

A&HP_IP_Interview_7_Aug_2018

Date: transcribed 24th August 2018
Comments: anonymised March 2021
Duration: 00:56:01

KEY:

Cannot decipher = (unclear + time code)

Sounds like = [s.l + time code]

I: = Interviewer

R: = Respondent

NT = National Trust Staff Member

IP = Inheritance Projects Other

I: I mean obviously I sent you that email with a bit of information about the project. Did you manage to have a look at the website?

R: I haven't done, no, I'm sorry.

I: Okay, don't worry. I just wonder whether maybe I should just give you a little bit of an introduction about who I am and our project before I go into asking you some questions.

R: Yes, I mean that (unclear 00:00:23) with, yes.

I: How long have you got anyway? Have you got half an hour?

R: Don't worry, I'm fine. I'll go easily to 4:30pm.

I: Okay. I'm [I]. I'm a Research Associate at Newcastle University and I'm working on, it's a three year AHRC funded research project called Mapping Contemporary Art and the Heritage Experience. The lead person on that is Professor Andrew Burton and Fine Art here. So it's a practice led project but with a number of components to it. One of them is the practice based bit, that we've just produced a series of commissions in collaboration with the National Trust and the Churches Conversation Trust and English Heritage in the North East, so a number of commissioners with contemporary artists, mainly visual artists and some sound works. That's just come to fruition over the summer.

Another part of it is looking at how audiences engage with those projects, so we're doing a series of focus groups but this part of the project and the one I wanted to talk to you about is this idea of mapping this world or practice of bringing contemporary art works, by which mainly we're looking at visual arts, bringing contemporary art works and artists into heritage site contexts, however heritage sites might be sort of described or defined. Obviously the partners we're working with, National Trust, English Heritage are the mainstream heritage organisations in the UK with the kinds of properties of historic country houses, historic designed landscapes and then the Churches Conservation Trust looks after a collection of listed churches which are no longer in use for congregations and things and looking at new uses for those, so one of our projects is in one of those churches in Sunderland.

So we're now half way through our project. We've been going for about eighteen months. At this stage, what I've been doing is building up a kind of database, it's just an Excel spreadsheet at the moment, of a whole load of projects of this kind that have taken place across the UK currently but also going back to the 1980s, 1990s. So some of those projects are things which are artists engaging in museum collection contexts and some of them are projects in things like National Trust with Trust New Art and other kinds of independent heritage sites or, indeed, sites which artists have engaged in independently rather than it being a commissioned project. So that's how I've come across you and Inheritance Projects. That's what I wanted to talk to you principally about. But before, I've got my little agenda and it's really a conversation.

I mean obviously I've got my agenda. I think I sent you an outline of that in the email but it's a conversation so we can go in different directions if we want to. As I said, I'm currently recording our conversation. I hope that's okay with you.

R: Yes, that's fine.

I: What will happen to these interviews, obviously we've got them audio recorded and then they'll be transcribed. We'll use these interviews as part of our data analysis so this material might appear in later publications or on our website. I mean we wouldn't use the recording directly on the website but extracts from transcripts and things will go into our research outputs. I'm hoping you're happy with that.

R: Yes, that's fine.

I: That's great. So I've recorded that. What I would normally do is I have a consent form and other things that I would normally give you and we'd get an exchange of signatures and things if we were meeting face to face. I can email that to you if you want me to.

R: I trust you. I'm okay with that.

- I: So I've recorded that. That's my capture of that information. But before I start, do you have any questions for me at the outset before we begin?**
- R: Just going back to what you were saying before, if you are putting stuff online or quoting me and stuff like that, would you mind asking or showing it to me first?
- I: I mean I think probably what we might do is if it's more...**
- R: Or anonymise.
- I: If it's long extracts from an interview that we're putting in a case study or something like that, I think we will get back to people but some of our analysis might be looking at themes and things, where it might be shorter quotes. So if it was something substantial, is that okay?**
- R: Yes, that's fine.
- I: I'll just make a note of that. That's fair enough. Anything else? Did you want to know anything more about the project?**
- R: Just so that I can have it on in the background, just remind me quickly of the website.
- I: I can't remember what the address is. I've got it on here. Have I got it on here? It is a bit of a funny one. So it's <http://research.ncl.ac.uk/mcahe/>. Have you found it? If you do a Google search for mcahe, you might come up with it.**
- R: I'm just curious about the commissions but I suppose I can look at that at another time.
- I: Have you found it? On the website there's a section on the commissions bit.**
- R: Yes, I can see that.
- I: Okay?**
- R: Yes.
- I: So it's just an opener really, so can you tell me about the history of your engagement, yourself as a curator and in terms of Inheritance Projects? That's my direction but there may be other things you can tell me about your practice in terms of your engagement with this area of contemporary art, contemporary artists in heritage sites and the partnerships or relationships you've developed with the heritage sector though that.**
- R: Sure. I mean how personal do you want me to be? I mean do you want to know the initial interests?

I: Yes, initial interests, tell me your response to that really.

R: My background as curator or as an arts administrator, I didn't come from an art school background. I in fact studied organisational management within museums as part of my degree and so I was working in museums and in the Potteries Museum and was involved with museums and heritage institutions before I was involved in artistic practice.

I: In the UK? I detect from your accent that maybe you're from somewhere else.

R: I've been here for 22 years. No, I finished school and went to university all in the UK so this is up in Staffordshire is where I studied and was working in the Potteries Museum and Gallery. So I came to it with an interest in museums and thinking about how museums could be more contemporary. I had a burgeoning interest in contemporary arts and visual arts and art history but focusing on contemporary art and was thinking about how the two could be brought together. Inheritance Projects was initiated in order to experiment in this way, in order to bring together contemporary practitioners with heritage spaces and museum collections. I would say that Inheritance Projects has transformed quite considerably since then but that was the initial impetus.

I: I had a look at your website and it has got a note on it saying it hasn't been updated. I did a bit of research around on you as well so I gather although it started off, I think it said initiated in 2007 and then there was a bit that I particularly obviously focused on, which was some work that you did with the National Trust in about 2011/2012. Then I can see that recently you've got this other interest in new towns and you're doing a PhD and things.

R: Yes. I mean it really comes from the same place though. I would say it's a preoccupation with the lack of history or the creation of history with the new towns stuff. The second part of your question is how did... so I mean it's weird because the way that these relationships grow comes out of personal connections and knowing people in places but when I initiated Inheritance Projects I was part of a fellowship scheme with [NT1] before he had gone to the National Trust.

I: Where was that?

R: It was through the ICA. I can't remember who sponsored the whole project but it was basically... God, it's so long ago but it was basically a bit like an incubator scheme for people who were starting creative organisations. [NT1] and I were both there interested in contemporary practices within heritage organisations or heritage futures. I had just done the exhibition at The Old Operating Theatre Museum and [they were] still working for the Council. We hit it off because we had really similar interests and this idea of engaging people in history through the contemporary artist or contemporary practitioner. [NT1] then got the position and came to me and asked if I had any thoughts on developing a programme of any kind, did I have any ideas, did I have any thoughts.

The residency programme that we did with three of the properties was very heavily inspired by the Artist Placement Group. Are you familiar with the Artist Placement Group?

I: A little bit, yes, but go on and tell me about how it was linked.

R: Well I can't remember if [NT1] came to me asking about residencies or whether we... "Are you interested in doing anything?" I think [they] may have mentioned residencies and I started to look at the history of residencies. I think at the same time, I had in fact been looking at different ways that artists intervene into institutions, not just heritage institutions but organisational structures. I encountered, for the first time, the Artist Placement Group, initiated by Barbara Steveni and her partner, John Latham, with a number of other artists. They initiated placements initially within large corporations and artists were paid a salary and were invited to spend time either on the factory floor or within the management offices with an open brief. So it wasn't that they were making art for the hallways, the hope was that they would influence decision making.

So I wanted to propose placements basically and for there to be open ended residencies for artists who would not be obliged necessarily to make work even but that they would be there to influence the story telling of that particular property. It was really up to the artist how they might interpret this open brief because I was basically borrowing this idea of the open brief. Sorry, you were going to say something.

I: Yes. The programme was called the Residence, is that right, and it was around 2011/2012?

R: Yes.

I: You had three artists and it was Tris Vonna-Michell, Laure Prouvost and support structure, which was [Name] and somebody else. I had a look at your videos actually. There were a couple of videos on your website. I found them so I did have a little delve into that a bit. So that's a great idea, so you had this open brief for the artists. Is that what happened in effect? How did your initial idea, your proposal work with the National Trust? What actually happened?

R: Well there was one element of this which I didn't mention. Each one of the residencies was done in partnership with a contemporary institution in the vicinity of the National Trust property. They were there for support and for the connection and the potential opportunity to represent their time in residence through screening performance or even an exhibition. That was to be left open as well, which is quite a difficult thing to do but it was the idea that if an artist, they were not expected to produce necessarily but if they did produce, they had the opportunity to show that work. In the residencies themselves, each one of the artists wanted to produce work and to show it. The idea initially was that if there was to be an outcome, that it would be shared across both sites but in actual fact,

in Tris Vonna-Michell's case it was simply an exhibition at the BALTIC as opposed to having things on site.

Because the openness of it, which was really challenging for everyone but was also the point of it, meant that it was actually quite difficult to control and that there were hopes that things would be shared across the site but it didn't actually make sense and that because there is this commitment to artist development which I would say ended up being a primary concern in the product. We had to support the artists in only having an exhibition on one site. So I mean it was thought through the Artist Placement Group, which was looking both at the impact of the artist on the organisation and the organisation on the artist but doing it, it became quite clear that my responsibility was very much to be supporting the artist first and foremost.

I: So you were the curator of that?

R: Yes. I mean we organised everything and was the... things become quite collaborative when you're spending a lot of time with an artist in a place but I would say we organised it and were acting as go-betweens, mediators and facilitators. We were also responsible for a large part of the communication and the interpretation but we were working with the institutions. There were lots of people involved and lots of people who had stakes and investments in it so it was (unclear 00:18:20) not just the artists but everyone who was involved and managing their expectations, which was really tricky. The most challenging thing was managing the expectations of the property managers who's understanding of contemporary art practice is very singular as say sculptures in a space.

I: So just reeling back slightly on that, which came first? So you've got the National Trust heritage sites and that's National Trust because of this invitation from [NT1]. You've got the arts institutions' gallery at Baltic and Hepworth, etc., and you've got the artists. So did you select artists or did you choose? Was it all done... how did you decide which National Trust sites or which artists and which other partners? Where did it start? How did that work?

R: What came first was a call out from [NT1], from Trust New Art team to every single property in England to ask whether they would be interested in artists residencies programme. Those that responded, so by this time Inheritance Projects was myself, [IPO]. We chose specific geographic areas that made sense to where we were familiar. The idea was that they would continue but we chose the three in the North East. Laure, at the time, was living in Newcastle. [Name] joined halfway through. So the call out went to all of the properties, dozens replied. We chose the areas and we went to visit all of the properties that were interested in having residences in those areas, did research into them and chose which ones we felt would be most interesting or strategic with residencies. So Gibside was chosen because of its proximity to BALTIC.

We felt that there could definitely be something there. Then the next step was to approach those contemporary institutions and ask if they wanted to partner with

the National Trust and with us as curators. Everybody did. I would say with Hepworth, when we started this project the Hepworth didn't exist. We were working with the Media Museum in Bradford. That relationship got very, very difficult as lots of people lost their jobs. There was a very nasty atmosphere there and so what ended up happening was us, at a very late stage, turning to the Hepworth and saying, "We're working with Laure " so this is jumping ahead a bit but, "We're working with Laure, who is an amazing artist and things have fallen through with the National Media Museum. Would you like to step in?" They were like, "We wish that we were there in beginning to give Laure a big show," and whatever.

Then with the property managers of the National Trust property and with the responsible curator at the contemporary institution, Inheritance Projects put together a long list and we deliberated over that long list, we gave presentations on all of these artists' work. It was chosen by us. It was curated by us, these long lists because they were told that we were interested in working with them, interested in practices. With each one of these residencies, three artists were chosen to come and visit the site and put forward a proposal and they were paid to do that. Then an artist was selected by that same team, the same steering group team people. There was a grant of £8,000 given to the artist which was to cover fee and production, aside from the production of the exhibition at the contemporary partner. So that's how the selection was made. It wasn't an open call. We wanted to contain it and curate it a lot more than that.

- I: So the selection of those artists was done with the property manager and your institutional curator and yourself obviously? So from your long list, you invited say three artists for Gibside in collaboration with this property manager at Gibside?**
- R: Yes, and Laurence Sillars who is no longer at the BALTIC.
- I: That's a familiar panel structure, the sort of thing we did in our own commissioning, a little bit like that. Was it funded entirely through Trust New Art, the Trust New Art programme?**
- R: Yes. There was a little bit of money put in by the contemporary partners.
- I: How long did that whole process take? I mean obviously my dates are like 2011/2012, well that's the presentation I guess of it.**
- R: I mean the whole thing, the residency periods were six months long. There was a minimum of over six months. I can't remember. I think it was 30 days full time and they could split it how they wanted. It was very flexible but there was a six month period and in that time they have to spend x number of days. They could spend more but not less. With each one of them we worked out what made sense, whether they were to live on site for a short period of time, whether they were to come back and visit regularly. Each artist worked in a very different way. So the whole thing was two years from start to finish.

I: I saw that at Gibside, Tris, I think there was some reference to him staying in the banqueting house building which is a Landmark Trust property. So was that just a paid for rental type thing or was there an actual partnership relationship with them as well?

R: There was a partnership with them that broke down. They were incredibly unpleasant, I have to say. There was a reduction of rates because of the project but the property was wholly unsuitable for living in. The property was disgusting and not really liveable so we had to take Tris and his assistant out, who is also his partner, and put them in somewhere else because it was unsuitable. The staff at Landmark Trust were incredibly rude. They also ended up sending me their internal emails by accident swearing, effing and blinding. But it worked out fine in the end. We gave them a flat in Newcastle and Tris came into Gibside every day.

I: I was just intrigued by that because obviously that's on my horizon of other sorts of heritage organisations, Landmark Trust is. I know they have done some of their own commissioning separately as well so I was just intrigued by that little connection.

R: I mean they were a reluctant partner.

I: I mean Gibside is actually one of the sites that we've worked with in our commissions so I'm particularly interested in your experience there maybe as a... I think you said managing expectations of property managers and how that works because obviously you're working with different levels of an organisation like National Trust. We're in the same position, working with [NT1] who has got a national remit. Then you've got people who have their own remit in that particular place. I don't know whether you wanted to reflect on, whether you could say anything more about how that worked, the challenges of that or the difficulties or what issues come out of that working.

R: I think with the National Trust and with [NT1], [they] had a very good understanding of contemporary art practices and was incredibly supportive of what we were doing and the idea of this open brief which was radical within the Trust New Art programme. Radical is a bit extreme but maybe a bit alternative. You had to think through it as opposed to being present with an artist and their artwork. I mean managing [their] expectations was an easy thing to do. We were on the same page and that's head office, with the properties and the property managers and the volunteers and all of the staff at the properties was an ongoing process that we were responsible for. It was a pedagogical exercise really. There was a lot of presentations and discussions about what is contemporary art. There was a lot of reluctance, in some properties and some instances there was a reluctance to welcome it or just a lack of understanding of what it could be.

I mean another one of our priorities was to get the volunteers on side. I'm thinking particularly at Treasurer's House because the volunteers and the staff are incredibly protective of their properties and incredibly protective of the stories of properties as well. The whole point of the artist being there was to disrupt that a bit

or a lot, was to disrupt it. So it had to an exercise in welcoming conflict in a way and managing expectations of the property managers, what the outcome was going to be. What were they going to see? What were they going to smell? What were they going to hold? What was it going to be? Not knowing that as the curator, that was an ongoing challenge but I had to gain the trust of the property manager and just convince them that there would be something and that they would be comfortable enough with it or that what would happen would be worthwhile.

That was just constant reassurance and, again, education of what art could be. I think in the process of shortlisting artists, that was also an education in contemporary art a bit but trying to imagine what this kind of artist or what these kinds of artists could possibly produce. I didn't need to manage the public's expectation. That was not my responsibility. I didn't want to take that on really. I mean there was interpretation but it was the property managers and the other people in the property whose responsibility it was to take care of the public. We did it together but that was rarely my major concern because we knew that, well we felt that it was that... I don't know. What did we feel? These kinds of artists' work is not something that has to be encountered and that we didn't want to I think maybe control that encounter so much, like I said, it was supporting the artist and making the work as the principal (unclear 00:32:41).

I: I think you said with Tris's work, well the residence was at Gibside but the work wasn't shown at Gibside, it was shown at the BALTIC.

R: That's right, yes.

I: What happened in the other two cases? Was there an element of the work that was shown in the site where...?

R: So with Laure's at Treasurer's House, there was a major intervention in Treasurer's House. She staged installations across the House in about, I think, seven different sites around the house. I can't quite remember how many there were. But it was a series intervention that visitors could not avoid. It was light and sound and signage. Then she had also used it as the location for a part of her film and so what took place at the Hepworth was a looped screening of this film. There was a performance and there was the same signage that had been around Treasurer's House was installed at the Hepworth.

I: What happened with the other one, Clumber Park?

R: With Clumber Park? So the intervention of support structure, they removed the... I'm not sure if you're familiar with Clumber Park but Clumber Park used to have a (unclear 00:34:26) house.

I: I haven't been to Clumber Park but I saw the video thing. It explained that there was a site where there was a trace of the house.

R: Amazingly, I saw in the newspaper that because of all of the dry weather that the plan of Clumber House is significantly more visible for some reason, because drying out of the grass and bare patches. Anyway, so on site in Clumber is a model of what the house and they've removed that and put it into Nottingham Contemporary. It was installed as an exhibition in Nottingham Contemporary along with a series of events that took place at Nottingham Contemporary. Then on site in Clumber they had produced their own (unclear 00:35:12) with the onsite brewery. They published a book, there was 10,000 of them produced so every visitor would receive them, about different stories about missing houses. They did a zombie walk, like a daylong performance or half a day long performance.

I: **I mean that's interesting, this relationship between obviously a residency which happens in those particular sites and then this making work for presentation to the heritage visitor audience say at Treasurer's House and then making another work or related works that then have a very different audience in the Hepworth, a gallery audience. I don't know whether there's anything more you wanted to say about that.**

R: I think that the initial ideas about inheritance projects, I mean I said that we didn't really think about the audience, that's not true because the ideas that I started with were to be cross those audiences. That meant that I understood them as being different, which is not necessarily true but actually in other places it is a very, very different audience. It was the idea of bringing heritage I suppose to a contemporary audience and vice versa. That was one way that we were doing it. There was also the hope that it would encourage people to visit each site so it wasn't just looking at the artist's work but it was maybe the idea of getting somebody into the BALTIC who hadn't already gone. Is that answering your question?

I: **Yes. I mean it's interesting because we've been doing onsite commissions and all our projects are actually artists who have made works and they're presenting those works onsite in the places where they did their research and made the work. Then actually next year, as part of our ongoing project, we're having an exhibition actually at the Hatton Gallery in Newcastle. We are, at the moment, in our own minds, playing with this idea, how do we represent these commission site specific practice, in our case, how do we represent that work in some way in a gallery situation. So I was just interested in your take on that. Earlier on we were playing with some of those ideas.**

R: Yes, I suppose the site specificity, I don't maybe have as much faith in certain ideas of site specificity but I had before that, I feel that work doesn't need to remain in situ, that it carries a story with it and that if you are taking it into a different context, it activates that context as well with a different meaning. It becomes a layered work. It becomes more complex and possibly then more interesting because it's speaking of another place. The idea for our projects was always that there would be the space for the heritage within the contemporary though it necessarily hadn't had the contemporary partner because it was really important to bring these histories into a so called contemporary space. It was

really important that we can bring that to the contemporary site. Not that it was a challenge but that's where the exciting friction was, was having this strange disconnect in a way on purpose.

I don't know if that makes any sense but site specificity is overrated. I mean that's not actually true because they're being site specific to somewhere else and then being taken somewhere else, it still has resonance and holds it but I think that it can translate.

I: I was going to slightly move on from that and also maybe that what you just said there about bringing history into the contemporary, I can see that that is maybe your linking train of thought with this new work or your continuing interest in the new towns, Milton Keynes and, I don't know, seeing the histories of those places or creating different histories in those places that seem to be new and don't have a history. I don't know, I'm trying to make that kind of connection. This project, the residents project was the one obviously I particularly focused on and spotted in this but I don't know whether there was more about, as I said, the history of your engagement in contemporary art in heritage sites or whatever, beyond that programme or what that morphed into or perhaps why you haven't continued working with maybe Trust New Art or National Trust as a partner because this is back looking at something in 2011/2012, that evolution.

Where did that go to? Now what, I suppose in between those things is what was the feedback or the follow on from that project that you did with National Trust, for yourself but also in terms of feedback from them or whatever?

R: Honestly, what happened is I took up a position as the director of Flat Time House. I don't know if you're familiar with it.

I: No, I don't know about that, no. Tell me.

R: Flat Time House is the home and studio and archive, it's a small institute in the former home of artist John Latham, who was Artist Placement Group. I became responsible for an archive. What I was doing with Inheritance Projects was essentially my job. It was a place with a history, with a personal history and a contemporary gallery space and a residency space. So what I spent four years doing was inviting artists, writers, curators, researchers to respond to that history in that context, that site. So it's me, so I'm part of Inheritance Projects and I went on to be the director of Flat Time House. So me as the independent curator, my interests didn't really change. It's just it wasn't with Inheritance Projects anymore. It became almost like an institutional position doing the things that I had been interested in, of working with history, thinking of history as a material and looking at the archive and using that as maybe the seed, an object from the archive as the seed of an idea for an artist's work or, similarly, a seed for a curated exhibition.

So what I was doing at the National Trust, the next step, was basically doing the same thing but with a very particular history and a very particular heritage site

which is essentially what Flat Time House is. New town stuff, that happened in parallel. That's my PhD research, that's my other stuff.

I: Are you in the middle of doing a PhD at Royal College, is that right?

R: Yes.

I: How far are you? I've just finished a PhD myself.

R: Oh right. I'm at the end of my first year so basically in crisis. I have no idea what I'm doing. This is like oh God, way too much.

I: That's good, great, brilliant.

R: I don't know. Is it?

I: Yes. I mean I felt like when I was in my first year, I did mine part-time so it took me six years because I've been doing other things as well. All I've done is write my proposal again and I still have no idea what I'm doing. It took a while but you get there in the end. We've been talking for about 45 minutes, which is brilliant. I don't know whether, maybe there's some sort of reflection from you possibly of this way of working, of this idea of bringing history and heritage and contemporary art together in various different ways or in different places. What do you think are the opportunities or issues or challenges for that kind of work currently or moving forward for you or more generally? Do you have a feel that this is a field of practice or do you think more specifically about the projects and places that you've been involved in? Sorry, that's two questions really.

R: I think it is a way of practicing. It is a field of practice like you say. I think there are boundaries to it that define it as being its own kind of practice, like working within heritage institutions. Obviously very specific to the way that we were working, there is a tendency not to take risks that comes from the heritage side of things, a reluctance to take risks that is quite difficult to work with when you are working with contemporary art practice. That makes it a difficult place to be experimental in. I would really love to do it again but I'd do it in a very different way, not to take away the open brief but to tackle some specific properties about... I'd want to be more politically engaged with the history of the properties but that's probably not part of your study. Your question was do I have any reflections on...

I: Yes, opportunities or issues or challenges for that field of practice, that was my first part of that question. But I suppose the other part which you did allude to, which is do you feel this is a field of practice with a shape and I think you said yes, it's got boundaries. So I'd be interested to know where you think those boundaries are.

R: I mean we're looking at quite specific places which have a very, I keep talking about the stories but have a very specific story. They're instituted with this story.

There is, very much, this idea that an artist is coming from the outside and that they're coming into a place, walking into this very rigid structure that is all focused on telling a very particular story. That's what everyone is working towards and fighting for and protecting. It has to be an invitation to come in. There is definitely a threshold that you have to cross over and that's not (unclear 00:48:47). So that's what I mean by there being a boundary. When working with heritage organisations or say working with an archive, it's that threshold that has to be crossed otherwise you're not actually engaging with it and it's not really concerned with a history or heritage. So I think it's a field of practice which I think is defined by institutions.

I think artists who do it... you don't need to have a curator. You don't need to have the institutions and interfacing with another institution. I think an artist can do it on their own. But what becomes interesting is when they're facing that boundary or where there's friction with those boundaries. I think the most interesting projects for me are those when they're attempting to change the institution, the artist (unclear 00:50:03) but that doesn't really seem to happen too much within the heritage institutions. I think that when I said that they're less likely to take risk or they're less open to change, the idea that an artist would come and spend time within their organisational structure and that that would be their art project, it doesn't compute. An artist belongs in the public interface.

Where their practice would be situated has to be about the public encounter and the artwork whereas the residencies that we were attempting to create was to actually have them embedded within there and to tell new narratives or those new ideas of working. I don't know, I'm going off on one.

- I: No, that's great, all good. I think probably we could more or less close with that at the moment. I'm just wondering, I mean obviously I've looked in terms of drawing more material on the kinds of projects that we've discussed I've got things from your website, the Inheritance Projects website and some of the video material but I don't know whether there's anything else that you have about your work in this area or about those projects that we've discussed with the National Trust that you'd be happy to share with us, if there's, I don't know, any kind of publications or other writing or evaluation or anything like that that you are happy to share with the research team or not.**
- R:** Let me have a look through, I'll see if there's anything that would be of interest to send to you. I don't have anything on this computer but I'll go through my other computer and see if there's anything that I can send you.
- I: That would be great. I mean I could also say there's a couple of other things that we're doing as part of the project that you might be interested in. One of the things we're doing, which is linked to this mapping and as I said, we've got this big database of hundreds of different projects. What we're hoping to do is to build an interactive Google Map thing of this information about projects that we've collected, not just current things but obviously historic projects that have happened in the past. What we're hoping to do is to have images and potentially video material. It's interesting how, especially with**

more recent projects, a lot of these small videos, and we've made small video films about our projects as well, it seems very common practice but there's nowhere to see all these things in one place.

I mean we'll come back to you on this but would you be happy for us to link with some of the video material that you've already produced, that's on your website or You Tube and link it in to our Google Map to make some kind of resource for the sector or artists?

R: Yes.

I: **Great, okay.**

R: I'm just thinking, the other people that you speak to, have you spoken to a lot of other people already?

I: **I'm about a third of my way through the list. Also, we're working with Arts&Heritage, I don't know whether you've come across Arts&Heritage, with Judith King. She's a partner, she's a senior researcher on the project. So we're already working with them and National Trust, Trust New Art are also one of our partners. So I've spoken to some people on the national level and also, through our research we've done, the desk based research. I'm coming to have conversations like this one we've just had with other curators and small arts organisations who have been involved in working with the National Trust or in other ways. So there's a variety of different people.**

R: You've got a lot of people to talk to.

I: **Obviously more people emerge. We're limited in our resources about how many interviews we can do but probably about fifteen interviews or something of this nature. Then if you see on our website, I don't think we've mentioned it yet but next year we're also doing a conference in July next year which will be a two day conference so we'll be putting some more information about that on the website in the autumn I imagine. So hopefully that might be something that you would be interested in maybe contributing to as a follow up to that?**

R: Yes, that would be great. I hope that it was useful. I recognise that I wasn't really talking much about strategy and networking and things like that that maybe you wanted me to talk about.

I: **I mean I think the idea, I've covered the list of prompts and things that I had. I mean there'll probably be other things that occur to me when I listen back to this or when I look back at the transcript, there'll be other things. No, it's great. It's been a really good interview. You've said some very interesting things for us I think.**

R: It feels like such a long time ago.

I: **Yes, I know, things move on, especially when you're in the middle of a PhD, you've moved on, it's difficult to think back at those things but talking about it makes it fresh again. That's great. I mean have you got any other questions or comments for me about anything?**

R: No, I don't think so. If I do, I can drop you an email.

I: **Please do. Yes, that's great so thank you very much, [R].**

R: Thank you.

I: **That's great, thank you.**

R: Alright, bye, bye.

I: **Okay, bye.**

[End of Recording]