Colleen Wolstenholme, *Iconophobia*

Virginia MacDonnell Eichhorn

Sculpture & humour (suite)
Number 77, Fall 2006

URI: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/8856ac

See table of contents

Publisher(s)
Le Centre de diffusion 3D

ISSN
0821-9222 (print)
1923-2551 (digital)

Explore this journal

Cite this document
Colleen WOLSTENHOLME, Iconophobia

Virginia EICHHORN

To be born woman is to know—
Although they do not talk of it at school—
That we must labour to be beautiful.
—W. B. YEATS, Adam’s Curse

Repression of feelings. Suppression of emotions. These have been with us for generations. In particular, women have been subjected to societal dictates of what is “acceptable” or appropriate behaviour. As children, as girls, we have been told how “nice” girls behave. One cannot be loud, or angry or boisterous. To be any of those things is somehow to repudiate or reject femininity and thus be left open for criticism or public censure.

Think these are old-hat ideas, things that have already been dealt with by past generations? Think again. Ways of thinking are deeply entrenched within our society and will take more then a few years to change. In 1993 then Prime Minister Kim Campbell was asked about the development of our National Forces during the debate. Her response was “That’s not about Women’s Issues.”

For several years now artist Colleen Wolstenholme has addressed these issues. In particular using the metaphor of antidepressants as her means. Her pharmacologically inspired work has gained attention internationally and has been widely featured in magazines and journals, including Harper’s, People, and the London Sunday Times, as well as being reviewed in numerous art magazines and journals. In particular, Wolstenholme looks at how pharmaceuticals have been used to create “acceptable” behaviours and demeanours in women.

Her latest body of work, Iconophobia, continues with her pharmaceutical metaphors but also extends itself to include a greater and more pervasive social critique—something that curator Ivan Jurakic described as a “metaphorical resistance against authoritative power structures...” and as a “...critique of ideological coercion.”

It is no accident either that Wolstenholme incorporates identifiable logos and trademark names in her work. By doing so she investigates the dynamics and relationship pressures we are told that “BuSpar is a 245 cm tall bronze sculpture which is an exact replica of BuSpar medications. Interestingly, on the company website amongst other information we are told that “BuSpar attenuates punishment suppressed behavior in animals and exerts a taming effect”. Wolstenholme’s dramatic presentation of this piece gives it an almost heraldic or totemic effect. It appears solemn and grandiose—something that is immovable and that will persevere through the generations. It is presented as an object worthy of veneration. In this work she dramatically shows the authority with which pharmaceutical companies present their wares—however we know that these things often come with disclaimers and contraindicators. That information is often “hidden” in small print or glossed over in consultations.

Wolstenholme reminds us to challenge these authorities and to, above all, question how something is presented.

Likewise Spill! is an installation of pills, each of which is a perfectly rendered enlargement of BuSpar and Amitriptyline. These large plaster sculptures are overwhelming and oppressive in scale. As one negotiates through the gallery space, one cannot get away from them. The artist effectively reminds us of how pervasive the prescribing of medications like this is within our current society.

Wolstenholme posits that this (over)medication is a means of keeping those who do not conform in society and those who are most economically vulnerable (children, women, seniors) in a “managed” and manageable state. Triad reinforces that concept. Rather than using pharmacueticals in this instance Wolstenholme created three burqa-clad women who are slightly smaller than life-size. The figures are placed in a circular arrangement but are facing away from one-another. There is a disconnect between them and their reluctance to look toward each other for support, creating a strong atmosphere of isolation. We cannot help but wonder at the source of is shaming? Is it fear of breaking out of imposed boundaries and expectations? The figures in Triad are vulnerable and helpless, imprisoned within the plaster casts of their burkas, unable to progress or move. They are incapacitated.

Wolstenholme’s work is strong. It is strong in technique and in intention. She takes the “power” of brand names and cultural icons and subverts them, taking from them the meaning that the corporations would like us to associate with them and giving us instead the opportunity to decide for ourselves. –
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