figure and battery, affirms itself as it establishes the place of its presentation by "absorption"—producing a fine irony on the *vexata quaestio* of the form and autonomy of the sculptural object, removing from its activation field the modernist prolegomena to all future art, and, paradoxically, ostensibly bringing the fiction of the sculptural object as an immediate object, one that clearly excludes the mediation of metaphor, of allusion.

However, "clearly" is an inappropriate word for this process (which is anything but clear), but it comes to our mind as the sculptures affirm themselves (with a sly, seductive smile) as immediate. Candidly, we believe: reflected on the mirrored surfaces, trounced, the body shattered and re-attached, the iron structures losing all the poise of reason, and sometimes the sense of measure, the space multiplying as everything is engulfed by what we could now call a phenomenological machine.

Suddenly, we could remember the history of the use display cases, from Yves Klein to Joseph Beuys, or Smithsons sculptural hap in 1964, Robert Morris, Picassos cubist sculptures or even, long before, El Greco's volutes of body distortion.

Nothing.

We look inside these sculptures and it is as if we see ourselves, broken and shattered, for the first time.

* * *

Before these sculptures intruded into our lives they were tested in drawings and prints[6]. There is a permanent contamination between the several procedures and genres used by Croft. In the prints and drawings we can find the signals of future changes in the artist's sculpture, the revision of unsolved problems, the development of topics and experiments. Paper and two-dimensionality unite the practice of drawing and printmaking. Both seem evident, but cotton paper, with its hapticity and physicality, plays a fundamental role in his work. Later in this book, the question of drawing and engraving/printmaking as practices revolving around the notion of surface and screen will be analyzed by Joao Silverio, but we can give emphasis, even if superficially, to the physicality of the sheet, its ductility and resistance, its weight and mechanical behavior, its capacity to absorb ink, and how it can be trounced, mashed, overprinted, repainted, cut. All this approximates the paper sheet to the physical and corporeal character of sculpture. Somehow, Croft's practice of drawing is a practice that cuts across sculpture and painting and, in this sense, refers constantly to the great names of modernist painting, from Malevitch to Mondrian, from Mark Rothko to Ad Reinhardt—a list to which I would add Robert Motherwell. Nevertheless, I now want to propose another question, one that exist regardless of hypothetical connections and echoes in his work. It is how Croft uses paper, the material, in (yes, again) choreographed movements and procedures that manipulate it with a total lack of consideration for image (let us say, for the aesthetic and ontology of image as image) and favoring the development of a metamorphic procedure. From a print, in its version of state proof and as we manipulate the etching plate, we can obtain another print, and another, and another—from some of these prints will arise (what we will lazily call) drawings. In these drawings, with their numerous layers of paint, varnish, Rotring or ballpoint pen traces, the initial print fades and another image appears to be worked on until it produces a problem impossible to solve using

[6] Hellmut Wohl, "Monumentos Vazios: uma instalação de José Pedro Croft no Museu Calouste Gulbenkian", *José Pedro Croft: Paisagem interior.* Fundaçãio Calouste Gulbenkian, Lisboa, 2007, pp. 11-21.

the same processes. The essential object of this process is not the resulting image, but the new and unapproachable problem. Often a ghost remains, underneath, visible to some as a specter of the artwork that originated it, but this is also an accident of the long metamorphic process in which, once again, one thing ceases to be what it was to—by a process of fitting and turning, coating and cutting—become the beginning of a new path, one that will be possibly continued by other means.

The connection between sculpture and drawing is thus decided by two processes: by symptom, as what is signaled in a certain disciplinary action can (and often does) later migrate to another disciplinary procedure; but also by contamination of its own process, to which is inherent the plastic condition of the material, the paper. As such, the status of paper in Croft s two-dimensional work is comparable to a test device: he never produces pieces *on* paper but always *in* paper—and this idea may help us understand why his wall sculptures have such a close relation to his drawings and prints, and these relate so closely to his three- dimensional sculptures on the wall, floor, and so on.

Nevertheless, all this arose *apropos* the forewarning we felt in the drawings he produced in 1997 relating to the structures that would permeate the sculptures he started producing in the following year[7], but it was especially in what concerns scale that the drawings attained this divinatory status.

In the case of the works on paper, the question of scale has an enormous importance as they have no anchor in the real able to provide the illusion of a natural scale. This means that, in the case of the sculptures, the scale of elements such as tables, chairs, screws, bolts, or marble veins, gives the final piece a scale that inexorably belongs to the world—even the oldest sculpture present in this exhibition, a floor piece in bronze, has the mark of the artists hand and fingers, which gives it a radical *anthropomorphia.* In his works on paper this relation exists only in those pieces that include photography, and, even in those, it is already a representational process that defines a scale in relation to its referent. Furthermore, scale is here produced by surface relations. Sometimes, these relations are very subtle, as it happens in his most recent pieces with their cuts and scratches—and here the scale and density of the scratch—when compared to the dimension of the chromatic surface (which defines yet another blurred epidermis)—propose another scale that depends on the distance or proximity of the spectator. Lets see if I can explain: Croft s works on paper play a fundamental role in his work, as they face the problem of scale as a pendulum, redrawing space using the spectator s vectors of distance and proximity. The spectators understand that their vision has to be employed in several ways—that what they see in the distance is not what they see up close, that their vision is produced as much by their eyes as by the legs, head, and arms they use to empirically measure the relation of their bodies to those chromatic surfaces that, never being geometrically regular, lay as screens in front of them. That zoom action performed by the spectator, in a proto-cinematic movement over those impure colors, contaminated in the thickness of the layers forming these screens. This is something that also appears in his more recent sculptures, especially in the one that opens the exhibition in the building of the Cordoaria Nacional.

[7] Something also noted by Hellmut Wohl in the quoted text.

In 2010, Jose Pedro Croft had a solo show and participated in a group show in which he presented two sculptures that included steel structures, surfaces in mirror and colored glass. Migrating from the works on paper to the three-dimensional universe, these pieces added another concept to the already complex universe of their production: the artwork as chromatic device. I say "device" because the piece does not only serve to fulfill its formal and compositional presuppositions—it was not said until now, but the question of the composition is central in Croft's work, even if following non-canonical or even unusual strategies—but also to allow itself to be traversed by the spectator's gaze and be converted into a point of view of the other and of the real space activated by use, inevitably contaminating the space it produces with an evidently invasive chromaticism.

This process is particularly intense as it materializes the question of the *sympathos*, which we already referred to regarding the use of mirrors, but now it does so by means of an opposing procedure, not (only) absorbing the corporeal image of the spectator, but also producing a chromatic contamination of the space, denaturalizing it. Here another instance of his sculptures corporealized scale is defined, now in a clear relation with the cinematic dimension I mentioned before, but also adding a pictorial facet to the sculptures' spatial relation, in a fluidity that quotes Judd's non-disciplinary three-dimensionality (which is not to say that the minimal is one of his concerns, as he is distant from the contempt for manufacture and from the interest in the Gestalt we can find in Morris between 1965 and 1967). However, both scale and the attention to the relation with the real space—here understood as architectural space—are tools also used by Croft, especially because his sculpture has been progressively reaffirming a realist influence, present in the use of furniture and architectural elements such as tables, stools, and especially doors. These elements, which now coexist with boxes, glass, mirrors, and other furniture pieces, are represented in a scale that tends to be more architectural than anthropomorphic. One of the most important changes brought by this return to the use of furniture pieces is the complexification of the *coupling* (or assembly) process: the focus is no longer in testing the tense relation between two elements, but to produce—by any means possible—a new polymorphic entity, abounding in internal references to its own history of use. The other important transformation is the introduction of multiple planes and possibilities that cut across the piece, intensifying the

complexity of its status. In this aspect, it is interesting to ask ourselves, for example, if an artworks nature is transformed because it includes an Eames chair—is it a chair, an Eames chair, or an "Eames chair"? A doubt we could never have had before. There is no cynicism in this process, neither is it something present in the artist's body of work, but there is an emphasis on the semantic deviation produced by the radical immanence of his pieces in which scale starts to produce an interesting and self-aware friction with the anthropomorphic condition that gave origin to it, subverting the architectural relation.

We find the fragile and realist desire for a transcendent condition in this friction between real space and the inadequacy of deviance: between remembering and suppressing memories, between forgetting the use and the cut, the fissure and the architectural plan.

And from that chasm anchored in our everyday life—anchored in failure, in the realism that materializes in the temporality of these artworks, immediate as the objects of our (now open) life; the transcendent opens like a door.

NOTE:

The title of the exhibition *Objectos Imediatos* (Immediate Objects) was stolen from a poem by Herberto Helder, an inexhaustible source of perplexity and openness to the world.

The exhibition is divided between two spaces: a series of works on paper will be shown at the Fundação Carmona e Costa, while a series of sculptures and other pieces on paper will be on display at the Torre da Cordoaria, in an effort to present some of the most important tendencies in the development of the work by José Pedro Croft in the last 12 years, a rare flashback. Many of the artworks are here presented for the first time. Despite the fact that this book accompanies this exhibition, it refers to many pieces that, for various reasons, were not included in the final show.