

**Audio File Name:** AB\_NT\_Gibside\_Interview\_17\_Oct\_2019  
**Date:** transcribed 12<sup>th</sup> November 2019  
**Comments:** reviewed March 2021  
**Duration:** 01:04:00

**KEY:**

Cannot decipher = (unclear + time code)

Sounds like = [s.l + time code]

**I1: = Interviewer**

**I2: = Interviewer**

R: = Respondent

NTG1, NTG2, NTG3 = National Trust Gibside Staff

NTGV = National Trust Gibside Volunteer

NTC = National Trust Cherryburn Staff Member

---

**I2: [NTG1] was talking about the value of the art when it was on-site, and then when it disappeared, it disappeared, you know, didn't it? I mean, that's exactly what you were saying.**

R: [S.l it's like a flame 00:00:07 – 00:00:08] – it goes out of existence and they are both forgotten about. (Unclear 00:00:11).

**I2: So, it's just gone, you know. It's gone. And so what is the value? Basically, what is the value when it disappears?**

R: Well, in other words, it's only got any value whilst it's there.

**I2: Yeah.**

**I1: Mm.**

**I2: So, you know... well, I pointed out to [them] that... there was a big picture of Gibside in the Hatton Gallery, for example, wasn't there?**

R: Yeah.

I2: **[They] didn't see that. [They] didn't come to the conference and [they] didn't see that.**

R: (Unclear 00:00:38 – 00:00:40).

I2: **No. So, the value... you know, and I'm saying... and those pots... you know, your works... I mean, [s.l he didn't say that 00:00:47], but you'll go on to a different venue. Fiona will be talking about Gibside in different contexts. And he was... he'd never thought about that.**

I1: **Mm.**

I2: **So, we *need* to demonstrate the value of these commissions in a very different way, other than...**

R: Well, the legacy thing is interesting as well, isn't it, because they don't, kind of, leave much of a... they don't really leave much of a legacy.

I2: **Well, they do in some cases, like Cherryburn or, you know, in other cases – there is a *great* legacy, and the legacy is the building up of the identity of... the integration of that.**

R: Mm-hmm.

I2: **Of the commissioning programming within what they do.**

R: So, are Cherryburn doing it again then, after next year?

I2: **Yes.**

R: And have they got (unclear 00:01:34)–?

I2: **And the year after.**

R: Are they?

I2: **Yes.**

I2: **[NTC] was really explicit – in a really [laughs] nice way – that [they] said, "This has really animated us, as a site." You know, [they] said that staff are excited. Staff are really thinking that this has brought... not *new* life exactly, but very much a new direction – otherwise it would just be, kind of, Cherryburn, whereas it is...**

I1: **And [they are]–**

R: Fantastic. Who dropped that sentence? Because we need that for our impact case study.

I1: [Name]. [They] ...

I2: [They] said, "The impact on Cherryburn has been significant. It has shone a light on Thomas Bewick and it has made me stop and think."

R: That's different from what you just said, though.

I1: Yeah, but the...

I2: Well, it wasn't as interesting as that story – inferring, though, wasn't it [laughter]?

R: Well [laughs], it wasn't quite as gushing (unclear 00:02:35 – 00:02:36).

I2: (Unclear 00:02:36 – 00:02:37) [laughs].

R: (Unclear 00:02:38).

I1: [Laughs] [they] said... yeah, it was at the very end, and I'm gutted because... that's what I was saying – I've have had a problem with the Zoom recorder. It was recording and then the card glitched.

R: Oh, no, so you didn't get it?

I1: So, I didn't get it on a *recording*.

I2: [Laughter].

R: Argh [laughter].

I1: But I wrote it down *immediately* because it was, like, "That was fantastic." You know, and [they] did say, "This has animated us, as a site. Staff are excited and they are talking about the future. It has really *activated* us." And all of that stuff about heritage in the *present*, you know, I think is great in terms of that.

R: We've *got* to capture this because we've been doing it... we're meant to be doing a (unclear 00:03:17) impact case study on this MCAHE project. But as ever with these things, we've failed to capture half the impacts.

I1: Yeah.

R: So, I'll have to come back to you for that. Have you got that... can you...?

I1: I've got it written down. I've got a sound file that I am going to try and see if it has worked. But actually, that is why I have just ended up recording on here with a... and I can't actually [s.I do it back 00:03:41] with my phone because the battery has gone on *that* now because I wasn't expecting to use [laughs] it. But I have just tested this and we are recording properly.

R: (Unclear 00:03:50).

I1: **So, with [NTG1's] interview, I recorded [them] in three different places [laughter].**

I2: **God.**

R: What happened to all those recorders we bought, then? Are they all in a drawer somewhere?

I2: **They must be in a drawer or something up at the... I mean, [NTC] said some absolutely brilliant things. [they] said that, you know, the impact on the team as well... [they] said (unclear 00:04:10 – 00:04:11), so [they] ...**

R: Fantastic. We've got to... because I've been playing down our impact case study because I was getting a bit worried that it wasn't having any policy impacts, [s.I but it will do 00:04:19] (unclear 00:04:20 – 00:04:22).

I1: **I don't... and it might... even if we *had* a recording, I don't think this... we would want to clarify this. [They] said it has impacted their retail and the way they think about that. They have got rid of all of the standard National Trust stuff and have only got, kind of, Bewick-related stuff. And we used... you know, we started doing some things with, you know, bags with images of Mark's paintings or...**

I2: **[S.I no 00:04:50].**

I1: **You know, it has completely changed how they think about that. There's definite evidence of different types of visitors, you know...**

R: Really?

I1: **Yeah.**

R: But is it... does it come down to the artist or is it the property that...? Because the way I was thinking, it's smaller properties that it seems to work better with.

I2: **Mm, *definitely* in smaller properties. I mean, we've been talking about this, about scale...**

I1: **Yeah, yeah.**

I2: **And it's because, you know, communication between teams and the way that they view... I mean, we've just been talking about this – the way that Gibside views itself and the way that Cherryburn views itself is very different. Because Gibside... there's no two ways about it – [NTG1] is viewing it as a, sort of, tourist attraction, as a commercial place, where he is *driven* by numbers and the business case. So, when the art comes, it has an impact, but if it doesn't achieve its impact, then it goes. But what's it...? And**

**yet, within Cherryburn, of course, the impact of the... it's an organisational...**

R: It's like value, isn't it? It's a value thing.

**I2: It's very interesting.**

R: Mm.

**I2: Right. I haven't got my pieces of paper with the questions on it [laughs].**

**I1: I've got them.**

**I2: So, I don't know that I'm going to ask you [laughter].**

R: Never mind. I don't know [laughter] what you are going to ask me either.

**I2: I haven't got a clue [laughs].**

R: How's the book, incidentally, Nick?

**I1: Sorry?**

R: How's the book?

**I1: It's... we are *literally* nearly there. We are literally waiting for some permissions, but it's 99.9% there.**

R: Are you going to do a launch?

**I1: Yeah, I'd like to. Yeah, and obviously, you know, with... you are in it, Rebecca and Nicky are in it...**

R: Is Catherine? Did Catherine do it with you? Catherine Taylor.

**I1: Yes, and Catrin Huber.**

**I2: Catrin.**

R: (Unclear 00:07:00).

**I1: So, there is a good, kind of, Newcastle [laughs] presence.**

**I did have pieces of paper. This is just outrageous. I can't find them.**

**I2: We can't find any [laughter].**

R: [Laughter].

I1: **We are falling [laughs] apart.**

I2: **We are falling apart.**

I1: **But I...**

I2: **Well, maybe we just have to make it up.**

I1: **No, I can find them. It will only take me two minutes.**

I2: **I mean, the *purpose* of the interview is to discuss the impact that it has on artistic practice. And that's it, really, (unclear 00:07:31 – 00:07:34).**

R: (Unclear 00:07:33 – 00:07:36). Okay. And you have to ask a bit more specific questions than that, because that's a bit hard.

I2: **Okay.**

R: I need a drop-down 'yes/no' [laughs].

I1: **[Laughs].**

I2: **Where did I put them? That's really annoying.**

R: The University has this thing called Form Builder, which I never knew about before, so you can build forms (unclear 00:07:55 – 00:07:56).

I2: **Can you?**

R: With drop-down menus and multiple choice questions and things. It's so addictive (unclear 00:08:02).

I1: **[Laughter].**

I2: **[Laughter] oh, God.**

I1: **Oh, here we go.**

I2: **Oh, we'll maybe have that (unclear 00:08:08 – 00:08:10).**

I1: **Um, yeah, because of the data. Have I got the...? Oh, God, no, this is growing ridiculous.**

I2: **(Unclear 00:08:25).**

I1: **Sorry, Andrew.**

R: It's alright. I'm in no massive hurry.

I1: [Pause] um...

I2: **We need to get home at some point. Nick wants to go to sleep.**

I1: [Laughs].

I2: [Laughs].

R: Oh, you're still in Newcastle (unclear 00:08:44).

I1: **I am, yeah, I am.**

I2: **Yes, I thought that was a good meeting with Wendy. And I don't know whether it will...**

R: She seems very up for it.

I2: **Yeah. It's whether she can convince them. But, I mean, we have... I feel...**

R: Mm.

I2: **When I was there, I said to... because Kate went and I said, "I feel like I'm in Groundhog Day," because it... that thing about the language of contemporary art and... you can't use that. You see, you can't use... if you go to Vindolanda and say, "We are doing a contemporary art (unclear 00:09:21)"... you have to find ways of saying, "We are going to find out from what it is you want to do."**

R: Do you know the people in Vindolanda?

I2: **No. I've worked with them once before, but no, not really.**

R: That is the, sort of, potential point where it is going to break down, though, because the only reason we have landed on them is because of, sort of, (unclear 00:09:43) organisation. Because there's no... we haven't really got any kind of reason to think that they should be particularly interested, so why are they going to want to put in four and a half...?

I2: **Nine, yeah.**

R: Well, [s.I a million or nine 00:09:54].

I2: **I mean, the other place is Senhouse Roman Army Museum in Whitehaven, which is run by the most peculiar [person] imaginable, who thinks that everybody wakes up on a Saturday morning and says, "I must go and see those Roman [s.I auteurs 00:10:11] in the Roman Army Museum," because there are *hundreds* and hundreds of them in that museum, and they are *deadly dull – really*. You just want to... and [they] ... I remember having a conversation with [them], when [they] said, "Oh, we can't put anything**

**outside of this museum because it gets vandalised.” It’s right in the middle of a housing estate, right? The Senhouse Roman Army Museum. And [they say], “It gets vandalised immediately.”**

**So, I said, “Oh.” And I said, “Do you have a youth... like, a community engagement group?”**

**“Oh, *no, no*,” [they] said [laughs]. “The only people who come here are interested in Roman [s.l auteurs 00:10:53].”**

**And I’m thinking, “Ooh, there’s no audience engagement then is there [laughs]?”**

R: [Laughter] maybe [they’re] trying and [they] can’t find any way of engaging people with Roman [s.l auteurs 00:11:02], apart from smashing them up [laughs].

I2: **(Unclear 00:11:03). I know, and you just think, “Okay...”**

**So, then when I said, “Oh, well, how do you make your money?”**

**“Oh, we don’t have to make our money. I’m an independent trust, you know.” Basically, “I’m only interested in...”**

R: [They] sound[ ] like a grumpier version of [s.l Lee Garrison-Jones 00:11:17].

I2: **Yes, yes, very grumpy.**

I1: **Um...**

I2: **Did you find it?**

I1: **I’ve had to go on to Filer... oh, hang on...**

I2: **And you can get into Filer?**

I1: **Yeah. This is ridiculous. [Pause] because I’ve got the one for [laughs] heritage and for site staff.**

I2: **But you haven’t got the artist one?**

I1: **I can’t for the life of me find the ones... and they don’t even appear to be in the same place, which is completely ridiculous.**

I2: **If we went on to Matt’s interview or Andrew’s interview, could we not follow the same...?**

I1: **Interview schedule...**

R: **Are they the same questions as last time?**

I1: **Yeah. They are in the same groups, you know, in the sense of contemporary art, but I think... data collection methods...**

I2: **Ah, I have added you back into Filer.**

I1: **Oh.**

I2: **So you should be able to see those files again – hurray! You know that e-mail sent out by Matthew [s.I Brimley 00:12:35]?**

R: Yeah.

I2: **Everybody is coming back [laughs]. They are just coming back and saying 'Yes, I'm really interested'.**

R: Oh, good. That's good, isn't it? Yeah. Afterwards, I was wondering whether we should have a geneticist or something like that.

I2: **I think he's... do you know who we should have? We should have somebody from the far-right at the table, is what we should have.**

R: (Unclear 00:13:00 – 00:13:01) only one in the University to admit to being in the far-right.

I1: **Mm.**

R: Well, that's curious, because I think there *are* one or two. [Pause] uh, that's quite interesting, so that's good. So, how many people are coming now?

I2: **Well, I've just... today I've been, sort of... all these e-mails are coming back from Matthew's...**

I1: **I've found it.**

I2: **I've got it. Hey, I'm in.**

I1: **[Laughs].**

I2: **Oh, my God, I'm in.**

I1: **And I've found the...**

R: You've found the questions.

I1: **I've found the questions from last time.**

I2: **Excellent.**

I1: **But I think, with the Heritage site staff, we have been a bit more open.**

I2: Yes.

I1: In the sense of saying, “Well, these are the broad areas” – which I can now *confidently* say started with heritage understanding, the commissioning process, creative practice and audiencing as the four themes. But we have been a bit more just reflective, haven't we?

I2: We have been a bit more, sort of... yeah.

I1: In terms of capturing the impact of the project on you, in whatever way that might be, and I suppose that some of that should be around understanding of – and relationship with – heritage. So, maybe we could start with that.

I2: Yeah, let's go with that.

R: And this is as an artist here?

I1: This is you, as an artist.

I2: Yes, as an artist.

R: So, what's the question?

I1: So, having participated in this project, has it had an impact on you in terms of changing and developing thinking towards the future in terms of your relationship with heritage?

R: Um [pause], yeah, quite possibly. I mean, it's a bit... you know, given that things, kind of, work from one project to the next, in a sense [pause]... yeah, I think it has. For example... well, I mean, it's a bit (unclear 00:15:29). This is heritage, but I've done a project... the project I did in Korea – which kind of comes, in a way, out of this MCAHE one – was working with kimchi jars. They are called 'onggi' or something like that. So, they asked me to do a piece of work, so I asked if they could obtain 100 kimchi jars, which they did. This was the organisers of this [s.l biennale 00:15:58]. And they are the most amazing things. They are like a huge... like, a metre high and about a metre wide.

I1: Right.

R: So, they got all these kimchi jars – which are, obviously, kind of, related to the jars that I was working with at Gibside.

I1: Mm, mm.

R: And they are bound up with Korean heritage in a different kind of way – not specifically to the narrative of an individual (unclear 00:16:21 – 00:16:22). But kimchi is a, sort of... I don't know if you know what kimchi is, but it's like this preserved, kind of, cabbage [s.l or piccalilli 00:16:29].

**I2: Mm.**

R: It's pretty disgusting, actually.

**I2: Mm.**

R: But anyway, the Koreans absolutely adore kimchi. So, in a way, it was kind of speaking... I suppose it's kind of heritage, but it's also a current sort of thing. But also, the fact that these pots were all old – they were all, like, 50 to 100 years old, so they were, kind of, heritage objects. So, working with real heritage objects, I think it was pretty well a direct result of the MCAHE... I don't think I would have done that, actually, had that not... I don't think that line of enquiry would have opened up for me, otherwise.

**I1: I mean, that's interesting because, like I say, I hadn't initially understood the jars as heritage, but the idea of kimchi as a cultural heritage...**

R: Well, what they actually asked me to do was to make a piece of work that signified the peace and reconciliation between North Korea and South Korea. They said, "Can you do that?"

So, I thought, "Ooh, well, let me think about it."

**I1: [Laughter].**

R: And then I said, "Okay. I think what I can do is I can do something with kimchi," because I'm sure that kimchi is a common denominator across Korea.

**I2: Mm.**

R: And I was working with these bricks. They were small bricks, because they had them [s.l around 00:17:52] from the time before. So, that's when I said, "Have you got any kimchi jars?"

And they had this fantastic collection of huge kimchi jars. She said, "Yeah, you can use them" – which was pretty amazing because they were all, kind of, catalogued into the museum, so they must have been quite collectable objects.

**I2: Wow.**

R: Yeah, I'll show you the picture. So, yes, in a sense, it's a slightly different way of thinking about heritage, but [pause]...

**I2: So, that is cultural heritage.**

R: Uh, hmm...

**I2: Nice, yeah.**

**I1: Oh, wow. [Pause] yeah.**

R: So, it was actually a performance piece, except that (unclear 00:18:42 – 00:18:43) and they cancelled the festival.

**I2: Yeah. What was going to happen to those bricks? Were they...?**

R: Well, the bricks... it was a bit clunky, actually, (unclear 00:18:53). I mean, my original idea was, "I'll make this all [laughs] between these two layers of kimchi jars, you know, and break it down, and write some rather obvious and heavy-handed symbolism." But then, actually, as I got into it, I realised that, actually, you know, if you think about the peace – you know, the division of North and South Korea – as being 'breaking down a wall', actually, that wasn't it at all. It was more to do with peace as a process as being rather similar to building up a wall brick by brick by brick by brick – (unclear 00:19:29) this extended, fragile process that can break down at any minute. But that did not have anything to do with heritage at all. But I think that using the kimchi jars definitely did bring other artefacts into my work.

**I1: Mm.**

**I2: Yeah, it's quite interesting. So, it's actually... the, sort of... you know, if I think about those works, it's the actual... the physicality of those jars, of those huge vessels that [s.l form 00:20:03] Gibside – that was the thing that overrode, and *not* the story of Mary Eleanor Bowes and the text which was put upon it.**

**I1: Mm-hmm.**

**I2: So...**

R: That's not what most people took away from that, interestingly. Most people who I've spoken about that work to – or lots of them, anyway – have been struck by the lettering and have specifically talked about, kind of, trying to unravel the words and reading the words.

**I1: Mm.**

R: Whether it was on that black bottle... the one that I had a quote from Milton on it.

**I1: Mm, mm.**

**I2: Mm.**

R: So, it's surprising that the writing did seem to come across. But actually, now I come to think about it, there was another... and I also did a piece in Stoke for the Ceramics Biennale there recently, since the MCAHE thing. And that was, in a way, also about the ceramics heritage of Stoke, thinking about bricks and the manufacture of bricks.

**I2: Mm.**

R: Certainly, yeah, Stoke as a place with particular heritage. But, I mean, heritage and site specificity, sort of, blur into one another, don't they? Because lots of artists make pieces that are, kind of, specific to a site, in one way or another.

**I1: Mm, mm.**

R: And whether you think about that as being heritage or history... it's almost inevitable – it *is* going to be the history of the site.

**I2: Mm.**

R: You know, because Stoke has obviously got this very strong ceramics history – the history of the ceramics industry.

**I1: Mm, mm, which is re-emerging, isn't it, in Stoke? As there has been somebody trying to set up a new ceramics company almost literally within the shell of an old ceramics factory, you know.**

**I2: Yeah, yeah, (unclear 00:22:03).**

R: Well, it's a curious... it's a *weird* place. I don't know if you've ever been there.

**I2: I've never been there.**

R: Stoke is obviously the five towns, so Stoke city centre is actually in Hanley. But Stoke itself is such a run-down, poor place. It's incredible.

**I1: Mm, I've never been.**

**I2: No, I've never been.**

R: It's really... you don't even think that places like that exist in Britain anymore. But it's Brexit central, of course, and you can see why.

**I1: Mm-hmm.**

**I2: Mm-hmm.**

**I1: Mm, interesting.**

**I2: So, the legacy of the commission at Gibson then is really the [pause]... would it be, sort of, the making of something? I mean, how important now do you think that story of Mary Eleanor Bowes was to the making of the work?**

R: Very important.

I2: **Right.**

R: Because that was really at the centre of making the work.

I2: **Okay.**

R: Using those texts – yeah, totally. That idea of recounting a narrative in the surface of a pot... I mean, just making the pots sufficiently big to actually be able to contain a whole lot of text is something that I am thinking that I will probably revisit at some point and in some form. But also the way that the Mary Eleanor story was so, kind of... what's the word? Lurid, gruesome, um...

I2: **Lurid.**

I1: **Mm.**

R: So, using that really, sort of, [s.l deeply 00:23:42] red, bloody [s.l glaring 00:23:45] in that black pot, I thought that worked quite well as a way of symbolising just how awful the story is.

I1: **Mm, mm.**

I2: **Mm.**

R: And actually not so much that Mary Eleanor was exploited herself – although, she obviously was – but that she was also (unclear 00:24:05) and bound up in the whole thing. She was as much a protagonist as a victim, I think.

I1: **Mm, which is interesting because, of course, that *hardly* figured in the conversation with [NTG1]**

I2: **No.**

R: The Mary Eleanor Bowes (unclear 00:24:25)?

I1: **Yeah, yeah.**

I2: **Yeah.**

I1: **It was much more around, you know, whether they had a dip in visitor numbers or whether they... and, you know, where their focus of activity was. They were reflecting that they had made some mistakes in... and I can't quite remember how the interview went, but I think we had to ask [them] about...**

I2: **The brief.**

I1: **Or remind [them] that the brief was *actually* about telling a different story. And then [they] did say, "Oh, yeah, yeah, yes, of course."**

I2: **Yeah.**

I1: **But we have reflected on this and I think...**

R: Well, I don't know if you saw that feedback [s.l on safety 00:25:05] about those workshops that we did up at Gibside.

I2: **No.**

R: So, we did some workshops with a poet called Linda France, who is a local poet from here.

I1: **Oh, yeah.**

R: So, the idea was that was she would go up and get these participants in the workshop – of whom there were quite a lot – to write poems about Mary Eleanor Bowes, and then the poems would feed into the ceramics workshop that we did on the following weekend – which is exactly what happened. And they... so, Sophie got a load of feedback from the people who took part, and they very strongly made the link between Linda France going and talking about the story of Mary Eleanor Bowes, and then they wrote poems, kind of, in response to that. They're quite good poems, actually, some of them.

I1: **Which does...**

I2: **It's a thing about the artist brief, which was... I mean, we get... I keep come back to that – which was very 'direction' from Gibside and more open at Cherryburn – and how that actually did impact on the work that was produced. But [s.l yes, you're right 00:26:19] – for the site, for [NTG1], it wasn't...**

I1: **No.**

I2: **It [pause]... it was weird, because it *didn't* feature in the conversation. You're right.**

I1: **No, no, not at all. And I think, again... and I know this is why these interviews at this stage are *really* interesting, trying to make connections, because we were also, at various points, having this conversation about programming.**

I2: **Yes.**

I1: **And, you know, that's a really fascinating example – that, actually, you have had a whole bunch of people come down and have a creative workshop, deeply engaging with the aims of the brief, and I wonder whether [NTG1] even knows it happened.**

R: [They do] know it happened, actually, but [they weren't] ... I think it was [NTG2] who was still there, but [they were] in the process of leaving. It's a great pity that you didn't get a final interview [NTG2], because [they were] much more engaged with the whole thing.

I1: **Yeah, yeah.**

I2: **Yeah, yeah.**

R: Do you know where [they] went?

I2: **[They were] off sick.**

R: I think [they've] left Gibside altogether, though, [haven't they]?

I1: **Oh, yeah, [they have], but...**

I2: **Yeah, yeah, yeah. [they weren't] there for a long time and then [they] just, sort of, disappeared.**

**So, those Linda France workshops were really successful?**

R: *Very successful, yeah, yeah.* I mean, she had different groups of people, so some of them were quite experienced poetry writers and some of them were totally inexperienced poetry writers. But they wrote... they all... because then they got a questionnaire from Sophie, and they had all felt that it had heightened their awareness of the Mary Eleanor Bowes story.

I1: **Mm.**

I2: **Hmm, that's interesting. I don't know, sort of...**

R: But in a way, poetry is much more direct, isn't it? Because it's, you know... in a sense, you have to write a poem about *something* or in response to *something*. So, if you are given the story of Mary Eleanor Bowes, then... I wonder what's happened to the poems. The poems were absolutely hilarious. [Laughter] and one of them was something like... uh, how did it go? 'The Three Andrews' – because the poet was called Andrew, I'm called Andrew, and there was an Andrew in the... Andrew Stoney. (Unclear 00:28:38 – 00:28:39). I think [laughter] it was something like: 'If you put three Andrews in a pot [laughter] (unclear 00:28:42 – 00:28:45)'.

I1: **[Laughter].**

R: [Laughter] this was by one of the experienced poets. It was most brutal sort of ending.

I2: **[Laughs].**

R: And I (unclear 00:28:51). I said, "[S.I golly 00:28:52], that's quite funny."

I1: **Yeah. I think you... I don't know whether you quoted it in your chapter. Obviously, it's–**

R: Oh, I did, at the end (unclear 00:28:58), yeah.

I1: **You did. Yeah, you did, yeah. That's why it rings a bell.**

R: Well, I haven't quoted it accurately this time, but I must... I *have* to get a copy of that poem because I've...

I1: **Yeah, yeah.**

I2: **Um... oh, I was trying to get back to the interview sort of thing. From an artist's point of view, if you were advising the National Trust as to what it could have done better, from your point of view, what would you say? For this commission, what would you identify?**

R: Well, I mean, I think they didn't really know who was supposed to be taking ownership of that project at Gibside, so that was always a bit of a muddle, because when it *did* appear to have someone who owned it – which was when [NTG2] was picking it up – it ran much more smoothly than when it didn't. It quite often seemed to be falling between different [s.l stools 00:29:59]. In terms of where the work could go, they didn't really have the courage of their convictions. I mean, that may be partly because it wasn't a Gibside-initiated project in the first place, of course.

I2: **Do you feel that that might have had a bearing on your experience?**

R: Well, it *definitely* had a bearing on my experience, because I think if it had been my choice, I would have planted the pots in the middle of the avenue of trees – as was up for discussion, but obviously that fell by the wayside, ostensibly because of the difficulties of tree roots. Actually, in the event, it would have turned out to be highly problematic because of the [s.l weather at the end 00:30:41] (unclear 00:30:42) trying to get them installed, but we didn't know that at the time.

I1: **Mm-hmm, mm, mm, mm. So, you know, I suppose I am bound to make this connection to the question that we were going to ask about scale of organisation. You know, that issue about who has ownership – was that part of it? In terms of the number of the size and the size of the–**

R: I think it was, because I think if it isn't written into their job description or time management or whatever it is... if there isn't one of them who specifically identifies this as their project, then it *is* going to, sort of, fall between different people.

I1: **Yeah.**

R: Well, they were all, obviously, very, very overworked at Gibside and quite stressed.

I1: **Mm.**

R: And so nobody is going to pick up an additional piece of work if it's not specific (unclear 00:31:38) to...

I1: **No, no. And [NTC] was very explicitly the other way round, wasn't she?**

I2: **Yeah, [they were].**

I1: **[They were] saying, "Actually, the whole point about Cherryburn is that the person who might be in the café still knows about the artwork, is still happy to talk about, still knows what is going on, is totally behind it. And even if they are not even behind it, they still have ownership, as a site." So, that's interesting.**

R: A curious thing at Gibside is that one group who surprisingly *did* take quite a high level of ownership were the volunteers. But again, it came down to individual people, because there was one volunteer called [NTGV]. Do you remember [NTGV]?

I2: **Yeah, yeah.**

R: We, sort of, took on the planting up of those pots with great enthusiasm. And, you know, we made seven visits to the garden stuff and stuff, to buy the plants that they wanted.

I1: **Mm, mm, mm, mm.**

I2: **But that's interesting. How does it work for you and it didn't work for Fiona?**

R: The volunteers?

I2: **Yes.**

R: Because I think it just comes down to...

I2: **Did *you* approach the volunteers?**

R: No. I can't remember how the volunteers got in touch. I think it might have been through [NTG3], the gardener.

I2: **Ah.**

R: But it was really down to... it was only really one volunteer, you know.

I2: **Okay. Oh, okay.**

R: And it's made on a, sort of, individual level, so I got... over the course of the project, I got to know [NTGV]. And then at the end [they] said, "Do you want to sell me one of those pots?"

I1: **So, is that to do with your geographical proximity? Was that enabled by your geographical proximity?**

R: Yeah, probably. It would have been more difficult without that.

I2: **Or is it because your work had an obvious involvement from volunteers? Right at the very beginning, that it was stated that you *wanted* the volunteers to plant up the... I mean, did you have that idea at the very beginning?**

R: Yeah, I think so. I can't quite remember when that idea came along, but it was fairly early on, I think – that some of the pots could be planted by them, with the sort of plants that William Paterson might have seen on his journeys to the Cape.

I2: **So, there was an intention that there was going to be volunteer involvement in the making of the work, which means that there's an equality to the making of the work; whereas in Fiona's, it was volunteers helping *her* to make the work. Do you understand?**

I1: **Ah, yes, yes, I do.**

R: I think that might have even been written up in my presentation to the Gibside team.

I2: **I think you did.**

R: I can't quite remember now whether it was in at that stage. But I thought that was quite important in the whole project – that if it was going to get embedded at Gibside, then there needed to be some sort of participatory thing happening in some way.

I2: **Mm. Okay. So, you instinctively knew that or... not 'instinctively' – you *realised* that that was important, for them to take it on board and just to have a sense of ownership.**

R: Do you know, I can't think when exactly that must have come into play, though, because when it... if the pots had been in the alley – you know, the Grand Walk – then that wouldn't have been possible at all.

I2: **No.**

R: So, it must have been later than I'm remembering it, because it can only have happened after we moved the Walled Garden. Or maybe that was a, sort of, compensatory thing, or maybe that cropped up when they *were* in the Walled Garden – "Oh, yeah, that could work, because they could be treated as pots."

I2: Yeah.

R: I can't quite now remember what the sequence was.

I2: I think it's interesting. I think those two scenarios are really interesting. One of the biggest issues for Fiona was, sort of, you know, the isolation that she felt, because she *assumed* something was going to happen – there was going to be this, sort of, making of the work, with the volunteers helping. And yet, that didn't happen. And yet, with you, it *did* happen, and I'm wondering if that was because there was... the way it was articulated was that, you know, it was more *equal* – it was a more equal oral participatory role than helping.

I1: Mm. I think that... yeah, because that was the word I was thinking of, because that has come up today. But it's interesting that it also came up in relation to the visitor experience of the artworks, in terms of the differences between Mark Fairnington's as quite *scopic* – i.e. he went in and *looked* at it – but actually, Marcus Coates's, you sat *in* it, were surrounded by it and listened to it, and that was quite fundamentally different.

I2: Yeah.

I1: So, I think the fact that the engagement, both in the 'making of' with visitors, there is a difference, or there has been a difference, and I do think that is interesting.

I2: Yeah, yeah.

R: I certainly think the heritage property value the work more when they can see their visitors and volunteers or whoever actually engaging with the stuff much more proactively, rather than just looking at it.

I1: Yes. And then [laughs] we were talking about Cartsten Holler and slides. How did that come up? But it... yeah...

I2: It was about what... you know, we were talking about things that are, you know, like, involved with...

R: Yeah.

I1: Yeah.

I2: You know, we *were* talking about that.

I1: Yeah.

I2: But there is something that I want to revisit, because I remember asking you this last time – it was about a loss of control over your own work, because

**you were actually giving over a [s.I loss 00:37:42]. I mean, they could... the planting...**

R: I didn't like.

**I2: Yeah, you didn't like.**

R: No, I didn't like it. But nonetheless, I was okay with that, because that was... I mean, they chose plants that I didn't particularly like.

**I2: But how come you were okay with that?**

R: Because I was... I had decided to, kind of, hand control of it to somebody else.

**I1: Mm-hmm.**

**I2: I find that...**

R: It was a bit strange. I mean, one of them, I would wince every time I looked at it. [Laughter] I really do not like those plants at all. But I wouldn't... I made a distinction in my mind between various different [s.I ones of the pots 00:38:26]. Like, there was that group that didn't have anything in them and that was, sort of, outside of the Walled Garden.

**I1: That had the coal...**

R: Yeah, that had the coal.

**I1: The coal [s.I bridge 00:38:35].**

R: I think they came into themselves as, kind of, sculptures rather than pots much more when they came into the Hatton Gallery, actually.

**I1: Mm.**

**I2: We need to go to that. It's about the difference between the gallery... you know, putting those works in the gallery and how you felt about that. How did you feel about those two locations – a site-specific location in the landscape or the gallery situation?**

R: Well, I think they worked quite well at the gallery.

**I2: Mm.**

**I1: Mm.**

**I2: [Pause] why, do you think?**

R: I think, visually, they probably worked better in the Hatton Gallery. I think they were more... to some extent, they were more visually exciting in an *inside* space, where you looked at them in a different way, in terms of their scale and the way that people read the... well, for one thing, the plants in the pots were out of them, which probably actually improved them.

I2: **So... yeah.**

R: And... yeah, because as soon as you take... the thing is, whether you like it or not, as soon as you put plants in a big pot, it turns it into a plant pot in some shape or form.

I1: **Mm, mm, mm.**

R: When you take them out, then it becomes sometimes else.

I1: **Yeah, yeah. Or like you say, they just... the physical relationship between you, the pot and its environment – there is a very different, you know, sculpture and a very different kind of relationship. Because even though they are... that relationship, it's bigger than you... I think it's more obvious... you know, it's kind of... it's (unclear 00:40:33)...**

I2: **We were saying that it's actually in that contained space that they actually looked...**

I1: **Yeah, yeah.**

I2: **Actually, for me, they looked more menacing in the gallery because of the scale. Because of the containment of the scale, they looked more menacing – which I thought was a strength of the work. So, they became very different.**

R: They did become very different indeed. I think they were definitely better in the gallery.

I2: **Yeah, which is [pause] (unclear 00:41:03 – 00:41:04), because we are... I mean, you know, the whole conversation that we had this morning with [NTC] about site specificity and the strength of that – the strength of actually making work for the site and it being in the site rather than being placed *upon* the site – it, sort of, negates that. It, sort of...**

I1: **Mm.**

I2: **Although... well, there's something in that, isn't there? There is something about the work being placed on Gibside being more rooted in the story of Mary Eleanor and a narrative being important. And then it goes into the gallery and the actual physical presence of the work has become more important.**

I1: **Mm.**

R: They do. Although, people were reading the text in the gallery – quite a few people asked me about the Mary Eleanor Bowes connection, reading the work in the gallery. I mean, don't forget, in the gallery, they obviously won't take it totally out of context, because we were kind of providing the context in the written notes.

I1: **Yeah, yeah.**

R: On the placards and stuff.

I2: **Yes, that's true. That's true, actually – the work of the interpretation. There was more interpretation in the gallery than there was on the site.**

I1: **Mm, yeah, and that's important. That is important to remember.**

I2: **That is important to note, I think.**

I1: **Yeah.**

R: We did put that board up at Gibside, which a lot of people read.

I2: **Yeah.**

I1: **Mm.**

I2: **Yeah.**

I1: **And the other thing... and I don't want to infer *too* much from something that Fiona said, but I kind of got the feeling that *part* of her resistance to her work being moved was to do with the integrity of it as a *made* object. Now, I know that if I am making something that is a permanent thing, that's different from a wall drawing that I have done, where I have peeled them off and thrown them away. There's a very different sense of relationship. And I certainly wouldn't want something that I felt was temporary to be moved, not only because of conceptually, but actually, physically and practically, because actually, I didn't really make it... I made it as an ephemeral thing. So, even though perhaps that Wardian case could *easily* have moved and worked, part of that was about the ephemerality and the making of it. Does that make sense?**

I2: **Yeah. But it was also about the relationship between it and the orangery.**

I1: **That... yeah, yeah.**

I2: **So, it was the architectural...**

I1: **Yeah, it wasn't... yeah.**

**I2: It was the conceptual, sort of, relationship, but it's also the architectural... the built relationship issues with...**

**I1: That was it, yeah, yeah.**

**I2: We just felt that it didn't make sense when you can't tell–**

**I1: It didn't make sense *without* that, yeah.**

R: Actually, I wish we had thought more seriously about trying to put Fiona's piece in the gallery.

**I2: But she was very resistant to it. She was absolutely (unclear 00:44:06).**

R: Well, it was never an option, though, because, practically speaking, we didn't have anywhere to store it. So, it was never really considered that carefully, was it?

**I2: Yeah, but even conceptually... I think she said it in her interview that. She was *very, very* clear, that it did not make sense.**

**I1: Yeah.**

**I2: She did not... even if it was practically possible to do that, she didn't want that.**

R: Oh. Well, that's interesting.

**I1: Yeah. No, she–**

R: Because I think it would have made... I really think it would have been, kind of, spectacular in that... and, you know...

**I2: It would have had a very, very different reading – *very* different.**

**I1: Mm.**

R: It would, but it would have (unclear 00:44:42 – 00:44:43) a Wardian case.

**I2: Mm.**

R: Which would have been interesting because, you know, Wardian cases are interesting in their own light.

**I1: And they travel fast [laughter].**

R: Yeah [laughs]. It's a balance, isn't it?

**I1: So, yeah.**

I2: But it was too big. You see, she... her work is about architecture as well.

I1: Yeah.

I2: It's about the relationships between structures as well.

I1: Mm, mm, mm.

I2: So, I can see why she would feel that it was losing half its meaning.

I1: Yeah. And I kind of wasn't trying to say that that was the *only* reason, but I'm also thinking about what the parameters of an artist's commission are. If they are asked to do something temporary, does that *allow* them to do something that is physically ephemeral? In the sense of, "Oh, well, I'm not really worried about the longevity of this. I'm going to do something that I very definitely [laughs] don't want moving because it's only nailed together on the inside," or something like that.

I2: Yeah.

R: Yeah, it might have been told to me that the production values of that, it worked outside, but it would not have worked in the gallery for it as well.

I1: Yeah. Yeah, that's the [s.I link 00:45:55]. Yeah, that's the word I was [laughter] looking for there – 'production values'.

I2: Production value.

R: Yeah.

I1: So, um...

I2: Okay.

I1: I suppose there is one specific question which has come up a little bit today and we have asked... I think we asked both, but we definitely asked [NTC], because it has come up about the implications of this in terms of supporting artists in these projects in the future, and I suppose it's to ask you to reflect on the skills that were necessary to navigate this project. That maybe you would now feel, "Oh, right, I need to talk my students about that," or, "Now I need to think about this for the next project" – you know, what skills are they?

R: I would say there were: readiness to compromise – whether that is a good thing or not, I'm not quite sure, but I think it was necessary for working at Gibside, otherwise it would have just probably been abandoned and it would not have happened – and to be ready to see the whole thing through their eyes, from the perspective of the property. [Pause] what was the question again?

**I1: Just, yeah, what kinds of skills were necessary? And I'm using that word because, in a sense, in the brief of the project is 'how do we support and enable artists to do this well'.**

**I2: Mm.**

R: Well, I think the artist has to be ready to communicate with the property and, sort of, you know, go some way to meeting their objectives for the project as well. So, for example, Gibside did want it to engage their volunteers, so that was probably one of the reasons why I was okay about, "Alright, let's hand over a bit of ownership to the volunteers."

**I1: Mm.**

**I2: Would they have got that in the group? I don't think they got that in the group.**

R: I must have got that idea from somewhere.

**I2: Mm.**

**I1: Mm, so it would be easy–**

**I2: What about audience? What about having to think about audience? Did you think about audience (unclear 00:48:20)?**

R: Yeah. Actually, I wish there had been more opportunities to do, kind of, talks in front of the work at Gibside. That could have happened, but it didn't, apart from on the opening event.

**I2: Mm.**

**I1: Why didn't it happen?**

R: I think because they couldn't be bothered.

**I2: I think, actually, that's true. I think we did offer that. I think we did offer that.**

R: I'm sure we did.

**I2: We did, yeah. And then something about the confusion about interpretation, which we said we'll... they had fed back quite late about needing more interpretation.**

R: Well, they did, but... at which point we had that interpretation board made.

**I2: Yeah.**

R: But actually–

**I2: But then it took ages for them to install it.**

R: It did. And then... you know, it did take a long time. And then we had... if you remember, they asked if they could hang on to the pots for longer.

**I2: Yeah.**

R: At which point we said, "Alright, well, okay, but we've got to make this a positive thing so it's not just that they are getting left there for a bit longer, so we want to construct some other activities around them" – which is where that workshop idea came from. And [NTG2] did get on board with that and stayed on board with it.

**I1: Did you take students to it?**

R: No, I think it was probably during our Easter vacation.

**I1: Timing-wise, it was a bit odd, wasn't it?**

**I2: Timing-wise, it was over the summer.**

**I1: Yeah, because I took an MA group, but...**

R: Ah, right, yeah, no, that's... for the main works, yeah.

**I1: [Pause] yeah.**

**I2: What about the intermediary between the site and the artist?**

R: Well, it was very variable, because sometimes... again, it comes down to individuals. We are establishing a successful working relationship with, you know, an individual or a couple of individuals there. So, I interacted with staff at Gibside in very different ways. You know, some of them were more interested than others.

**I1: Mm.**

R: Like, [NTG3] was pretty good – [NTG3], the gardener.

**I2: Yeah.**

R: And [NTG2], as I say, was very good. But others were less engaged with it, really.

**I2: Mm. So, is a stable point of contact important?**

R: Well, it should really be the person who is leading on the project, shouldn't it? You know, if they... they may think that they *did* identify somebody to lead on the project, but if they did, they never told us. I don't think (unclear 00:51:16 – 00:51:17).

**I1: Mm, mm, mm.**

**I2: I think they do. I think [NTG1] thinks that there was a continuity person.**

**I1: Mm, yeah. And, you know, in a way, maybe that is a really simple [laughs] bullet point for the report: 'there has to be a single person who is there and who will see the project through from beginning to end'.**

R: What actually added to the complexity of that was that [Name] in a way, took up that role, but she is not really... because she is not part of the property staff, she can't have ownership of the project. It needs to be somebody at the property who has ownership. It's not...

**I1: Mm, mm.**

R: And I don't know whether this is the case at Lindisfarne – whether she had... who had ownership of the Anya Gallaccio piece up there.

**I2: I think that's the general manager there, [Name]. [They are] very [pause]... oh, what's the word? He is very committed to a contemporary programme.**

R: Right.

**I2: Personally, [they are]. So, you know, [they weren't]... they are continuing there, aren't they?**

R: Well, they advertised for another...

**I2: Yeah, yeah.**

**I1: They have, haven't they?**

**I2: Yeah.**

R: For another, yeah.

**I2: So, I mean, [they are ] *not* put off by all that press stuff that went on about Anya Gallaccio. [They're] not... [they aren't] really isn't put off by that. [They're] personally committed.**

R: I don't know. I didn't see that press stuff. Oh, I did, in the Times... they mentioned it (unclear 00:52:40) in the Times.

**I2: Yeah, it was very negative. You know, it was negative for the...**

R: Was it?

**I1: Mm.**

**I2: Yeah. There was a lot of negative press around it. But [they are] actually not running scared of that, and [they are] going forward.**

R: But interestingly, they put it out to [s.I April competition, this one 00:52:58 – 00:52:59], haven't they?

I2: **Mm, mm. [Pause] are there any... anything that is really important that has come from...? Well, I mean, you work in heritage. You've done work for heritage sites before. So, in a way, you are not... you know, you are quite experienced at that. But is there an overriding recommendation?**

R: Yeah, I think it's good, because I think it does give you something to get your teeth into. I think [pause]... you know, if you are an artist, a brief is quite an exciting thing in some ways, because it does give you something to intellectually engage with.

I1: **Mm.**

I2: **Mm, mm. [Pause] [s.I I don't know if I should say that 00:53:55].**

I1: **[Laughs].**

I2: **And I always say... what do I say? When they say it's a 'rich foundation'. I'm going to say 'intellectually engage with them'.**

R: Well, you need a brief. I mean, you couldn't just... if you were doing any competitive, otherwise... I didn't look at the Lindisfarne brief. Did you look at it?

I2: **No.**

R: I don't know whether they wrote one for it or not.

I2: **No, I didn't look at it.**

I1: **I collect them for my module, but sometimes I collect them [laughs] and I don't even read them, you know, but I've got a whole stack of briefs now.**

I2: **[Laughs] did you read it?**

I1: **But I still can't remember it if I *did* read it [laughs]. But I did think it was interesting that they are doing it again.**

R: Well, they could almost be done to a template.

I1: **Mm, mm.**

R: Yeah, they *are* doing it again. And somebody told me that they are doing it again more than once. But I think that could be...

I1: **Mm.**

I2: **Who? At Lindisfarne?**

R: I was talking to somebody about it last night.

**I2: They are doing Wallington. No, they have just advertised for Wallington.**

R: That's what they are doing. I think that's [Name]. I was talking to [them] today. [They] said [they were] at the over...

**I2: Yeah.**

R: They want very socially-engaged artists or something.

**I1: Mm.**

**I2: Yes, yes, 'two opportunities below: Crow Park in Keswick and Wallington river walk'.**

R: Wallington river walk?

**I2: Yeah. So, 'situated at the peaceful home of...' yeah, so it's... the artist brief is more about the river walk, I think. I'm just looking it up now.**

**I1: Mm.**

R: Well, this was the one where [Name] was saying today that they are specifically looking for someone who is a socially-engaged artist.

**I2: (Unclear 00:55:37 – 00:55:41). Quite a lot of the heritage sites want socially-engaged practice now.**

**I1: Yeah.**

R: But do they know what that means?

**I2: Yeah, do they know what that means?**

**I1: That's a really good question.**

R: I think there might be a misunderstanding there – what they think it means is someone who will engage with their audiences.

**I1: Mm, mm, mm.**

**I2: Yeah.**

**I1: Mm. [Pause] um...**

**I2: I'm fine.**

**I1: Yeah. And I just want to ask one question, really. And in a way, this is not necessarily... this isn't to you specifically as an artist, but it's just something that I think has come up, interestingly, a couple of times in the project. And I suppose I was curious about you being a PI on this project *and* being an artist on it. And I don't even know if that is [laughs], kind of, an official question, but I am just, sort of, curious about that, in the structure of the project and how you have managed that.**

R: Well, it's interesting, because the project itself... the art... making the art and... because... well, I suppose it did actually take a lot of the time up in that year, but the... it's a bloody big sledgehammer [laughter] to crack open the nut of doing a piece of work.

**I1: Mm.**

R: You know, the whole project was a, sort of, massive *thing*, you know.

**I1: [Laughs].**

R: Whereas the artwork itself, in one sense, was only quite a minor part of that.

**I1: Mm.**

R: Like, there were six commissions and...

**I2: [S.I are they 00:57:12]?**

R: Yeah, there were six of them.

**I2: What, with Marcus?**

R: Yeah.

**I2: Mm.**

**I1: Yeah.**

**I2: Yes, of course, yeah, yeah.**

R: I think it... I think what was good about it was that it was led from practice. I think it was much more... certainly from my perspective, having it led, well, from practice, by one of the artists who is involved in it, it gave it a different kind of perspective or, you know, it prioritised different things than if it had been... as most of these projects are *not* led from practice. They are led from somebody else and then they, kind of, bring the artists in.

**I1: Yeah, yeah, yeah.**

R: I think because... I think we really foregrounded the art much, much more than quite often happens.

I2: **Mm.**

I1: **Yeah, yeah.**

R: And, you know, the value and the important to the artists and the value to art practice.

I1: **Mm.**

R: So, I think the way that we structured it was actually good.

I2: **I think we could do that again. If we did another one, it would be... I think we should track the artistic practice. But it could be just about that and really go at, you know, a *huge* survey of, "Actually, well, *has* it...? What has happened to these people that are being commissioned to make work for heritage and what happens to them?"**

R: Mm-hmm.

I1: **Yeah. And I think it's interesting, because I have been looking, in the last couple of months, at Fiona's blog entries. And I know that it wasn't a requirement to *do* a blog, but it was thinking, you know, "What *is* the process?" And it's really quite interesting to look at what she was doing. And effectively, she posted lots of things on that blog, but as a... and again, we didn't impose a blog on her, but we said her sketchbooks or whatever... and we were interested in tracking it. But it's *really* limited in terms of a representation of the journey of making that work, because effectively, you know, she might have posted about 30 different posts, but they were probably only on about four or five different days. Right at the beginning, she made about five or six posts; then in the middle, she made two or three posts of several different things; and then at the end there were two days, when she installed, where she probably posted about ten different individual blog posts, but all actually within two days. 'Arrived', 'painting', 'building', 'installed', and then that was the last one.**

R: I should have probably been much more meticulous about... you know, and kept an artist's blog of the journey, but the thing is, you really don't want to do that while you are involved in making the work.

I2: **Yeah, yeah.**

R: You don't... you know, it's like if you were writing a novel – you wouldn't, sort of, give a daily blow-by-blow account of what's going on.

I1: **No, no.**

**I2: No, no, I know.**

R: I mean, perhaps there is a way of doing it so that it can be published retrospectively. But there is no way that you really want to make it so visible whilst it is happening.

**I1: No, no. No, that's –**

R: I had thought, before we started, that I wouldn't quite feel like that. I did definitely feel that I didn't want to.

**I1: Yeah.**

R: That I didn't feel comfortable, sort of, putting oneself on show through the whole of the process.

**I1: No.**

**I2: No, absolutely now.**

**I1: Yeah, that's totally fair enough.**

**I2: I totally understand.**

**I1: But interestingly, the project did set out to track how the project developed.**

R: Yeah.

**I2: Yes.**

**I1: And actually, it *did* articulate that we would do that in some way.**

**I2: Mm-hmm.**

**I1: And, you know, we have got various bits of stuff to reflect on about that and that part.**

R: I think if we were doing it again, there would be a way of... because I think we set out saying that the blog should be published while the project is being developed.

**I1: Mm-hmm.**

R: But I think there would be a way of, you know, keeping an artist's diary or something like that that was not... you know, that was then either not published until afterwards or the artist had much more control over what they [s.I really think about the making 01:01:32] process.

**I1: Mm, mm, yeah.**

I2: (Unclear 01:01:36).

I1: So, interestingly, if you were to do it again, you know, it might be that at least one of the artists... not necessarily all of them, but you would have somebody who does *actually* work in sketchbooks or on paper or...

I2: I think Mark did that, didn't he?

I1: Yeah, Mark did as well. It's only because I was just doing Fiona's the other week that... you know, I've still got Mark's to do.

I2: Mm.

I1: But yeah.

R: I mean, I've got a lot of sketchbooks that have drawings and so on that I made during the... as that project developed – you know, sort of, the point when the birds got introduced and all of that kind of stuff. It's just that that has never... I've never, kind of, published that (unclear 01:02:19).

I1: Yeah, yeah.

I2: I mean, you know, why should artists have to do that in some sort of way?

I1: No, at least they have–

R: Well, possibly, if you undertake to do a research programme, I think it's at that point that you actually do commit to it.

I2: I know, that (unclear 01:02:33).

I1: Yeah.

R: So, it's probably a bit naughty not to have done.

I1: Yeah, yeah. No, [s.l and then they shouldn't at all 01:02:37 – 01:02:38]. I suppose it's a personal issue to me, because I *love* artist sketchbooks. They are just *really* fascinating. And whether they are very drawing-focused or whether they are much more thinking-focused or... it's just that relationship between, kind of, an ongoing making thinking, and then these things that emerge as the objects, which are the result of this other kind of practice. But, you know, I suppose I'm interested in that, just personally, in terms of practice.

I2: It's funny, because I think it's a very personal thing – like, a sketchbook and everything is a personal thing – and I wouldn't want someone else to see it.

I1: No, no.

**I2: So, in a way, you know, it would... I sort of think, "Why should we?" And then you get onto 'how much interpretation should you provide' and all of those sorts of areas.**

**I1: Mm, mm, yeah, yeah.**

**I2: You know, so, how much should you reveal, I suppose.**

**I1: Mm, mm.**

R: They are different things. I think interpretation probably is–

**I2: Interpretation is different.**

R: Yeah.

**I1: Mm. Okay.**

**I2: I'm good.**

**I1: I'm good.**

R: Okay. Well done. Thank you.

**I2: Well done.**

**I1: Thank you.**

**I2: Thank you very much.**

**[End of Recording]**