

Audio File Name: AB__NT_Gibside_Interview_13_May_2018
Date: transcribed 8th June 2018
Comments: reviewed March 2021
Duration: 37:19

KEY:

Cannot decipher = (unclear + time code)

Sounds like = [s.l + time code]

I1: = Interviewer

I2: = Interviewer

R: = Respondent

NT1, NT2, NT3 = National Trust Staff

I1: ... and the work?

I2: Okay, so this is Nick Cass with Judith King interviewing Andrew Burton on the 12th May, okay?

I1: So, have the requirements of the commissioner, that's National Trust, affected the development of your thinking of your work? And, you know, how has that changed from the very early concept of your work? Because, your concept has changed, how do you think the balance of the commissioner has been in that thinking?

R: Quite a lot, in as much as the Mary Eleanor Bowes thing, was a continual pull back to that, you know, the topic of the brief. They probably would have gone in a slightly different direction had they not been, you know, at the back of my mind, and at the front of my mind. Also, making work fairly accessible, I mean, that wasn't the state of the comment of the other commissioner, but that was also the one which should be accessible and available to people.

And, then, I suppose a requirement that it was in the walled garden, which was not going to be something in the first place, lead some of those pots in a different direction. For instance, the planting in them I am sure wouldn't have happened if they had been somewhere else. So, I would say a lot, quite a lot. I mean, to some extent, there were, kind of, reflections along the way, because, much as we ... I mean, I think they were quite changeable in their approach, as well. I could maybe talk a bit more about those in a minute.

I1: How much do you think the requirements of the audience, it being a place that has a large audience, 279,000, you said that's influenced, has it influenced it quite a lot, or...?

R: Yes, I think it has influenced it a lot, in that, as I say, I wanted to make a piece that was going to be available to people who weren't, sort of, art public, you know, because they are not art public, really, so it needed to be something that had a visual impact and that, sort of, unwound that story of Mary Eleanor Bowes, and the whole Gibside estate in a fair and clear kind of way.

I2: Mm.

R: You know, so I think it does, kind of, speak quite directly to people about what we have found out, quite how directly we speak, maybe not quite directly enough, but, you know, what we are about is in there, not very (unclear 0:02:52.4).

I1: Because I'm quite interested in how the other elements came into the work, that the vessels were the vessels, and then the planting, and the ceramic parrots, and the cock. Do you think that was location, which you said, you know, if it was in the walled garden, or was it the audience? Was it having to ... was it the audience almost inhabiting the heads of the audience?

R: They were always going to be in there, I didn't know exactly what, but there were always going to be things in those pots. Whether it was going to be – at one point, a portrait or bust of Mary Eleanor Bowes or birds, or, you know, a lump of coal, or other things, some of which ended up there, and some of them didn't.

So, that was in my mind right from the get-off. In fact, the biggest thing was that the arrangement ... I still think it would have been better, actually, I still think it would have been better in the walled garden like that individually, it's not totally satisfactory. I think it would have been better, probably, as a bigger group, where that felled beech is, or best of all, on the avenue, I think that was a missed opportunity, definitely missed opportunity.

I1: Do you feel uncomfortable about that? Do you think they should be somewhere else, or...?

R: Yeah, I think they would, I think to have them in the avenue would have been a better place for them to go.

I1: Mm-hmm.

I2: Mm-hmm.

I1: Because, the commissioner was quite prescriptive about that, or it became more and more tied to control.

R: Yeah, they seemed to get cold feet about it, do you remember at one point they went up there –

I1: Yeah.

R: – and they were open to that, and there was a discussion around that, you know, that [s.l opportunistic 0:04:41.4] garden thing, and that actually it wouldn't be a bad thing ... you know, they obviously thought it was going to be challenging having them on the avenue, both for technical reasons, and because people would be annoyed, I think they were scared that people would be complaining because their favourite view was going to be disrupted. Actually, I think that was ... I don't think they needed to have worried about that, because they probably should have had the courage of their convictions.

But, in the wool of that lies the story about how this particular commission came about, that we weren't really in a position to come and twist their arm, because it wasn't their ... you know, they hadn't initiated the thing, it was initiated by us, and particularly my piece. Obviously, this hadn't gone through their – initially anyway – through their selection committee, so it was quite hard to be, in fact it was impossible to be insistent. And, in fact, I think the avenue would have been deeply problematic as it turned out, because they had it closed off as it got too wet, so I think we would have hit some fairly serious problems had that gone down that route. But, I still think that would be where they would have looked most striking.

I1: **Mm-hmm. Yeah, note to self, yeah, because I think it is a thing about the discussion right at the very beginning, and it's about ownership as much as discussion right at the very beginning. Actually, location of works for the artist is really important, and it's not for the, you know, for the visitor flow, and all of those sorts of practical wishes. A recognition from their point of view that actually location of works is really important as a sculptural intervention, or whatever, it's really important. And, again, I think it is inexperience of that particular site that they were nervous, and, again, it's about experience of working with artists.**

R: Well, I don't think they understand that where you place something is incredibly important, I think that they think that it's the work and, you know, put it in there or in there is going to be pretty much the same thing –

I2: **Yes, I think that's really (over-speaking 0:06:50.0).**

I1: **Mm-hmm, yeah, it is.**

R: – which is not proper understanding. But, also, the particular line-up of people there, there wasn't a real champion for the project at Gibside, so, maybe if [NT1] had stayed there, and been there, [they] would have, sort of, taken it on board a bit more to go with ... to stick to (unclear 0:07:09.4) a bit more. But, I think, you know, there was not somebody on ... you could tell that they were having conversations and were getting nervous about it. It was quite interesting what [NT2] said, you know, that reference [they] made in [their] speech to the ... how challenging it had been, I still don't quite know what [they] meant by that, because I asked [them], [they] said (unclear 0:07:27.2), you know, there was obviously quite a lot of stuff going on [laughter] in the background. I, kind of, got hints of, but...

I2: **And, we are due to interview them again, aren't we?**

I1: **Mm-hmm.**

I2: **Yes, so.**

I1: **Interesting, I think that's really interesting. Again, it goes back to ... and I suppose how do you feed that back to them, is there, actually commitment ... it's this thing about trust again that we've been talking about with Fiona, it's the thing about trusting, and a relationship about trust.**

Practical (unclear 0:08:02.8). Have any specific individuals helped you in the development of the work, and, if so, how?

R: Oh, yeah, lots of people from, you know, working with Irene's sister, Helen Brown on ceramics, you know, glazing, and that kind of stuff. I hadn't done glazing before, so technically, like that. And, obviously, the guy that had been helping me in the studio, Aaron, it's incredibly important to have assistance on that level. But, if you mean more broadly about the kind of conceptual, you know, how they would be as pieces of art, not that much, really, you know. Obviously, I've been and looked at things, and been to exhibitions, and, kind of, seen things along the way that have influenced it quite a lot. Other artists, mainly, looking at other artists' work.

I1: **And, what about ... does that mean the individuals in the commissioning, at Gibside?**

I2: **Yeah, I think it is about this sense of the, kind of, network has been necessary in the realisation or the, you know, I think it is practically people at Gibside, so yeah, I think it (over-speaking 0:09:26.0).**

R: Well, the Gibside team, I wouldn't, sort of, knock them too much, really, because they were enabling, in the end, you know. [NT3], for instance, you know, what you can have, how deep you can dig, and how you can excavate, and for reference and go on the website, and all that sort of stuff. That was really always the, sort of, brunt of it was where pieces were going to go, and what was possible on a National Trust site, because they are such a risk-averse organisation, you know, quite extreme, they were really.

I2: **Yeah.**

I1: **That site is ... because, you know, the accountants, they are ready to go with it.**

R: Frightening, isn't it? Because Fountains is actually much more important.

I1: **Well, it's a UNESCO 100 ... but they have been doing it for three years, so, that relationship has built up. I think it's reflecting on Gibside, actually, more than anything.**

I2: **Yeah, and not in a bad way, just a sense of how do things happen, who needs to know what when, you know, I think it's just that practicality of how**

it works, I think is important to think about, you know, and would feed forward into them doing more.

R: It's probably an inexperience thing, isn't it? I don't think ... they don't really have one back-up ... nil experience, hasn't it, that live work which for whatever reason didn't happen.

I1: **Didn't happen. I mean, getting on to that, what has the experience been with Gibside? You know, can you elaborate a little bit more about that?**

R: With the Gibside people do you mean?

I1: **Yeah, with the team.**

R: Well, I would say it has been mixed, because I felt that it was, sort of, one step forward, two steps backwards, quite often, you know. For instance, it all comes back to where the pieces can go, and I think their lack of confidence, perhaps they weren't confident that I understood their concerns, you know, about where things could be placed, how much we could dig up the ground, what their audience were going to feel about it. I think that comes back to a, sort of, nervousness around artists, that we are here for something else, you know, just here for ourselves, and...

I2: **Yeah.**

I1: **Yeah. What about the planning issue?**

R: Well, that wasn't an issue in the end, I mean, I think there are quite a lot of things that were presented as being issues – planning permission, where the things could go, tree roots, stuff that might be buried underground, actually getting things in position, travelling over the ground, all of those kinds of things were ... they were definitely inhibiting factors. You know, there were times when I was got a bit pissed off with them really, because it didn't seem to be going ... you know, you'd think you had got somewhere, and then, no. And, I think they were quite ... as I said, there were obviously concessions that were going on behind the scenes, where you got a sense of what might have been (unclear 0:12:54.3), except that they weren't being particularly open about their concerns.

I2: **That's interesting.**

I1: **Mm-hmm. We need to think about how we feed this back to them.**

R: [Laughter]. Better not put it quite as bluntly as that.

I1: **Well, because Fiona was, you know, saying something similar, really similar things, and I think we really need a discussion about how we feed, constructively, that back, because, if they are going to continue commissioning, there has to be a more considered, and joined-up approach from that side.**

I2: **Yeah.**

R: It will be very interesting to see what they do, because, in one peculiar way, Gibside needs contemporary art considerably less than other National Trust sites do. Because they have already got, you know, the demographic of their audience is not old, middle-class, middle-aged, people, you know, its families, and ... it's a much broader sort of demographic. Most people go there for different reasons, they go and have walks, or they have a picnic, or go to the kids' playground.

I1: **Mm-hmm.**

I2: **Yeah.**

R: Or, go to the pub. It's a very different National Trust property because there isn't, you know, it's not about an historic house with furniture and stuff in it, it's about open space.

I2: **Yes. And they were very specific about the kind of audience they wanted, but they almost didn't want family audiences. I remember that meeting where they kind of said what audience, additional audiences they wanted, not families. But not the weekend, because, actually, at the weekend, our car parks are full, you know, it's mid-week that they were kind of, interested in. But, anyway...**

I1: **Okay. Has there been any areas about the installation, and the opening that you felt particularly nervous about, or uncertain about, that raised its head? I can think of quite a few.**

R: Well, in the end, it was alright, you know, because we had, sort of [laughter] got it down to the lowest common denominator of where they could go. You know, by the path, in the walled garden, by some kind of tree being chopped out, which was not particularly ... you know, you couldn't make an argument that that was a kind of precious piece of the estate. I remember at one point, they were trying to put me in a field of sheep, somewhere.

I1: **Yeah, I know. Do you feel compromised by that? Do you feel cross about that?**

R: I wouldn't say I feel cross about it, I really was cross at a certain point. I think it was a bit of a missed opportunity, I think that, to put those pieces in the avenue would have been a very different piece of work that would have worked in that landscape, and in quite an astonishing way between the column and the chapel. The, sort of, spacial relationship of the forms, what the meaning of those works would have had in that space would have been very, very different. And, plus, there would have been much more inter-action with people, because ... okay, a certain number of people go through the walled garden, but the main drag of that site is down the avenue.

I1: **I am quite interested in ... when you say that, are you thinking they've missed a trick, or do you feel, "My work has been compromised, and I feel it would have looked..."**

R: I think both. I think they've missed a trick, because I think it would have ... and I think what you begin to see is that, actually, that work does get a good response, people like it, you know, I think it's popular, I think it's work that people enjoy, and... [phone ringing]. What was I saying?

I1: **I said, have they missed a trick, and do you feel, "My work has been compromised, and I am..." I don't know, I am trying to sort of ... when you were saying, "Well, they should have ..." I don't know, some artists may feel, "Well, actually, I should be..." you know, "This is really ... I don't want my work to be seen ..." But, you are also thinking of them, aren't you?**

R: Yeah, I think I should have pushed a bit harder because that's probably never going to happen. Yeah, I think also they ... because the response to that work will be something that is important to them, and I think, had it gone in the avenue, it would have a very strong response, and I think it would have been, you know, probably a different order of that piece in the avenue.

Because it wouldn't be one piece, I'm not particularly keen on where they have, kind of, positioned along ... in the walled garden, that's actually my fault, because I, kind of, thought, "Well, that's what I'll do." But, in retrospect, I don't think it was very satisfactory placing, because they are really very different sorts of work, and much better as a group. (Unclear 0:18:13.3) where there are four by that beech tree, it seemed a bit better if they were in the walled garden.

I2: **That's interesting.**

I1: **I think, selfishly, I am asking it for myself is that, actually ... I am just thinking if this was a project where I had been working on before, I would be the person who would say, "Actually, no, you can't compromise this artist's work," you know, "This has to be here," and be more assertive. So, I am wondering whether we ought to have been much more assertive and say, "If you want this work..."**

R: Yeah, I think it might have ended up with the thing falling apart, and not happening there.

I1: **Right, yeah.**

I2: **Mm-hmm.**

R: It might have ended up as a kind of head-to-head, you know, take it or leave it, kind of thing.

I1: **Right, okay, yeah.**

R: I don't know.

I1: **I don't know, we'll never know, will we?**

R: No.

I1: But, it's a learning, I think it's a learning.

I2: Mm-hmm.

R: But, I think if they did it again, they should be more ready to put pieces in...
[Laughter].

I1: Yes, yes. They need to...

R: But, (over-speaking 0:19:14.5) because they nearly went there at one point, they were kind of ... but they would have been, you know, on about tree roots, or something like that. It would have been a reason...

I1: Yeah. I mean, just imagine if they had said, "Right, we have got ten Antony Gormley something or other," I'm not saying that you are not (over-speaking 0:19:34.5), but do you know what I mean?

R: (Over-speaking 0:19:34.7) Yes.

I1: Do you know what I mean? Would they have actually gone [sharp intake of breath], you know, "Never mind about the tree roots." I don't know, it's...

R: Well, that's interesting, because there was a similar discussion going on in Newcastle University about Antony Gormley, and the executive committee there were quite nervous, or are quite nervous about where it's going, but because it's Antony Gormley. Because, there is a hierarchy, isn't there?

I1: Okay. Right, that's me.

I2: Okay. So, we have covered some of this, and part of it is just to, kind of, capture, in terms of the evidence or... Can you just give us a quick description of the project as it is now, the work, which is about your creative practice? So, I guess this is just a description of what you have installed, partly because then some of the follow-on questions relate to that. So, can you just give a quick description and overview of the work at...?

R: Yeah, there are ten large-scale ceramic vessels, I think five of which are placed individually in the walled garden, and then there is a group of four pieces. And, they are big pots, basically, and some of them have got other elements with them, like a piece of coal, or birds sitting on the top of them. Others have got writing inscribed in the surface which, you know, is writing taken from contemporary sources, such as The Confessions of Mary Eleanor Bowes, or a contemporary account of her life, or contemporary journals written about plant hunting.

I2: So, with that sense of what you have installed now, has there been much change? I know we have talked about changes in terms of where they are located, but in terms of what you have made, what your thinking is in terms of your practice? Has the work developed? Has it changed in any unexpected ways?

R: Yes, I mean, it's hard to try and put one's mind back to what I thought I was originally going to make. I don't think I knew that I would do those ... some of the vessels are in two parts, and are, kind of, stapled together. I had to mention making those so, you know, the configuration of the pots themselves is different from what I first of all thought, I thought they would be all the same. The way the writings in them, the way that the parrots and birds are in them, the way that that piece of coal turned out, is different from what I expected. Some things that I thought I was going to make, I didn't end up making, I didn't have time, or because I decided not to.

I2: **Mm-hmm. And again...**

R: Actually, there is a very important point there, which is that I have always thought, and still do you think, that the commissioning process, where you have to present a, kind of, end product at the beginning, is flawed, it does not get to the best pieces of work. And, I could tell that there was a frustration. One of the frustrations was the National Trust not knowing what they were going to get, you know, that sort of uncertainty about it.

And, even down to the end, they were still worried about, for instance, the birds, even though, you know, structurally they weren't going to make a blind bit of difference. I could never quite get what they were worried about there. Did they think they were going to offend people, or ...? I thought they were really going too far in, sort of, editorial control, (unclear 0:23:11.3) birds. Well, okay.

I2: **Yeah, that is...**

R: I can't ... well, obviously, Fiona works in a very different way. What she does is, kind of, conceive something, and then goes off and makes them. That's fine, because there is no wrong or right way to make work. I don't work that way, at all, there has to be, to some extent, a journey of discovery. They have to be prepared to change along the way.

I2: **Yeah, that's really interesting partly because some of the questions we have been having about ... even right back to whether this was a commission, or whether they were residences. And, I know it was never going to be a residency, but there is a spectrum between, "I am delivering what I showed you," or "I am going to spend some time thinking and being in this site."**

So, I suppose, it's just to perhaps push that a little bit, where have those changes come from? You know, is it the site, the place, the narrative you set out, you know? And, interestingly, pragmatically, you were saying, "Oh, I was given some glazes, and I, kind of, wanted to think about how to do that." So, what is it that has affected your thinking in a way that, maybe, you hadn't anticipated?

R: Well, it's reading around the topic for one thing, it's finding those characters in that story of Mary Eleanor Bowes, such a line of unpleasant characters, you would be hard-pushed to [laughter] meet a group of more unpleasant people. So, trying to extract something out of that. Well, actually, William Paterson is the only one, you know, who actually seems quite a nice sort of guy, but then he came a cropper in

the end. But, he was unceremoniously dumped by Mary Eleanor Bowes anyway, you know, and left to find his own way back from South America.

So, I suppose, the idea that somehow this could be a piece that, kind of, celebrated a woman who was, sort of, emancipated, and fighting the cause for women. I just cannot find that, because I don't think this woman of immense privilege, who was not actually a sympathetic character at all, stands for that. I always thought there was a bit of tension between the year of women's suffrage, what's it called? Women and Power?

I2: Mm-hmm, Women...

R: Maybe Women and Power, and the divorce courts, you know, there is something in that, of course.

I2: Yeah, it's kind of really interesting. Okay, I am conscious of time, so I'm going to call that. Heritage?

I1: Okay. So, Heritage. We talked a lot about heritage in the first interview. Have your ideas about heritage changed? Or, what do you currently think about this?

R: Um, yeah, they have changed, but I am finding it very hard to describe precisely how. I mean, I think engaging with the stories of that site has been extremely interesting, and happening in different ways. So, I think it's actually richer than I had imagined it would be. For instance, the idea that you can allude to those characters in the story by making birds, or by making pots, was not something that occurred to me in the first place. You know, the way that you can almost be quite clunky about, you know, here's a piece of coal, (over-speaking 0:26:36.4) coal underneath, this is stable, it has made its money into coal. It's actually quite nice to do that, I am sure (unclear 0:26:45.9) literal going on obvious. I think it works, it works quite well, because of the visual, the way it works visually.

I2: Mm-hmm, yeah.

R: So, I think heritage does give you, you know, the specifics of the heritage site, do give you quite a rich resource. And also, when I began that work, I didn't really like the site very much, I actually like it much more now.

I2: That's interesting.

I1: Why? Because you know the history of it, because you know the story, because you understand the...?

R: I don't know if it is that. I think I just feel much more positive towards that site, and I think I had always found that ruin of the house a completely unattractive building. And, I was, kind of, prejudiced a bit against the site, because of that. But now I think that the walled garden is actually very charming until it gets 'monster-ified'. [Laughter]. You know, there are lots of things about that estate that are actually nice, and I think it's the fact that people obviously enjoy going there. It's a fabulous resource for those people who use it, it's a very popular place.

I1: **Mm-hmm.**

I2: **That's interesting, because that's very much about it as a place today –**

I1: **Now.**

I2: **– that you have, kind of, changed. So, maybe that would be different if you didn't live in Newcastle.**

R: I don't know. I think familiarity – what's that saying? [Laughter].

I1: **Familiarity ... I mean we were talking about it last night, about the Gibside, last night, and actually, for me, my view of Gibside has changed because I see it as a front-thing that has been chopped off. So, truncated, and not whole, and I find it problematic, because I want to understand ... in fact when we were talking last night, I thought, "I must get a map out and actually see what it was like." Because it feels, you know, it feels fragmented. Um, interesting. Okay.**

I2: **Yeah. I think you've touched on this a little bit, but can you just say a little bit about ... I mean this audience thing, this is the engagement with visitors, you know. Has the process affected how you think about that? The engagement of visitors with your work, and the site, either together or individually, or, you know, visitors, site, what do you think?**

R: It's partly confirmed me in a view that I have found making art for non-art audience quite rewarding. Gibside is a non-art audience (over-speaking 0:29:35.9). So, even that opening last night, although that's probably blown on the side of an art audience – not sure that they were actually – but I think people respond to things where things can be explained to them, and – what was the question again?

I2: **It's just about how has the process affected how you think about visitors engaging with your work, you know? So, it's just about...**

I1: **I mean, you can continue that thought, you know, of that...**

R: Well, I think, possibly not massively, but I mean, it is always rewarding when people like your work, you know, and sort of, obviously have a positive reaction to it. But, I think, placing something that, you know, you put something in an art gallery, it's a self-selecting audience, isn't it? People who want to go to an art gallery ... people who go to Gibside, wherever, you know, they are not people who want to go to an art gallery, so they would have every sort of reason to feel, they say, "I don't like this here." That's fair enough, they didn't go there to see a piece of art and we're kind of sticking something under their noses they don't want.

But, actually, that hasn't been the response that I've picked up, I dare say there are some people who (over-speaking 0:30:55.0). For the most part, it isn't. But, I think that's probably an explanation of how it works, because in the new garden you can find plant pots with flowers growing out of them, it's almost not

contemporary art, it's almost like garden furniture. So, I actually found that, kind of, blaring fact defined, quite interesting.

I2: Yeah, that is interesting.

R: I think it's gone a bit too far, actually, you know, putting those blinking plants in some of those pots.

I1: You feel it's gone too far?

R: I think the ones where ... I would be very cautious about being (unclear 0:31:26.0) about this, but there was one charming – one of the volunteers – extremely enthusiastic, and very nice, you know, planted up one of those pots with, kind of – it was my suggestion that volunteers should get involved – but I don't think it really does what I ... it goes too far.

I1: That's interesting.

I2: That is interesting.

R: Even though they've already put the plants in, I'd take them out, because I don't think it really works.

I1: That's interesting, that you've given control over, you have given control over to somebody else.

R: Mm-hmm. I know, and somewhat regretting it. Not massively, but I think, you know, the planting is very difficult. I think that's something that I ... you know, can you make plants structural, or does it just turn things into flowerpots, you know?

I1: Yeah.

I2: Yeah, there is a lot in there that's really interesting. It's (a) about this opportunity pushing you as an artist to think about, "How do I interact in this situation?" And, the whole thing about engaging with contemporary art, how does that happen, you know? That's really interesting.

I1: Doesn't that make you feel vulnerable? Don't you think ... ah, what am I saying? Yeah, you have just said a really positive thing about putting your work in a non-arts situation, and they are not self-selecting. That's a vulnerable position, isn't it? I mean, you are actually taking quite a risk in doing it. What if everybody comes back and says, "I absolutely hate Andrew Burton's work, take it down, it's just dreadful." I mean, you are putting yourself in a really vulnerable position. Each artist who does that, is putting themselves in a very vulnerable position. I never really thought about that.

R: Well, I think you are also putting yourself in a vulnerable ... I'm all for collaborative ... I find collaborative working really quite interesting, because collaboration is such a difficult thing. Because, obviously, it's not collaboration at all, you are using people to make stuff. Like, you know, I couldn't say the work with Helen was collaborative, but, basically, she showed me how to use glazes. But that woman

was charming with her planting, that probably is more collaborative. So, I did give over control to her, which means someone might come along and go, "God, that's not bloody sculpture, that's just an over-sized plant pot with a ridiculous display of plants in."

I1: Mm-hmm.

R: I think quite a number of people probably would say that. So, yeah, you do, kind of, lay yourself on the line a bit. But, I still think there is a kind of art exploration to be had in there, how you combine planting things, and keeping the past bit of it in there.

I1: Mm-hmm.

I2: Which I guess, you know, is something interesting which ought to be followed on with all of the artists in that sense of how has working in this context affected how they are thinking, or what they might do afterwards. And, everybody has, sort of, intimated a range of ways that, you know, that is, kind of, going to happen.

I1: I guess that's the final interview.

I2: Yeah, yeah.

I1: That's the final interview.

R: So, there is one more interview to go.

I2: Yeah, there is one more interview.

R: I was talking to (unclear 0:34:35.3) about this this morning.

I2: Yeah, there are three, you know, beginning, middle, and post. So, it will be interesting to think about the timing for that.

I1: Yeah. So, right at the end, maybe.

I2: Yeah, because everybody has very definitely spoken in very particular ways about questions they now have with their practice, how it has influenced where they are going, what they are thinking.

I1: Yeah, I know we are out of time, but there have been some interesting things that you've been saying. Mostly, I mean, for me, it's interesting, because, as an intermediary sometimes, as the curator sometimes, is that you are right that the location do want certainty, and it's problematic when something changes.

And, this has happened, we were talking about this this morning basically at Kielder, and at Fountains Abbey, is that one of the people that were chosen by a committee of representatives from that heritage site, chose a certain proposal. And, for me, from overall curatorial vision, I was choosing, you

know, we were putting works together. Suddenly, after putting in of the proposal, one of them came back with a totally different proposal, utterly and totally different proposal that completely threw the National Trust. And, they really got wobbly about it, totally wobbly about it.

And, I got concerned about it, because the group of works that we had chosen had had a relationship with each other, and suddenly, there was a completely different one. So, you know, there is that ... where does that stand? And, obviously, you don't want to affect artistic practice, and thinking when it changes, but, equally, you have to think about the ownership of the commission. So, I mean, it is just another interesting area.

R: Well, it is, they are not art galleries, are they?

I1: **No, they are not art galleries.**

R: In an art gallery, the artists have a right to do that.

I1: **Yes, but they are not.**

I2: **Yeah, and that's the heart of the question about what is happening in these things. Do you want me to leave you to carry on the conversation, or?**

I1: **No, unless Andrew...?**

R: No, I think we are okay.

I1: **Great, okay.**

R: I'll point you out the right way, you are probably going to sprint off somewhere and go the wrong way.

I2: **Okay.**

I1: **There are some plants that are apparently out by the Abbey.**

R: In the little Market Square?

I1: **Yeah, apparently, that's what...**

[End of Recording]