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Abstract

Since being designated in 2001 as a natural World Heritage Site the Jurassic Coast managers have worked for it to be recognised as the Creative Coast. This thesis explores and challenges the entanglements of policy and practice in the process of the site becoming creative. Through archival research, interviewing and ethnographic methodologies this project has sought to develop a site-specific approach to creative arts policy. Research has integrated investigation of the embodied and quotidian geographies of decision-making with policy discourse analysis. Following formal and informal, public and private artistic practices, this research has traced how the Jurassic Coast is constructed by the creative activities of those who inhabit it.

In this research, relationships between the arts, creativity and geological heritage become complicated due to a paradox inherent within the site’s policy. The geological heritage preserved through the Jurassic Coast’s designation is acknowledged to be under continual processes of change. In response, this research illustrates how creativity can be used as a tool to illuminate tensions between the need to preserve natural processes of erosion and retreat and the desire to provide access and promote engagement with the site.

Furthermore, it is argued that using a site-specific and critical approach to everyday creativity allows geographers to understand how people engage with place in a multitude of ways. This is especially significant as the heritage value of this site lies in the ways in which different communities engage with it. It is through these day-to-day creative encounters that the Jurassic Coast is culturally constructed.
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“Think left and think right and think low and think high.
Oh, the thinks you can think up if only you try”

– Dr. Seuss
Prologue

Creative methodologies: Tracing Coast-lines

On the 31st October, a shadowy night, I opened the dark wood and glass doors hooking them to the brick wall to prevent them from blowing shut in the warm autumnal breeze. The light from inside the white room spilled out onto the tarmacked courtyard, which also served as the back entrance for the Seafood Platter pub opposite. Back inside, with a couple of generous volunteers I had wrangled from my family, we laid out glasses and a selection of food. Slowly familiar and new faces peered into and trickled into the room and began to inspect the images I had carefully hung on the walls. Candles flickered as the movement of bodies around the space disrupted the air and as murmurs in hushed tones built into chatter-filled conversations. With that, the Tracing Coast-lines exhibition was open.

In the autumn of 2014 I was invited to create and exhibit an artistic exhibition based on my archival research within the Jurassic Coast organisation. Supported by the ESRC (Economic and Social Research Council) Social Science Festival, I was keen to find a location “on the site” to present these works, which were based on the documents collected there. Due to my connections with the East Devon ambassadors, and through a recommendation by the Jurassic Coast team, I decided on the Bomb Shelter in Beer, East Devon as a venue [Fig. 1]. The Tracing Coast-lines exhibition gave me the opportunity to artistically experiment with ideas of what makes an archive. I had been fascinated by the wide collection of materials I had collected over the period of my research, from flyers to fossils to policy documents and candid photographs. I wanted to find ways to show how these materials influenced one another simply by being placed within the same collection. I also wanted to experience the challenges encountered by artists and producers working with the concepts, interpretation and branding of the Jurassic Coast site. The exhibition evidences some of the creative activity embedded throughout this research demonstrating how creativity as method and subject was intertwined in practice.
Exhibiting artwork from the archives

The *Tracing Coast-lines* exhibition comprised two main components. A large painted triptych on one wall was framed by fragments of driftwood floating against each sidewall, with photographs printed onto the surface of the wood. As I knew where I was going to exhibit when I created the work, I was able to adapt it to suit the space. The triptych was composed of three metre-square canvases that filled the end wall and provided a striking view as visitors entered the space.

The colour palette for the paintings was selected from an ancient fossil, a Victorian drawing, and a digital photograph [Fig. 2]. These were then overlaid with various maps of the coast – our human understandings of place portrayed in lines. Because these lines are our ways of measuring and communicating place, I was interested in how I could overlap these images and themes to create a collaged impression of the local coastline.

The pictures overlain onto the wood were snapshots from my research forming a personal archive of materials to complement the organisational archival materials of the *Creative Coast*. Many of these were photographs taken when I walked the 95-mile stretch of the Jurassic Coast in September 2013. The combination of images and wood, shaped by the sea, reflected how the organisation of archived materials can affect how they are interpreted and understood. For example, the grain of the underlying wood re-formed the images by shifting the perceived horizon, or changing the shape of an object.
Figure 1: The Tracing Coast-lines exhibition at Beer Bomb Shelter (photo: author)

Figure 2: Selecting colours and forms from fossils found on the beach at Lyme Regis and Charmouth (photo: author)
Discovering through curating

Increasingly, my research highlighted the importance of paying attention to the small and everyday. Exploring the creative responses to the Jurassic Coast involved being attentive to the detail of place and experience. By presenting conceptual ideas in the more unconventional form of an exhibition I hoped that I could portray some of the complexity and richness of the archives I had encountered. When deciding how to present the images collected throughout my research I wanted to nod towards the materials that construct and are constructed by the coastline.

I sought a technique that experimented with the colour, form and line of the images – morphing them and altering their meaning. I found this when I experimented with printing my archival research images onto driftwood. After searching various online craft blogs I came across the material for the task: gel medium. I printed the inverse of photographs on a laser printer and then coated them in the gel medium before sticking them to the wood. I left them to dry overnight and in the morning I rubbed away the top paper layer slowly, using a soft cloth and warm water.

This method was a more unpredictable and labour intensive process then I had imagined. The texture and grooves of the wood were tricky and at times frustrating. But as I continued I began to enjoy the suspense of not knowing how the image would emerge. Carefully constructed compositions were undermined, and the knots and form of the wood decided which features in the image would be picked out. Of course each surface of wood was different from the last. Some became sodden very easily; others had residual varnish, which seeped into the colour of the pictures; some were so ridged that the removal of the paper took away the majority of the image with it.
It was in this process, the making of these appliqued images, that I found the space to think about the archival research process afresh. All the photographs used I had taken myself and as such they formed part of my personal research archive; I knew them well. However, in the process of transferring them onto a new medium they gained new meanings in relation to one another. Suddenly, images that had seemed totally unrelated became symbiotic. Horizon and cliff lines shifted, influenced by the grain of the underlying wood: the buses, bridges and boats, popped out more readily than before; natural features receded [Fig. 3].

In essence, the composition and aesthetic of my personal archive and the collected archival material was transformed under this new context of wood and exhibition. Rather than a fixed collection of materials to be studied, the photographs became shifting materials in the process of research. I learned that creative approaches are valuable not only in communicating research, but also in conducting it. The Tracing Coast-lines exhibition was not necessarily effective as a method of communicating the content of the archival documents to new audiences. However, in the process of transforming the materials and overlaying them across each other, I gained valuable insight to how these documents work in the archive and how archives themselves are constructed materially and conceptually. Furthermore, the artwork and exhibition has had several new iterations since the original exhibition, including as an interactive activity at the 2016 Fossil Festival [Fig. 4]. This has allowed me to gather responses from a range of audiences and to start new conversations about creativity on the Jurassic Coast. Reflections to the work often included personal accounts of the
Figure 3: One driftwood piece juxtaposing different digital images of the Jurassic Coast alongside one anther - flowing and falling (photo: author)

Figure 4: Translating the art exhibition into an interactive activity for the Lyme Regis Fossil Festival 2016 (photo: author)
coastline and associated stories of the role of the WHS. Some identified their favourite locations along the Jurassic Coast, whilst others suggested other views or sites that were missing. In their new context many iconic landmarks of the WHS became amalgamated and decontextualized making them hard to identify. Although this muddling unsettled some it intrigued others who made new connections between seemingly disparate parts of the site.

This thesis examines what it means to ask questions about creativity and to creatively ask questions. It is about process and practice as well as artistic and creative outcomes. Much like a play within a play, this smaller project within project of the thesis mirrors some of the entanglements of policy and practice I encountered whilst researching creativity on the Jurassic Coast. The Tracing Coast-lines exhibition was a moment when these enquiries were placed in front of public audiences and my research was therefore reflected back to me in new ways. It was a moment in the iterative processes of the research: a conversation between myself and the multiple practitioners who imagine, narrate and (re)create the Jurassic Coast as a “Creative Coast”.

xx
1 Chapter One: introduction

1.1 Investigating creative responses to the Jurassic Coast

This thesis argues that creative practice has been an inherent part of the symbolic and discursive formation of the Dorset and East Devon World Heritage Site (commonly referred to as the Jurassic Coast). The creative conundrum of the Jurassic Coast is presented as a commitment to both creative questioning and a questioning of creativity in the site. Furthermore, I contend that engaging with critical notions of creativity opens space to question the logic and structure of how notions of a “Creative Coast” constructed and fostered specific forms of artistic practice along the Jurassic Coast. These critical creativities highlight some of the conflicts and tensions that arose as the World Heritage Site (WHS) sought to become a Creative Coast. Two arts programmes formed the formalised outlet for much of the creative output of the World Heritage Site: The Jurassic Coast Arts Programme (2008-2011) and Creative Coast 2012 (2011-2013). Tracing the policies of the Jurassic Coast Arts Programme (JCAP) and Creative Coast 2012 (CC2012) demonstrates how they were structured to engage with particular forms of elite public art. Since the establishment of the arts programmes, however, ideas of creativity have begun to open up to practitioners and audiences in different ways. This has fostered new ways of considering the Jurassic Coast and how it mediates residents’ and visitors’ relationship with the geological past.

However, alongside a re-thinking of the impact of the arts programmes, this thesis opens up investigation of creative practices to include the diverse ways that practitioners have historically and geographically engaged with the Dorset and East Devon coastline creatively. For example, historicising creativity on this site demonstrates its long reaching traditions. Furthermore, the WHS policies of the
Jurassic Coast are thought of as site-specific, and creative, performances, which engage with the particularities of the rural arts networks and environment networks in the region. This study therefore raises critical questions as to who creatively constructs the Jurassic Coast in meaning and policy. Examining everyday creativities on the site broadens its scope beyond being a method of communication tool for the geological science of the WHS. Moreover, the research broadens the concept of creativity by establishing that being artistic is not the same as being creative.

1.2 Research aims

1. To explore how the framing, policy, practice and performance of the Creative Coast programmes worked to shape perceptions of the World Heritage Site within the context of the creative economy.

2. To interrogate arts practice in the context of understanding geological/coastal change and natural heritage.

3. To examine how the international policies of World Heritage are articulated in the local setting of the Jurassic Coast World Heritage Site through a site-specific approach.

4. To investigate different forms of creative practice in response to the history and heritage along the site

1.3 Conceptual grounding of the thesis

Corresponding to the research aims above, this thesis makes contributions in four critical areas of the geography, heritage and arts nexus. These are articulated in the following broad themes:

1. Heritages of change

2. Disciplining nature

3. Performing policy
4. Placing creativity

Each will be explored in more detail in the following pages of this chapter before moving to an overview of the structure of the thesis.
Figure 5: Map of the Jurassic Coast World Heritage Site [not to scale] (illustration: author)
1.3.1 *Heritages of change*

The Dorset and East Devon coastline [Fig. 5] is England’s first UNESCO designated natural World Heritage Site (WHS). Informally referred to as the Jurassic Coast, the World Heritage Site was designated in 2001 for its apparent value in enhancing understanding of the earth’s past and the place of “humanity” within this history. A succession of rock sequences evident on the shoreline of the 95 miles of designated coastline represent over 180 million years of the history of the earth, primarily that of the Mesozoic era, the age of the dinosaurs. Tracing through Wadi-like deserts of the Triassic, to the warm, shallow Tethys Ocean in the Jurassic to deeper, stagnant oceans in the Cretaceous, the “walk through time” of the Jurassic Coast represents changing sea levels over geological time.  

There is a paradox built into the Jurassic Coast WHS because it was designated to preserve the dynamic action of coastal processes, such as erosion. These processes shift material extending and retreating from the coastline and form the geomorphology and geology it is renowned for. Therefore, notions of loss and change must be engaged within the management of the site. Furthermore, there has been a relevant body of work emerging in critical heritage studies over recent years that questions conventional conceptions of conservation and examines the heritage of change. This

---

1 The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) was established in 1945 and is responsible for the designation and management of WHSs through the World Heritage Convention. This is explored in more detail in Chapter Two [section 2.2.2: world heritage context].

2 The phrase a “walk through time” is commonly used by the Jurassic Coast to interpret the tilted geology along the site. Broadly speaking, walking from east to west along the designated coastline one encounters successively older layers of sedimentary rock formed in the Mesozoic era. Each layer provides evidence as to the environment in which it was deposited and the creatures, which lived and died there (as evidenced by fossilized remains). The Jurassic Coast team branding therefore uses metaphors of time-travel and reading pages from a book to interpret the geological significance of the site. An example is demonstrated on their website. Available at: [http://jurassiccoast.org/about/what-is-the-jurassic-coast/](http://jurassiccoast.org/about/what-is-the-jurassic-coast/) [Last accessed 09/12/2016].
project is situated amongst these debates and examines how the managers of the site must adapt to and accept change. It is argued that the Jurassic Coast has a powerful role to play in these discussions, especially those regarding policy and climate change. In practice, the management of the site requires daily negotiations with buffer zones, property at risk and shifting access and rights of way. Furthermore, the actual World Heritage designation includes acknowledgement of the continued shifts along the shoreline as environments slowly change and steep cliffs slip seaward. This is a place designated as being of heritage value because of its ability to expose us to the changing relationships between the land, the sea, and the lives lived along these boundaries.

The Jurassic Coast is therefore a heritage site where people encounter the geological past, but it is also where they write their own stories onto that past and use these to project into the future. This thesis explores the different ways people creatively engage with the coastline in Dorset and East Devon. Questioning the definitions and boundaries of the Creative Coast in policy and practice demonstrates how these creativities can be democratised to include new audiences and new cultures of knowledge.

1.3.2 Disciplining nature

Due to the site’s changing boundaries, the Jurassic Coast is reliant on cultural conceptions of environmental change and natural processes. Although it is a “natural” WHS, it is culturally constructed. The disciplining nature theme examines nature as a concept that is increasingly disciplined and valued according to economic, political, legal and bureaucratic enclosures. This leads on to discussions of how creativity is enrolled in the turn towards interdisciplinary working in the UK public sector. Faced with restricted funding allocation, the conservation, arts, health and transport sectors
are increasingly being encouraged to work with one another.\textsuperscript{3} \textit{Disciplining nature} looks at how those various sectors work together on the nexus of environmental public policy and practice. Encounters between different disciplinary cultures elicit conversations about how knowledge is constructed and authority reinforced.

In 2001, after a long campaign by local residents and councillors, as well as practicing geologists and geomorphologists working in the area, the World Heritage Convention accepted the site onto the UNESCO WHS list. A fleeting statement in a local talk about the geological importance of the Dorset and East Devon coastline had been developed into a detailed proposal to UNESCO for World Heritage consideration.\textsuperscript{4} The proposal was developed in accordance with the wants and needs of local interest groups including landowners, fossil hunters, and councillors. The process culminated in a tour around the region during which UNESCO “examiners” visited all the significant sites and met people that formed a part of the WHS application. Although the bid was not successful in being recognized as a site of ‘exceptional natural beauty’ (criterion seven), the 2001 WHS designation was developed to recognise the unique geology under criterion eight:

\begin{quote}
\textit{to be outstanding examples representing major stages of earth’s history, including the record of life, significant on-going geological processes in the development of landforms, or significant geomorphic or physiographic features.} (UNESCO 2015: 16)\textsuperscript{5}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{3} This is also a trend that is mirrored within academic fields, where collaboration both within and ‘beyond’ the institution is becoming increasingly embedded within the policies of research. Not only as a method to broaden the scope of research but also to justify the role of the university within society and draw out increasingly limited funding.

\textsuperscript{4} The mythology behind the origin of the site is that an eminent geomorphologist working in the region made an offhand remark after he had presented to the Lyme Bay Forum on the unique geology of the coastline that it was so unique it ought to be a World Heritage Site. From this point a movement coalesced amongst the influential practitioners at the meeting to develop a proposal for World Heritage status.

\textsuperscript{5} The Giant’s Causeway is the other natural WHS listed within the UK. It is also coastal and lists itself as a ‘dynamic site’ within its management plan (NIEA and CCGHT 2013: 13). This is attributed mostly to issues with slope failure due to the action of the sea and efforts to construct
Seemingly starting at the end of the Permian epoch at Exmouth [Fig. 1] the site encompasses the Mesozoic Era an interval of geological time divided into the Triassic, Jurassic and Cretaceous from 252 million years ago to 79 million years ago. Despite its perceived importance to the heritage of the site, the change from the ‘Permian’ and ‘Triassic’ time periods here is not actually evident in the exposed cliffs of the site. The division is an arbitrary measure: a social construction and enclosure of the past. Unlike other locations across the world, no clear distinction or change in the rock has been identified to mark a physical boundary between the Permian and Triassic epochs in East Devon. There is no fault line and no significant change in the composition or arrangement of the rock. Within this locality, to all intents and purposes this is a nominal division in time. It enables comparison and correlation with other geological localities considered to be within the same broad historical epoch. Therefore the specificity of the local environment adopts a universal or global geological value.

Likewise, World Heritage Sites are embedded within discourses of universality and operate beyond political borders. Defined by UNESCO and governed by the World Heritage Convention, sites such as the Jurassic Coast gain a particular heritage and maintain footpaths for visitor access. The active geomorphology here is also listed as being of ‘intrinsic importance’ to the site despite the challenges in ‘appropriate solutions’ to maintaining visitor access and safety (NIEA and CCGHT 2013). However, despite being designated in 1986 the Giant’s Causeway has been managed by a single, part-time WHS Officer since 2011 after a period of six years with no designated member of staff to manage the site. Therefore, resources for innovative responses to the tensions at the site are much more limited than on the Jurassic Coast.

At Orcombe Point one is stood on a cliff composed of rocks formed during the Triassic era (251-199 million years ago). The iron within the rock oxidizing causes the cliff’s red tint and the layers of rock exposed here signify a desert environment with bedding that suggests large rivers not unlike the Wadi desert environment found today in Jordan and Egypt. The cliffs across the estuary in Starcross, however, are classified as belonging to the Permian era, although the boundary between the two points in time is not clear. However, this nominal boundary in time contains a very significant event known as the Great Permian Extinction, or the Great Dying. It is thought that between the Permian and the Triassic epochs over 90% of the ocean’s life became extinct (Hart 2009). It is after this extinction event that reptiles became the dominant life form on Earth, as they were best able to adapt to the new environments. The Triassic is therefore known as the time in which the dinosaurs were born.
connotation when they are appointed to World Heritage status. UNESCO defines this as:

[C]ultural and/or natural significance, which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity. As such, the permanent protection of this heritage is of the highest importance to the international community as a whole. (UNESCO 2015)

The significance for which a site is designated is otherwise described within the global heritage discourse as ‘Outstanding Universal Value’ (UNESCO 2015). However, despite these claims to universality, the ways in which WHSs are constructed and managed is deeply local and parochial. It is important to recognise, therefore, the ways in which nature is disciplined through cultural practice on heritage sites such as the Jurassic Coast.

1.3.3 Performing policy

This research also makes a contribution to advancing geographical approaches to studying institutional policy. Offering a new approach to the study of policy in place, the argument is made for a peopling of policy research through ethnographic and embodied methodologies. This investigation of performed policy, it is argued, provides access to more nuanced ways of understanding the complex, intertwined and shifting networks of practice in an institutional setting, and the policies that structure them. This site-specific policy research is attuned to the embodied networks of those who write policy and the geographies of these spaces of decision-making.

The Jurassic Coast functions through the idiosyncrasies of many political, economic and social networks within the UK. Both Devon and Dorset County Councils fund it, for example. Most activity on the site needs to be negotiated through both county councils, and it is a similar story for the four district councils that are included within the designated length of coastline. Therefore, the structure and policies of local
government are at the heart of the international WHS practices in the United Kingdom. This is evident in the Management Plan, which forms a working contract between the UK government and UNESCO (Jurassic Coast World Heritage team 2014a). The plan is structured with detailed aims for the practice of the Jurassic Coast in accordance with partners and networks around the site.

A core team of eight practitioners is employed to manage the site. They are supported by a combination of the county councils (match funded by external organisations such as Natural England) and the Jurassic Coast Trust. Their roles include, Site Manager, Earth Science Manager, Learning and Participation Manager, Visitor Manager, Community Coordinator, Development Director and Jurassic Coast Trust Administrator.

The research presented here explores the different modes of creativity on the coastline and how these modes might be used to understand our relationship with the past. This is achieved in part by constructing a site-specific study of policy and embodied practice on the Jurassic Coast. Analysing the workings of policy and practice along the Jurassic Coast through a site-based methodology enables an investigation as to how the site is constructed and designed by those who encounter it. This research is therefore interested in how management of the Jurassic Coast involves mediating and interpreting certain pasts deemed of heritage value. Through the lens of creativity it is possible to examine how these pasts are chosen and reconstituted for the purposes of the site. I therefore argue that attuning oneself to the critical creativities of the everyday

---

7 The structure of the Jurassic Coast management team changes regularly but and these roles are correct as of July 2017.

8 The management team is listed alongside their contact details on the Jurassic Coast website: http://jurassiccoast.org/contact-jurassic-coast/contact-the-jurassic-coast-team/ [Last accessed 26/07/2016].
can provide insight into the workings of policy and practice in the local government networks, Arts Council England (ACE) and UNESCO contexts of the Jurassic Coast. Not only does this way of working provide insight into the modes of the arts and creativity employed within the public sector, I argue, it reveals the ways in which these creativities construct the WHS as a place of inspiration and curiosity. There are multiple ways in which creativity works to construct the discursive and material heritage site. Creativity therefore is a process that constructs and moulds the Jurassic Coast in myriad ways.

1.3.4 Placing creativity

The term creativity has been employed, within the discipline of Geography and beyond in many different ways. Trying to ‘place’ creativity on the Jurassic Coast is therefore one of the central aims of this thesis. By arguing that in geography creativity is often used as a short hand to refer to working with the arts sector, it is argued that creativity has a much longer history within other research traditions, such as psychology, law and philosophy. Through ethnographic, archival and interview the development of a new understanding of creativity is developed in this research that is closely tied to the specificity of the place of the Jurassic Coast. This approach thinks of creativity as a curious making which can work through person, process and product. In doing so this thesis argues that critical engagement with the term creativity must not only include the arts but also look to other cultures of knowledge. Critical creativities therefore are able to engage with discussions of “art-science collaborations”, for example, without reducing them to simplistic disciplinary binaries, or bounded practices.

The relationship between heritage designation and ideas of creativity forms the thematic context of this research, which explores these workings through a site-specific approach to policy and practice. Increasingly, the WHS has employed the arts within its
management plan to help deliver its heritage aims, as delineated by the local and national government, as well as UNESCO. Bound up with these discussions of the artistic, and the aim to meld arts and science practices, have been ideas of creativity. Arts programmes linked to the coast, and mostly funded by Arts Council England (ACE), worked through several policy iterations to brand the site as the Creative Coast. This thesis traces some of these dynamics of creative policy and practice as they developed on the site. However, I argue creativity is not just an agent to communicate or respond to the heritage coastline; it also constructs it. Furthermore, analysis of the arts programmes explores the ways arts and creativity are employed to interrogate issues of unequal power relations and contested ownership of the Jurassic Coast. These include whose heritage the WHS represents and whose creativity is visible as a part of this.

Beyond supporting arts and creativity through the public arts sector, the Jurassic Coast has begun to embed these ideas within the material of the management of the site. Since the completion of the formalised arts programmes, working with the arts has become a cross-cutting theme as expressed in the 2014 Management Plan (Jurassic Coast World Heritage team 2014b). A spill over from the Creative Coast is that the Jurassic Coast team and Trust increasingly employ creative methods and practitioners to communicate some of the more nuanced tensions with the site’s management to various audiences. Creativity is therefore being increasingly acknowledged and employed within its management. This includes an acknowledgment that “the public” engages with the site in multiple ways. For the Jurassic Coast team this involves an acceptance that in order to grow the work of the WHS, the Jurassic Coast policy needed to look beyond its scientific and natural heritage designation to address the perspectives of those inspired and connected to the coastline for other reasons. This increased capacity to integrate the arts and creative processes into their work
developed in 2015 and 2016 as the Jurassic Coast management team and Trust were re-structured into a charitable model outside the infrastructure of Dorset County Council. Within this organisational context, creativity and policy are overlapping themes, mutually constituted.

Emerging from the institutional contexts of the Jurassic Coast, this thesis traces how creativity has been an integral part of human interaction with the coastline for hundreds of years, from the responses of the early geologists and fossil hunters with their discoveries along the coastline to scientists and practitioners creatively engaging with the place today. The Jurassic Coast is imbued with a myriad of everyday creativities as people respond to - and in turn construct - the heritage site in new ways. This is a democratic, quotidian kind of place-making that is intertwined with the formal policy and practice of the site.

1.4 Thesis outline
The thesis begins by situating the research project within the relevant literature (Chapter Two). This chapter is structured according to the four themes introduced above. The methodological approach of the research is outlined in Chapter Three. Research undertaken included interviewing, ethnographic techniques and archival research. This chapter provides some context to these approaches and explores how this triangulation of methodologies has been developed for this research project. It is also where the ethical considerations of this research and the methodology involved are presented.

Chapter Four, the first of the empirical chapters, traces the history of the formalized Creative Coast programmes from 2008-2013, by discussing the ways in which the arts were “introduced” into the discourse of the natural heritage site. This topic is illustrated
through a series of events that allow us to home in on particular moments within a vast array of practice through time and place. We see the early enthusiasms as practitioners from various sectors join together and imagine the possibilities of this project. However, we quickly ascertain that the large aspirations of the project were difficult to maintain in practice. The commissioned projects were structured in a certain way so that the Jurassic Coast WHS became a patron, seed-funding new creative projects and supporting existing work along the site. This comes to a climactic moment of activity during the summer of 2012, when a part of the London Olympic Games was hosted in the Gateway Town of Weymouth, and neighbouring Portland.\footnote{As the WHS designation includes only the exposed cliffs and beaches, urban areas are not officially included in the Jurassic Coast. Therefore, the towns which provide the immediate services for and access to the site are referred to as Gateway Towns within Jurassic Coast branding (these include Exmouth, Budleigh Salterton, Sidmouth, Beer, Seaton, Bridport and West Bay, Portland, Weymouth, Swanage and Wareham).} At this point the Creative Coast had been extended into CC2012 with follow on ACE Grants for the Arts (G4A) funding. A site-specific approach to policy demonstrates how ambitious top-down initiatives such as Creative Coast become entangled within the practicalities of everyday decision-making. Although supporting innovative arts projects the chapter explores how limited resources and conflicting agendas became recurring themes within Jurassic Coast arts policy.

The aftermath of the Olympic months and the buzz of artistic activity along the coastline associated with the Cultural Olympiad were all but finished by Autumn 2012. At this point the harsh realities of the national funding cuts triggered by the global recession of 2008 were felt within the policy decisions for the site. The pre-allocated funds for the Cultural Olympiad had masked many of the public funding cuts to follow in the region. As a result many of those working within the cultural networks of the Jurassic Coast entered a professional period of precarity. It is within this context that
evaluations of the projects were undertaken and plans were made for the legacy of the work. This was characterized by a shift in agenda and narrative in the way in which the Jurassic Coast would work with the arts sector. Partnerships moved towards a focus on predetermined outcomes and commission-based working rather than those based on collaboration. Alongside these shifts was a heightened acknowledgement of the agendas of all the participating actors.

In Chapter Five I examine the impacts of this shift in practice and policy for approaches to the arts and creativity on the Jurassic Coast. Centring on the concept of the erosion paradox of the heritage site, the chapter examines how the management team have negotiated the implications of the dynamic coastline in their interpretation and visitor safety activities. An “outcome-based” approach to the arts was set in relation to the changing practices of arts and sciences practitioners in this post-Olympiad policy culture. Exploring Erosion was a project which artfully addressed the conflicting messages of erosion and coastal change on the site. It was framed as a legacy project for the Creative Coast programmes and aimed to continue the relationships and partnerships that developed over the previous years. This chapter critically analyses the project noting how erosion had become a key term to reference issues of transience and geomorphological process along the coast. Analysing the work of arts practitioners: Art Spark (Jeff Pigott and Julia Warin) and Richard DeDomenici demonstrates how they were able to hold multiple and conflicting perceptions of erosion on the site, embodying the erosion paradox. This chapter therefore considers how the artworks presented the contradictory messages associated with coastal processes on the site in critically engaged and often humorous ways. Art therefore provided the Jurassic Coast with new methods of interpretation through creative collaboration. However, this chapter also identifies that limited resources and mixed
objectives between producing partners continued to create tension in this final iteration of the *Creative Coast*.

In Chapter Six I argue that creativity, if employed critically, is a term that allows for analysis of a wide form of engagements with the Jurassic Coast. This chapter is composed of fragments of everyday creative engagements with the coast. These are structured according to three themes that weave through these everyday creativities on the Jurassic Coast: building creative capacity, learning and creativity, and placing everyday creativities. The practices of creative engagement come in many different forms including painting, poetry, GPS surveying and geological illustrations. The fragments also span through time from practice in recent years to before the designation of the site, and including the longer histories of the science of geology in the nineteenth century. They illustrate the scope for understanding and democratizing creativity along the Jurassic Coast WHS from beyond the public arts sector to the multiple resident and visiting practitioners at work here.

This thesis makes four critical contributions to research into heritage studies, the creative industries and policy. Firstly, notions of critical creativities, it is argued, expand the scope for how geographers understand and employ creativity beyond a narrow focus on the arts sector. In doing so, the thesis works to understand commonalities of practice across different knowledge cultures. Secondly, the management of the Jurassic Coast provides a useful example of how heritage is practiced in changing environments. This research illustrates how policies and practices of World Heritage are complicated when the designated site is acknowledged to be under continual processes of change. Finally, the site-specific approach to policy provides a model to re-think the practice of institutional decision-making on a national and international
scale. Furthermore, this is achieved through embedded and embodied research methods to elicit the everyday geographical spaces of policy.

In the following pages this thesis explores the agency of creativity on the Jurassic Coast over a period of eight years. I trace official attempts to embed the arts into the policy and practice of the site by branding it a *Creative Coast*. These are juxtaposed with contemporary and historical everyday creativities that constitute this section of coastline for its many inhabitants and visitors. It is through the tensions of creativity that the site is enlivened in the imagination of those who engage with it. Furthermore, defining creativity on this heritage coastline also delimits which practitioners are able to define something as creative, and how. For this reason it is essential to question what it means to be creative on the Jurassic Coast.
Chapter Two: literature review

2.1 Introduction

This thesis is situated at an intersection between research on critical heritage studies, the creative industries and environmental management within the discipline of cultural and historical geography. The aims of the research cover a wide range of literature including arts practice, programming and policy, creative industries and economies, and local and international heritage in the context of changing environments. The theoretical context for this research is divided into the four themes as outlined in Chapter One:

1. Heritages of change
2. Disciplining nature
3. Performing policy
4. Placing creativity

Discussion of these themes establishes the philosophical and research context for this project, as well as structuring the contributions the research makes to current scholarship.

In this chapter, the four themes provide conceptual grounding for the research and its contributions to the field. The first theme addresses current debates within heritage studies. Discussion centres on the recent movement in heritage studies towards acknowledging, adapting to and accepting change. This includes the role of natural WHSs in the context of these heritages of change. Examining how natural heritage is structured through institutional policy opens up broader discussion regarding the cultural representation and construction of nature. This argument is developed further in the subsequent section, disciplining nature. Critical evaluation of the increasing popularity of interdisciplinary working engages with debates on the connectivity
between cultures and natures. The disciplining nature theme begins the discussion of how nature is disciplined into economic, political and bureaucratic enclosures. These debates are contextualised within current work in Science and Technology Studies (STS) and also draw on the work of relational theorists. The understandings of natural heritage reflected on in the thesis are set in a backdrop of a moment of shifting attitudes to cultural policy in the UK. The rise of the creative industries during the New Labour period drew the arts and heritage sector into a new form of political and economic structure. These shifts are explored in the section performing policy. Finally, a part of the work of this thesis is to understand how cultural and environmental (heritage) policies are enacted in the everyday. The final section placing creativity locates notions of creative practice and policy within geographical research. This involves tracing the long history of the arts and artistic research in the discipline of geography. By drawing on research into creativity in other fields the theme also acknowledges current limitations with uses of the term by geographers. This includes finding space to engage with creativity in its broader form beyond the scope of the arts and the rhetoric of the creative industries.

Once the research aims are situated within contemporary debates, the methodological approach will be outlined in the following chapter (Chapter Three).

2.2 Heritages of change

2.2.1 Critical heritage studies: a brief history of heritage

The term ‘heritage’ can be defined in several ways but most commonly it refers to the use of objects, practices and traditions inherited from the past, which hold significance for contemporary society. The conventional association between heritage and protection is something that is challenged by dynamic heritage sites. Initially, historical
context will be provided to the dominance of protection ideals within heritage studies to situate these more recent debates. According to David C. Harvey,

The history of heritage is a history of the present, or rather a historical narrative of an endless succession of presents, a heritage of heritage that can have no terminal point (Harvey 2008: 23).

For Harvey, heritage is not a standalone movement or project but instead describes the discursive processes through which people use the past (Harvey 2008). Heritage is often narrated as having “begun” in Britain during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. These accounts attribute “the birth of heritage” to sentiments about loss during the industrial era, with crucial influences from the Enlightenment. Such accounts often refer to the work of John Ruskin and William Morris, setting the date for the first heritage legislation at 1882 with the creation of the Ancient Monuments Protection Act of 1882 (See for example Harrison 2012b). This date is often referred to in reference to the nineteenth century identification of heritage as a list of places or landscapes at risk, which were beginning to be protected through national legislation in the United Kingdom, Europe and Northern America. Conversely, critique emerging in the 1980s linked a burgeoning of heritage practice with post-modernity and the post-modern economy. These accounts also associated the restructuring of economies and narratives of loss with increased interest in practices of heritage (Hewison 1987).

However, criticizing what he sees as the present-centeredness of heritage studies, David C. Harvey reminds us that the practice of employing past events for contemporary agendas has a history (and heritage) which extends much further back than the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Harvey 2001). Listing examples in Britain such as Bonfire Night, Harvey demonstrates how historical events were used as elite and commonplace crucibles for power through identity formation. He argues

---

10 I use the term heritage practice to encompass the various ways of “doing” heritage.
[a] deeper understanding of the historically contingent and embedded nature of heritage allows us to go beyond treating heritage simply as a set of problems to be solved, and enables us to engage with debates about the production of identity, power and authority throughout society. (Harvey 2001: 319)

For, as Harvey reminds us,

People still had a relationship with the past, and they still actively preserved and managed aspects of interpretations of that past; they were just nurtured into a different experience of this heritage. (Harvey 2001: 333)

Consolidating this power over the nation, heritage practice was rooted in the legislation and listing of material artefacts in the nineteenth century. This aligned with a parallel movement at this time regarding an increased interest in nature conservation. Arts and literary figureheads such as John Constable, JMW Turner, Ralph Waldo Emerson and Henry David Thoreau were instrumental in promoting images of the concept of wilderness beyond the realms of industrialized urban areas in Europe and North America (Harrison 2012b). It has been argued that these conceptions of wilderness were strongly rooted in Judeo-Christian ideas of the Garden of Eden and the idea of a fall from grace (Examples include Harrison 2012b; Massey 2006; Solnit 2001). This has important ramifications for the kind of nature conservation practices that would and could take place as a result of this movement. Rebecca Solnit explains why:

Eden is a place in which nothing is supposed to change, a steady-state ecosystem without history. It is both the place where nothing is lost or absent and the place where that primary loss that launches all stories take place… If we seek to make a future in the image of an idealized past, the particulars of that past matter immensely. (Solnit 2001)

This Eden-like, steady-state image of the wilderness was also fostered by John Muir in North America and the National Trust in Britain. They developed conceptions of a nature that was in opposition to human occupation as a central tenet to the conservation movement.11 These movements, Harrison argues, were key for the

11 The structural and conceptual consequences of the conservation movement and the corresponding conceptualization of the natural world as fragile and separate from human development will be developed further in the next section of this chapter [section 2.3: Disciplining nature].
heritage imagination in the nineteenth century as they conceptualized natural places as ‘good for the human constitution but also fragile and in need of protection from humans and industrial development’ (Harrison 2012b). During the institutionalization of heritage during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, conceptions of conservation emerged from a fast-changing industrial present. Heritage practice therefore emphasised preservation of the built environment and consequent listing and legislation practices. Within this social moment, heritage practices of collection typified by private cabinets de curieux (cabinets of curiosity) were institutionalized into national projects (in the form of museums and art galleries) (Bennett 1995).

The legislation, formalization and institutionalisation of heritage as a nation-building exercise in Britain are seen by many to have continued through the twentieth century. The First and Second World Wars especially provided further emphasis for preservation and conservation practices. However, at the same time, changes in technology also began to influence the way in which heritage was practiced (Harvey 2008). For example, legislation of heritage practice in Britain increased, especially during the peak of post-war rebuilding during the 1960s. Harrison notes that this resulted in an increase in the professionalization of heritage practice to ensure ‘compliance’ with the new regulations (Harrison 2012b). This became prevalent in the latter end of the twentieth century corresponding with the post-industrialism and the increasing importance of the knowledge economy. Heritage Studies as an academic discipline therefore emerged alongside a post-industrial “boom” in heritage. Critical discourse was focused largely on Hewison’s concept of The Heritage Industry, a publication that framed much of the debate at that time (Hewison 1987). This was a strong criticism at what Hewison saw as the anesthetization and commercialization of history through increasingly tourist-focused mechanisms of heritage (Harrison 2012b; Harvey 2008; Hewison 1987).
The post-industrial influences of the 1980s were translated into the Cool Britannia agenda of New Labour in the 1990s when the national Arts and Heritage department became the Department for Culture Media and Sport. Alongside these political shifts was a change in funding practice with the launch of the National Lottery in 1993 through the National Lottery Act [1993]. The associated Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) provided a new source of funding and consequent expectations that heritage would address social deprivation, especially through the networks of Local Government. Despite these aims, the HLF has since come under criticism for publically funding elite practice such as national museums under the auspices of social mobility and agency (Harvey 2008). These criticisms of the continuing dominance of elite narrative within heritage practice in Britain became the focus of what would become known as critical heritage studies. Scholars insisted on acknowledgement of the largely material bias within heritage and its emphasis on elite narratives of the past. As Waterton and Watson articulate:

…given its roots in the materiality of the past and associated imperatives of conservation, interpretation and display, we nonetheless find ourselves in a situation where it is hard to drag the locus of debate into potentially more fruitful areas. (Waterton and Watson 2013)

The preoccupation with the material within heritage studies was seen as a reflection of the broader historical biases of the heritage sector, something critical heritage studies seek to address. An important part of this rethinking of heritage studies was Laurajane Smith’s notion of Authorised Heritage Discourse (AHD) (Smith 2006). This highlighted how particular narratives of the past were given authority over others. Smith outlined AHD as a set of texts and practices that decide the ways that heritage is defined and employed within contemporary western society (Smith 2006). Using AHD Smith
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12 The ramifications of his act for the public arts and cultural policy in the UK more broadly will be expanded on in section 2.4: Performing policy.

13 This was technically called the National Lottery etc. Act 1993. But for brevity I will refer to it as the National Lottery Act.
questioned notions of value in the cultural and material past and how these determine what is preserved, restored or left to ruin (Smith 2007). Alongside this work, Rodney Harrison has outlined the importance of cultures of collection and acquisition to heritage studies, through critical discussions of memory and forgetting (Harrison 2012a). Critical Heritage Studies has therefore opened up important discussions on whose past is remembered, how it is remembered and how these practices provide insights into imaginings of the future. These have been articulated in many ways including ‘prospective memories’ and anticipatory histories (Harvey and Perry 2015: 9; DeSilvey 2012; DeSilvey et al. 2011).

2.2.2 World heritage context

As established above, the practice of heritage has been increasingly formalized and professionalised over the past two hundred years. This has included the development of a body of critical debate questioning its purpose and ways of working. Alongside outlining this critical history of heritage practice, Rodney Harrison, in his book Heritage: Critical Approaches, devoted a chapter to what he saw as the developments within heritage practice, which led to the conceptualisation of world heritage (Harrison 2012b).

The wide-scale bombing of historic buildings during the Second World War demonstrated the connection in political minds between heritage and national identity. The Baedeker raids in particular, where towns were targeted specifically for their perceived beauty and attractiveness for tourists, became emblematic of the new vulnerability of the built heritage in times of war (Harrison 2012b). Additionally, the League of Nations was transformed in the wake of the Second World War into the United Nations (UN), which sought to promote international cooperation and maintain peace (Harrison 2010; Harrison 2012b). This included the establishment of the United
Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) on 16th November 1945 with the aim:

- to contribute to the building of a culture of peace, the eradication of poverty, sustainable development and intercultural dialogue through education, the sciences, culture, communication and information. (UNESCO 2010: 2)

This marked a new ethos in international policy towards the social agency of culture, including in heritage practice. The UNESCO founding charter objective stated the following:

Since wars begin in the minds of men [sic], it is in the minds of men [sic] that the defences of peace must be constructed. (UNESCO 2014: 5)

Influencing thought and practice was seen as an essential part in embedding attitudes of peace within the public mind-set. Amongst its other agendas, UNESCO provided the scope for an international heritage policy, which began to be realized as early as 1954 with the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (otherwise known as The Hague Convention). In fact, the organisation has arguably defined many of the popular understandings of heritage (Donnachie 2010; Harrison 2012b; Harrison 2010). This self-proclaimed association with peace keeping and international harmony has allowed UNESCO to construct a certain moral authority in the global theatre. Harrison terms this the ‘universal language of heritage management’ (Harrison 2012b). These “universal” values have however been largely defined by a common set of philosophies originating in from a Euro-American way of thinking about the relationship between the past and the present (Harrison 2012b).

This new international heritage sensibility was brought to the fore in 1954 when the Egyptian Government announced plans for the Aswan High Dam.¹⁴ Set within a turbulent political backdrop, a twenty-year international appeal was launched by UNESCO to protect and conserve the monuments, including the Abu Simbel temples,

¹⁴ This event was, in fact, the trigger for the 1954 Hague Convention introduced above.
which were to be destroyed when Lake Nasser flooded behind the High Dam. Harrison argues,

> This was not simply a benign attempt to help out a fellow nation in need. International expeditions launched by member states demanded that half of the archaeological finds would be taken back to museums in their own countries. This led to the relocation of whole temples to New York, Leiden, Madrid, Turin and West Berlin (Harrison 2012b).

He states that the petition surrounding the flooding at the Aswan Dam created two tropes for UNESCO’s brand of international heritage. Firstly, the organisation valued the heritage of the built culture of the ancient Egyptians over the Nubian population (of over 100,000 people) living in the area at the time. Secondly, it established a post-colonial form of patronage for heritage including practices of international acquisition and intervention (Harrison 2012b).  

By the time of the 1972 World Heritage Convention, a dualism between culture and nature was entrenched within UNESCO’s structure and its approach to international heritage. The policy was set so that nature was separate from culture, with different definitions and requirements for the designation of each (Harrison 2012b). The concept of world heritage was seen as an ambitious place-making strategy to reconceptualise the world by rearranging the geopolitical landscape around these emblematic sites. Consequently, the World Heritage Convention established the phrase ‘universal heritage value’ to describe the international principles of UNESCO (UNESCO 1992: np). World Heritage was therefore a process to preserve “universal” histories through

---

15 The UK government only recently (June 2015) announced it would ratify this Convention. This was part of a wider protestation to the destruction of the artefacts and monuments such as the Palmyra heritage site during the civil wars in Syria by the Islamic State (Isis) militants. This makes the UK one of the last global powerful countries to sign the agreement, even behind the notoriously belligerent USA and China (UNESCO 1954). Shortly after announcing its intentions to sign the 1954 Hague Convention the UK Parliament voted to extend military intervention in Syria in November 2015.

16 Coincidentally, 1972 was also the year when the UK joined the European Union through the European Communities Act [1972] (UK Government 1972).
the specific ideologies of nostalgia and internationalization which had developed through ‘a growing sense of the vulnerability of global heritage’ (Harrison 2012b). Denis Byrne terms this as ‘the imperialist underpinnings of the world heritage concept’ (Byrne 1991: 274). He describes two assumptions linked to the employment of universal heritage in UNESCO’s conception of World Heritage. The first is that all peoples of the world share an equal interest in and concern for their heritage. The second is that these peoples will hold a similar concern for the heritage of other peoples in other nations (Byrne 1991). In addition to these problematic assumptions, “universal heritage value” also assumes that the sites or histories which UNESCO designates as being of World Heritage value will be the sites and histories that all peoples will deem worthy or valuable as such. Byrne also notes that as WHSs are designated on the national scale it is likely that they reflect the dominant social group of each nation, rather than any marginal populations (Byrne 1991).

The assumptions of universality embedded in UNESCO’s World Heritage claims are now signalled by the term Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). OUV defines ten criteria by which WHSs are classified and designated. However, there have been significant moves in recent years to acknowledge that not all heritage is material, through introduction of the term “intangible heritage” (Smith, and Akagawa 2008). Also, UNESCO hopes that the development of cultural landscapes acknowledges that the Cartesian dualism between nature and culture does not represent all heritage sites (Rössler 2006). Nevertheless, many of the structural inequalities and biases in the World Heritage discourse remain. Despite the recognition of intangible heritage, cultural landscapes and dynamic natural environments, the contemporary world
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17 These are comprised of six cultural and four natural criteria for designation (UNESCO 1992).
heritage backdrop still retains many of the remnants from its roots in the museology tradition.

Increasingly, the influence of World Heritage designation upon tourism economies, particularly in less economically wealthy countries, is recognised. However, the way in which WHSs are portrayed in official tourist accounts and the lived experiences of residents often do not correlate (Beck 2006). This inconsistency is perhaps linked to a tendency for WHS to be heralded as ‘best practice sites’ or ‘cornerstones of natural and international conservation’ (Rössler 2006). Marco D’Eramo responds to the conceptions that heritage is a useful tool for place-making with the observation that UNESCO’s efforts to preserve through designation in fact creates ‘non places’ (2014: 48). His critique of the influence of WHS designation to the tourism industry in urban areas is damning:

As the word suggests; to ‘preserve’ means to embalm, to freeze, to save something from temporal decay; but here it also means halting time, fixing the object as in a photography, protecting it from growth and change. (D’Eramo 2014)

The link between the World Heritage Industry and the tourism industry embeds paradoxes within UNESCO’s constitution. Most recently these contradictions have emerged in relation to the issue of global anthropogenic climate change.

In May 2016 UNESCO released a report titled *World Heritage and Tourism in a Changing Environment* (UNEP, UNESCO, and UCS 2016). This report outlined how the prospect of changing environments in the future might direct how the past is managed and preserved through global practices of heritage. Revealingly the report concluded:

Because World Heritage Sites must have and maintain ‘Outstanding Universal Value’, the report recommends that the World Heritage Committee consider the risk of prospective sites [becoming] degraded *before* they add them to the list. (UNESCO 2016: np. Emphasis added).
This suggests that sites deemed of heritage value may not be included on the WHS listing if it is decided that climate change will damage or destroy the site at some point in the future. This has important ramifications particularly in the some of the countries more economically and environmentally vulnerable, where tourism often makes up a sizable proportion of the economy. In short, UNESCO’s aim to eradicate poverty and encourage sustainable development is in conflict with the need to only designate WHS that can be preserved in perpetuity. This relates to some of the more recent work in Cultural Heritage Studies, previously mentioned, that examines transience and change in the practice of heritage (Examples include Harvey and Perry 2015; DeSilvey 2012; Harrison 2012a). It is to this work that I will now turn.

2.2.3 Heritage in the face of oblivion

In the words of Howard and Pinder, ‘we memorialise where we cannot conserve’ (2003: 61). The role of heritage in negotiating processes of change has gained increasing attention with critical heritage studies. David C. Harvey and Jim Perry outline this new agenda in their edited collection *The Future of Heritage as Climates Change*:

The traditional view that heritage conservation carries a treasured past into a well-understood future must be rejected. A new view of heritage, serving society in times of rapid climate change, embraces loss, alternative forms of knowledge and uncertain futures. It draws on creativity for adaptive solutions and it will ensure that future generations are empowered to make decisions about values and the ways heritage assets are passed through time (Harvey and Perry 2015: 3).

For Harvey and Perry, climate change provides a new set of challenges for practices and theories of heritage. They argue that ideas of certainty about heritage should be dismissed in favour of creativity, adaptive futures and a democratization of the powers

---

18 Harrison artfully discusses these tensions between processes of designation and deaccessioning (or remembering and forgetting) in his paper *Forgetting to remember, remembering to forget* (Harrison 2012a).
to tell histories (Harvey and Perry 2015). Accepting and embracing change, loss and decay almost requires a paradigm shift in the discourse and practice of heritage. Rather than uncritically protecting and ring fencing the “most important” histories, the sector is required to acknowledge the underlying powers of selection and value, and the inevitability of change. Histories are continually and necessarily being lost, but embracing changing climates and environments compels an unprecedented acknowledgement of these shifts, which in some cases leads to acceptance of loss and decay.

Change exposes some of the underlying processes at the heart of the heritage machine, which is driven by remembering and forgetting. The process of heritage designation is an active practice of remembering. However, in order to remember these valued pasts, other histories are silenced and forgotten. In order to remember you must also forget. Rodney Harrison employs ideas of individual and collective memory to argue how the heritage sector needs to embrace practices of active institutional forgetting.

[We have very rarely considered processes by which heritage objects, places and practices might be removed from these lists, deaccessioned from museums and galleries or allowed to fall into ruin without active intervention. One of the implications of taking a critical approach to heritage is that it can no longer be considered to be a universal category of value, hence objects, places and practices are conserved according to criteria that are culturally determined. It follows that certain objects, places and practices which have previously been identified, preserved and managed as ‘heritage’ will at some point cease to be relevant to contemporary and/or future societies, or come to represent values which are no longer considered pertinent or sustainable. (Harrison 2012a)

The heritage outlined by Harrison here is a critically aware telling of the histories that seem important to present day or future societies. He calls for a reinterpretation of the meaning and processes of heritage, from conserving and preserving certain histories to understanding their cultural and historical contingency and therefore becoming engaged with the possibility of fluctuations in perceived value and worth over time and
place. The contradictions between remembering and forgetting are at the root of practicing heritage. A conservation paradox within the heritage sector denies the notion that memories are passive (Harrison 2012a). Instead, Harrison states that we should see memory ‘as something that we must actively and mindfully produce in conversation with the traces of the past and their spectres’ (Harrison 2012a). Inserting this mindfulness of the future into discourses on heritage poses some challenges for the field, and opens up discussion on how to mourn histories, to grieve and express the pain of loss in an attentive and therapeutic ways.

It is important within this strand of thought not only to seek to find the beauty in loss but also to acknowledge this pain, to name and embody it within the practice of heritage. Change is something we witness and are familiar with in a multitude of ways. Material and conceptual shifts are everyday to our embodied and emotional experience of the world. But they can be painful. Reflecting on how we experience these shifts, Rebecca Solnit describes our inability to articulate the process of loss and decay:

But the butterfly is so fit an emblem of the human soul that its name in Greek is psyche, the word for soul. We have not much language to appreciate this phase of decay, this withdrawal, this era of ending that must precede beginning. Not of the violence of the metamorphosis, which is often spoken of as though it were as graceful as a flower blooming. (Solnit 2006: 81)

Despite the often-productive power of change and loss, finding ways to articulate the dark or negative aspects in a meaningful way is one of the greatest challenges for heritage. This is at the heart of the conservation paradox outlined by Harrison (Harrison 2012a). If heritage is constructed through deliberate acts, how might we acknowledge, embrace, and mourn loss whilst maintaining intentionality and an overriding sense that preserving some pasts is a worthwhile practice? The terrain is rocky and complex.
Benjamin Morris’ (2014) exploration of heritage and loss in the village of Dunwich on the retreating Suffolk coastline is pertinent for this discussion. He makes a strong argument for the agency of absence, loss and transience within heritage practice reminding us that, ‘the story of loss is never written in the same way twice’ (Morris 2014: 196). Through historical, archival and landscape analysis, Morris traces the histories of the local community’s response to loss in Dunwich, including their resistance to narrating the coastal heritage through permanent monuments.

Narratives of absence describe for Morris nostalgia for a glorious past, victimisation of the town ravaged by the natural processes of the sea and a landscape where the material and biological ‘dead’ re-emerge and are re-introduced and entwined with the present liveliness of Dunwich (2014). He states, ‘[o]n this view, absence secures a future for the site of a plurality of voices – not simply those of museums or guidebooks, or heritage-industry displays’ (Morris 2014: 212). Importantly, Morris notes that these changes in eroding heritage landscapes are not steady or constant. Gradual loss is punctured by sudden ‘pivotal’ events (Morris 2014: 199). He outlines how it is precisely this future loss of Dunwich that holds such an imaginative power for residents. Absence is so powerful that they actively resist any forms of permanent remembrance for the parts of the town that have already collapsed into the sea (Morris 2014).

Similarly, Caitlin DeSilvey’s notion of ‘anticipatory history’ (DeSilvey 2012) also provides a useful lens through which to examine the tensions between geo-conservation, changing landscapes and cultural place-making. Her approach is mindful of the on-going process of change on sites such as coastlines where the topology is constantly shifting, adjusting and depositing material. It requires an acknowledgement that the past cannot always be preserved or restored. DeSilvey terms this an ability to ‘respond to change creatively’ (2012: 50). This speaks to understandings of heritage as
processual and performed through multiple ways of telling histories (Duncan 2002). Accepting change and finding ways to narrate it is therefore becoming an important discussion within the heritage literature. Articulating loss and change within heritage discourse also works to illuminate and acknowledge the powers involved in acts of heritage remembrance.

2.3 Disciplining nature

The division between the natural and the cultural is still embedded within World Heritage policy. However, how nature is defined in culture has ramifications for environmental management and policy making as well as in the public imagination. Defining nature according to cultural ideologies and agendas disciplines it. There are multiple disciplinary cultures of knowledge that silo understandings of nature into specialisations of knowing and exploring the natural world. The conceptions of the differences between the sciences and the arts expose how these cultures of knowing are constructed in opposition to one another. Therefore, understanding how nature and culture are separated through practices of the sciences and the arts is essential when considering how and why the arts might be employed in the management of natural WHSs.

2.3.1 Cultures of nature

Within the context of Anglo-American disciplinary convention, nature (which is often distinguished in the literature with a capital N) refers to its conceptualization as independent from, but influenced by, culture. This is the conception of nature discussed above as a complete system that is separate for, but encroached upon by, human activity. This form of nature generates certain cultural responses, as Doreen Massey describes:
the notion of a nature that is harmonious and in balance is often mobilized in the cause of a foundationalism in which a settled past is necessarily presupposed in order to enable a narrative of subsequent loss. (Massey 2006: 39)

These “out there” perceptions of nature are debunked as critics of the dualism identify the many ways in which cultures influence natures (examples include Cronon 1995b; Hinchliffe 2007; Solnit 2001). In Massey’s terms, ‘our natures are always culturally mediated’ (Massey 2006: 36). Nature is no longer understood to be something distinct that is influenced by humans; it is instead materially and figuratively constructed through cultural activity. This second nature (as opposed to the first nature it contests) works to demonstrate the political ways that natures are connected, multiple and contingent to human activity (Archer, Ephraim, and Maxwell 2013; Hinchliffe 2007).

These shifts in perspective have important ramifications for environmental management and the construction of policies on ‘nature’. For example, authors such as Bill Cronon identified the harmful ways in which the concept of first nature worked in the world when he claimed ‘there is nothing natural about the concept of wilderness’ (Cronon 1995a: 79). He highlighted that conceptions of a nature isolated and protected from people, through imagery of wilderness, had in fact led to the displacement of indigenous populations in a form of conservation imperialism. Cronon highlighted how these ideas of a sublime and untouched nature kept apart from human activity had particular political ramifications, especially when disseminated through international conservation policy. Cronon criticized the influence these perceptions of wilderness and nature were having on native populations. In his words:

At its worst, as environmentalists are beginning to realize, exporting American notions of wilderness in this way can become an unthinking and self-defeating form of cultural imperialism. (Cronon 1995a)
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19 Archer, Ephraim and Maxwell in their edited collection Second Natures refer to Nietzsche’s use of the term as ‘an exhortation to rethink nature as a site of contest between entrenched habit and new emergent possibilities’ (Archer, Ephraim, and Maxwell 2013).
Cronon identified that these conceptions of nature had endorsed policies that depopulated environments seen to be wilderness or to have “conservation” concern. This was an imperial process that repeated the uprooting of native populations during the foundations of the National Park movement in the USA.

It is clear therefore that the cultures of nature, how nature is viewed and represented, can have significant political ramifications. Cronon continues:

It means never imagining that we can flee into a mythical wilderness to escape history and the obligation to take responsibility for our own actions that history inescapably entails. (Cronon 1995a)

Embedding particular cultures of nature within their historicity allowed Cronon to demonstrate how conservation values had created unequal power relations amongst humans. In a similar vein, Michael Watts provides a useful historical perspective on the influence of the UK enclosure acts from the 1740s onwards on perceptions and constructions of natures. He argues:

Enclosure marked two epochal moments: a deepening of the market as common rights were displaced by private property and land ownership and by wage work; and the efforts of the state (through parliamentary enclosure) to both simplify and make more visible the rural world. (Watts 2004: 51)

In short, by regulating and labelling common land the enclosure acts enforced governmental power through surveillance. Watts argues that through disciplinary power, as understood by Michel Foucault, when “natural” spaces were made visible they were also brought under control (Foucault 1979; Watts 2004). By describing the cultures and histories of nature, Watts, Cronon and others were able to highlight that the ways of knowing nature were limited to the methods of human enquiry. Rather than being “out there” to be discovered, they argued, natures were constructed through human activity.
2.3.2  Disciplinary thinking: silos of knowledge

The ways in which natures are disciplined through cultural practices of knowledge making have important implications for the management of the “natural” environment. These processes of defining how nature is interpreted and influenced are inherently geographical and culturally influenced. Bringing the cultures of nature to the fore, relational thinkers such as Bruno Latour and Donna Haraway demonstrated how multiple ways of knowing the natural (over time and space) were limited by the methods of human enquiry (Haraway 1991; Latour 1987). In short, how natures are investigated and studied determined how they were defined and disciplined (Law 2004a). Furthermore Livingstone posited that, rather than being universal, sciences were touched by local conditions (2003). He demonstrated the importance of place to science by debunking assumptions, such as the assertion that the laboratory is a site for the placeless repetition of experiments. For Livingstone, an acknowledgement of the importance of place was essential in understanding how theories developed and therefore the conditions under which scientific knowledge is generated. He stated:

We must work with a less fixed conception of what science is. What passes as science is contingent on time and place; it is persistently under negotiation. (Livingstone 2003: 13)

In agreement with this line of thought, Sarukkai also argued that natural science doesn’t question itself, and rather sees itself as a set of practices and methods rather than as a particular type of knowledge (Sarukkai 2009).

These arguments imply that the sciences, alongside other disciplines, are cultures of knowledge, where the methods of enquiry and resulting perceptions of the world are guided by the specificities of the place and conditions within which they are contextualized. Discipline in this sense means sticking to the rules and regulations of the community, remaining within the lines of the cultures of knowledge. In other words, it frames certain ways of knowing as valid within that community, as well as the
acceptable ways of gathering or collecting that knowledge. Therefore the ways in which natures (and cultures) are examined and explored actually define them. This resonates with Michel Foucault's understanding of disciplinary power where the processes of identifying and defining – or making visible – are instruments of power (Foucault 1979).

One way in which these cultures of knowledge have been explored has been through comparison of seemingly opposite traditions, such as that between the sciences and the arts. According to Ashley-Smith the words “science” and “art” had adopted connotations that reinforced their separation by the end of the nineteenth century in the UK (Ashley-Smith 2000: np). He argued that silos of knowledge, the separation and increasing isolation of disciplines, continued through the 20th century. Specialisation became popular and disciplines were formalised within the education system. A dualism between science and art was infamously highlighted by chemist and novelist C. P. Snow in his 1959 Rede Lecture where he referred to them as the ‘two cultures’ of art and science (2012 [1959]: 1). A polarisation of perspectives for Snow had arisen from the separation of the humanities and the sciences within educational systems. He exclaimed, ‘There seems then to be no place where the cultures meet’ (Snow 2012). He also contended that bringing them together would generate many possibilities:

\[ \text{The clashing point of two subjects, two disciplines, two cultures – of two galaxies, so far as that goes – ought to produce creative chances. (Snow 2012)} \]

His core argument was that the prosperity he believed was possible through the application of technology and science was being foiled by the miscommunication between ‘traditional culture’ and ‘natural science’ (Snow 2012). For this he blamed those who comprised traditional culture. Snow’s lecture was widely published and triggered much debate within public circles.
In response, Snow was met with strong criticism in the face of Frank Leavis who saw his argument as overly assertive, unsubstantiated and unsophisticated (Leavis 2013 [1962]). Many public figures criticized Leavis for his strongly worded and personally targeted response to Snow’s concept. They took exception to the tone of Leavis’ argument. For example, he had opened his Richmond lecture in 1962 with the following remarks:

If confidence in oneself as a master-mind, qualified by capacity, insight and knowledge to pronounce authoritatively on the frightening problems of our civilization, is genius, then there can be no doubt about Sir Charles Snow’s. He has no hesitations. (Leavis 2013)

This hotly contested debate became known as ‘the two cultures controversy’ (Collini 2013: 2). The public and the media on the whole sided with Snow in the debate, although Leavis’ criticism centred more apparently over Snow’s tone than his argument itself (Collini 2013). However, Leavis was not alone in his criticism of Snow’s concept of two cultures. Susan Sontag, also writing in the 1960s labelled Snow’s argument as ‘crude and philistine’ (Sontag 2001: 294). Sontag stated that the issue of division between the arts and the sciences long pre-dated Snow’s lecture. Furthermore, she suggested that Snow’s critique had been met by the arts community with a weak defence of the role of the arts and a corresponding submission in status beneath the sciences. She argued:

Some literary intellectuals and artists have gone so far as to prophesy the ultimate demise of the art-making activity of man [sic]. Art, in an automated scientific society, would be unfunctional, useless. (Sontag 2001)

The insinuation that the arts be obliged to yield to the forces of the sciences and other political societal agendas shall be developed further in the following section. For now it is important to state that art had not only been developed as separate to the sciences since the Industrial Revolution in the public imagination, it was also seen as subservient to it. Instead, Sontag argued that the arts and sciences both belong
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20 In particular see section 2.4.2: Art and instrumentalism: the Cultural Olympiad.
underneath the wider umbrella of culture (Sontag 2001). Through this lens, the activity of the arts and that of the sciences could be described as different cultures of knowledge, framing how humans understand and interpret their world of experience.

Consequently, three decades later Sommerer and Mignonneau claimed that you ‘can no longer speak of the “two cultures” but rather the “two hundred and two cultures” (Sommerer and Mignonneau 1998: 8). Their critique of the epistemic reductionism in science and art asserted that scientists and artists seek to establish an increasingly specialized niche for their work. This, they argue, results in a fragmented approach to knowledge enquiry where each individual is blinkered by his or her own specialist concerns. Likewise, David Bohm argues that this specialization has led to an absurd situation where scientists rarely examine their fundamental questions, instead concentrating on the details and modifications of their own systems (Bohm 2002). Multi-disciplinary decision-making for nature requires an understanding of both the arts and sciences and how they might work together in practice.

2.3.3 Post-disciplinary thinking: the art and science of collaboration

Attempts to break down these disciplinary boundaries have had mixed success. In recent years there has been an apparent increasing popularity of collaborations between the arts and the sciences. For some, “Art-Science” offers a critical counterpoint to the assumption that art and science are diametrically opposed (Ede 2005). This coincides with trends towards interdisciplinary ways of working, partly in reaction to what has been seen as the specialization and reductionism of knowledge. Sommerer and Mignonneau contend that ‘art and science should no longer be considered separate and contrary disciplines, but instead complimentary to each other’ (Sommerer and Mignonneau 1997: 13). Their argument aligns with an increasing spirit of interdisciplinary and holistic thinking in the twenty-first century, including an
acknowledgement that there are many similarities between a scientific and artistic way of looking at the world (Ede 2005). Taking this one step further, Mark Goodwin set a post-disciplinary agenda for geography where ‘transcendence’ in disciplinary boundaries might prompt greater recognition of the constructive role of space (Goodwin 2004: 78). This, he argued, would include space and spatial practices in all aspects of analysis of contemporary capitalism (Goodwin 2004). He described this as working not just across disciplinary boundaries but also beyond them.

Nature is not only disciplined by individual disciplines but also by conversations between different fields. Collaborative practice and knowledge making therefore construct conceptions of nature in particular ways. In his book Together Richard Sennett explores the notion of collaboration as an overlooked part of the human condition (2012). It is his contention that ‘cooperation is imprinted in our genes’ (Sennett 2012). However he argues that ‘modern society has weakened cooperation in distinctive ways’ (Sennett 2012). This he partly attributes to social inequality and changes in the structure of modern labour, through the neoliberal forces of capitalism. Describing different forms of collaboration, Sennett distinguishes between two types of conversation: dialectic and dialogical. The first involves detecting what might establish a common ground between two parties. The second, coined by Russian literary critic Mikhail Bakhtin, is a discussion that does not resolve itself by finding common ground. It is this dialogical form of conversation that Sennett utilizes to illustrate how cooperation may work across difference without dismissing it (Sennett 2012). It is this latter form of mutual exchange for Sennett, which allows for failure and illuminates cooperation as a tool in itself.

Sennett’s advocacy for cooperation as a sustained skill within society is set up as a movement against the growing dominance of individualism within capitalism and
neoliberalism (Harvey 2005). In many ways neoliberal thought denies difference, claiming to create a 'level playing field' (Smith 2005: 893). Neoliberalism therefore produces forms of difference and then denies the very existence of the difference it produces (Giroux 2010; Goldberg 2009; Mehta 1990). McDowell recognizes that an individualistic ethos pervades both the labour market and the welfare state (McDowell 2004). Mohanty describes ‘the hegemony of neoliberalisation, alongside the naturalization of capitalist values’ (Mohanty 2003: 508). These structures are significant as it is through particular methods of enquiry that nature is defined and therefore constructed.

However, in practice, many institutional and public structures of collaborative projects are set up within the neoliberal agendas outlined above. For example, many collaborative projects across the arts and sciences in the public field were established because of the political concept that through working together the UK would increase its innovation and creativity, which in turn would elevate the nation state and make it more competitive in the free market (See for example Smith 1998).\(^{21}\) This means that rather than finding conviviality across difference, the differences between practitioners and therefore disciplines are further emphasized. The artist must behave like an artist and the scientist must behave like a scientist. They must continue to report and function within their own communities of practice as well as being able to communicate with those beyond it. It is also important to recognise that many collaborative projects, despite the best of intentions, were set up because of neoliberal economic policies that combine funding streams across public bodies.

\(^{21}\) This was especially true of New Labour’s Creative Britain agenda and will be explored further in sections 2.4.1 and 2.4.2. These explore the creative industries policy and instrumentalism in the public arts.
However, collaborations across disciplinary divides provide an opportunity to question and undermine the development of silos of knowledge. They also allow for different conversations about the constitution of nature through different ways of knowing. Nonetheless, much of this work views the human as the sole container or vessel of knowledge about nature. Furthermore, by framing these relations as boundary crossings the difference between the identities of the collaborators is often reinforced.

2.3.4 Multiple ontologies of naturecultures: political ecologies

A different way of moving beyond the disciplinary understandings of nature is to rethink the relations between human and non-human. Influenced by post-structural philosophy, particularly that of Bruno Latour and Donna Haraway, a field of work has emerged exploring the multiplicity of nature. These cultures of nature, or naturecultures as they are sometimes referred as in Science and Technology Studies (STS), open up interesting questions about the encounters between the human and non-human (Law 2004b; Hinchliffe 2007). This perspective understands natures as not just culturally constructed phenomena but also in continual intermingling (what Deleuze and Guattari call assemblage) and a state of becoming in relation with others (Deleuze and Guattari 2013; Hinchliffe 2007; Law 2004b). John Law describes this in the following way:

Latour argues that the secret of modernity is not its purity, its dualist distinction between ‘nature’ and ‘culture’ (or ‘science’ and ‘society’). Rather it is its insistence on this distinction and its purity while, as [sic] the same time, making endless hybrids, putative naturecultures that may or may not make it into relative stability. (Law 2004b)

Drawing on the multiplicity outlined by Latour and the interferences and situated knowledges of Haraway, this ‘more-than-representational’ approach emphasizes relation in naturecultures (Lorimer 2005). Following this, Annemarie Mol’s notion of the body multiple provides methods to consider how humans are a part of the material world that not only influences but is influenced by the material world (Mol 2002). This
moves the human away from being a container within which the entire knowledge of
nature is housed.

Therefore within this field of thought there has also been a movement towards
materiality. This movement is, in part, spearheaded by Jane Bennett whose ethics of
enchantment and vibrant matter has guided much of this work (Bennett 2010; Bennett
2001). In her words:

I wonder if the category "environmentalism", with its suggestion that the
nonhuman world is a background for action rather than an effect-producing
assemblage of human and nonhuman actants, is our best conceptual bet.
(Bennett 2013: 150)

For Bennett materialism enables consideration of political agency in a way that
environmentalism cannot. This, she argues, is because materiality makes the relations
between humans, biota and abiota more horizontal and draws attention to ‘the
profound… connectedness of all things’ (Bennett 2013: 151). Through this approach
Bennett defines “nature” as:

...[A]n active becoming, a creative not-quite-human force capable of
producing the new, buzzes within it. Is this the vibrant matter of which I
dream? It could be. (Bennett 2013: 154).

These relational and multiple approaches to naturecultures provide methods to work in
different and illustrative ways that are, to some extent, not as restricted by disciplinary
structures. However, the field has been troubled by questions of how to address
political agency within the flat topology of relation and assemblages. Steve Hinchliffe,
drawing on Massey’s work, attempts to account for difference through his employment
of the term contagion. This enables him to work with ‘differences in degree’ rather than
the ‘differences in kind’ present in much representational theory (Hinchliffe 2007).
Hinchliffe’s argument enables a discussion of immutable mobiles (Latour’s term) in
multiples that are in a state of becoming (Hinchliffe 2007; Latour 1987). This consists of
accounting for the flexible and fluctuating ways agents transfer information. However,
he argues that these exchanges can also be momentarily framed (Goffman’s concept) according to their positioning in space and time (Goffman 1974; Hinchliffe 2007). Allowing for this framing of immutable mobiles gives Hinchliffe’s notion of contagion a political agency lacking in other relational work.

Annemarie Mol describes her multiple and relational approach as ontological politics (Mol 2002) where actants are shaped by more than one practice.\textsuperscript{22} Others use the term political ecology, after Latour (Lorimer 2012a; Neumann 2011; Bennett 2010; Latour 1987). These relational philosophies enable sensitivity to the ways in which actants are continually changing or becoming and only become fixed for certain purposes (like in law) for a short time before changing again. John Law acknowledges that within these models there needs to be ‘space for not-quite-real protestors to say that they are really real’ (Law 2004b). Likewise, making space for the not-quite-definable, Hinchliffe speaks of the inherent impurity of these multiple naturecultures where ‘order at the same time produces disorder’ (Hinchliffe 2007). When translated to discussions of policy, political ecology encourages a receptiveness to the mobility and multiple ways in which naturecultures shape and are shaped by equally multiple and mobile actants.

2.3.5 Managing uncertainty in changing environments

Understanding naturecultures as assemblages of multiple, fluid, becoming actants has important ramifications for rethinking critical questions of agency, volatility and uncertainty in our relationship with “natural environments”. In her essay Landscape as Provocation, Doreen Massey demonstrates the interconnectedness and continual transformation of the world. She argues:

\textsuperscript{22} Actants are ‘a source of action that can be either human or nonhuman; it is that which has efficacy, can do things, has sufficient coherence to make a difference, produce effects, alter the course of events’ (Bennett 2010: viii).
For if ‘Nature’ is always turbulent, troubled, indeed destructive as well as creative, then how are we to evaluate human intervention? … With nature mobile and out of equilibrium no guidelines are offered for political action or ethical stance. (Massey 2006: 39).

These turbulent natures bring to the fore the mobility and motility of matter and materials, disturbing any notions of a steady-state nature in equilibrium. This vibrancy of the matter of the earth mean that not only are humans the agents of change, they also must adapt to it on a variety of scales in time and space. Likewise, in Inhuman Nature Nigel Clark writes of the mutual adaptation to change amongst living beings and the forces of what he terms the volatile planet:

‘Living beings, ourselves included, contribute in their own ways to many of these transitions but also find themselves having to weather changes over which they have little or no leverage. (Clark 2011: 213)

Jane Bennett’s approach towards an ethics of materiality and the ontological politics of relational theorists such as Latour, Mol, Haraway and Stengers, however, allows a different kind of vocabulary to emerge in relation to this volatility of the earth. Recognising turbidity and change also requires an acknowledgement of material loss and a sense of loss. Change, for Massey, requires ‘political, and ethical, attention’ (Massey 2006: 40). In short, if change is inevitable then it is important to explore, discuss, dispute and challenge the ethical and practical characteristics of that change. Nigel Clark begins to plot some of these ethical and practical questions when he outlines ‘cosmopolitics’ for the volatile planet he examines (Clark 2011). In his words:

Only by knitting together an array of landscapes and seascapes readied by other’s habitation or transversal has our current version of the global materialized. By the same token, only by way of a pre-existing atmosphere, biosphere, lithosphere, hydrosphere – a decisively pregiven globality – could humans have ever gained purchase across the earth’s surface.

In this way, every genuine encounter with another human being is an opaque window into a particular passage through the earth’s shifting, tilting course. Without discernable origin, but not necessarily without end. So too is a brush of our own with a cyclone, a heatwave, an epidemic, an opening into processes with a temporality that stretches back into a past without me, a past without any of us. (Clark 2011)
This intertwined and embedded connectivity between human and non-human actants as both objects and forces that shape one another engages with new forms of political potential. Turbulent natures enable a rethinking of the ways in which policy and management is undertaken.

Conceptions of changing and volatile environments expose the uncertainties inherent in human understanding and management of natures. For one thing:

…policies are also practiced in lots of different ways, in lots of different places and with different people and things, and to pursue better policies we need to consider how those various practices are assembled. (Hinchliffe 2002: 165).

Hinchliffe suggests that a new way of enacting policy is through what he terms ‘ecologies of action’ which enable sensitivity to the multiplicity of things even within the framings of policy (Hinchliffe 2002). In order to move towards sustainable policy-making, Hinchliffe suggests, we must challenge Foucault’s discourses which Hinchliffe argues are ‘all encompassing orders’ (Hinchliffe 2002). He is also wary of simply blaming bureaucratic processes, including the propensity towards calculation or “market-forces” as this, he suggests, over simplifies their influence on shaping policy and therefore limits the power of such arguments of resistance. He reflects that Gibson-Graham refer to this as the ‘romanticism of defeat’ (Gibson-Graham 1996; Hinchliffe 2002). For Hinchliffe the notion of ecologies of action provides ways to write and account for uncertainty by making space for complexity and multiplicity in policy-thinking. This not only accounts for Latour’s immutable mobiles (Latour 1987) but also allows for future change and multiple scales within the framed worlds of policy (Hinchliffe 2007; Mol 2002; Latour 1987).

The links between methods of enquiry, knowledge-formation and policy-making are mobile and intertwined. Therefore, in a similar vein to Hinchliffe and writing in the
journal *Nature*, Andy Stirling suggests that those who advise policy on behalf of science move away from a rhetoric of risk and towards discussions of on-going uncertainty within policy writing. He argues that considering uncertainty in policy enables a shift from a ‘narrow focus on risk to broader and deeper understandings of incomplete knowledge’ (Stirling 1993: 1030). Importantly, this transition towards portraying the uncertainty of knowledge moves the onus of decision-making from clear-cut “scientific” results to the political networks decision-makers. In his words:

> When knowledge is uncertain, experts should avoid pressures to simplify their advice. Render decision-makers accountable for decisions. (Stirling 1993)

Stirling argues that if knowledge of naturecultures is uncertain and multiple it should be reflected in policy. Hinchliffe and Blowers (2003) also make this argument. They write usefully about how naturecultures might be brought together or framed into communities during policy creation and practice. They note that responses to environmental change can be enacted by both human and non-human actants at a variety of scales over place and time (Hinchliffe and Blowers 2003). This means that calculating risk is a complex process, which cannot capture the multitude of responses and causes of change. They argue that instead of top-down, expert-led approaches to decision-making in the face of uncertain and volatile environments alternatives could include deliberative and consensus based approaches (Hinchliffe and Blowers 2003).

The relationship between the human and non-human is integral to conceptions of nature. A key issue with volatile naturecultures is that they are often under-acknowledged in policy making even when uncertainty is recognised. Psychologist Tali Sharot describes this as an optimism bias (Sharot 2011). Sharot explains how humans often develop optimistic projections of the future and overestimate their control over future events even after facing disconfirming evidence. She states that the reasons for this might be that optimism reduces stress and anxiety (Sharot 2011). Furthermore,
models of predictive bias... hold that the extent of unrealistic optimism should increase with uncertainty. People will show the largest bias in situations with the greatest unknowns. (Sharot 2011)

This suggests that there are significant barriers to attempts to manage or write policy of volatile naturecultures where levels of risk and change are uncertain. This is particularly applicable when assessing the best ways to communicate risks of volatile environments, such as coastlines, to the wider public. The optimism bias suggests that where risks are most unknown or uncertain people are more likely to believe they will be safe.

Both Stirling and Hinchliffe and Blowers advocate acknowledging the presence of uncertainty when writing policy for changing, volatile environments (Hinchliffe and Blowers 2003; Stirling 1993). Additionally, the theory of optimism bias suggests that levels of danger and risk are often underestimated. Taking these into consideration further supports the open discussions and reflections enabled by understanding naturecultures as multiple and changing. Massey, whilst reflecting on landscape as provocation, focuses on the continuing process of questioning based on ‘anti-foundationalism that insists on a commitment to openness and questioning’ (Massey 2006: 44). For Massey this involves engaging with scientific forms of knowledge not just to appropriate useful and convincing conclusions but also to adopt openness and questioning as practice. She describes this curiosity as:

That space of agonistic negotiation that is the political should be recognized as including negotiation also with that realm that goes by the name of nature. It will, moreover, be a negotiation that includes within it the very conceptualization of that ‘nature’ itself. (Massey 2006: 45)

Massey is not alone in recognising the significance of curiosity to understandings and conceptions of both politics and nature. Richard Phillips also writes of the political importance of practices of curiosity and how they align with playfulness and creativity (Phillips 2013). He also highlights that curiosity is a practice that many individuals and
groups struggle for. He advocates finding spaces to be curious and to explore through open-ended questioning and examining the world (Phillips 2015; Phillips 2013). This form of curious practice aligns with Massey’s notion of landscapes as events or happenings, ‘as moments that will be again dispersed’ (Massey 2006: 46). Suggesting that both naturecultures and the ways in which knowledge is formed about them are contingent, changeable and multiple opens up how policy writing and decision-making might need to shift on a volatile planet.

Exploring the ways in which natures are culturally constructed opens up discussions on the contingency within these constructions. The ways in which the “natural” world is disciplined through different cultures of knowledge making (both in the sciences and the arts) have an integral influence on how nature is conceived and managed. Interdisciplinary working addresses some of the restrictions of silos of knowledge. However, past “art-science collaborations” give insight as to some of the challenges of working in this way and acknowledging the mutability of naturecultures within policy settings. These difficulties are especially prevalent in changing and volatile environments where the relationship between the natural and the cultural is a crucial part of policy formation.

2.4 Performing policy

So far this chapter has explored how conceptions of culture, nature and heritage have influenced decision-making and policy construction. The movement towards interdisciplinary working within the UK public sector emerged at a particular political moment. This following section explores this context and the rise of instrumentalism within the arts sector specifically. It considers the nexus of historical, political and ideological implications associated with an instrumental approach to creativity, the arts
and culture, thus exploring the context for much of the decision-making and practice explored in this thesis.

2.4.1 British cultural policy and the Creative Industries agenda.

In March 2016 the Department of Culture, Media and Sport published The Culture White Paper (DCMS 2016). This was the second white paper on culture to have ever been published in the UK and the first for over fifty years. With a fiery rhetoric Ed Vaizey, the then Minister for Culture, Communications and Creative Industries, proclaimed:

This white paper seeks to harness the nourishing effects of culture. It seeks to ignite the imaginations of young people, kindle ambition and opportunity and fuel the energy of communities.

It seeks to spread the gifts of our arts, heritage and culture to more people, and more communities across the country and abroad and free the creative genius that can make a better world for all. (DCMS 2016)

The Conservative Government held high aspirations for the ability of arts, heritage and culture (note the separation of the three here) to ignite, kindle and fuel society by freeing ‘the creative genius’ (DCMS 2016). However, the actual mechanics of the document were less aspiring in ambition. With what was deemed by some as ‘deadening instrumentalism’ (Guardian Editorial 2016: np) the document outlines four main targets in their future approach to culture. These are, in short:

1. Everyone should enjoy the opportunities culture offers, no matter where they start in life
2. The riches of our culture should benefit communities across the country
3. The power of culture can increase our international standing

(DCMS 2016)

In fact, at the time of publication many of these policies were already in motion or underway (Guardian Editorial 2016). Yet, the publication of The Culture White Paper
was a significant declaration by the UK Government (especially for one with a Conservative majority). It emphatically made the statement that culture matters, and is something that should be fostered by public funding and policy-making. The desire for the arts and culture to influence social agendas is something I shall reflect on in the next section. However, in order to understand some of the nuances to this white paper, it is important to place it within a historical context of cultural policy-making in the UK.

The term “culture” was formally adopted into UK formal governmental policy during the Second World War with the establishment of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts (CEMA) in 1940 to “boost morale” and as employment opportunities for artists and performers (Weingärtner 2006). Built on a committee of specialist expertise including advisors such as Sir Kenneth Clark, CEMA quickly developed aims for promoting the high arts across the country (rather than supporting a wide-range of arts across class divides). It also set the expectation that culture would be well equipped to address societal issues. The suggestion that “mass culture” was a democratising force troubled many twentieth century philosophers (Hesmondhalgh and Pratt 2005). For example, Adorno and Horkeimer criticized what they saw as the commodification of art through The Culture Industry in Dialectic of Enlightenment (Adorno and Horkheimer 1997). This was recognition of the rise of mass culture and

23 In his book The Arts as a Weapon of War, Jörn Weingärtner gives a detailed account of the conception of formalized cultural policy during the Second World War. He identifies that the influence of the blackout regulations in the first winter of conflict caused a phenomenon known as the ‘Bore War’ in the United Kingdom (Weingärtner 2006). Pressure was placed upon central government to develop forms of entertainment for the public and the arts and culture were seen as important to boost the population’s morale as well as continuing support for the arts and cultural sector workers whose employment had become unstable with the enforcement of the blackout meaning that people were not able to congregate in the evenings.

24 “High art” and “high culture” are terms commonly used to identify art and culture that aligns with the aristocracy (upper class) and intelligentsia (status class). High art is defined in contradiction to “low art” or “low culture” which are terms used for popular culture and art conventionally seen as the purview of less-educated social classes.
what they saw as a banality of everything (especially art) as a result, through the influence of capitalism. In the words of Adorno:

The culture industry fuses the old and familiar into a new quality. In all its branches, products which are tailored for consumption by masses, and which to a great extent determine the nature of that consumption, are manufactured more or less according to plan. (Adorno 1991: 98)

Not only were the arts increasingly recognized for their economic circulation (incidentally this was nothing particularly new), culture had agency to influence its consumers. Additionally, there was an increasing recognition of the importance of what Bourdieu termed cultural capital (Bourdieu 2011 [1986]). This defined the importance of culture as a facet of societal power.

The way that cultural policy was developed structurally in the UK had important consequences. Under the direction of economist John Maynard Keynes it was established that CEMA would not report to an Arts Minister or to the Education Department but directly to the Treasury. This would later be recognized as an “arm’s length” approach to cultural policy which advocated maintaining distance between the workings of the arts and politics (Hewison 2014). It also reflects the tendency for those in government to choose the expertise and personnel involved in shaping arts policy rather than directly determining the policy itself, which is also a legacy from this emancipated structure of CEMA (Weingärtner 2006). Another legacy is the bias of public arts funding to central London and specifically elite cultural institutions such as the Royal Opera House, a bias that continues, in many respects, through to the present day.  

Hewison (Hewison 2014) argues that the present geographical inequality in the public arts was established through Keynes’ powerful connections. His influence was substantial, when the Arts Council of Great Britain was formed to replace

---

25 A recent example of the regional funding imbalance was highlighted by GPS Culture in their report examining the ACE National Investment Plans for 2015-2018 (Stark, Powell, and Gordon 2014; GPS Culture 2014).
CEMA in 1946 Keynes was named the founding chairman; however he died that same year.

Although there were many significant moments in the work of cultural policy in the UK in the intervening years, many cite the 1980s and the culmination of post-industrial policy with neoliberal ideals as the next significant shift in the way culture was valued within governmental policy. Post-industrial changes in public sector management and the rise of the “knowledge economy” resulted in an increased mirroring of examples from the private sector, such as target setting and monitoring outputs, within public sector management (Crossick and Kaszynska 2014). Even more than before (and alongside similar shifts in heritage) the arts became increasingly appreciated for their non-arts outcomes which ‘drove the discourses for cultural value’ (Crossick and Kaszynska 2014).

As mentioned above, the National Lottery Act [1993] enabled the gathering of significant funds for public spending in broadly speaking cultural concerns. Specifically, at the time, this was to benefit the ‘existing heritage’, the ‘living heritage’ (sports and arts), charities and the Millennium Fund (Major 1994: np). Launching the National Lottery, the then Prime Minister John Major stated:

I strongly believe man cannot live by GDP alone. A rounded life involves much more than economic security. A country can only be strong, healthy, and contented if it burnishes its heritage, encourages its citizens to pursue excellence in sport, and cultivates widespread appreciation of the arts. I would like to see everyone in this country share in the opportunities that were once available only to the privileged few. (Major 1994)\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{26} This statement was later adjusted by Ed Vaisey in his introduction to the 2016 Culture White Paper where ‘burnishes’ was replaced by the safer term ‘cultivates’ and the context of GDP and economic security were removed (DCMS 2016; Major 1994). This was a part of Vaisey’s shift in cultural policy from public art that adds to modern life and is a charitable concern to art that solves its societal issues whilst being financially independent.
This was a cultural policy aiming to show that government could influence the lives of their population beyond the economy. When the Arts Council of Great Britain was divided into three bodies for England, Scotland and Wales in 1994 they took on the responsibility of distributing the significant public funds raised through the National Lottery. As a result the organisation quickly grew to compensate for the much greater administrative capacity required (Hewison 2014). At the same time, New Labour was being conceptualized, with Tony Blair chosen to lead the party in July of the same year. When New Labour was elected into government in 1997 their Creative Britain agenda aimed to reinvent cultural policy within Britain once more.

Creativity had been a fundamental part of the New Labour manifesto and was used to strike a new balance between social agendas and neoliberalism. Their policies sought to encourage individualism and a new spirit of entrepreneurialism. Creativity provided the platform for New Labour to create institutional reform by changing the emphasis away from culture and onto creativity. In the words of Hewison:

"Culture would be the means to achieve the transformation of Britain: liberated from the old bureaucratic procedures, lifestyle would govern a new politics of choice that changed the individual’s relation to the state and stimulated permanent innovation. Hence New Labour’s rhetoric of ‘creativity’, and the invention of ‘Creative Britain’ – a phrase that resonates throughout New Labour’s time in office. And who could be against creativity? Creativity is positive and forward thinking – it is cool, just as New Labour wished to be. (Hewison 2014)"

Cultural industries, a term that had been used since the 1960s, held problematic connotations of the direct relationships between art and politics (Banks and O'Connor 2009). By becoming the creative industries cultural policy could be re-imagined to suggest innovation, invention and creation (Hesmondhalgh and Baker 2011).\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{27} I continue to use the term cultural policy as acknowledgement that the discourse of creative industries is a form of cultural policy that emphasizes innovation and neoliberal economic principles whilst including a much wider range of activities than simply the arts and heritage sectors.
Early in the tenure of New Labour and the newly formed Department of Culture Media and Sport (DCMS), two mapping documents were published addressing the creative industry sector (DCMS 2001; DCMS 1998). These expanded the influence of cultural policy whilst usefully raising the economic projections of the creative industries by absorbing the highly profitable software and IT sectors into its remit. McRobbie outlines why this was so significant in her book *Be Creative*:

> The punch line was that this was a sector of industry that had hitherto not been considered as having economic value, and in addition this whole field had an egalitarian and anti-elitist dimension because ‘everyone is creative’. (McRobbie 2016: 62)

Creativity amalgamated the heritage and the arts with digital and media production, fashion and craft sectors. Significantly, the creative industries concept was developed upon a founding tension of commerce verses art (Luckman 2015: 47). Under the creative industries model not only did the arts sector in particular need to demonstrate “value” for money but arts organisations were also seen as ‘key enablers of capitalist innovation’ (Luckman 2015). This model depended upon the continuous innovation that it was assumed the creative economy would be able to provide (Hewison 2014). Furthermore, the creative industries would be populated by a new generation of makers referred to as the “creative class” (Florida 2002). These were:

> young and eager people, who, in spite of their techno-savvy, clung to the romantic image of the struggling artist, whose individualism would make the breakthrough that justified their insecurities and self-exploitation. (Hewison 2014)

According to the creative class concept, popularised by geographer Richard Florida, the creative industries workers were based in urban “creative cities” where their combination of creative flair and business acumen were able to rejuvenate and resuscitate the post-industrial economy (Luckman 2015; Hewison 2014; Florida 2005).28

---

28 There have been many recent discussions on the role of artists in gentrification of post-industrial spaces. Often these accounts narrate how an area with an active arts scene becomes
However, these conceptions of the creative city and creative class privileged certain (often commoditized) forms of creativity and creators over others. Gibson contends that the increased focus on creativity in academic work and policy making has contributed in shaping a set of assumptions about the location and conditions necessary to foster creative work (Gibson 2012; Brennan-Horley and Gibson 2009). Sorenson states that much of this academic work on creativity leaves this urban bias unacknowledged (Sorensen 2009). In response to this, there is an expanding body of work that questions this urban dominance (Harvey, Hawkins, and Thomas 2012; Gibson 2012; Bell and Jayne 2010; Gibson and Kong 2005). These demonstrate that creative industries are not restricted to the urban and by exploring examples beyond the urban they raise questions of the natures of remoteness and alternative place-making strategies.

Writers such as Sarah Luckman have identified advantages for the predominantly female workforce in creative industries, especially the field of craft on which she focuses (Luckman 2015). She lists these benefits as including the ability to self-manage time and the self-esteem of directing income opportunities. However celebrations of “creative class” are also criticized due to the precarity of creative labour and the corresponding need for business and marketing skills, which has risen with the creative industries agenda. Furthermore, as McRobbie has identified, the creative industries (including the work on the subject within the academy) have encouraged a generation of workers into this sector where job insecurity is high, and where they are removed from many of the systems, which regulate and protect their rights (McRobbie 2016). She states that

gentrified to the extent where the artists themselves are priced out of the area (Pritchard 2016; Lewis 2016).
the call to be creative is a potent and highly appealing mode of new
governmentality directed to the young in the educational environment,
whose main effect is to do away with the idea of welfare rights in work by
means of eclipsing normal employment altogether. (McRobbie 2016: 14)

In addition to the problematic political positioning (and dispossessing) of the “creative
class”, some of the criticisms that emerged for this new form of cultural policy
illustrated that many of the longstanding issues with public funding of the arts
remained. Emphasis remained on elite arts and the historic buildings, in which they
were housed, mainly in central London. Furthermore, the increasing political need to
account for the funds that were being spent created complicated and bureaucratic
systems of auditing in the arts especially.

It was beginning to seem that the creative industries had had their moment when the
New Labour project was punctured by the global economic downturn of 2008. Initially,
in this context, the creative industries were seen as crucial agents for problem-solving
and innovation to aid the resilience of the UK economy (Banks and O’Connor 2009).
When a coalition Conservative and Liberal Democrat government took power in 2010,
the rhetoric of austerity dominated UK politics. The embedding of neoliberal and
capitalist competitive agendas for culture, and more specifically the arts, was further
tested as funding was greatly reduced (Hewison 2014). Furthermore the arts lost
political influence as DCMS retreated into the shadows of government (McRobbie
2016). Additionally the demand on ACE’s increasingly limited resources was increased.
Following the closing of the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (MLA), ACE
assumed the responsibility for supporting museums and libraries into its remit in 2011.

When the National Portfolio Organisations (NPOs) for 2015-2018 were announced in
2014, one organisation leader wrote anonymously in Arts Professional magazine of the
problems still present within the Arts Council funding system. In it the author protested against a lack of transparency within central organisations, the emphasis on supporting cultural buildings over ephemeral practice, a lack of honest and open practice with the allocation of funding and an imbalance between the treatment of individual practitioners in comparison to large organisations (Anon. 2014). Some of these criticisms were seemingly addressed in the Culture White Paper of 2016 with its emphasis on access to the arts and a regional approach to cultural policy. However, the inherent tension within cultural policy still remains where the arts are asked to justify themselves and their worth in terms of their ability to meet the objectives of other political agendas. As the eminent arts administrator John Tusa wrote in the Guardian on the announcement of the latest cycle of NPOs: 'Nitpicking around the edges of a tiny budget is not an arts policy. It is bad politics too' (Tusa 2014: np). In short, the shift from the cultural to the creative had embedded some of the longer assumptions of the benefits of the arts for the wider welfare of the population into the sector’s public remit.

2.4.2 Art and instrumentalism: the Cultural Olympiad

As established in the section above, the role of instrumentalism in the arts is long standing. Although not always termed instrumentalism per se, the utilization of the arts within cultural policy has a long tradition and a corresponding tradition of resistance. For example, in his essay The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction, Walter Benjamin traced the development of the utilization of art to Post-Renaissance thinking and the dawn of Socialism (Benjamin 2008 [1936]). According to Benjamin,

---

29 National Portfolio Organisations (NPOs) are those selected by ACE to receive a regular income allowing them to develop longer-term strategies. The scheme was developed in 2008 to replace Regularly Funded Organisations (RFOs). This change in structure symbolized a shift in approach from ACE, namely removing the assumption that the Arts Council would fund some organisations indefinitely. In 2014 it was announced that the Arts Council England would fund 663 art organisations as NPOs from 1st April 2015 to 31st March 2018. This included 43 new organisations but removed 60 previously funded organisations from the scheme. Consultation is currently underway for a re-structuring of the NPO system to accommodate the variance in size and purpose of portfolio organisations from 2018 (Hill 2016).
what he called the “aura” of art (its genuineness of being in a particular place and time) is lessened or even destroyed by the processes of mass production triggered by the development of reproductive technologies such as photography. He continued his argument to state that this signalled a transition from processes of ritual to those of politics for the arts with, in retaliation, the rise of l’art pour l’art (art for art’s sake). The discussion of the purpose and value of art is therefore one that has been embedded within cultural policy since the Second World War.

During the development of the New Labour creative industries agenda, the tension between promoting and supporting art for the sake of art and its use as a tool to achieve other policy agendas became pronounced. By using creativity to define the neo-liberal positioning of the party, the arts took on an instrumental, symbolic and political role within the UK (Gross 2015). This was an end to the “arm’s length principle” as the arts were brought wholeheartedly into the fold of Whitehall. Clive Gray (2002) identifies what he terms a strategy of policy attachment whereby the arts, with a small budget allocation and little political influence, have progressively attached themselves to economic and social agendas, thus benefitting from the larger budgets and greater political influence of those areas of public policy (Garnham 2005; Belfiore 2004). This has meant a shift from instrumental justifications for supporting the arts to an increased culture of accountability and reporting for the public arts sector.

This instrumental approach was highlighted during the Cultural Olympiad, a compulsory cultural programme attached to the London 2012 Olympic Games. Set in motion by New Labour after they won the Olympic bid in 2005, the Cultural Olympiad was part of an ambitious plan to utilize the large sporting event and was publically justified due to its projected role in promoting gentrification and social inclusion. In
developing the bid Tessa Jowell, the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport at the time, stated the following in a speech to the House of Commons:

We want to harness the power of sport to help address some of the key issues our nation faces – health, social inclusion, educational motivation and fighting crime. We want the Olympics to be the catalyst that inspires people of all ages and all talents to lead more active lives. (Jowell 2003: np)

It is a legacy of the inspiration of the founding father of the modern Olympic Games, Pierre de Coubertin, that dictates that every nation hosting the Games must also develop an accompanying cultural programme (Garcia 2008). However, the International Olympic Committee (IOC) does not determine what this programme will look like. Few had attempted such an ambitious four-year cultural programme before London 2012. The nation-wide Cultural Olympiad Jowell envisioned would be a part of the wider project of urban regeneration through a trickle down-effect of cultural activities (Low and Hall 2012; Hewison 2014). It was also hoped that a longer period of cultural activity leading up to the Olympic Games would benefit the economy through increased visitors and tourism. These aims sat comfortably with New Labour’s concept of culture and the creative industries as instruments for social inclusion and widening participation (Gilmore 2012).

The Cultural Olympiad launched in 2008 with events across the country and the aim of providing “once in a lifetime” events through ‘diversity, inclusion and world-class performance’ (LOCOG 2012: 97). The ambitious programme aimed for a national reach which would feature, amongst others, disabled artists and ‘showcase art in places where it would not normally be found, including iconic heritage sites’ (LOCOG 2012). However, from the outset its structures of organisation were confused and convoluted (Hewison 2014). ACE and the London Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games (LOCOG) reflect on this in their final Cultural Olympiad report:
At this early stage diverse teams created diverse opportunities for cultural and community organisations, but the lack of a single management structure impeded the development and delivery of a single vision. Whilst this could be considered a strength for grass roots and community-led programmes of the Cultural Olympiad, the public struggles with the idea of what a Cultural Olympiad was. (ACE and LOCOG 2013: 27)

To mitigate this confused structure and lack of “single vision” the London 2012 Festival was developed for the weeks preceding and during the Games themselves, even though this focused activity back to the capital city. However, in the longer term, the Olympiad did generate activity across the countries and regions of the UK. In total 117,717 activities took place over the four years (Garcia 2013: 19). These involved over 40,000 artists and 5,370 new artistic works or commissions (Garcia 2013).

The London 2012 Cultural Olympiad demonstrated that although facilitating cultural activity, the bureaucratic procedures connected with this form of public programming presented limitations for arts organisations. I have already alluded to the administrative transition associated with the shift to the creative industries model. In particular this policy shift involved an increased emphasis on processes of accounting and auditing cultural organisations (Belfiore 2004). The influence of the post-industrial private sector on public sector management resulted in managerial strategies that highly valued numerical measurements and statistics in their evaluations. Processes of target setting and auditing were supposed to demonstrate that the arts (and culture) were meeting the instrumental aims of social inclusion, widening participation and education. The commercial and instrumental expectations for the arts were therefore embedded within the creative industries agenda. As we have already explored, this also shaped the tension where the arts were expected to provide innovative solutions to complex social issues whilst still justifying their worth and value in their own right (McRobbie 2016; Tusa 2014; Hewison 2014; Belfiore and Bennett 2010; Belfiore 2009). This has, in turn,
generated questions within academia as to the way in which critical research into creative industries and cultural policy should be undertaken.

2.4.3 Performing policy: towards a site-specific approach

Suggestions that academics should look for different ways to talk and write about cultural policy emerged from concerns about the increased bureaucratic and statistical monitoring of the arts within the creative industries. This prompted arguments for talking and writing about cultural policy in a different way. It was also supposed that this new approach might help extend cultural policy debates beyond the realms of public art. Simultaneously, many academics were concerned that their research was being utilized as part of the auditing of the arts. Eleonora Belfiore, for example, argues for a new approach as she outlines the role of “bullshit” within cultural policy:

"Until we accept the need for carefully thought-through research questions and for a genuinely exploratory approach to the study of something of such extraordinary complexity as people’s experiences of and responses to the arts, the production of bullshit might not be avoidable." (Belfiore 2009: 354)

Here she is calling for considered and critical research questions and open, exploratory studies into the 'extraordinary complexity' of peoples' responses to the arts (Belfiore 2009: 354). Research that looked beyond the numerical and statistical to analyse the influence of cultural policy on society was increasingly seen as necessary to move beyond self-gratifying research into the public arts. This necessitated expanding the kinds of data and the constructions of policy included when researching culture and specifically the arts: closer attention to and analysis of the processes and institutions of policy making and implementation would be helpful (Hesmondhalgh and Pratt 2005). It

30 For the sake of clarity, within this research the term policy is seen as the processes of decision-making and strategies adopted or proposed by an individual or organisation. These often, but not always, include written documents stating these aims or plans of action.
was also recognized that cultural policy making needed to examine the processes of decision-making and practice rather than simply outputs and results.\textsuperscript{31}

Therefore, part of the process of understanding the entanglements between arts policy and arts practice necessarily involves an interrogation of current methodologies of arts evaluation. In their paper on the percent-for-arts policy, which attempted to embed public art within other sectors, Pollock and Paddison identified the some of the difficulties when evaluating arts practice and policy:

Evaluation, in its different guises, has been a (if not the) dominant theme surrounding the installation of, and debate on, public art in Britain. One outcome of this recently completed research... attempts to provide evaluation toolkits, however, because of the multiple claims made for public art and because of methodological problems in assessing its imputed economic, social and visual impacts, evaluating the benefits of public art continues to be problematic. (Pollock and Paddison 2010: 337 [emphasis added])

Pollock and Paddison here comment upon the difficulties of trying to capture the richness of the arts. Nevertheless, understanding arts evaluation has become an important question for researchers. This was highlighted when the AHRC funded a research project titled \textit{The Cultural Value Project}, which aimed to interrogate notions of value and evaluation in the arts (Crossick and Kaszynska 2016). One of the key findings of this research was the importance of first-hand, individual experiences of arts and culture to discussions of cultural value. This conclusion has been reached by others also, for example Pollock and Paddison acknowledged that understanding the various facets of public arts requires multiple methodological approaches (Pollock and Paddison 2010). However, in contrast to their stance, they relied mainly on questionnaires and follow-up interviews to reach their conclusions. In contrast, Belfiore

\textsuperscript{31} The specific approaches to policy are explored in Chapter Three alongside other methodological considerations. However, a short contextualization of the political project of researching public arts policy is provided here.
identifies that within this political research climate we must be careful not to try and reduce complex and myriad problems into a set of essentialised and sweeping solutions (Belfiore 2009).

In this vein, Harriet Hawkins poses two questions for art-geography engagements (2012). Firstly she asks how we should ‘think about and approach art as a critical object in the face of all its richness’ (Hawkins 2012: 3). Secondly she questions how to make sense of and employ the trends of thought and practice common to the contemporary fields of both arts and geography (Hawkins 2012). In light of this, an alternative approach to researching creative policy, is through the concept of performance. Thrift famously stated that performance is ‘one of the most pervasive metaphors in the human sciences’ (2000: 225). It is a concept that has been adopted in different ways across geography according to different understandings of human agency, subjectivity and power (Gregson and Rose 2000). Performance has been employed as a way of exploring ideas around embodiment, non-cognitive behaviour and knowledges and the production of social life through everyday practices. However, most applicable to this project are the considerations of liminal times and spaces in performance studies and the notions of performativity defined by feminist Judith Butler (Butler 1988). Butler describes how social subjects are produced by performance. Catherine Nash perhaps best defines this:

For performativity is not just a singular act but a reiteration of a norm or set of norms that have assumed this status through their repetition, and that become known in myriad ways including their representation. (Nash 2000: 662)

Unlike the performance of non-representational theory, Butler’s performativity maintains the political agency and identity of the actor. Again Nash states:

Exploring practices, performance, texts, object and images together rather than abandoning the knowable for the unknowable may be less theoretically ambitious than ‘nonrepresentational theory’ but it is also more politically effective in unravelling the certainties of national identity. (Nash 2000: 661)
This form of material performativity therefore provides an embodied way of exploring social structures and personal agency within geography. Ric Knowles states that this materiality of performance has been under-examined even within the field of theatre studies (Knowles 2004).

Notions of this form of material performativity within performance studies are perhaps best understood within the theatrical concept of dramaturgy. Performance practitioner David Williams defines this Germanic term as the ‘rhythmmed assemblage of settings, people, texts and things’ (Williams 2010: 197). He states that dramaturgy is uncovered through processes of making and rehearsing, rather than being predetermined... So there are dramaturgies of theatre, dance and performance, but arguably also of parties, meals, meetings, conferences, presentations, demonstrations, ceremonies, festivals, buildings, gardens and other public spaces. (Williams 2010: 198)

In this sense, dramaturgy can be understood as an assemblage of place, people and policy. Pearson and Shanks, combining the approaches of performance studies and archaeology, propose dramaturgy to be a kind of cultural assemblage (2001). These concepts of performance inspire research into cultural policy that is site-specific and attuned to the multiple assemblages of practice. Understanding policy as performed and site-specific provides critical devices to undermine the instrumentalisation and bureaucratisation of public arts policy in the UK. Enlivening and “people-ing” arts policy can therefore elicit fresh perspectives upon the Creative Britain and Cultural Olympiad agendas.

2.5 Placing creativity

2.5.1 The arts and “creativity” in geography

Many consider artistic practice to have been integral to the practice of geography since the earliest development of the discipline (Marston and Leeuw 2013). Some make reference to the scientific voyages and explorations of the eighteenth and nineteenth
centuries as evidence of the combination of scientific and artistic methods to interpret the environment (Marston and Leeuw 2013; Dixon, Hawkins, and Straughan 2012). Figures such as Alexander von Humboldt feature largely in these accounts. Humboldt’s artistic work, for example, was integrated in the knowledge formed in his scientific drawings, ships and expedition accounts (von Humboldt 2010 [1846]; Dixon, Hawkins, and Straughan 2012). During this Romantic age, geographic, geological and geomorphic knowledge was constructed through a combination of what is now seen as artistic and scientific practices. This often gets described as polymath thinking. Marston and Leeuw call this the first substantive phase of creative practice in geography (Marston and Leeuw 2013). The second, they identify as the period of cultural geographical work, which emerged during the 1970s as a response to the quantitative revolution. This included the perspectives of landscape presented by scholars influenced by humanism, phenomenology and the humanities such as Yi-Fu Tuan and Carl Sauer (Tuan 1977; Sauer 1925).

Although this work continued through the following decades, it was Meinig who made the case for geography as an art in itself, rather than simply a humanistic concern (Meinig 1983). The “new cultural geographers” of the 1980s and early 1990s evolved the role of the arts within geography further. Stephen Daniels, Denis Cosgrove and James Duncan in particular examined questions of culture, power and politics through studies of landscape, art and architecture (Barnes and Duncan 1992; Daniels, Cosgrove, and Daniels 1988). Their close readings of works of art illuminated underlying power dynamics within the landscape and the networks of production, authorship and consumption behind them (Marston and Leeuw 2013). By reading art objects as texts these cultural geographers were able to move beyond description to discourse and semiotic analysis of duplicitous (often colonial and imperial) landscapes (Duncan 1990). With the more general move towards the more-than-representational
(Lorimer 2005), cultural geographers also began to consider the agency of the arts to address questions of affect, matter and non-human lives (Examples include Lorimer 2012b; Gibson 2010; Wylie 2005).

Labelled a creative (re)turn (Hawkins 2012; Tolia-Kelly 2012), the most recent work on creativity in geography can be seen to broadly align with three themes: dialogues, doings and the geographer as ‘geoartist’. Hawkins identified two modes of practicing creative geographies as ‘dialogues’ and ‘doings’ (Hawkins 2011: 465). Dialogues involve the interpretation and analysis of art to make sense of the world (Hawkins 2011). Doings encompass, for Hawkins, an increasing tendency for geographers to work directly with artists to explore the methods and agency of creativity within knowledge making in geography. This was part of an acknowledgement of common concerns and avenues of enquiries. In the words of Marston and Leeuw:

Just as geographers are employing creative practices to gather knowledge, analyze information, and explain and disseminate their work, so...are creative practitioners of various shapes turning to theorizations and concepts we may associate with the geographical. (Marston and Leeuw 2013)

Madge (2014) adds to Hawkins’ analysis of the creative (re)turn by identifying a third strand. This she identifies as the geographer as ‘geoartist’ (Madge 2014). This sees the geographer become creative agent and maker through their own creative practice within their research. It is this newest identity that has caused perhaps some of the largest identity crises within creative geography where researchers and artists struggle to negotiate the role of professionally honed craft within creative research (Cresswell 2014; Madge 2014). Alongside this there is recognition that these creative expressions can be seen as political acts (Madge 2014). Through making and experimenting with processes of creating within research Crouch argues that geographers can enact a ‘gentle politics’ of the world (Crouch 2010: 125). This, he argues, includes the ability for creative practice to engage geographers with how ‘multiples mingle’ allowing them to
be grounded in a materiality ‘in stuff and feelings’ (Crouch 2010). These creative engagements are not without their limitations; several geoartists have been criticized for navel-gazing and excluding the voices of the politically marginalised. As Madge reminds us

...the creative geographer must not shy away from the painful and disturbing terrain of our multi-polar world to reinvigorate Anglo-American provincialisation, nor only attempt to deal with comfort-able topics and forms of expression. (Madge 2014)

The creative (re)turn has opened up many more avenues of research within geography. It has spawned a wide range of engagements with the creative economy, artistic production and process. However, there is still much that remains outside the bounds of what is accepted within the field of creative geographies.

2.5.2 Art/science collaborations in geography

For some geographers, working with artists and arts organisations provided new ways of not only presenting research but also in undertaking it. Whilst these collaborative practices became more common so too did discussions of the mechanisms of practice. Many geographers and artists found that they were finding interesting things out about each other’s epistemologies as much as about the subject they were jointly studying.

Geographers have therefore engaged with collaborative projects across the disciplines of the arts and the sciences in a wide variety of ways. Work such as the Swiss ‘artists-in-labs’ programme, for example, emphasised the collaborative process in the production of ideas (Dixon, Hawkins, and Ingram 2011: 417). This exhibit even included videos of artists and scientists conveying both communications and miscommunications during the project. Another example of these collaborations is U-n-f-o-l-d: a cultural response to climate change (Straughan, Dixon, and Hawkins 2012). This high profile touring exhibition formed a response to the effects of climate change
at Cape Farewell and other ‘fragile’ landscapes forming part of the larger Cape Farewell cultural project. In their study of the project, Straughan, Dixon and Hawkins liken this work to that of “travelling artists” on eighteenth century exploration ships who contributed to the Enlightenment impulse to inventory and the practices of colonialism (Straughan, Dixon, and Hawkins 2012). In this way, they argue, U-n-f-o-l-d sits within a long tradition of artistic practice playing a vital role within the epistemology of science (Bast 2010; Straughan, Dixon, and Hawkins 2012). According to the U-n-f-o-l-d publication, artists were used to fill the gap left by scientific language to convey complex scenes and evoke a sense of wonder (Buckland 2010). Gerald Bast expands the relationship between the arts and climate science:

[A]rt is not purely an instrument of social communication. In fact, a growing number of scientists have established that when confronted by the need to pursue new paths, conquer additional scientific or aesthetic ‘worlds’ and create new realities, the greater the similarities become between the methods and strategies employed in both artistic and scientific research and development. (Bast 2010: 14)

He advocates a synergistic relationship between the processes of interdisciplinary knowledge production. This approach, Bast contends, should not be seen as a ‘luxury’ or ‘quirk’ within the academic community (2010: 14).

Other geographers have engaged with artists through residency programmes or exhibitions (e.g. Foster and Lorimer 2007). This has often led to more detailed consideration of the process of collaboration itself:

[C]ollaboration has also challenged some of our assumptions and habits, and forced us to articulate something of the ongoing process of work, as well as some of our differences. (Foster and Lorimer 2007)

32 More information is available at: www.capefarewell.com [Last accessed 15/10//2016].
By working with artists, geographers were able to examine some of the assumptions within the discipline and question conventions in practices of knowledge making. This kind of project extended collaborations between geography and the arts to not just be about how the arts are able to re-present geographical ideas but also about considering different ways of knowing and doing the world. Gibbs expands on this:

[C]ollaborative work – and particularly collaborative, embodied methodology – makes a real difference to research practice and outcomes: it pushes us to reflect on assumptions of our own practice; calls for new skills, methods and techniques; opens possibilities for observing and for asking previously unimagined questions; and presents possibilities for political engagement and communication with new publics. (Gibbs 2013: 223-224)

With this in mind, Dixon, Hawkins and Ingram consider these kinds of collaborations not as a boundary crossings but instead as a ‘blurring of boundaries’ (Dixon, Hawkins, and Ingram 2011: 417). However, a counter argument is that many of these collaborations do not blur identity and disciplinary boundaries but in fact re-enforce them. Assigning roles at the outset of projects can reinforce stereotypical perceptions and expectations for participants (for example, the geographer and artist are both expected to act in a particular way). Furthermore, Marston and Leeuw warn that, ‘we must not homogenize either art or geography’ (Marston and Leeuw 2013). They elaborate:

The risk we see in geographers’ engagement with arts practices is one of oversimplification; differences among various arts practices and the forms of “work” they do need to be appreciated. (Marston and Leeuw 2013)

Roberts phrases this in a different way; he suggests that through collaboration the individual identity of the artist is subsumed into the group identity of artists and art:

The individual artist’s identity is dissolved into the collective-artist, and, perhaps more pertinently, into the collective identity of the non-artist, just as the identity of the non-artist collaborator is subsumed under the identity of the artist-collective. (Roberts 2004: 557)

This highlights complexities with issues of authorship and recognition during collaborations. It has been recognized that anxieties over authorship are extended to problems with acknowledgment for the individuals and groups who contribute to the
collaborative effort (Roberts 2004). This is especially pertinent in the arts sector where
long-standing issues with justifying practice and resisting complete instrumentalism are
prevalent.

As geographers gained confidence and experience of working with artists and the arts
sector and as they developed relationships and networks, they were encouraged to
work in diverse ways with the arts. Increasingly they began to explore creative
processes themselves. This was complemented by a growing number of PhDs by
practice in several UK geography departments. Artistic objects and processes are no
longer just the subjects of research and geographers recognise that their identities are
much more fluid than academic/artist when working in collaborative relationships with
artists (Foster and Lorimer 2007).

Many geographers now embrace artistic methods as a way of constructing knowledge.
This includes acknowledging the processes within geography that are inherently
creative such as writing (DeLyser and Hawkins 2014), field science (Forsyth 2013) and
archival research (DeSilvey 2007). However, it also includes developing skills in other
creative fields such as sound (Gallagher 2011; DeSilvey 2010; Atkinson 2007; Butler
2006), film (Jacobs 2013), poetry (Cresswell 2014), light installation (Jaramillo 2016)
and sculpture (Paton 2013). These new creative geographies have highlighted the
different ways in which making in geography can be a political act. David Paton, for
example, practices sculpture-as-ethnography which he describes as a dialogue
between ‘stone-metal-flesh’ (Paton 2013). This creative making, for Paton, opens up
other ways of knowing:

To make something with a material is a creative relationship, an open-
sourced reciprocating highway of sensual orders… Making is not just about
the material; making becomes social and emotional from a position of
individual knowledges working heterogeneously in a unified and creative
sensuality. (Paton 2013)
These new creative geographies, where geographers also identify as artists, performers and makers have provided space for different discussions about the processes of constructing knowledge. Most importantly it is acknowledged that these practices of art and geography are continually evolving and shifting opening up further conversations about aesthetics, the arts, place and space:

There are many more ways of researching art, working with artists, and of exploring the spatialities of art; we are excited by the possibilities that remain as yet uncovered, the complicated, secretively three- (or multi-) dimensional and deeply embodied experiences of making and knowing art geographically. (Cant and Morris 2006)

The relationship between geography and the arts is more diverse, complex and established than ever before. However, within this field of geographic practice, the terms creativity and art remain somewhat interchangeable. This does not reflect wider academic understandings of creativity and to some extent limits the discipline’s ability to critically engage with the concept.

2.5.3 Examining historical traditions of creativity research

Research into creativity is by no means limited to the discipline of geography. The term creativity itself came to prominence as an emergence of twentieth century political anxieties. Literary critic Rob Pope identifies the materialization of creativity as an Anglo-American term, which emerged in the 1940s and 1950s. He states:

It is a specifically 'modern' response to problems associated with rapid social and technological change. Creativity is needed, it is insisted, to meet the challenge of accelerating changes of an unprecedented magnitude; and the key areas of both change and challenge are those of scientific discovery, technical invention, commercial competition and military rivalry. (Pope 2005: 19. Emphasis added)

Pope notes that the term creativity emerges in the wake of the Second World War alongside new notions of internationalism, societal cosmopolitanism and industrial modernism (Pope 2005). The development of research into creativity also began in the 1940s and 1950s. The field has expanded in four broad waves within psychology and
other associated disciplines. Early research on creativity focused on the personalities of those who were acknowledged to be “exceptional creators” (Sawyer 2012). In the 1970s and 1980s this developed into a cognitive approach, which sought to ascertain the internal processes people engage with whilst “being creative”. A third wave of enquiry was based upon a sociocultural approach which began in the 1980s and 1990s (Sawyer 2012: 4). This is an interdisciplinary approach that explores creative social systems in a similar vein to work in the creative economies on art worlds and cultural fields (Becker 2008; Bourdieu 1993).

Psychologist and professor in education, Keith Sawyer, (2012) suggests that a fourth wave of research on creativity might be established on interdisciplinary approaches re-thinking creativity (Sawyer 2012). Similarly, Janet Chan, a multidisciplinary researcher based in law, terms this in another way in her introduction to the Handbook to Research on Creativity (2013). She charts the long debates within the field about whether creative studies should be about the person, the process or the product (Chan 2013). She highlights further avenues for research into creativity including the critical paradigms of feminism and post-structural analysis, which she states are still ‘relatively rare’ within creativity studies (Chan 2013).

Similarly, Pope outlines how ideas of creativity and its potentiality for socio-political and ethical change can only be fully understood through an interdisciplinary approach to the term. He explains:

... the theory and practice of creativity can only be fully grasped by reaching beyond distinctions between the arts, sciences and technology as conventionally conceived. They also prompt us to revise the history of creativity and recognise that it is only relatively recently - and even then only partially - that these various ways of saying and seeing, knowing and becoming, have been separated out and disintegrated. (Pope 2005)
Notions of creativity are therefore - necessarily - bound up within the structures of disciplinary cultures of doing and knowing. Interdisciplinary conversations therefore enhance critical detailed understanding about the processes and practices of creativity, which is otherwise in danger of becoming an overly conflated term.

Philosopher Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi defines creativity much more broadly as that which distinguishes humans from "other animals". He states for example:

...creativity results from the interaction of a system composed of three elements: a culture that contains symbolic rules, a person who brings novelty into the symbolic domain, and a field of experts who recognize and validate the innovation. All three are necessary for a creative idea, product or discovery to take place. (Csikszentmihalyi 1996: 6)

The ability to create, he argues, necessitates complex communication across generations and symbolic domains. According to Csikszentmihalyi, creativity is 'a process by which a symbolic domain in the culture is changed' (Csikszentmihalyi 1996). This, he notes, generally involves crossing the boundaries of the domains. It is the perception of uniqueness or inventiveness within the framework of the domain that is important here. To be defined as creative, he argues, is as dependent on the context of the activity as the activity itself. The act of creativity is therefore situated within a field of prior knowledge but also within cultural assumptions of what is known and what is "new". We can think of it as having a geography or spatiality. This provides a different perspective for examining anthropologist Tim Ingold's notions of creativity as explored through methods of thinking and making. For Ingold, there is a demarcation between the two, so that the theorist makes through thinking whereas the craftsman thinks through making (Ingold 2013). However, this separation between making and thinking seems a little coarse and reminiscent of the Cartesian dualism between body and mind. It also fails to acknowledge the multiple ways in which thinking and making are enacted within different fields and domains. A palaeontologist working in a laboratory, for example, could be seen to be thinking through making (and unmaking) materials.
In his studies on creativity, Csikszentmihalyi also works to debunk the popularly held notion that creativity is born out of the individual experiences of despair and discomfort borne by the lone artist. This is particularly pertinent in Britain where the notion of the struggling artist has been reinforced in many of the creative industries discourse to disregard precarious labour and reduced workers’ rights. In their exploration of cultural psychology of creativity, Glâveanu and Lubart also argue for thinking beyond the discourse of the lone creative worker to the various communities and relationships involved in the creative process (Glâveanu and Lubart 2014). However, this research seems to go beyond the usual sociocultural approaches to creativity. Interviewing creative professionals in various fields, including science, their research highlights, ‘the existence of others within the creative self’ (Glâveanu and Lubart 2014).

More generally, Janet Chan identifies anxieties within creativity studies about the lack of agreed definition of what creativity is and means within the field of research. She highlights that some studying creativity call for a clearer definition as disagreements ‘can only serve to undermine the scientific credibility of all investigators’ (Simonton 2013: 80). Chan, however, resists this. She questions:

Is the lack of consensus contributing to confusion about creativity or is it opening up new ways of understanding creativity? (Chan 2013)

Creativity therefore might be the method through which these complexities and debates within the research might be channelled. It is this ability for creativity to enable nexus thinking through arts, geography, aesthetics, processes, and cultures of knowledge - as well as political and economic questions - that inspire the work of this thesis.

2.5.4 Towards new critical geo-creativities

This was explored in more detail in section 2.4.1: British cultural policy and the Creative Industries agenda. New Labour in particular built up romantic images of the struggling artist living uncomfortably but getting satisfaction from their work to make it worthwhile.
Within geography, creativity studies most often seem to be focused on artistic processes and aesthetic theory (See, for example, Hawkins 2013). In addition, creative economies research has opened up important political questions including who defines creativity and which places can be creative. These include feminist critiques (Mclean 2014), broadening which places are acknowledged to foster creativity (Harvey, Hawkins, and Thomas 2012; Gibson 2012; Bell and Jayne 2010) and a celebration of unofficial and vernacular practices (Edensor et al. 2009). However, there has been less work bringing together the economic and political mechanisms of art whilst remaining attuned to its symbolic richness. Furthermore, attention is needed to discern what agency creativity has to examine why and how we make the world, and the relationship between individual experiences and societal manifestations of creativity.

There are wider debates within creative studies addressing the conflict between the creativity of the individual (often defined with a small c) and Creativity acknowledged at a societal level (defined by a capital C) (Simonton 2013; Csikszentmihalyi 1996). Csikszentmihalyi outlines this dilemma:

Who is right: the individual who believes in his or her own creativity, or the social milieu that denies it? If we take sides with the individual, then creativity becomes a subjective phenomenon. All it takes to be creative, then is an inner assurance that what I think or do is new and valuable. There is nothing wrong with defining creativity this way, as long as we realize that this is not at all what the term originally was supposed to mean—namely, to bring into existence something genuinely new that is valued enough to be added to the culture. (Csikszentmihalyi 1996)

For his studies he prefers the notion that creativity is confirmed by society to be novel and transformative. However, he then uses these examples of societal Creativity to explore how everyone might employ traits of creativity into their everyday lives. This
builds on his previous work on the power of flow to influence happiness (Csikszentmihalyi 2002). He goes on to define creativity according to three types:

- Interesting and stimulating people with uncommon thoughts
- Those who experience the world in novel ways
- Individuals, identified by the public, who cause a significant shift in culture. (Csikszentmihalyi 1996).

These definitions, he argues, counter the suggestion, ‘that the term “creativity” as commonly used covers too much ground. It refers to very different entities, thus causing a great deal of confusion’ (Csikszentmihalyi 1996). Others have also argued that creativity is a term that has become conflated and meaningless through overuse:

"Creative", "Creation", "Creativity" are some of the most overused and ultimately debased words in the language. Stripped of any special significance by a generation of bureaucrats, civil servants, managers and politicians, lazily used as political margarine to spread approvingly and inclusively over any activity with a non-material element to it, the word "creative" has become almost unusable. Politics and the ideology of ordinariness, the wish not to put anyone down, the determination not to exalt the exceptional...have seen to that. (Sawyer 2012)

This is therefore a problem that has been heightened by the extensive use of the term in British politics, especially during New Labour’s Creative Britain strategy. Either creativity is the realm of the elite practitioner who has honed a particular craft and therefore can be labelled as creative, or it is a more democratic process whereby we all have access to brief moments of creativity in our day-to-day lives. In many ways the two cannot exist alongside one another.

To counter these accusations of conflation and nebulousness, many researchers of creativity focus on finding a definition for the term. According to Csikszentmihalyi, creativity can only be acknowledged if it is considered to have transformed the domain.

---

34 In short this work looks to finding a balance the levels of challenge and skill of a task that enables a hyperfocus called flow. Csikszentmihalyi argues the longer a person stays in flow the happier they will be.
What is not immediately apparent is how individuals might be creative in a way that is not necessarily construed by the public to be positive. What would detrimental creativities look like? Furthermore, restricting the creative individual to those acknowledged by wider society dismisses the small and everyday ways in which people interact with, perform and shift their culture in small, yet significant ways. It also does not seem to account for some of the problematic power relations associated with notions of novelty and discovery in the public imagination. Unofficial and lay forms of creativity remain outside this definition and it doesn’t fully account for changes in perceptions over time.35 What is clear is that notions of creativity and how it is possible to be creative are constantly being reassessed. This is therefore a shifting term with political potential.

There seem to be two possibilities. Creativity could be dismissed as a term that has lost its meaning due to its overuse and kitsch undertones in political policy. This is in many ways the intention of social theorist Thomas Osborne in his ‘philistine rant’ against the term (Osborne 2003: 507). He criticizes the widespread use of creativity and draws upon philosophers including Deleuze, Leavis and Cézanne to escape what he recognizes as the moral edict to be creative. Osborne’s useful essay makes the case for moving beyond creativity as a term and to encourage critical interrogation of the concept. He argues that ideas of inventiveness and an ethics of inertia, ‘can help liberate us from the potentially moronic consequences of the doctrine of creativity’ (Osborne 2003). However, we have already established that a substantial body of work and activity is undertaken under the name of creativity.

35 For example, what about an individual’s contributions which are only recognized in their field after their lifetime or those who are creative by existing beyond and disrupting institutional ways of knowing?
Rather than abandoning the term a critical re-thinking of creativity could provide yet another facet to the study of the concept and especially how it constructs naturecultures. This is not to discredit exceptionally talented craftspeople and makers but to democratize the possibility or propensity for creativity. Instead of trying to define it as a particular process, product or person, creativity could be seen as an emerging out of something being missing, a kind of making in itself. Csikszentmihalyi again:

The creative process starts with a sense that there is a puzzle somewhere, or task to be accomplished. Perhaps something is not right, somewhere there is a conflict, a tension, a need to be satisfied. The problematic issue can be triggered by a personal experience, by a lack of fit in the symbolic system, by the stimulation of colleagues, or by public needs. In any case, without such felt tension that attracts the psychic energy of the person, there is no need for a new response. Therefore, without a stimulus of some sort, the creative process is unlikely to start. (Csikszentmihalyi 1996)

Furthermore this allows a critical opening up of who can be creative and where this creativity is fostered. For, although creativity can be inspired by being in or moving through aesthetic settings, ‘[i]t is true that inspiration does not come only in locations sanctioned by the board of tourism’ (Csikszentmihalyi 1996). Referring to individual and lay forms of creativity as societally significant, a notion of everyday creativities can emerge. Csikszentmihalyi touches on what this might mean:

Even though personal creativity may not lead to fame and fortune, it can do something that from the individual’s point of view is even more important: make day-to-day experiences more vivid, more enjoyable, more rewarding. (Csikszentmihalyi 1996)

Eliminating the need for societal recognition as a boundary for creativity expands the political potential of creative engagements for all. What is significant here is acknowledging that these everyday creative encounters have the power to shape the world. Furthermore, it is curiosity that enhances this creative action, so that the creative person is attuned to the richness of the world and to their political agency within it. Not only can everyone be creative, these creative encounters bring novel, stimulating and significant changes to the world.
2.6 Chapter conclusion

Broadly speaking, this thesis addresses the multiple ways in which people respond creatively to a changing heritage site. The research addresses a wide variety of fields within the cultural and historical literature. For this reason this chapter has been shaped around the four central themes of the thesis to gather and articulate these debates by way of introduction. These are: *heritages of change*, *disciplining nature*, *performing policy* and *placing creativity*. The scope for exploring these tensions here is limited and therefore the sections above provide little more than an initial introduction to the debates in which this research project is situated.

The Jurassic Coast is a heritage site that is constantly changing both conceptually and materially. Therefore, it assembles interesting intersections between the cultural and the natural in the way it is managed. These are contextualized amongst regional, national and international attitudes towards national heritage and cultural policy, especially that of the public arts. Therefore, alongside these dynamics, this research opens up space to think about naturecultures within management and policy. Within this context, the agency of the term *creativity* can be stretched beyond the way it has been conventionally used within geography in recent years. The project therefore required a methodological approach that would address the conceptual tensions between naturecultures, alongside bureaucratic and performed processes of everyday decision-making and the politics of policy writing. It is these methodological approaches that will be addressed in the following chapter.
3 Chapter Three: creative geo-investigations

3.1 Introduction

While situated within the traditions of cultural and historical geography, this thesis presents new approaches to research on heritage and arts policy through its site-specific engagement with practice. The methodology developed through the research made space for considering the agency of performance and everyday exchange in order to understand conceptual political and economic debates. The approach to this research has been influenced by work that uses ethnographic techniques to acknowledge the embodied researcher within decision-making processes (Crang 1994). Guided by a multi-local ethnographic approach, as defined by Cook, the way in which policy and practice travels along the site works is explored by connecting seemingly disparate actors to re-think notions of creativity (Cook 2005). A site-specific approach to the policy and practice of creativity on the Jurassic Coast has also called for an ‘ad-hoc archaeology of the recent past’ (DeSilvey 2006: 318-319) to produce what Dydia DeLyser terms an archival autoethnography (DeLyser 2015). The researcher is positioned at the centre of this site-specific approach to policy, which undertakes archival research into organisational archives and weaves through the narratives of practitioners as they engage in constructing the Jurassic Coast through entanglements of policy and practice.

Logistically and financially, the research project was facilitated through the Arts and Humanities Research Council’s (AHRC) Collaborative Doctoral Award (CDA) studentship in partnership with the Dorset and East Devon WHS. This formalized a collaborative relationship with the Jurassic Coast WHS from the outset of the studentship. Access to the team and financial support for travel along the site was
included within this agreement. Additionally, the Jurassic Coast team were incredibly generous with providing access to their archival resources and also inviting me to attend team meetings on a regular basis and participate in management discussions for the site, without stipulating any formal requirements in return.

I therefore, to a certain extent, had freedom of access to resources and personnel during the period of this project. This enabled a flexible and creative approach to researching the policy and practice of heritage management on the Jurassic Coast. Research was conducted through a triangulation of interview, ethnographic and archival methods. This enabled the research enquiries to effectively investigate the products, processes and people who construct the *Creative Coast*.

3.2 Ethnography

Using techniques from ethnography, specifically participant observation, this project sought to approach policy in a site-specific way. Not only did this allow for localised and embedded research on international heritage policy, but it also enabled investigation into the locations and definitions of what constituted the site of the Jurassic Coast. Despite its somewhat problematic origins in social anthropology, and subsequent associations with colonialism, the techniques of ethnography have been enthusiastically adopted within a wide range of social sciences, including geography. The broad aim is conventionally that an external researcher enters “indigenous” communities in order to understand them more thoroughly through personal engagement (Jupp 2006; Stewart 1998; Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw 1995). Emerson, Fretz and Shaw emphasise that ethnographic research is not about finding the truth about a community but exploring the multiple truths evident in others’ lives (Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw 1995).
As a way to engage with the policies and practices of the heritage sector, I employed ethnography within the institutional setting of the Jurassic Coast. This allowed me to work with and write about policy and practice in a peopled and embodied way and make observations and engagements with the quotidian entanglements of policy on the site. In many ways, this responds to recent work in institutional ethnography (IE) within the discipline of human geography. In 2015, Billo and Mountz (Billo and Mountz 2015) suggested that engagement with institutional ethnography in geography is limited. They claim this ‘fragmented history of engagement’, (Billo and Mountz 2015) ignores IE’s potential usefulness for geographical enquiry into institutional agendas. IE, they argue, allows interaction with aspects of an institution including ‘conceptualization, socio-spatial relations, [and] effects in daily life’ (Billo and Mountz 2015).

Therefore, this research project seeks to contribute to this sub-field by employing ethnographic techniques within the institutional setting as a method of researching policy in its place. Ethnographic techniques enable interaction with the grounded, stickiness of policy as it circulates within and beyond the institution of the Jurassic Coast. As described in the previous chapter, one of the main themes threaded through this research was the critical engagement with policy as a grounded and performed series of practices, entangled between statements on written policy document and the embodied everyday lives of practitioners and policy-makers. This project to re-place policy, to bring it out from the page and into its performed networks of practice, aligns with humanist geographer Ley’s critique of Goffman and Weber’s ‘pure’ or ‘total’ organisations (1961 in Billo and Mountz 2015: 201), suggesting that they are in fact, ‘distinctly and unevenly… operated on the ground’ (Billo and Mountz 2015).

36 For more detail please see Chapter Two: literature review. Specifically section 2.4: performing policy.
Through participant observation, this research has engaged with the sites in which employees and external practitioners make decisions about the Jurassic Coast. This includes the spaces in which policies are conceived and performed during the processes of management of the WHS. Originating in the offices of the Dorset County Council, where the WHS management team was nominally based during the research period, the site explorations expanded outwards along the coast to alternative spaces of policy and practice. As a researcher this predominantly involved a combination of full days at the County Hall offices and visits with the team to locations along the WHS. The mobility of the approach provided engagements with the, ‘daily happenings within and between institutions and their relationships to larger economic, political and cultural processes’ (Philo and Parr 2000: 514-515).

The approach therefore broadly aligns with Billo and Mountz’s conception of IE where the researcher is, ‘looking at institutions as sites where employees enact policies across time and space, where the everyday relations among those theoretically conceived of as “outside” bleed into daily institutional life and vice versa’ (Billo and Mountz 2015). Understanding these blurred boundaries between the institution and the practitioners’ daily lives required flexibility and sensitivity. This approach therefore sought to maintain contact with research participants in a regular routine over a longer period of time, allowing for immersive depth. In total this research is based on over 130 days of participant observation; in general the aim was to meet with the Jurassic Coast team monthly between October 2012 and May 2016, and undertake activity in and around this schedule, which deepened the relationship and allowed access to the varied terrain of their activities [Appendix 1].

This meant that participant observation began almost at the outset of the studentship, with the start of a field diary and exploratory conversations from the start of October
2012. The methodologies employed were honed throughout the research process, and therefore early experiences, which are very important when entering a new community, were used as pilot field recording exercises for learning how to undertake IE in practice (Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw 1995). Building relationships, refining techniques and witnessing crucial moments of policy decision-making in the post-Olympic Summer 2012, was possible in these early stages of the research. The ethnographic methodology employed, as with other research techniques, were continually being altered and honed as I gained experience in both the methods and the research subject. This project and the methodologies employed evolved together through the embedded engagement with the Jurassic Coast organisations and its networks over a substantial period of time.

Practically this involved attending meetings and events in various, sometimes very distant, locations [Appendix 1]. This provided an invaluable embeddedness within the management of the WHS in remote meeting spaces, at picnic lunches and on exploratory walks along the coast with participants. These engagements provided situated and geographically grounded insights into the decision-making practices of the Jurassic Coast practitioners and those they work in partnership with. Ethnographic techniques highlighted the ways in which these practitioners socially construct this site, producing particular knowledges and identities for the Jurassic Coast. Beyond the formalized structure of the Jurassic Coast management, ethnographic methodologies enabled access to the liminal and marginal spaces of the WHS. These spaces of exception, where the Jurassic Coast is constructed and managed from beyond the bounds of the County Council and its personnel, enabled a mapping of the entangled and embodied movement of policy and practice through and beyond the World Heritage organisation (Billo and Mountz 2015).
A significant proportion of this project was therefore comprised of observing the various organisations with decision-making power along the Jurassic Coast WHS. Practically, as a researcher, this often involved switching between being a fly-on-the-wall observer and a contributor within these organisations and those working within them. This flexibility between a role as a participant and as observer was necessary to experience the ways in which creative organisations and individuals navigate funding, collaboration and policy as a part of their day-to-day practice. The project therefore employed ethnographic methodologies throughout to establish ‘what people do as well as what they say’ (Herbert 2000: 552). These included immersive techniques of participant observation, which Mike Crang and others have argued remain comparatively underutilized in the interview-dominant field of geography (Dowling, Lloyd, and Suchet-Pearson 2015; Crang 2002; Crang 1994).

In regards to the practice of participant observation, Behar states that ‘nothing is stranger than this business of humans observing other humans in order to write about them’ (Behar 1996: 5). In many ways, the process of participant observation can feel at best unnatural and at worst deceptive. Ian Cook outlines two distinct forms of participant observation: covert and overt (Cook 2005). Covert observation involves taking notes and recording the activities of people who are unaware of your research. There are often uncomfortable moments during this kind of research when participants become aware of your presence (Crang and Cook 2007). Furthermore, recording participants who are oblivious to their involvement within your research is one of the sensitive ethical problems to be navigated by the ethnographic researcher (Cloke et al. 2004). For this reason, and because of the pre-arranged access through the

---

37 These organisations included the Jurassic Coast team, Jurassic Coast Trust, Dorset Arts Trust, Natural England, Youth Hostel Association, Natural History Museum, and Dorset and Devon County Councils.
Collaborative Doctoral Award (CDA) studentship, I conducted participant observation as an overt and inclusive practice. This is recommended by Emerson, Fretz and Shaw (Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw 1995), who state that an additional advantage of researching in an overt manner is that it enables the researcher the flexibility of when, where and how to write research notes. I found this especially true in the context of meetings where I was able to write notes about decision-making without feeling too at odds with the context.

This approach also aligned itself with an over-arching ethos of democratic research praxis, which formed the backbone of the project. Recognising that I as the researcher had no more, or less, knowledge than the research participants, I sought to facilitate a sharing of research power as much as possible whilst conceding that ultimately it would be my own words which inscribed the social discourse (Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw 1995). Despite my best intentions, the distinctions between covert and overt participant observation were not always clear-cut in the messy realities of research. Although all efforts were made to keep this research overt no claims can be made that it remained overt at all times. For example, when conducting participant observation at local science festivals where encounters were brief and with a multitude of members of the public, overtly stating my research aims to every passer-by seemed inappropriate and at odds with the setting.

The practical guidance provided by Emerson, Fretz and Shaw in Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes formed an invaluable starting point for writing observations into a field diary (Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw 1995). As many of my observations involved “sitting in-on” meetings, note taking became a fairly unobtrusive yet overt way to record events and vignettes as they occurred. Laurier defined participant observation as, ‘the skill of doing and watching that we all do as part of our everyday lives without realizing it’ (Laurier
Writing field notes was a method of capturing the quotidian and often banal details of creative collaboration, policy-making and practice. These notes, if handwritten, were then expanded into a typed descriptive text including information from meeting minutes (if circulated), images, photos and quotations collected during the day. This thick description, largely guided by memory and recollection of events from scratch notes, formed a detailed diary of researcher observations that were then coded and analysed.

### 3.3 Interviewing

Archival and ethnographic research methods were supported by conversations with participants in the format of semi-structured interviews. Kevin Dunn describes the interview as 'a spoken exchange of information' (Dunn 2010: 101) and outlines four benefits of conducting interviews:

1. to contextualise knowledge from observation
2. to investigate complex behaviours and motivations
3. to collect a diversity of meaning, opinion and experience
4. to show respect for and empower research participants

(Dunn 2010).

Interviews therefore provided a way to include participants’ voices within the research. Additionally, interviewing was a useful method for gauging participants' opinions (Hoggart, Lees, and Davis 2002), allowing participants to raise issues that myself as the interviewer may not have thought of and to highlight any misunderstandings (Valentine 2005). Importantly this was not about establishing 'the public opinion' (Dunn 2010), as interviews are most useful for capturing some of the nuances of individual experience (Valentine 2005).
Interviewees were mostly encountered through the ethnographic research, but this was supported by “key-players” identified through textual analysis of the policy within the archives. Participants included practitioners active in the production of the Jurassic Coast team and its arts programmes as well as artists, scientists and practitioners from outside the boundaries of the WHS and the Creative Coast programmes. Participants were identified through a snowballing technique as the research evolved and questions emerged about the history of the arts programmes and beyond (Valentine 2005). Phillips and Johns state that these types of interviews require 'skill and tenacity from the researcher' (Phillips and Johns 2012: 147). Gaining access to certain arts and practitioner networks has required navigation with some gatekeepers. However, the formal positioning of my research within the Jurassic Coast team afforded me as a researcher access to many of the local networks central to the research questions through a position of power that had to be managed carefully. As already mentioned this positioning was accompanied with a certain authority and this tension is recurrent through the research project. As explored in the research ethics section below, the collaborative nature of this research allowed access to be made and relationships built with a range of possible participants. However, negotiating complex power relations, and minimizing the effects of the Jurassic Coast authority that formal connection through the CDA provided, required critical reflection and reflexivity throughout the research process.

As already mentioned, the interviews were semi-structured. I aimed to maintain a flexibility and natural flow of conversation as much as possible. This was because I saw the agency of the interviewee as an important part of the direction and construction of the research. I wanted their interests to guide the discussion when the opportunity arose. Despite this desire to pass on this power to participants, it is important to note that these accounts were likely to be, ‘performances or constructed
narratives rather than one-to-one reflections of daily life’ (Dowling, Lloyd, and Suchet-Pearson 2015). The interviews largely followed the aims of the research, as directed by this being the purpose for meeting initially. However, on occasion, participants also reflected on their own performance of policy through the interview process. Nevertheless, it is impossible to escape the fact that semi-structured interviews are restricted by the scope of questions asked and therefore deal with the issues and areas judged by the researcher to be relevant to the research (Dunn 2010). The fluidity and conversational tone of the interviews was aided in most cases by their context. Interviews were, where possible, held in venues familiar to the interviewee. These included cafés, the participants’ homes or studios and on walks along the coast. Many of the conversations that occurred on the move (either outside on the beach or in the studio) allowed the interview to be interrupted by objects or events of inspiration that triggered further thoughts in the conversation, taking the interview into unexpected yet fruitful terrain (Dowling, Lloyd, and Suchet-Pearson 2015).

Throughout the interviewing process I tried to remain attuned to the influence of my own position. I therefore adopted a reflexive research strategy to acknowledge my own positionality during the research (Phillips and Johns 2012). Positionality is, however, not just about the researcher themselves but the relationship between the researcher and the researched as well as how the researcher herself is viewed before, during and after the interview (Hoggart, Lees, and Davis 2002). These negotiations were often reflected on in the field diary, which embedded each interview event and transcript within a reflexive account of the meeting. This gave useful insights as to the various power relations and translations as they shifted and developed through the interview process. In the words of bell hooks:

I want to know your story. And then I will tell it back to you in a new way... Rewriting you, I write myself anew. I am still author, authority. (hooks 1990: 342)
Aware of my authority as the author I maintained reflexivity on my position through the processes of interviewing, transcribing and analysing. On reflection, my perspective sometimes shifted so that statements that meant one thing during an interview were often assigned new meanings as I became embedded and familiar with the archival materials and conducted further interviews. Nevertheless, I remained attuned to and humbled by the trust that participants showed me during the research. The final transcripts were close to a verbatim account of the interview and, if requested, were returned to the participants for editing before the coding process was undertaken. This, I hope, was an opportunity to democratise the process of gathering information and return some of the agency in the research process to the participants. Dunn states that allowing the interviewee to vet or authorise the transcript usually, 'improves the quality of your record' (Dunn 2010). This process of checking by participants also served to set up further questions and lines of enquiry for continuing interviews. Interview transcripts, once approved, were coded using the computer software NVivo. This enabled flexibility as the codes could be adjusted and amalgamated or separated as the project evolved. Even though this coding process remained within the digital constraints of the software, transcripts were also printed and sorted in material form to further develop an understanding of connections and tensions between different participant’s accounts.

Although there are other important ways of understanding meaning-making, the dominance of institutions in perpetuating discourses has been thought to be well communicated through the language of critical discourse analysis (Sharp 2011). Critical discourse analysis formed an important part of the approach to coding transcripts, especially when examining both the formal and informal arts policy. This involved examining the workings of policy through documents as well as through the spoken discourse of curators and arts intermediaries within the field diary. This established the disparity between what was stated in the policy documents and the
practices observed. It is hoped that through this approach to textual documents, including field-notes and interview transcripts, the languages and discourses of policy were critically elicited.

3.4 Organisational and ad-hoc archives

As a part of the CDA structure this research was facilitated by generous access to a wealth of archive material held by the Jurassic Coast WHS. However this volume of materials elicited several challenges. The archives of JCAP and CC2012 were located in multiple sites, both material and digital. Furthermore, the enormity of information and knowledge held within the various filing cabinets, box files and folders in Dorset County Council might have appeared to be a complete account; however this was misleading [Fig. 6]. As with any record of history there were gaps, silences, ghosts of the absent, words written between the lines (Crang 2003). So this archive was not complete and could not by itself narrate the history of this site. However, it did enable an elicitation of the multiple stories of construction and narration of the Jurassic Coast as a site. I found that creatively working with these organisational if somewhat ad-hoc archives opened discursive spaces as to the construction and circulation of the Creative Coast.

Ashmore, Craggs and Neate (2012) argue that when examining personal archives the where of the archive is critical. Working through collaborative archiving within domestic spaces, they challenge the clean, ordered restrictions of the institutional archive. They state:

Just as in libraries and other formal depositories, location plays a role in the encounter with archival materials. But rather than isolated materials delivered to reading rooms and worked through alone and where the labour of others provides only an audio background, these objects were enlivened through their place within the clutter of the domestic environment. (Ashmore, Craggs, and Neate 2012)
This engagement with the setting and social environment of archives is important. However, I was reluctant to settle with the binary classification set out above where the formal and informal spaces of archives are described as contrasting fields of research experience. The formal depository is influenced by its own contextual influences and, like the scientific lab, is as much of an embodied and messy experience as any other archival encounter (Livingstone 2003). The description above of an enlivened and interactive experience with archives is very similar to the, albeit institutional, context of the ad-hoc archives in the Dorset County Council offices.

Inevitably, to uncover the archival materials for the *Creative Coast* programmes, I needed to shift heavy boxes filled with books and flyers, or to ask the Site Manager to wheel their chair to one side in order to open the filing cabinet drawer fully enough to retrieve files. Additionally, these activities were played out to the soundtrack of burbling conversations, the on-going rings of unanswered phones, the questions by someone making a coffee round and some humorous exchanges being bantered across the room. In the setting of the Dorset County Council the majority of archival information was stored in filing cabinets. Matthew Kurtz explores the history of the ubiquitous filing cabinet to acknowledge the systems of organisation and control present within these ad-hoc archives (2001). In this context of control and order, the filing cabinet is a powerful invention. In the words of Kurtz they 'diffused like dandelions', not only structuring the methods of systematising organisations but, as he argues, forming the structure of organisations themselves (2001: 29). He states that controlling the archive equates to controlling memory.
Figure 6: The ad hoc archives filed in Dorchester County Hall, Creative Coast archive (photo: author)
Therefore, as with all archives, it was important to remain attuned to the ways in which the material was organised, what had been kept and what was missing. In ad-hoc archives such as the Creative Coast materials it was easy to forget that these systems of memory and control were threaded through the construction and composition of the materials. The powers inherent in systems of archives and filing were present in these ad-hoc archives within their seemingly unregimented form. Derrida traced back the word archive to the Greek αεκχειον, which was 'the residence of the superior magistrates, the archons, those who commanded' (Derrida 1996: 2; Featherstone 2000: 167). Additionally, Kurtz traces back the word file, which according to the Oxford English Dictionary relates quite simply to the Latin fila meaning thread (2001). This originated from the thread used by the Romans to bind separate sheets together. As Kurtz highlights, its meaning directly equates to unification. Similarly, Derrida refers to 'the archontic principle' in which in order to be an archive the documents and information are gathered together within the same space (Derrida 1995: 3). Unfortunately, this principle involves geographical conditioning in the organisation of information. For example, Derrida’s principle prevents the archival materials collated by the Arts Coordinator at Dorchester Hall from belonging to the same “archive” as the folders on my office shelf gifted to me by the Arts Programme Evaluator, or even to the files handed to me on CDs by the Arts Coordinator that resided on my office desk and computer on the University of Exeter's Streatham Campus. I would therefore contend that archives are not constructed through geographical unity, much like they are not constructed through a unity of time. In contrast it is the agency and embodied practices of the researcher that unifies disparate and ad-hoc archival materials through their modes of enquiry. It is my embodiment of these separate collections of information through the questions I have formulated as a part of this research, which connects multiple and mobile archives across different locations. Archival research therefore involves cross-referencing disparate materials, weaving various documents from
different sources together along with interview transcripts, field diary extracts and "eureka" moments in other settings. This broader, non-empirical notion of archives borrows from Foucault's notions of discourse where the archive is 'the general system of the formation and transformation of statements' (Foucault 1972: 130; Featherstone 2000).

If, as argued above, the agency of the researcher is elevated further in ad-hoc archives it could therefore be argued that questions of value become increasingly noticeable. This includes recognizing what has been identified as important to remember and what is ignored, or excluded. Including the acknowledgement that some materials are valued as "more suited" to archiving than others (Kurtz 2001). Bourdieu states that value 'emerges contextually and relates to the interests of those doing the valuing' (Cresswell 2012: 167; Bourdieu 1984). Therefore the agency of the researcher must be considered in this kind of research. Cresswell expands this point:

...seeing value as intrinsic to an object only hides the interests of those doing the valuing... Science and connoisseurship both partake of this illusion. (Cresswell 2012: 167)

The archivist also makes these problematic claims of value. Tensions to be navigated include which objects, theories, ideas, and methods should be held to be of better value than others. How can one possibly make value judgments if all things have a worth? The researcher using archives therefore undertakes a continual process of remembering and forgetting through materials. Judgments are conditional to each researcher and may alter as the archiving (and research) continues. Anxiety with this process can trigger a hoarder instinct within the researcher. A wish to leave nothing disturbed, preserve every minutia detail of the haphazard and disorder, to capture chaos. DeSilvey describes this continual nostalgia for a recent past when she laments, 'I wished I could go back to the moment before the string fell away' (DeSilvey 2007: 891). Mike Featherstone also talks of this angst of the researcher whilst constructing
an archive, 'the problem then becomes not what to put into the archive, but what one dare leave out' (Featherstone 2000: 161). With the sheer amount of ever increasing and diversifying information, in both material and digital form, it is impossible to capture but a fragment of the picture. However, this offers potential to subvert conventional archival practices as, 'potentially anything can become significant for archival reason' (Featherstone 2000: 170).

On one occasion during my interactions with the ad-hoc archives at Dorchester County Hall I remember being praised by a colleague for making it look much tidier than before. I was so disappointed that I had somehow ordered or filtered some of the contextual meaning of the archival materials away. I feared that I had not achieved what DeSilvey describes as the collaboration with the former organisation and collecting practices of 'those that left things behind' (DeSilvey 2007: 892). I felt I had overlooked the secret messages and meanings left in the order of pages facing one another or a haphazard note slipped in upside-down. I still had the clues manifested on the page with the faded coffee ring, turned down corner or ripped-out staple. But what worth were those without the detailed context of the pages within each file? In hindsight this was an over-reaction, I had maintained the groups of pages, sheets and notebooks in the same alignments and even the same order. But my fingerprints were on the files; it was obvious I had been there. The neatly aligned folders and files betrayed my presence [Fig. 7].

I needed to approach these archives differently. This came when I accepted my own narrative within that of the "official" archive, it was after all mine to use, and I suspected in many respects only kept so extensively by the Jurassic Coast team because of my research into the arts programmes. These folders, files, CDs and computer folders were part of the reason I was here, not just within Dorset County Hall but doing the
PhD in the first place. Likewise they were only kept together and in this location for my research. We were in a symbiotic relationship, these files and me, mutually dependent for our privileged existence in the offices of Dorset County Council. Approaching archival research in this manner enabled me to open up these methods again to a more creative or artistic approach. I embraced my agency as a nexus and catalyst for connections between these materials using ideas of collage to draw together matter and meaning. Working with archives and archival materials creatively enabled me to embrace my own embodiment and positionality at the core of this method of research.

Figure 7: A selection of archival arts materials from the ad hoc archive, Creative Coast archive (photo: author)
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38 On a few occasions I have rushed to the Jurassic Coast team offices in Dorchester to document or collect documents from the archive during a clear out.
3.5 Creative practice in geographical research

Wishing to engage with the richness of the artistic processes, products, and people with which I was engaging, I embraced creative processes myself to respond to ideas and concepts during the research. Therefore writing a field diary was not the only way in which ideas from ethnographic and embodied research were processed during this project. Creative responses weren’t regular or regulated but included drawing, collage, creative journaling, painting and photography. The outputs of this work will be evident through the following chapters (especially in Chapter Seven where I write about Tracing Coast-lines an exhibition I created and curated). Creative geographers need to be aware of ‘research tourism’ taking advantage of different and unfamiliar cultures (Thrift 2002; Marston and Leeuw 2013). However, the benefits of sharing in and developing practice beyond the realms of the discipline of geography have been widely acknowledged. Furthermore, working as creative geographers requires us to be attuned to the various ways in which our practice is political (Marston and Leeuw 2013; Paton 2013). Therefore, it was through creatively re-working archival materials, for example, that I understood their power in the decision-making process through repetition and juxtaposition. Additionally, by re-contextualising the materials I was able to question perceptions of unity and completeness in the archive.

For many, creative practice opens up new ways of doing geographical research. For example, Caitlin DeSilvey explored how her engagement with a sound artwork installation provided new perspectives on cultural memory-work in Milltown Montana (DeSilvey 2010). She rationalizes:

Creative mediations can open up alternative ways of knowing the past in place, and may offer resources for the researcher seeking more subtle and oblique strategies for exploring the performative aspects of cultural memory-work. (DeSilvey 2010: 492).
Her engagement with the sound artwork enabled DeSilvey to become ‘part of the memory-making process’ bringing a different perspective to her research (DeSilvey 2010: 506). Similarly Wilson and Jacot explored how enacting ethnography through graphic narratives elicited different material in the research process (Wilson and Jacot 2013). Their graphic output required visual information from participants transforming the fieldwork process. Graphic narratives also enabled the researchers to tell two stories simultaneously producing new opportunities for research presentation (Wilson and Jacot 2013). Similarly, I have found making images alongside my research to be a useful method of capturing information and storing ideas in different ways.

Alongside providing new approaches to geographical enquiry, creative methodologies have encouraged geographers to rethink some of their existing practice. For example, some geographers have sought to investigate the process and practice of writing. This was part of an acknowledgement that these the process of writing are often veiled by the sleek presentation of its published form (DeLyser and Hawkins 2014). Rethinking writing as a creative research tool that has always been a part of the geographers’ ‘craft’ has therefore enabled an acknowledgement of the process of writing as a part of the formation of geographical knowledge rather than simply a final representation of research findings (DeLyser and Hawkins 2014: 131; Cresswell 2014). Additionally, collectives have come together to find ways to expose the discursive process of collaborative writing (Cook et al. 2013). In this vein, field notes are included throughout this thesis to provide insight as to the experience of the researcher at certain moments. These are narratives that tell particular stories allowing the reader to see how some of the ideas for this final thesis were brought together. Another way of tracing the iterative
stages of the research is on the Jurassic Research blog, which I regularly posted to throughout the fieldwork process [Fig. 8].

Another way in which creative methodologies have influenced the practice of geography is the ways in which they have encouraged a re-thinking of the positionality of the researcher. As DeSilvey states:

I realized that I was acting as a conduit for material that might not have been included if I had not been involved, muddying the water with my intervention. (DeSilvey 2010: 502)

She notes that had she not have been connected with the piece her interpretation of how it worked may have been different. However, DeSilvey chose to be ‘honest about the way the piece worked on and through me’ (DeSilvey 2010: 502). Additionally, creative practices have enabled researchers to present the reflexivity of their positionality in new ways. For example, working through graphic narratives allows the researcher to illustrate themselves back into the frame of their research (Wilson and Jacot 2013). Creative practices therefore afford many opportunities to re-think and re-present the processes of geographical research. They also highlight the ethical issues and political implications of our own knowledge making practice. Therefore, the reflexive style of this thesis mirrors the creative ways in which it was undertaken.

---

FRAN | DRIFTWOOD DRAWINGS

November 16, 2014

When deciding how to present the images collected throughout my research I wanted to nod towards the materials that constructed and are constructed by the coastline.

I looked for a technique that experimented with the colour, form and line of the images – morphing them and altering their meaning.

I found this when I experimented with printing my archival research images onto driftwood. After searching various online craft blogs I came across the material for the best, Del Medium.

I printed theReverse Photographic on a laser printer and then coated them in the Del Medium before placing them in the wood. This I left to dry overnight and in the morning I rubbed away the top paper layer using a soft cloth and warm water.

This was a more unpredictable and labour intensive process than I had imagined. The texture and grains of the wood were tricky and at times frustrating. But as I continued I began to really enjoy the suspense of not knowing what image would emerge. Carefully constructed compositions were undermined and the lines and form of the wood dictated which features in the image would be picked out. Of course each fracture of wood was different from the last. Some became soiled very easily, others had varnish which seeped into the colour of the pictures, some were so nitid that the removal of the paper took away the majority of the image with it.

Orcombe Point, Simswarth ©Fran Rylenda

Figure 8: Screenshot of a post from the Jurassic Research blog (photo: author)
3.6 Research ethics

This research would simply not have been possible without the cooperation and generosity of time and ideas from those I encountered through the fieldwork process. It seems constricting to formalize many of these exchanges into a narrative of the “researcher” meeting “participants”. Yet, it is essential to be aware of the power and authority inherent within the identity and role of the researcher. Due to the collaborative nature of this research and the need for it to be integrated from the outset, a clear ethical framework was established early on. It was therefore important to clarify from the outset the kind of engagement I was expecting to do so that participants could get a clearer sense of why I was attending meetings, spending time in the office and at events. As a result of this two key documents were drawn up: a summary of the project aims [Appendix 2] and an interview consent form [Appendix 3].

As a way to practically introduce my research to potential participants I initially sent a summary of the project and its aims. I circulated this document prior to meetings and when contacting practitioners I was hoping to interview. Although this solved many problems in terms of gaining full explicit knowledge and consent for the research, it did hold some significant restrictions. First, the document whilst attempting to open up the project to participants undoubtedly guided some as to “what I was looking for”. This narrowed down the scope of the research and perhaps closed off some unforeseen avenues of enquiry. Additionally, the aims outlined on the document became reproduced, re-circulated and therefore a reinforced discourse to the research. Second, others may have assumed that their work was not relevant to the research and therefore disregarded the invitation. Third, sending the invitation did not guarantee that possible participants read it and therefore did not knowingly give consent. Some may not have wished to contribute but by not responding to the form and by being present in a meeting were a part of my observations. Additionally, as mentioned above
there were contexts where circulating the research form seemed inappropriate. Furthermore, in many ways I became tied up with the authority and power of the Jurassic Coast team. If practitioners wished to work with the team they sometimes became a part of the participant observation as a result. I hope that my personal approach enabled most participants to state when they wanted themselves or their comments to remain "off the record". However, I was acutely aware of this imbalance of power and I remained attuned to it throughout the analysis, coding and representation of field diary data.

The opinions and positioning of the researcher was inevitably biased and this was therefore acknowledged throughout the research. However, it was not enough to merely acknowledge the bias of positionality. Critical self-reflection was also required throughout, including sensitivity when handling and analysing the thoughts, opinions and actions of other people. This was mostly undertaken by writing a reflexive research journal, which formed a part of the research diary. A continued awareness of the respondents' voices it is hoped was retained throughout this thesis and its discussions.

There were specific influences upon the project as a CDA studentship, which was influenced by the formal relationship between the University of Exeter and Dorset County Council (on behalf of the Dorset and East Devon WHS). Formalized collaborative research and the Higher Education Impact agenda brings with it opportunities for funding and access on the behalf of all parties involved. However, it can also leave the researcher with many anxieties as to the instrumentality of their research. This project was about the Jurassic Coast organisation; there was no way to escape this. It was formed as part of a working relationship between the University of Exeter and the Jurassic Coast team in a strategic partnership. Although this may cause concerns as to the lack of an "organic" foundation, I feel it has been an important part
of this research that some of the initial questions and areas of enquiry came from the organisation itself. I embraced the opportunity to be embedded within the Jurassic Coast team and have been privileged to be a part of their work and practice as well as being present in meetings where decisions on policy were made. The inclusivity and trust afforded to myself by the Jurassic Coast has really been remarkable and I am extremely grateful for their generosity of resources, time and support.

Although being welcomed into an institution such as the Jurassic Coast has many benefits, there are limitations and restrictions to this form of research practice. For example, there were many that encountered the Jurassic Coast, and therefore by association myself, from an "outsiders" perspective. It was complex straddling a role of critical friend both within and outside of the boundaries of the Jurassic Coast organization. Additionally research conducted with such generous access to practitioners and confidential professional materials required the researcher to exercise judgment and integrity continually. To this extent, I hope I have conducted myself in the best way possible; it is certainly something I have been acutely aware of throughout the research process. Although I alternated between being an "insider" and an "outsider" to the Jurassic Coast organisation, there are undoubtedly blind spots within the research due to this embedded approach. At the same time, the constant questioning of oneself and one’s role within a group of people can make the researcher feel like the outsiders themselves; it can be a precarious position to be in for four years. At times my role felt awkward and inappropriate. However, despite the responsibilities associated with the roles of ethnographer and interviewer, I would argue there are times where it is best to sail with the wind, to get caught up in the moment and to enjoy the company of the people you are with. I hope I have succeeded as far as might reasonably expected to meet the expectations of those that have contributed to this research.
Even though participants consented to be a part of this research, due to the small networks that define the arts and heritage sectors, they are often still identifiable. For this reason recorded interviews, informal conversations and written correspondence are combined and referenced as personal communications (pers. comm.). This enables a critical engagement with institutional and organisational debates without signalling to specific events, individual conversations or correspondence. I have therefore afforded them a higher level of anonymity than they are expecting. Furthermore, pseudonyms do very little to mask the identity of the participant. Where possible practitioners have been identified according to their roles rather than names such as arts producer, science advisor, and evaluator. Although, when writing about specific published work, I have included artists' names where possible to recognise their identity as connected to their practice. Processes of anonymity have been especially difficult when referring to the Jurassic Coast team. I have listed the job role where possible, although occasionally, when it seems appropriate, I have simply referenced a “Jurassic Coast team member” to avoid singling out individual’s in an already small team. However, again when referring to published work and creative practice I have often mentioned the participant by name. This was to acknowledge their authorship over their practice.

3.7 A note on subjectivity and positionality

Throughout this research I have at different times defined myself, whether explicitly or implicitly, as a geographer, artist, performer, geology student, walker and, for a period, a television researcher. Sometimes I am all, often I feel as though I am none, these are emerging identities. Insecurities with my identity in relation to the research are a symptom of how I have attuned to the precarious position I find myself in. This threads its way through my research, in the conversations I start, the activities I participate in,
and the questions I do not follow up. How could it not? The story written between the lines of this research is the very real identity conflicts I found myself in as I defined my work according to the discipline of geography in a precarious economy. In particular, the contradiction between seeking to leave doors open and to also create a niche with an identity as a “specialist” is true for many of the participants in this research. Many of the career paths within the public arts and environment sectors are precarious and require prudent employment of multiple networks and identities. This note is simply an acknowledgement that I too am wrapped up in these tensions and contradictions.

3.8 Conclusion

This research has been undertaken through a triangulation of ethnography, interview and archival methods. This approach has enabled site-specific and peopled perspectives on the entanglements between policy and practice on the Jurassic Coast. Furthermore, it has also enabled engagement beyond the geographical and institutional boundaries of the site. Creativity and embodied practice was embraced within the research in order to appreciate the richness of art and the quotidian experiences of participants. There are many ethical complexities when working with an institution and its partners in such an embedded and personal way. Therefore, I acknowledge that this research is thoroughly directed by my own embodied experiences over the past four years, geographically, conceptually and emotionally.
Chapter Four: constructing the *Creative Coast*

4.1 Introduction

By examining the history of the Jurassic Coast Arts Programme (JCAP) and Creative Coast 2012 (CC2012), this chapter demonstrates how work with the public arts sector became embedded within the institutional structure of the WHS. The networks brought together through the arts programmes extended across the Jurassic Coast management team, Devon and Dorset County Councils and formal relationships with local arts organisations. Therefore, this is a story of the interplay between resources, infrastructure and conflicts of interest, and of tensions in the objectives that emerged as partners work together. By “people-ing” the policy of the Jurassic Coast and its arts programming, this research embeds itself within, and animates, the spaces and geographies of decision-making.

Tracking the way that the policies of JCAP and CC2012 were performed in practice is essential for understanding how “creative” and “artistic” approaches became important for the formal mechanisms of the Jurassic Coast. Both JCAP and CC2012 were situated within very particular political and economic moments within the United Kingdom. However, they have influenced the site by crafting a lens through which artistic encounters on the coastline has been understood, both historically and in projections of the future. The programmes therefore have important implications as to the role of creativity and creative practitioners in the construction of the heritage site. Furthermore, investigating the ways that creative policy happened in practice illustrates the tensions and complexities involved in the day-to-day workings of the creative industries in this region (Luckman 2015; Hewison 2014). As an ethnographic and site-specific approach to the history of public arts policy in relation to this WHS, this research contributes not only to understandings of heritage but also to practicalities of
working in the arts. It also provides an embodied, embedded and localised perspective to the workings of the public arts in England. The research, therefore, responds to national developments including the complexities of precarious labour and instrumentalism in the context of the creative industries (McRobbie 2016). Engaging with the specificities of project production and resource enables a localised and peopled analysis of the interplay between the public arts and heritage sector in the recent recession and post-recession economy in the UK.

The following chapter therefore addresses how the arts were embedded into decision-making processes on the Jurassic Coast. This was achieved through substantial funding facilitated by Arts Council England (ACE) for arts development for the heritage organisation and wider region. Arts programming on the Jurassic Coast supported a wealth of public activity and aimed to showcase this work alongside the international attention drawn by the Olympic Games 2012 and associated Cultural Olympiad. However, despite supporting a wide range of arts activities along the coastline the practicalities of working across sectors in new ways created certain tensions. These included mixed messages about ownership of project work and conflicting needs for publicity by contributing organisations. I argue that the Creative Coast agenda was able to meet some of the high aspirations of its policy. However, as a new practice for the Jurassic Coast organisation the infrastructure was not able to support the aspired work fully. These difficulties were magnified by an increasing awareness of the conflicting aims amongst partners as the arts programmes developed. These issues, alongside national influences, led the Jurassic Coast management to rethink approaches to working with the arts after the completion of CC2012. This chapter therefore traces complex timelines and multiple histories of the Jurassic Coast arts programming.
It seems fitting to begin the exploration of creative encounters along the Jurassic Coast in this thesis at the moment when arts practices became embedded within the written policy of the site’s management practices; when it became the Creative Coast. Initially, policies of the public arts and natural heritage in the region became officially recognized and integrated within professional practice during the creation and progression of the Creative Coast programmes. Together JCAP and CC2012 linked together a substantive body of artistic work in the region associated to the WHS over a period of five years [Fig. 9]. The strategy and planning was drawn together under the phrase Creative Coast.

4.1.1 The Creative Coast context

The Creative Coast was an innovative approach to heritage management, which sought to expand the interpretative reach of the Jurassic Coast through the public arts sector. Contextualised within the wind-down of the Creative Britain agenda the arts programming aimed to enhance the site through arts production and development (Hewison 2014). The arts provided new perspectives on the interpretation of the heritage of the Jurassic Coast site, however, complexities of cross-sectoral working and conflicting objectives complicated this ambitious programme of work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Creative Coast 2012 Final evaluation report published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fossil Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Creative Coast forum: Widening the Jurassic Coast Partnership; Barclays House, Poole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April</td>
<td><em>Exploring Erosion</em> commissioned to Dorset Arts Together (Dorset Loves Arts at the time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>April</td>
<td><em>ExLab Dialogue Day at Bridport Arts Centre</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>PhD Research Begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>Creative Coast forum: Arts, Science and Environment, University of Exeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>Coastal Voices performed at Weymouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July</td>
<td><em>Sturzstrom</em> is premiered at Beer Quarry Caves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Performance of <em>Desert Crossings</em> in Exmouth as part of Jurassic Coast Earth Festival 2012 - cancelled due to bad weather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td><em>etude</em> performed at Durlston Castle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Creative Coast forum: Arts, Festivals and Tourism; Portland Heights Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Creative Coast forum: Earth-art=Eh Monkton Wyld Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>Creative Coast 2012 launched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Crossings tour</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Coast JCAP Evaluation published</td>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurassic Coast Arts Programme ends – period of transition.</td>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossil Festival 2011: Pliosaur, MEMO festival, Desert Crossings, Jurassic Journey and Purbeck Clay</td>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011: Inspiration Aspiration Partnership</td>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurasic Journey premiered</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 2010: Inspiration Aspiration Partnership</td>
<td>Sept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First University of Exeter PhD studentship begins.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding and development for Coastal Voices begins (money allocated from JCAP) and Fossil Festival 2010 including B Sharp’s creative workshops on biodiversity and Herbie Treehead</td>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning a Festivals of Carnivals 2012 initiative conference at Weymouth college.</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Value Performance: Without Us at Lulworth Cove</td>
<td>Sept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurassic Coast Public Art Code published</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMO festival at Fossil Festival and Portland</td>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Sharp collaborative performance parade at Weymouth carnival.</td>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Value Performance: Here Now at Budleigh Salterton</td>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocks: from axe head to Zennor Head exhibition and Mapping the Jurassic Coast exhibition</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone, Paper, Scissors at Walford Mill, Wimborne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Value Performance: Without Us at Lulworth Cove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurassic Coast Public Art Code published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMO festival at Fossil Festival and Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Sharp collaborative performance parade at Weymouth carnival.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Value Performance: Here Now at Budleigh Salterton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocks: from axe head to Zennor Head exhibition and Mapping the Jurassic Coast exhibition</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone, Paper, Scissors at Walford Mill, Wimborne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Value Performance: Without Us at Lulworth Cove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurassic Coast Public Art Code published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMO festival at Fossil Festival and Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Sharp collaborative performance parade at Weymouth carnival.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Value Performance: Here Now at Budleigh Salterton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td><strong>Sept</strong> Universal Value Performance: <em>Origin of the Species</em> at West Bay Cultural Olympiad Launched</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>May</strong> Boat Trip from Exmouth is the launch event Jurassic Coast Arts Programme (JCAP) begins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td><strong>Dec</strong> Jurassic Coast awarded ACE G4A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Aug</strong> Consultants appointed to write G4A bid under the name the Jurassic Coast Arts Programme &quot;The only WHS to have such a strategy&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Public Arts Strategy published</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>May</strong> The first Fossil Festival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td><strong>March</strong> Jurassic Coast Interpretation Action Plan published</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Jurassic Coast World Heritage Site: Scoping Study on Interpretation Facilities undertaken by NHM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Jurassic Coast World Heritage team established</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Dorset and East Devon World Heritage Site Designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Idea to make this coastline a WHS first suggested at Lyme Bay Forum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9: Timeline of activity leading to and during the JCAP and CC2012
The first formalised programme (JCAP) ran from 2008-2011. The funding facilitated the employment of an Arts Coordinator within the Jurassic Coast management team, as well as other personnel support. Fundamentally, JCAP had the aspiration:

To encourage residents and visitors of all ages to visit and experience the Jurassic Coast for themselves and to understand it more profoundly through high quality arts experiences. (Schwarz 2011: 4)

This first programme was overseen by the Creative Coast Group and supported twenty-two arts projects based along the site. It involved 90 artists, 12 new art works, 3,000 participants and 60,000 audience members.

In 2011-2013 this work was continued, with some of the original funding carried forward into a legacy project, CC2012, which was designed to run alongside the Cultural Olympiad and Olympic Games 2012. In 2011 the Jurassic Coast was awarded further £92,000 funding from the ACE for CC2012. This second programme had a slightly different aim. It hoped to ‘engage people’s imaginations with the stories of the Jurassic Coast WHS by building the creative sector into the management of the site’ (Schwarz 2013: 4). Therefore, rather than seed-funding new projects, the strategy for CC2012 was to work with pre-existing projects and delivery partners to coordinate a collective programme of ‘great arts and science projects’ linked to the WHS (Schwarz 2013). There were nine partners listed in the evaluation of CC2012 as ‘actual delivery partners’ (Schwarz 2013). Alongside these art projects, four Creative Coast forum events were held to support networking between practitioners working in the arts,

40 ACE awarded £123,000 under the Southwest G4A scheme. A full budget income for the JCAP is listed in Appendix 4.

41 These were the University of Exeter AHRC Collaborative Doctoral Awards, the Lyme Regis Development Trust for the Jurassic Coast Earth Festival, the Lighthouse, Poole for Coastal Voices, Big Picture with ExLab, State of Emergency with Desert Crossings, Arts Reach and Villages in Action with Ben Osborne and Jurassic Journey, Helen Poyner with Walk of Life, Quest Ltd. with The Battle for the Winds and artists Amanda Wallwork and Jeremy Gardiner’s exhibition Coast Uncovered. Activate Performing Arts were also listed as an organisation with whom the Jurassic Coast had had a supporting role, but were not listed as delivery partners.
museums, environment, science, and tourism sectors. Additionally, CC2012 included developing publicity for Creative Coast, which was promoted locally, nationally and internationally as innovative ways of arts working with natural WHSs. Therefore, as part of CC2012 an advocacy document was published by the Arts Coordinator to share information about these programmes with other WHSs and other networks. Because of this work JCAP and CC2012 are seen internationally as examples of good practice for heritage working with the public arts to increase engagement and develop how visitors and residents experience heritage.

4.1.2 The development of JCAP and CC2012.

The origins of arts programming on the Jurassic Coast was embedded within the establishment of the site itself. Ever since the development of the Jurassic Coast as a WHS there had been an increasing call for artistic outputs. Soon after the designation of the site, the Natural History Museum was commissioned to develop an Interpretation Scoping Study for the Jurassic Coast, which was published in 2003 (Bowers et al. 2003). Alongside many different suggestions for the development of the heritage interpretation, the report made several recommendations for widening interaction with local communities. Alongside the proposal for a coherent brand to unify the site, was the advice that:

the [heritage] offer must remain diverse. This will lead to a diversity of audiences, and be refreshing for repeat visitors. (Bowers et al. 2003)

It was suggested that some of the ways in which this diverse offer might manifest was through arts festivals and artist residencies. For the first time the arts had entered into the management policy of the Jurassic Coast site.

The place of the arts on the Jurassic Coast was further cemented through a detailed Interpretation Action Plan, which was published two years later in 2005 (JCWHS
Interpretation Action Plan 2005). Formed from a series of conversations with interest groups along the coast, the document specifically listed the arts as a way to engage lay audiences and excluded groups with the heritage messages of the site. It stated that the arts have:

High impact potential for raising awareness amongst lay audiences, engaging different groups (including more excluded groups), and for profile-raising, particularly out of season. These events are the responsibility of the individual towns or local authorities along the coast. (JCWHS Interpretation Action Plan 2005: 15)

As a result of these conclusions, the Action Plan suggested setting up a Jurassic Coast WHS Cultural Delivery Group to develop this approach by working with local partners to deliver the artistic outputs. In response the Creative Coast Group was formed and in 2006 a Public Arts Strategy was developed for the site. In it the vision for public arts on the WHS was described in the following terms:

The Jurassic Coast is culturally unique and creatively inspirational. The geological, scientific and environmental interest of the Coast, and its beauty as a place to live, relax and find inspiration is a powerful mix… The arts programme must be of global significance to match and underpin the international importance of the Jurassic Coast. (Morland and Mason 2005: 5)

After the WHS was awarded the G4A funding bid in late 2007, artistic practices were formally embedded within the management policy and practice of the WHS and JCAP officially began in March 2008. An Arts Co-ordinator was employed and the WHS was re-branded as the Creative Coast.

Enmeshed within concepts of “art/science collaboration” and interdisciplinary working, by its launch JCAP was no longer about introducing arts to the management of the site but about integrating ideas of creativity into its ethos. This intention is evident in documents such as the Jurassic Coast Public Art Code, published in 2009, which stated:

The purpose of the Arts Programme is to encourage residents and visitors of all ages to visit and experience the Jurassic Coast for themselves and to
understand it more profoundly through high quality arts experiences. The projects which form the Arts Programme must be of the highest quality to match and underpin the international importance of the Jurassic Coast and provide opportunities for artists to create new work in a context of international significance. (Evans and Bolt 2009: 2. Emphasis added)

As illustrated by the wording of the Public Art Code, JCAP sought to embed arts practice into residents’ and visitors’ engagement with the WHS. The arts programme had an ambitious remit to attract new audiences and foster artistic work of international significance. At this moment in the policy-making process, the uses of the term creativity to mean the arts began to be blurred in arts policy on the Jurassic Coast. This is likely, in part, to be due to the irresistible alliteration between the terms ‘creativity’ and ‘coast’. Nevertheless, the Jurassic Coast started to be branded as a place that inspired creativity due to its unique heritage value. Furthermore, rather than simply employing creativity as a tool for interpretation the Public Art Code had reinforced the idea that the site itself was ‘unique and creatively inspirational’ (Evans and Bolt 2009).

4.1.3 Outlining the chapter structure

In summary, the way the term creativity was employed within the management strategy of the Jurassic Coast prompted some interesting issues as to who inscribed the narrative of the WHS and who had the power to create. The multiple ways in which creative practices have developed within the management of the Jurassic Coast WHS will be explored over the following pages. Needless to say, creative practices are evident in many different forms and are driven by different motivations, outputs and strategies. This thesis investigates the employment of the arts in this natural heritage environment. In particular this chapter explores the tensions between communicating science and facilitating world-class art, and it questions which kinds of creativity are recognized within this policy context.
This approach adopts the notion that the creative policy of JCAP and CC2012 was performed and enacted by a series of actors. Establishing policy as performance, in the following pages a history of the programme is traced through a series of events. These events are:

1. A boat trip from Exmouth: 23rd May 2008
3. Shifting strategies from JCAP to CC2012: May - September 2011
4. The premier of Coastal Voices at Beer Quarry Caves: 1st June 2012
5. The ExLab Dialogue Day at Bridport Arts Centre: 24th October 2012
6. The final Creative Coast forum at Barclay’s building, Poole: 8th May 2013

In the following accounts a broad transition may be distinguished. The early coming together at events such as the boat trip were dominated by a sense of anticipation and high aspirations. These early expectations were evident in ambitious early projects such as Universal Value in 2008. As the complex relationships between different organisations and interest groups were projected onto the multiple locations along the coast a different strategy needed to be employed. The Creative Coast programmes increasingly took advantage of a mosaic of funding sources and strategic uses of limited resources. In addition, ideas of collaboration and collaborative working became prominent in the practices of many of the arts organisations involved in the programme.

The partnerships that contributed to JCAP and CC2012 were complex and some were perceived to be more successful than others. This became vocalized during moments of reflection, especially in autumn 2012 when evaluations of the various Creative Coast projects were undertaken, such as that for ExLab. These moments also allowed for reflection on the success of collaborations across professional sectors. The post-Cultural Olympiad climate was very different with increasingly limited funding from bodies such as ACE. As a result, a new form of structured policy attachment for the arts became institutionalized within Dorset County Council.
4.2 Who’s on board: boat trip 23rd May 2008

4.2.1 Finding a beginning

There were many voices that inputted into the design of the arts programme and how it might work with the local arts community and develop the interpretation of the site. Consultation occurred over a period of five years, which meant that many of the issues and opportunities outlined at the early strategy development stages were less appropriate later on. Additionally, practitioners from different backgrounds had different perspectives. Through the long period of consultation and strategy building the voices of the arts development sector became increasingly dominant as funding was targeted to ACE. The Jurassic Coast Arts Strategy written in 2005 stated that over 400 people were involved within its consultation. Released shortly after the announcement of Olympics being hosted in London in 2012, the strategy adopted the Cultural Olympiad into its approach with plans spanning the period of 2006-2013. This was an ambitious document calling for an extensive and wide-reaching series of arts projects along the WHS. It listed nine objectives including ‘to provide creative opportunities for resident and visiting artists’ and ‘to enrich the delivery of the Interpretation Plan and… its conservation, scientific, educational and tourism objectives’ (Morland and Mason 2005).

Around this time the Jurassic Coast Group was also split into various more directed groups. As a result the Creative Coast Group was formed by a selection of people who in many ways would provide the framework for and define the arts programmes. In, 2007 the group was awarded seed funding by ACE to develop its proposal. Consequently, two Strategic Development Managers developed a large G4A

---

42 The Jurassic Coast Group was divided into working groups where a network of experts and advisors who directed the early work of the Jurassic Coast in various areas including tourism, education and conservation. The Creative Coast Group was formed in 2005 to guide the way the Jurassic Coat would work with the arts. The group commissioned the strategy documents and the G4A funding bid to ACE.
application and funding was awarded in early 2008. This listed four phases as a strategy for building the infrastructure and network of arts projects linked to the WHS:

• Phase 1 Publication of the Arts Strategy (2005)
• Phase 2 Strategic Development (2006-2007)
• Phase 3 Implementation (2008-2011)
• Phase 4 Realising the aspiration (2011-2014)

(After Jurassic Coast World Heritage team 2007: 3)

The funding application proposed to support Phase 3 including the development of an arts programme that would bring some of the recommendations from the Arts Strategy into practice (this would become JCAP). This was to be followed by Phase 4 (CC2012), which was planned to include a legacy programme and consolidation of the work so far. It was supposed ‘that major projects of international importance will start to be realised within this time frame and the Jurassic Coast will be positioned as a leader in the application of arts within a WHS context’ (Jurassic Coast World Heritage team 2007).

Developed from the Arts Strategy document, the G4A proposal also incorporated integration with the Olympic plans for Weymouth as well as many other existing policy strategies in the region. These included Dorset’s National Indicator 11 status,\(^\text{43}\) new collaborative models and an increasing popularity for projects exploring the “two cultures” of the arts and the sciences, such as Cape Farewell.\(^\text{44}\) A boat trip in May 2008, at which the newly appointed Arts Coordinator was present, marked a transition

\(^\text{43}\) The National Indicator 11 (or Engagement in the Arts) is a Government measure for arts engagement measured as a percentage of adults (16+) who have engaged in the arts three times or more in the past 12 months. This was an important part of Dorset’s Cultural Strategy published in 2009.

\(^\text{44}\) Cape Farewell is an on-going collective of creative and scientist partners that link issues of climate change to cultural responses in the hope of inspiring transformative action. More information can be found on the project website: http://www.capefarewell.com/ [Last accessed 30/07/2016].
from years of planning, strategizing and funding applications in Phases 1 and 2 to activity and appointments in Phase 3. Although partly distorted by time, this boat trip still holds clues to the early motivations and aspirations of those constructing and performing the Jurassic Coast arts policy. For example, one of the recommendations was:

That a two-way and equal flow of influence and inspiration between scientists and artists is encouraged and supported as a core value of this strategy. (Morland and Mason 2005)

As this implies, conversation and the exchange of ideas across disciplines was designed to be at the core of the JCAP. Additionally the Arts Strategy had explicitly stated that the Arts Co-ordinator should ‘have considerable ability in developing the partnerships and networks that will be required’ (Morland and Mason 2005). As the first official networking event of JCAP, the boat trip in May became an example of this networking practice and the importance of the coastline to the interpretation of heritage and art on the site.

4.2.2 The structure of JCAP

The funding JCAP received from ACE’s G4A scheme was understood to be seed funding for projects that were either inspired by or interpreted the coast creatively. Guided by ACE and by various members of the Creative Coast Group, the funding application had specified a structure to achieve these goals (Arts Producer 2013, pers. comm., 25th July). This structure reflected the contemporary ethos within the public arts as well as areas of work seemingly in vogue. The application was organised into five themes, which were to permeate the programme for the next five years. These were:

1. **Arts and Earth Science** – Hoping to integrate artistic practice with scientific research, it was acknowledged that collaboration would require ‘ownership within both the artistic and scientific community’
2. **Carnival** – Listed as a theme with the hope of developing already strong relationships with The Pitons WHS in St Lucia where carnival was a primary art form. It was thought this would have links with the Cultural Olympiad, which also listed carnival as one of its themes.

3. **Celebration of Stone** – This theme had no specific planned outputs apart from using stone (which underpinned the heritage value of the Jurassic Coast) as inspiration for projects and activities.

4. **Jurassic Coast Fellowship** – At the time of the funding application this theme aimed to develop links with the University of Plymouth to create a Jurassic Coast Arts Fellowship.

5. **Sounds of the Coast** – The scientific communities along the site suggested this theme and in particular saw possibilities with audio recordings of the movement of the coastline for arts and educational projects involving local communities.

6. **Site Specific Arts** – Looking to integrate temporary and permanent public art interventions along the site, this theme included aspirations for new interpretation centres and physical infrastructures.

(Jurassic Coast World Heritage team 2007)

The JCAP structure was a therefore marked departure from the 2005 Arts Strategy, which had proposed the following themes linked to the WHS:

- Time
- Migration
- Origins
- Layers (geological and human, each generation building on the last)
- Landscape and the mind
• Climate change and the history of the earth

(Morland and Mason 2005).

The Arts Strategy had planned for these overarching themes to work on a three-year cycle to ‘deal with large concepts exemplified in the formation and history of the Coast and provide flexibility to embrace the widest range of arts projects’ (Morland and Mason 2005). The difference between the two documents reflected the increase in the influence of policy makers from the arts industries who tailored the project to appeal to ACE and to integrate with other aims in the public arts sector at the time. This could be attributed to the significant number of ACE affiliated members within the Creative Coast Group. However, it also shows the practical requirements for integrating the Jurassic Coast within an already active arts sector with ambitious plans for projects linked to the upcoming Cultural Olympiad already in place. The themes in the G4A application, therefore, not only fit with contemporary agendas within the public arts sector but also outline more clearly defined delivery plans. One of the most notable changes between the Arts Strategy in 2005 and the eventual G4A application in 2007 was the loss of the migration theme. Importantly, the Arts Strategy had involved consultation with the Black Environment Network (BEN) who had suggested the working theme ‘Pangaea: That one time we came from the same place’ and ‘Migration processes’ to discuss that ‘the history of people is the history of the movement of people across the earth’ and that this has parallels in the natural world (Morland and Mason 2005). In hindsight this was also a loss due to the BEN’s work in ‘the bringing

45 The Jurassic Coast site manager later suggested after JCAP and CC2012 were complete, that they felt in hindsight that it was written to fit arts agendas and not necessarily in keeping with the agendas of the Jurassic Coast as a conservation and environmental organisation.

46 The Creative Coast Group had strong links with local ACE networks. In fact its three chairs either came directly from or went on to work for ACE southwest (Schwarz 2011).
together of social, cultural and environmental concerns’ (Morland and Mason 2005). These aspects were not present in the JCAP and CC2012 strategy.

By the publication of the programme’s evaluation report in 2011, the themes that structured JCAP were listed as:

- Arts and earth science
- Celebration of Stone
- Carnival
- Sounds of the Coast
- Site Specific Arts

(Schwarz 2011)

The evaluation stated that these themes were retrospectively discussed within the Creative Coast Group with mixed conclusions as to their effectiveness (Schwarz 2011). Despite some of the initial aspirations these themes remained superfluous through the production of JCAP. It was concluded that they didn’t feature as a guiding framework for the arts programmes. The shifts in the policy themes and their employment within the Creative Coast strategy demonstrates conflict between the agendas of the Jurassic Coast and the arts fields from the outset. Themes acknowledged to fit the interpretation needs of the WHS were restructured as a key element of the G4A bid. This shift suited local contemporary agendas within the arts sector and fitted with ACE’s aims and objectives. However, the structure and organization of materials within the archive tell a different story. I would argue that, despite mixed opinion of their benefit, the themes continued to form a guiding framework and a focus for what work and projects should be undertaken for Creative Coast.

47 However, they did provide a guiding framework for three PhD CDAs which were designed according to the themes of carnival, celebration of stone and, arts and earth sciences (the final theme is that in which this thesis broadly sits).
One thing is certain; the G4A application generated a great deal of expectation within the communities and networks associated with both the Jurassic Coast and the public arts (Jurassic Coast 2013). It was suggested by the Arts Coordinator that the funding application had been written in a way to encompass all of these expectations within a very ambitious programme with a pressure to produce over 30 projects (Jurassic Coast 2013). The practicality of this themed structure was questioned early in the process of delivery. Despite this, these themes were a fundamental part of the structure of the policy that defined the practice of the programme over the next five years and beyond.

4.2.3 Who’s on board? Building networks across the arts and heritage.

Early on in this research I was told anecdotally that the best way to visualise and experience the geology of the Jurassic Coast was by sea. The boat trip on the 23rd May 2008 provided this view for participants in early discussions of how the Jurassic Coast Arts Programme might develop.

The importance of the seascape and its underlying geology is significant not only to this event but as to how the heritage of the site is interpreted more widely. The sequence geology along the WHS is more or less the same underwater as along the vertical cliff edges. Ribbons of rock flow from the inland rolling hills and valleys of Dorset and Devon to meet the sea at the coast and then continue in banded lines along the seafloor. The geology beneath the water is as complex as that on land. So as you traverse the coast by sea you are not only observing the change in geological environment through the Mesozoic period; you are also travelling over it. Furthermore, the geological idiosyncrasies influence the movement of the water, the roll of the waves and ultimately the course of the boat.
The significance of the geological exposures along the Jurassic Coast site is reliant upon the dynamic relationship between the land and sea. The action of the sea waves and the wind erode the cliffs exposing further layers in each rock strata, uncovering new fossils and providing further scientific evidence as to prehistoric Earth during the Mesozoic. Steinberg writes of geographers using 'the application of theories, methods, techniques, or analyses that cross the land-sea divide' (1999: 369). So what is the significance of this meeting being on the sea rather than on land? Kimberly Peters describes the sea as 'a space of difference, opposed to and dissimilar from the land' (Peters 2010: 1266). The boat trip was the device that encouraged site-specific practice at the start of JCAP. The site was therefore presented as the key element of the programme, which aimed to present the Jurassic Coast in new ways.

Field note: researching the Creative Coast archives, Dorchester – 15th July 2013

Ad-hoc archives, un-catalogued led to two sheets of paper, stapled together; within a grey box-file containing agendas and minutes from the Creative Coast Group tells us of a launch event [Fig. 10]. The stapled sheet listed the names of invited guests. On the crumpled white paper was inscribed a column of names. Suddenly these pages took on significance as I began to unravel the pun behind the list's title: Who's On Board. Who's on board the boat, who’s on board with the ideas, on board with the structure and networks of the programme? I scanned down the list and was surprised at the number of names I already recognized despite only being a couple of months into my research. I had met quite a few of these people already, as they were still involved in the arts programmes in 2013. Even if I had not already met them, I would have recognised the names as they had formed an integral part of the arts programmes. Not only did this list outline the inter-disciplinary networks drawn on at the beginning of the project but it also recorded the organisations and job titles associated with each name. It gave a real insight to the organizational structures in which the arts programmes had been manifest. I am eager to find out more and I will question research participants to hear their memories of the day.

---

48 Or at least these were the names that stuck out for me on the first reading. It is likely that many of those I didn’t recognise remained ‘silent’ in the research.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arjana Khetwa</td>
<td>WHS Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Bayer</td>
<td>ACE SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becca Gill</td>
<td>Activate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrie Treehead</td>
<td>Artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Sofiaar</td>
<td>Artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Crabtree</td>
<td>Artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Gardiner</td>
<td>Artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candida Blaker</td>
<td>Artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Walkworth</td>
<td>Artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jem Southam</td>
<td>Artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica Gardiner</td>
<td>Artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Head</td>
<td>Artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Dunford Wood</td>
<td>Artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell Wakelam</td>
<td>Artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammalisa Rennee</td>
<td>Art in Hospitals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Coulter</td>
<td>Beaford Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Wallace</td>
<td>Common Players</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Richards</td>
<td>Common Players</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Croose</td>
<td>Composer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Treacher</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna Morland</td>
<td>Creative Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Kay</td>
<td>DAISI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Hill</td>
<td>DAISI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisanda George</td>
<td>Devon County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Holder</td>
<td>Devon County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Whitfield</td>
<td>East Devon Artists Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Wright</td>
<td>Exeter Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Cunningham</td>
<td>Filmmaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Owen</td>
<td>Forkbeard Fantasy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Britton</td>
<td>Forkbeard Fantasy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Britton</td>
<td>Forkbeard Fantasy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Mason</td>
<td>Forkbeard Fantasy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Cowie</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Donaldson</td>
<td>HERDA SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Ledgard</td>
<td>Hidden Dorset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy Sutcliffe</td>
<td>InsideOut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jurassic Coast Arts Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10: The invitation list for the first JCAP boat trip, *Creative Coast archive* (photo: author).
In many ways the congregation of these people on this boat on this occasion formed a new community across the fields of science and the arts. The list of names in the archive provided an insight to the characters at the start of this tale. Although not included within the official archives, the deckhands, caterers, captain and other employees may well have influenced this micro-culture and its conversations. However, this small group of practitioners influenced the artistic practice and policy formation within the programme and beyond it. The Arts Coordinator described the event as an introductory event for themselves and the local professional networks built up around the Creative Coast project (Arts Coordinator 2013, pers. comm., 25th July). It was the first networking event of the programme and as such could well be considered to be its launch and therefore a key moment in the initial implementation of the early arts policy on the Jurassic Coast.

The expectations for what the arts programmes would bring to the site, as mentioned earlier, appears to have been high. They included the proposition of additional arts funding and activity as well as a re-branding of the Jurassic Coast as a hub of cultural and creative activity. One attendee stated that the list of delegates invited included, 'all the great and the good from the arts world' (Jurassic Coast team member 2013, pers. comm., 12th November). This was an event which congregated many Council members, arts organisations and producers as well as artists themselves. In this sense, the geography of the boat again becomes interesting. A member of the Jurassic Coast team mentioned that the boat setting was useful because everyone was located in the same place and as the meeting time was structured by the time at sea there was a focus to the discussion (Jurassic Coast team member 2013, pers. comm., 12th November). It is impossible to claim that it was a result of this boat trip that people gained power and influence over the direction of JCAP. However, these initial conversations were likely an important starting point for much of what was to come.
The invitation list contained many of the practitioners who were to become integral to the working of the programme. This is perhaps to be expected, however it does suggest that the way in which the Jurassic Coast would make partnerships with local arts practitioners had been pre-determined prior to the launch of the arts programme. There will be many who were invited but couldn’t make the event. As of yet these people remain largely unknown. However, this trip does seem to be an early reflection of the networks within which the policies of the arts programmes were to be performed.

4.2.4 Cast off! The arts programme sets sail

The boat trip was the first visible event of the Jurassic Coast arts strategy after several years of planning, consultation and funding applications. The launch of JCAP occurred at a particularly interesting national context as it coincided with the beginning of the Cultural Olympiad in the UK. The setting of this initial congregation of practitioners was made more intriguing by its location on a boat. This event has therefore been cited as a source of inspiration giving an insightful perspective on the relationship between seascapes and perceived creativity. Perhaps most importantly, the boat trip was where the Arts Coordinator, who had moved from London, was introduced to the existing networks of influence in the region. In many ways therefore this was a meeting that would structure the rest of the Creative Coast programming.

4.3 The Universal Value commission: Deep Time and the Origin of the Species

28th September 2008

We are potentially just another layer – one of many.
We are of the land, it is us, and we are it.49

---

The first art event followed shortly after the boat trip: a performance of *Origin of the Species* in September 2008 was the first of three performances in Charlie Morrissey’s *Deep Time* trilogy. Already in development at the launch of JCAP the project had emerged as a commission stream from Dorset-based arts organization PVA MediaLab under its *Art, Lifestyle and Globalisation* strand. The commission was initially given the name *Outstanding Universal Value* touching on one of the most prevalent terms within world heritage discourse. As explored in the chapters above, this is a ubiquitous term within world heritage discourse used to demonstrate that a particular aspect or trait of a site has such heritage value that it is supposed to transcend international political boundaries and to be of value for all of humanity. It is a highly contestable term, especially as it is often stated that preserving sites of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) as identified by UNESCO is a universal responsibility. The commission title was quickly shortened to *Universal Value* and its brief only scratched the surface of these issues. The commission focussed on the more immediate relationship with people and their environment rather than the politics and narratives played out by the world heritage community.

There is evidence from the outset of this project of its ambition to align with the launch of the Cultural Olympiad on the 28th September 2008. The commission was widely advertised in late August 2008 and the artist was selected from applications at the start of September. Alongside this very quick timeline for production was a tight budget of initially only £1,500 for the project [Fig. 11]. Furthermore, the *Universal Value* commission was split into three separate events spread across the period of a year from September 2008 to September 2009. The ambition for *Universal Value* was therefore to provide multiple arts events over a long period of time with limited resources. Charlie Morrissey’s proposal was selected and offered:
a trilogy exploring different aspects of human connections to the process of evolution, drawing attention to the land as a record of everything that has passed, and to human relationships to the landscape now. (Morrissey 2008)\(^5^0\)

As mentioned above, Morrissey’s triptych was titled Deep Time and was divided into three performances:

1. *Origin of the Species* 28\(^{th}\) September 2008 at West Bay
2. *Here Now* 17\(^{th}\) April 2009 at Budleigh Salterton
3. *Without Us* 12\(^{th}\) September 2009 at Lulworth Cove

Morrissey’s work was set out to be a site-specific response to three localized beaches along the Jurassic Coast and the people who inhabit these spaces.

---


---

Figure 11: Initial proposed budget for the Deep Time commission, Creative Coast archive (photo: author)
In the context of this thesis, *Universal Value* offers insight as to how early artistic events were structured within the nascent arts programme. It was also subject to what, in hindsight, were recurring tensions within the arts programme concerning commissioning, collaboration, publicity, and logistics. The ambition of the project quickly expanded reflecting the contemporary culture of artistic funding and assurances associated with the launch of the Cultural Olympiad and the build up to the London 2012 Olympic Games. The opportunistic policy was aligned with ambitious aims for the Cultural Olympiad to use cultural and creative activity to provide regeneration through increased tourism and visitors (Hewison 2014). Therefore, it was hoped the arts would not only provide the attraction for this tourism boost but would also serve as instruments for widening participation in the arts and social inclusion (Gilmore 2012). This second fragment of the history of JCAP demonstrates how these early expectations were placed on mostly small artist-led arts organisations without suitable infrastructure support to meet the aims of the overarching strategies of the Cultural Olympiad and JCAP. As a result, after an early experimental phase for JCAP, projects such as *Universal Value* were subsequently replaced by a pragmatic and structured approach to supporting projects as the limitations on resources at the level of project delivery and complexities of working on the site became apparent.

4.3.1 **Origin of the species**

*Origin of the Species* was performed at West Bay on Sunday 28th September 2008 after dark. A sixteen-minute video, composed of moving portraits of local people and visitors on the beach, was projected using East cliff as the screen [Fig. 8].

It was emblematic of Charlie Morrissey’s work which explores the interactions between the

---

51 Examples of Charlie Morrissey’s site-specific work is available at: https://vimeo.com/20976954. [Last accessed 03/12/2016].
human body and its setting. For example, an earlier piece Where the Land Meets the Sea was performed at Big Dance in Brighton in 2006 and involved 100 performers dancing on the beach at night-time with choreographed sequences in the water as well as group dances on the beach. Morrissey’s plans for Deep Time reflected this practice. However, despite the standing of the artist and the producers, and the high anticipation for JCAP, the first performance in Bridport was to a small audience. The producers were apparently nervous about the short development for the project and therefore only a few invitations went out:

![Figure 12: Origin of the Species at West Bay: the first performance of Deep Time, Creative Coast digital archive (photo: Third Party Copyright)](image)

52 For more information on Charlie Morrissey and his artistic influences see his website: http://www.charliemorrissey.com/about/ [Last accessed 24/08/2016].

Universal Value, the first thing we did, was [in] September 2008 so it was very, it was quick. And basically we put, we topped up [the] budget that [PVA Medialab] already had for doing a commission and supported [them] on making it Jurassic Coast suitable...Very opportunist I'd say... (Jurassic Coast team member 2013, pers. comm., 18th March)

While describing this initial event a member of the Jurassic Coast team described that, ‘all the key people were there but there wasn’t a big public audience’ (Jurassic Coast team member 2013, pers. comm., 18th March). In total it was estimated that 50 people attended the performance of Origin of the Species (Jurassic Coast team member 2013, pers. comm., 18th March). I was fascinated as to who these ‘key people’ might have been. It had been indicated by a member of the Jurassic Coast team that as a launch event for the Cultural Olympiad that weekend, the audience comprised members of ACE and other influential practitioners from the arts sector. Unfortunately, there seems to be no evidence of the guest list or audience within the Jurassic Coast archive. Whoever they were, this initial event despite its small audience built up momentum for the wider project.

All the audience comments for the entire commission on Charlie Morrissey's website were taken from this first influential group. Although the format suggests these responses appear to be for all three events on the webpage, they are in fact only from this initial and limited audience. This in part demonstrates the carefully constructed professional identity of some public artists and the need for funders such as ACE to see evidence of audience reception. It also illustrates the partiality of the programme’s archive, illuminating how silences and missing information can be as important as that which is visible within the recorded materials for an event.

4.3.2 Cultural Olympiad launches

As Morrissey's first performance event, Origin of the Species had been structured to become a part of the launch weekend of the Cultural Olympiad. It was listed alongside
other arts events in the region also linked to this national activity. In fact, the whole commission *Deep Time* became a part of the Cultural Olympiad in its build up to the Olympics, which was formalised when the project was awarded the London 2012 Inspire Mark.\(^{54}\) However, issues with branding and acknowledgement were also linked to the Cultural Olympiad.\(^{55}\) The limitations placed upon the Inspire Mark restricted the publicity of local funders on the national stage, despite the reach of the brand. In particular, this caused problems with recognition of funding support and subsumed the identity of local arts organisations underneath the umbrella of the Cultural Olympiad. It also therefore excluded local supporters of the arts from accessing the national publicity afforded by the Inspire Mark status. Additionally, the necessary negotiations with LOCOG were also seen to be a time consuming part of collaborative projects within JCAP:

> All the liaising with the Olympic stuff... they were very demanding with regard to logos. Branding things and they wouldn't let any other branding on anything that was branded by them unless it had been part of their branding. So there were a group of very large corporate sponsored backers who went into the – oh what was it called – the logo. The Inspire Mark was it? But you couldn't put the Inspire Mark on something and have local sponsors for the project as well... I think the Jurassic Coast was included in the Inspire Mark so you could with them. But if the Jurassic Coast had sponsors you couldn't put those on. And there was loads of wrangling about this sort of stuff, which was very demanding. (Arts Producer 2014, pers. comm., 22\(^{nd}\) April)

The complex negotiations and infrastructures associated with the Cultural Olympiad were not helped by the fact that the aims and structure of its programme were not made clear until it was well underway (Hewison 2014). It was a regularly discussed topic on the agenda of Creative Coast Group meetings as they continually strived to remain up to date with the latest strategy and how they might adjust *Creative Coast* policy to fit with the national cultural programming for the Olympics. The significance of

\(^{54}\) The Inspire Mark and its relationship with the JCAP is explored in more detail later in the chapter [section 4.6].

the Cultural Olympiad therefore cannot be understated within the early formation of the arts programmes policy. Another Arts Producer described the expectations during these early stages:

I think that it’s interesting here to look at expectations on the events which were originally just supposed to be works in progress but got pushed to be more and more public and high profile because of people’s expectations of the scale of [JCAP] and its part in the Cultural Olympiad. (Arts Producer 2013, pers. comm., 18th March)

Alongside this, the programme lengths of the Cultural Olympiad and JCAP conflicted. Although both began in 2008, the Olympiad ran until 2012 whereas JCAP was only funded until 2011. This discrepancy had been acknowledged within the development of JCAP and was partly unavoidable due to the structure of G4A funding which supported projects no longer than three years in length. Additionally, the funding climate shifted significantly between the winters of 2007-2008 as global economic recession took hold. The mismatch between the timeframes of the Cultural Olympiad and Creative Coast would bring difficulties later at a point when production of developed work was at its height.

The opportunistic connection between JCAP and the Olympiad launch also created tensions at the early stages of the programme. Initial projects, such as Universal Value, were quickly elevated to a national platform without the necessary practical resources for delivering these expectations. For example, the Cultural Olympiad scheme aimed for ‘diversity, inclusion and world-class performance’ through the arts (LOCOG 2012). These were ambitious goals for a recently launched commission coordinated by the internationally renowned, yet very small PVA MediaLab organisation. Furthermore, the aspirations for internationally renowned art and reaching wide ranging audiences shaped the way in which JCAP identified arts projects and artists with whom to work with. Included in the policy strategy for JCAP, the prevalence of the Cultural Olympiad within the sector encouraged large-scale projects reaching numerous audiences. In
addition, after five years of strategizing on how the Jurassic Coast might work with the arts, there was also a clear desire to begin to produce and support projects right from the outset of JCAP. The Arts Coordinator described this in a speech delivered later in the programme:

[T]here was an urgent need to start to actually do some stuff, and that the expectations, opinions, approaches and priorities of the various stakeholders were different, although I didn’t think this was insurmountable. (Arts Coordinator 2012)

Many practitioners had been involved in the interpretation strategies and consulting and devising of the arts strategy. Therefore, many of these practitioners had a clearer idea of what they were hoping to see from the arts programme than the recently appointed Arts Coordinator. Furthermore, it had been JCAP’s aim to create opportunities for artists to create new work inspired by the site and to enable the development of arts projects that enhanced the interpretation of the site. *Universal Value*, addressed both of these aims. However, as it was already a commissioning project set in motion by PVA MediaLab it was not creating these opportunities from scratch. Furthermore, although JCAP provided funding, it was not made explicitly clear within the archive how the programme developed the project to enhance the interpretation of the site, aside from through the commission’s initial brief and name. At the beginning of JCAP, the sheer amount of arts opportunities available and related to the site in some sense or other made focussing on what the arts programme might contribute harder to ascertain.

4.3.3 Here now

The second event for the Deep Time project was titled *Here Now*. It worked with dance groups across Devon and was held at Budleigh Salterton on the International Day of Dance. It was described in a Jurassic Coast press release sent out in April 2009:

---

The piece, inspired by the question ‘what does Outstanding Universal Value mean in the context of our World Heritage Site?’ is a comment on human presence as “inconceivably brief in the scale of geological time, our time as visitors, guests watched over indifferently by the land”. The work will combine live movement and projection and includes a specially commissioned soundtrack. (Jurassic Coast 2009)  

This second performance consisted of two videos and a performance by local participants [Fig. 13 and Fig. 14]. The first film was a re-edited version of that shown as a part of Origin of the Species at West Bay. A second was also shown, which Charlie Morrissey had filmed focusing on local people at West Bay. He described the purpose of the piece in the following words: ‘Here Now comments on the fact that our presence is inconceivably brief in the scale of geological time’ (Morrissey nd). This was a more ambitious project and the budget reflected this. Between the first and second events the budget rose from £3,250 to £8,000. The £750 funding from the WHS team was bolstered by an additional £1500 from Creative Coast resources. This was also supported by in kind support of £600 from Dance in Devon and £650 from Ocean Bay Caravan Park. Curiously £1000 was also listed, as the artists own resource, although again there are no further clues as to what this might have consisted of.  

Being far away from PVA MediaLab’s base and resources in Bridport was described as one of the biggest difficulties of this event for the producers. When technical problems surfaced, spare resources were not to hand. On the night of the performance it rained heavily, damaging the equipment. The budget and resources for a thorough wet weather contingency plan were lacking and replacements were too far away. When

---

58 Jurassic Coast. 2008. 2012 Framework projects v.8, 23rd September, Creative Coast digital archive, Dorchester.  
59 Jurassic Coast. 2011. Budget FINAL, Creative Coast digital archive, Dorchester.
Figure 13: Performance of Here Now: the second Deep Time event at Budleigh Salterton, Creative Coast digital archive (photo: Third Party Copyright)

Figure 14: Dancers performing Here Now at Budleigh Salterton, Creative Coast digital archive (photo: Third Party Copyright)
they were eventually able to get the equipment working it was much later in the evening than planned. The update to the Creative Coast Group from the event was revealing,

Event on 29th April was very disappointing – the weather was dreadful and we had severe equipment failure, and an obvious lack of contingency planning (Arts Coordinator 2009, pers. comm., 27th May).60

The disappointment registered at this meeting was likely to be partly a result of the high-expectations built up since the event the previous September. The difficulties with the weather highlighted teething-problems with project infrastructure and support for the outdoor beach location, especially when located far from the organizational base. Throughout the arts programmes the regions of East Devon and Purbeck on either end of the designated site were in many ways geographically isolated from the core hubs and networks of management in Dorchester and Bridport. Despite efforts made to spread activity along the Jurassic Coast, bias of infrastructure meant that residents and practitioners often lamented the isolation of locations from initiatives at the very east and very west of the site (Jurassic Coast resident 2013, pers. comm., 1st February). In this case, Deep Time was located at three locations along the length of the site, however there was a compromise for producers who worked remotely at each location.

Additionally, there were problems with ensuring that the artist met the obligations of their contract. There were failures in recruiting volunteers for the work and deadlines were missed during the production of the work. These issues combined to leave a disappointed audience, including about fifteen members from the Arts Council (Arts Producer 2014, pers. comm., 22nd April). This was particularly detrimental as the project had hoped to use momentum from the second event to fund larger activity for the third performance of Deep Time, due to take place later in the year.

---

4.3.4 Without us

The third event in the Deep Time triptych was held at Lulworth Cove in September 2009 and titled Without Us. Morrissey’s title was taken from The World Without Us a book written by American journalist Alan Weisman that explores what might happen to the natural and built environment if humans suddenly disappeared.⁶¹ There is very little detailed information about this final event within the archive despite its apparent scale. It seems that the relationship between the artist and project producers had disintegrated since the previous spring. The Arts Coordinator suggested that the artist had moved on to other work at this point; he wasn’t present at the performance. Without Us was originally planned to be performed at Winspit Quarry on the Isle of Purbeck but was subsequently moved to Lulworth Cove.

The report back to the Creative Coast Group suggested ‘continuing issues’ and a ‘mismatch’ between the expectations for the project and the capacity of the small production agency PVA MediaLab.⁶² By this stage it was implied within the Creative Coast Group records that a continuing commission for Universal Value was unlikely to occur. Another Universal Value commission was tentatively developed in 2010 with PVA supported by the Jurassic Coast Trust and the Fine Family Foundation rather than JCAP although this never came to fruition (Jurassic Coast 2010: 13). Unfortunately there is very limited material information about the third and final performance of Deep Time in the archive. This is probably due to some of the tensions and difficulties that arose through the project. However, in some ways this also reflects conflicting desires between the artist’s construction of transience and the structures of the Cultural

---


⁶² Jurassic Coast. 2009. Creative Coast Minutes, 21 September, Creative Coast digital archive, Dorchester: 2.
Olympiad, which aimed to build legacy and regeneration. Its influence is hard to describe and even harder to measure. There is a conflict therefore in the archives between the difficulties of capturing a transient artwork despite the programme’s efforts to sustain and report on the work. This tension between producing affective and influential art work and needing to reproduce and report on activity to continue to produce the work was articulated by a PVA MediaLab arts producer. They described the benefits of finding new ways of presenting artwork in Dorset with its lack of visual arts galleries and formalised arts spaces:

…for example projecting onto the cliffs at West Bay. Highly experimental, risky, but it worked like an absolute dream. Second time we tried to do it in another location and it was complete and utter mayhem. But you can create something transitory and beautiful and the people who experience it just are blown away by it and then you get the fall back, the response, which is why didn’t we know about it? Where is it? Where can we see it? And the fact is you can only do that once, because you want it to be special. What happens then? Do you just show a document of the actual...being projected that’s not the work? So you are then re-interpreting it for a new audience who might appreciate what it is but can’t experience the real thing. It’s a different piece of work. (Stevens 2011: np. Emphasis added.)

Reflecting on the successes and difficulties with *Universal Value*, this producer demonstrated how it is a difficult balance to meet the expectations of funders as well as providing flexible and ephemeral spaces for taking risks. With JCAP increasingly acting as an opportunistic match funder rather than a seed funder, even in these early stages, meeting expectations for audience demographics and record keeping were at odds with the artistic aims of the work.

4.3.5 *Universal value?*

The *Universal Value* commission in many ways demonstrated the early expectations and high aspirations for JCAP. The first event of *Deep Time: Origin of the Species* became the poster child for the *Creative Coast* [Fig. 12]. The image of a green face projected onto the cliffs was often used in presentation slides by the Jurassic Coast and was included in the final 2013 Advocacy Pack. This prompts questions as to the
effectiveness of reproducing art works in this way. Furthermore, Deep Time encountered issues with ownership over material as it was often implied in publicity that the Jurassic Coast had produced the work, with PVA MediaLab taking a backseat to the bigger brand. Reproductions of the work for publicity did not tell the entire story of the commission. Firstly, the project was referred to as Universal Value, the name of the commission stream rather than the artist’s name for the work: Deep Time. Additionally, the wider circulation of one or two photographs hid the absence of a range of information on the project within the archive. Furthermore, anticipation of the contribution of JCAP to the local arts sector was quickly undermined as some of these early projects were produced (for example Universal Value only received £1,500 from JCAP).

The pressures upon JCAP understandably influenced the policy and practice of arts on the Jurassic Coast. Placing the responsibility for managing the new arts programme within an organisation predominantly concerned with environment conservation was unusual. A Jurassic Coast team member described this period of the arts programme as a period of trial and error and reflected a lack of experience, expertise and understanding. They stated that they were:

…creating this sort of organisation or infrastructure from scratch… And so it was creating something out of nothing. And we had this money, this match-funding project and some of that worked all right and some of it didn’t work alright and some of it was. Some people were clearly just messing about with the money. And to use that to help promote their own aims and weren’t interested in the coast really. Others were fantastic and very interested in the coast and really wanted to promote it (Jurassic Coast team member 2013, pers. comm., 12th November).

This account perhaps illustrates a lack of experience of the structural demands of the public art sector within the organisation of the Jurassic Coast site. They refer to the strategy as match funding when in fact it was initially supposed to be seed funding. Revealingly when they speak of a disinterest in the coast this practitioner is referring
specifically to the WHS and its particular aims and objectives rather than the physical coastline. This is one of the earliest indications of a recurring tension between the agenda of the Jurassic Coast arts programmes and the established policy of the Jurassic Coast WHS. As already explored, the WHS was guided by UNESCO’s definition of Outstanding Universal Value and the concept that there are aspects of the site that are valuable for the entirety of humanity. This is a concept that *Universal Value* worked to interrogate by artfully exploring the relationship humanity forms with the environment and the past.

In conclusion, *Deep Time* was adopted into JCAP, born out of early enthusiasm at the opportunities of the G4A and a slightly unusual concept of match funding. It exposed some of the issues with the early programme’s infrastructure, which was overwhelmed by the ever-expanding scope of work it encompassed. The practicalities of hosting arts events in partnership with non-arts organisations hindered the early performance of this ambitious policy. This was magnified by a lack of resources and clarity regarding organisation and procedure. Additionally, there was confusion regarding the shared objectives and needs of the artist, producing body and JCAP, which exacerbated these tensions. In the later evaluation of this project it was identified that there had been some major issues and confusion about ownership of the work and the project. The extract below is taken from the official evaluation of the JCAP produced by a local arts evaluator who also evaluated the later CC2012 programme:

> From discussions with a range of people involved in the project, it is also clear there was some mismatch in project expectations amongst partners and stakeholders and a lack of clarity of roles and responsibilities. What was originally conceived as a project within PVA’s regular artist development programme was then assigned a wider role and significance, including acting as a regional launch for the Cultural Olympiad. It is likely that practical issues were manifestations of some fragmented working that could have been mitigated by a clearer mutual understanding of the partnership
(and what that meant for project management) between PVA MediaLab and Creative Coast (Schwarz 2011).63

On reflection, the Jurassic Coast team saw the Universal Value commission as an opportunistic attachment to an on-going programme of work by PVA MediaLab. Deep Time did provide visual material and activity for the early publicity of the programme. However, the burgeoning size of the events lacked essential resources and support. This was perhaps exemplified by the fact that images from Deep Time were widely used in the programme’s publicity but label the work as Universal Value a name more associated with the management of the WHS than the artist. Eventually the commission was dropped alongside an abandoning of Universal Value as a theme in JCAP. It was seen by the Creative Coast Group to be a little too generic to all WHSs rather than focussing on the specific activity along the Jurassic Coast. Meanwhile they were busy developing new projects, which fit the aims of JCAP and the Jurassic Coast site more explicitly.

4.4 Shifting strategies from JCAP to CC2012

From May 2008 until May 2011 JCAP supported the role of the Jurassic Coast Arts Coordinator and provided seed funding for public arts according to its five themes. In total between 25-30 individual projects were supported through the programme with a wide variety of outputs from an accordion player performing in an abandoned mine to groups of school children creating dinosaur models out of cardboard [Appendix 6].64 As

63 The JCAP and CC2012 evaluations were documents specifically written to report to the Arts Council addressing the aims and objectives of the project as outlined in the G4A bid. This project in contrast is contextualized within the conceptual debates of the work of art and heritage in the UK and therefore is interested in why the aims and objectives were developed in the first place as much as whether they were deemed to have been achieved through the activity of JCAP and CC2012. Although some of the conclusions between the official evaluation and my own are similar, it is important to state these differing aims.

64 The final number depends on how projects are defined and where the line is drawn between overlapping initiatives linked to JCAP. Over 30 projects were involved in JCAP in some form of official capacity or other although the extent of involvement varied widely. It is important to acknowledge here that this does not mean that these projects were not largely independent of
demonstrated by the lengthy list of projects brought into the JCAP umbrella, the structure of the programme became incredibly complex and confusing. This was not aided by a lack of clarity in much of the record keeping of JCAP in the archive. Furthermore, the level of financial contribution by the arts programme to individual projects varied according to each application. Some projects, which did not receive funding for a variety of reasons, were still included in the programme under the auspices that it might be mutually beneficial for the arts project and JCAP to do so. However, for this latter group it appears that the expected levels of contribution by both the programme and the partnership arts organisation were unclear for many projects. This led to mixed expectations across partnerships and a mutual dissatisfaction at objectives not being met.

Despite the complexities and seeming disjointedness of the eventual structure of JCAP it facilitated a phenomenal amount of output in terms of arts projects. Furthermore, activity was relatively evenly spread along the three years of the JCAP programme. There were approximately ten projects each year (although the exact numbers depend on where the divisions between projects are drawn). Spreading resources relatively thinly and targeting contributions towards specific goals achieved the vast number of events associated with JCAP.

At this point the Creative Coast strategy comprised attaching its policies onto existing arts projects. Using the JCAP funding to include the Jurassic Coast site in on-going artworks had become de rigueur. It was an effective way of incorporating the site in a wide range of local and regional artistic activity. However, it often meant that the Jurassic Coast. This is something that caused contention during JCAP, as arts practitioners believed their work was co-opted by the programme in a slapdash way that ignored the separate origins of each work and external sources of funding and partnerships.
specific interpretational aims of the WHS became an afterthought in arts projects. As a result, engagement with the scientific interpretations of the site was mixed. There was an increasing sense, especially amongst the site management team, that the Jurassic Coast was being shoehorned into some existing art projects simply to bolster publicity and funding. This was rocky ground as in many ways this was the aim of JCAP. But with networks and personnel thinly spread, the relationships required for thorough and embedded partnerships across the arts and heritage sectors was limited.

Towards the end of JCAP the policy strategy shifted. Rather than making small piecemeal donations (between £1,000- £4,250) to many projects in an opportunistic way, the Creative Coast Group selected fewer projects to more substantially support. These were:

- Ben Osborne’s Jurassic Journey
- State of Emergency with Desert Crossings65
- Poole Lighthouse and partners with Coastal Voices
- The Big Picture collaboration and Exploratory Laboratory (ExLab)
- Activate and partners with a large carnival event (this would become Battle for the Winds).
- Lyme Regis Development Trust and the Jurassic Coast Earth Festival 2012.

It was thought that a focus on fewer but more substantial projects would enable the Creative Coast programme to appear more coherent and focussed whilst maintaining a diverse range of outputs [Fig. 15 and Fig. 16]. Each project received between £10,000-£30,000, which was typically contributed on the condition that this funding would

65 Although listed as one of the projects to receive further substantial funding the evidence in the archive (and in the evaluation report sent to the Arts Council) suggest that Desert Crossings only received £4,500 from JCAP.
Figure 15: Jurassic inspired art article advertising the arts programme in Dorset Coast and Countryside magazine, *Creative Coast archive* (photo: author)

Figure 16: "Creative Coast showcase" publicity in Dorset Coast and Countryside magazine, *Creative Coast archive* (photo: author)
and its heritage messages. The ways in which projects undertook this in practice took many different forms including enabling certain art works to embed scientific expertise in their development (the Jurassic Coast Earth Festival 2012) and paying for commissions inspired by the geology of the coast (Coastal Voices).

The change in strategy arose from an increased lack of match funding opportunities due to national public funding cuts across all sectors. Initially through a seed funding approach JCAP had previously supported art that not been able to find support elsewhere. However, the Creative Coast policy had to be flexible to the shifting public funding context in the local region and England as a whole. A policy shift towards match funding discontinued one of the original central aims of the programme: to facilitate new opportunities for artists to create art and to develop work according to the interpretation of the site. The evaluation for JCAP therefore outlined three areas for ‘learning and future planning’ (Schwarz 2011). These were:

1. Building the identity of the programme through clearly articulated and focussed aims.
2. Clarifying mutual expectations within partnership projects, including evaluation.
3. Maximising limited resources in taking a strategic role to ensure the programme makes a local, regional and international impact.

(Schwarz 2011)

In 2010, towards the end of JCAP, the Creative Coast Group developed a further G4A bid from the ACE to support phase four of the planned activity as outlined in the 2005 Arts Strategy (Morland and Mason 2005).\(^6\) This final phase aimed to consolidate the

\(^6\) The four phases of activity for Creative Coast are outlined above in section 4.2.1: Finding a beginning.
arts programme and look towards developing a legacy.\textsuperscript{67} However, the bid was initially rejected in May 2011 due to concerns that key partners such as Local Authorities would no longer be able to match fund the grant. Additionally, feedback suggested the proposal didn’t adequately outline clear plans for future sustainability within the changing economic climate.

The Creative Coast therefore needed to clarify its objectives presumably with a view of being able to prove whether these goals had been achieved. Ironically this reflected the programme’s own strategy to consolidate its funding towards arts projects that had already gained significant external support. This is further evidence that JCAP was working more as a funding body than an arts facilitator. Furthermore, feedback suggested that the measurable outcomes of the proposed project were not made clear in the proposal. The application might have also suffered from the fact that the final report had not yet been made available, as the Creative Coast Group had applied for the grant whilst JCAP was still underway (this final point was considered more important for providing support for the application rather than justifying what had already been done) (Arts Coordinator 2011).\textsuperscript{68}

After being re-submitted with significant alterations the bid was successful. It was confirmed on 11\textsuperscript{th} August 2011 that ACE would be funding Creative Coast 2012 (CC2012) to the tune of £92,080.\textsuperscript{69} This funding was to support a total planned

\textsuperscript{67} The idea of legacy comes up time and time again within the context of the Creative Coast and the Cultural Olympiad. The term came to refer to a loosely defined continuation of the work from the funded programmes. Identifying legacy was an expectation of even transient artworks and projects once funding to support the work had ended.

\textsuperscript{68} Arts Coordinator. 2011. Position Statement for Creative Coast Group. May 2011, Creative Coast digital archive, Dorchester.

\textsuperscript{69} This was more than the £80,300 applied for in the failed bid submitted the previous year. It contributed to a total budgeted income for the programme of £155,848 that was boosted by £32,248 worth of in kind contributions from the Jurassic Coast Partnership (the team and Trust)
expenditure of £155,848.\textsuperscript{70} However, the delay in securing this funding bid resulted in a gap in the Arts Coordinator role from May until September 2011 at a moment which later would be identified as crucial to networking between arts and science practitioners at the outset of projects (e.g. at the ExLab dialogue day). Aligning with the shift in policy towards the end of JCAP, the second G4A application had a very different structure to that of its predecessor in 2008. Rather than the six themes and objectives for seed-funding new work outlined in JCAP, CC2012 was based on two aims and nine planned actions [Appendix 5]. It was also heavily structured around supporting existing partnerships and projects already underway in partnership with the Jurassic Coast through JCAP. However, rather than direct funding, this additional support was offered through days contribution from the Arts Coordinator to:

\begin{quote}
Coordinate contact between delivery partners and the management of JCWHS to create and market a coherent programme of great arts and natural science projects. (Creative Coast 2012 Action Plan 2011: 3)
\end{quote}

The role of CC2012 was therefore to unify the diverse work of JCAP so that it appeared, and could be communicated, as a cohesive arts programme. These contributions took the form of an allocated number of days when the Arts Coordinator would work towards each project. This structure meant that the actual inputs were drastically different depending on the producers of each project and what they asked the Arts Coordinator to do with the time. Furthermore, and surprisingly, this support was largely unexpected by those producing the work and therefore didn’t form part of their strategy. In short, once donated the Arts Coordinator’s time in the autumn of 2011, many were not sure how best to use it. For example, to input into the Jurassic Coast Earth Festival 2012 the Arts Coordinator worked on developing further funding bids, which were unfortunately unsuccessful. For Coastal Voices the CC2012 support

and the County Councils. The actual expenditure and income for Creative Coast 2012 as of 18\textsuperscript{th} June 2013 was confirmed at £146,755.50 (not including in kind contributions).

\textsuperscript{70} Jurassic Coast Trust 2011. Creative Coast 2012 G4A submission, Creative Coast archive, Dorchester.
involved opening spaces for rehearsals and providing logistical support. The sporadic approach including top-down decision-making in CC2012 will be explored in the second half of this chapter as these contributions were at times seen as advantageous and at others confusing for partners.

Alongside working with current partners on continuing projects, CC2012 aimed to communicate good practice to other partner organisations and international bodies such as UNESCO and the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) to advocate working with the arts. It also sought to develop Creative Coast forums as an avenue for networking and sharing practice as well as supporting three art/science lab days. Furthermore, with a view to creating a longer term continuation of Jurassic Coast arts programming, CC2012 aimed to develop a large-scale community-based arts commission for 2014.71

4.5 Coastal Voices: Sturzstrom 1 June 2012

Five partner projects had been identified as a part of the CC2012 arts programme. One of these was a large-scale choral collaboration, which worked with several community choirs along the coastline to produce four different musical arrangements performed along the Jurassic Coast. Coastal Voices demonstrated some of the conundrums surrounding how success was measured in the JCAP and CC2012. Furthermore, this project elicited the many ways in which audiences reacted and responded to the perceived OUV of the natural heritage of the site when presented alternative interpretations of the geology.

---

71 At the time it was thought that this would be an extension of the carnival network, which was developing in anticipation of the Cultural Olympiad activity in 2012 (Croose 2014).
A series of performances along the coast composed the wider umbrella of Coastal Voices connecting seemingly disparate projects into one wider effort. The project included some choral pieces where the connections to the specific natural heritage of the Jurassic Coast were tenuous at best. Furthermore, references and engagements with the heritage narrative of the Jurassic Coast site were limited in the Coastal Voices publicity. Later the Jurassic Coast team would list this as a project where the arts were “doing their own thing” or creating “arts for art’s sake”. However, on reflection, there were multiple objectives for the various funders and partners of Coastal Voices and therefore it was likely that there would be tensions emerging as these agendas collided.

Coastal Voices was an ambitious project both in size of collaborations it developed and the scale of performance. However, it was one that was well supported by the JCAP and CC2012. In fact Coastal Voices received the largest sum of any project from the seed funding allocation of £30,000 (Jurassic Coast 2011). This funding contributed to the composition of three new pieces of music, however it was only a drop in the budget ocean that was required to gather together the choral ensemble that was to form the many Coastal Voices events. Between March and July 2012 more than eight hundred singers performed four new commissions in five performances. This required support and resources for twenty-nine rehearsals, forty school sessions and three conductors. The project culminated in a joint concert of the four new choral works at the Lighthouse in Poole on 8th July 2012 and performances at the opening of the Olympic Games at Weymouth on the 27th July 2012.

Again connections to the Cultural Olympiad and the associated Inspire Mark branding were without doubt an integral part of the production of this project. Alongside the funders’ objectives and agendas for Coastal Voices the Cultural Olympiad provided thematic and scheduling focus for the project. A cumulative moment of performance at the opening of the London Olympic Games 2012 in Weymouth was a point of high exposure and recognition for the project and, more widely, for public arts in the region.

According to some accounts, the Coastal Voices project was in fact already in development prior to the Arts Coordinator’s appointment in 2008. Others saw it as a direct result of networking events held during the lifespan of JCAP. In fact, there were several groups of arts organisations working on a large-scale choral project concurrently. Regardless of origin, a large-scale community choral project was a long time in the making throughout the lifespan of JCAP. Multiple organisations working on choral projects linked to the Dorset and Devon coastline at the time came together to develop a single project working across numerous communities. Coastal Voices therefore became a collaborative vocal project. During the final coordination stages, whilst formalising the relationship contractually, an email from the Arts Coordinator to various partners and stakeholders described the project in the following way:

Coastal Voices is an umbrella project linking the arts and earth sciences through the concept of ‘the voice’. It aspires to encourage and stimulate coastal communities in the South West to examine and ‘voice’ the unique relationship with the geology and forces which shape our environment, and also to explore the ‘voice’ of the coast. It will actively promote international exchange and dialogue, and connect communities, amateurs and arts professionals, leading to a shared outcome for 2012 and beyond.

Coastal Voices has three aims:

- To undertake cross art form exploration of the ‘voice’ of the World Heritage Site and our natural heritage

- To enable communities along the Jurassic Coast and beyond to achieve a greater understanding of their environment by creatively exploring the global context of the Jurassic Coast World Heritage Site and our natural heritage
• To contribute to the development of a sustainable infrastructure for vocal music in Dorset and East Devon which provides continuity of opportunity for children and adults, whatever their age and ability, to develop their skills in singing, leading, composing and performing world class vocal music. (Jurassic Coast 2011).\textsuperscript{73}

_Coastal Voices_ therefore was another project with ambitious objectives. These included targeting large audiences and involving many members of the local community. The Jurassic Coast’s involvement, as evidenced above, was articulated through the second aim of the project: to explore and understand the WHS and concepts of natural heritage. However, there were also expansive goals to ‘encourage and stimulate’ local coastal communities of all ages and abilities to come together to produce “world-class” vocal music (Jurassic Coast 2011: np).\textsuperscript{74} To realise these aspirations _Coastal Voices_ sought to bring together music professionals and practitioners from multiple organisations to work as a collaborative force. A large partnership combined the activity and aspirations of these multiple organisations along the site (and beyond). _Coastal Voices_ was produced by Serious and Lighthouse Poole with the aforementioned commissioning support from JCAP and CC2012. However, in addition it involved the collaborative efforts of B Sharp, Voiceworks, Soundstorm, and Bournemouth Symphony Chorus.

In fact the Jurassic Coast stipulated that the funding had been provided on the condition that _Coastal Voices_ worked as, ‘ONE unified project delivered collaboratively by several organisations/ individuals’ (Jurassic Coast 2010: np).\textsuperscript{75} _Coastal Voices_ therefore embodied much of the values of practice and advocated ways of working that

\textsuperscript{73} Jurassic Coast. 2011. Agreement Letter Lighthouse FINAL, 16\textsuperscript{th} May. Creative Coast digital archive, Dorchester.

\textsuperscript{74} Jurassic Coast. 2011. Agreement Letter Lighthouse FINAL, 16\textsuperscript{th} May. Creative Coast digital archive, Dorchester.

had developed throughout JCAP, namely partnership and collaboration. This was one of the most visible moments for the Jurassic Coast within the Cultural Olympiad. Like *Universal Value*, and several other projects associated with the arts programmes, *Coastal Voices* was awarded the Inspire Mark.

The Inspire Mark was a promotional tool aiming to create associations with London 2012 for new audiences in the country. It was the first time that Olympic and Paralympic branding had been shared with non-commercial organisations (LOCOG 2012). Despite the opportunities afforded by the Cultural Olympiad and the Inspire Mark this often led to confusing and multiple brands all competing for space within the same project. This was especially the case for collaborative projects such as *Coastal Voices* where several organisations were working together supported by multiple funding streams. *Coastal Voices* demonstrated the potential for interplay between place and artistic performance on natural heritage sites, specifically through its engagement working with local coastal communities. However, the particularities of the production of *Coastal Voices* may have led those working for the Jurassic Coast to feel like the work was not as “relevant” to the natural heritage agenda as they had initially hoped. The question of relevance and conflicting agendas is something we will return to time and again throughout this thesis. In teaming up with the Lighthouse Poole the Jurassic Coast lost a lot of control over the narrative of the *Coastal Voices* project and its connection with the Jurassic Coast WHS. However, it gained new partners and most importantly it enabled the project to go ahead with the Jurassic Coast’s involvement. The balance struck between controlling the interpretation of the site whilst working with

---

76 In total 2,713 projects were developed over the five years which the project ran and is thought to have included over 10 million people nation-wide (LOCOG 2012). These projects covered a wide span of sectors including sport, education, culture, volunteering, sustainability and business.
partners was an aspect of the arts programming that the Jurassic Coast team found challenging.

4.5.1 Complex networks of production

I have to say with Coastal Voices there are different stories about who started it off. (Arts practitioner 2013, pers. comm., 8th July)

As mentioned earlier, the process of bringing Coastal Voices to the stage was protracted and complex. Correspondingly, there were conflicting accounts in the archive as to how it was set in motion. A working group developing a choral project linked to the Jurassic Coast with a focus of activity over the Olympic summer had brought practitioners together from across the region. Therefore, the website described the final performed project with the following words:

Working with our partners, we commissioned four new choral works bringing hundreds of singers together for performances across Dorset and Devon as part of London 2012. Coastal Voices aims to give a new voice to the coastline that forms a stunning backdrop to the sailing events at London 2012. Commissions include arrangements of cult classics by Nick Cave, the geologically-inspired sound world of Marc Yeats, Songs for a Coastal Wind by John Surman and On Golden Cap by John K Miles, inspired by work with Billy Bragg, B Sharp and the young people of West Dorset and East Devon. (Coastal Voices 2014. Emphasis added: np)

There is no mention of the Jurassic Coast in this description, however other ownsrships and identities are presented here within the breadth of the project. This are significant as although the Jurassic Coast is not mentioned by name, the geographical area of West Dorset and East Devon, which the Jurassic Coast encompasses, is referred to. A member of the Jurassic Coast team later suggested that the WHS had been ‘shoehorned’ into the project (Jurassic Coast team member 2013, pers. comm., 14th November).

Coastal Voices had relied on an assorted network of funding sources and practitioners for the project. Although this approach provided a range of engagements with the local
communities and genres of musical responses, it meant that the presence of each of the producing partners was diluted. However, despite some tenuous links to the site in the commissioned pieces, the Jurassic Coast team recognised some were more attuned to their interpretation work. One commission that nestled alongside the themes of the site, as a small group of choral voices amongst a cacophony of others within Coastal Voices, was Sturzstrom. This piece provided a creative and fascinating response to the natural heritage of the coast as it was deliberately inspired by the geology and geomorphology of the site. Sturzstrom therefore demonstrated how creative methods of practice disrupted the interpretation of the Jurassic Coast through finding new ways to work with local communities.

4.5.2 Creating Sturzstrom: Marc Yeats and Jurassic Coast inspiration

Based within the wider network of choral practice that was Coastal Voices, a site-specific (or to be more accurate a site inspired piece) was composed by locally based, but internationally recognised contemporary composer Marc Yeats. His work Sturzstrom was a choral piece of music that responded to the event of the substantial Bindon landslip of 1839 off the East Devon coast.77 ‘Sturzstrom’, the German word for a type of land-fall (‘Sturz’ meaning fall and ‘Strum’ meaning Stream) was a choral piece that re-vocalised the movement of the land and cultural responses to it. In contrast to the large choirs formed for Coastal Voices at other locations on the coast, an ensemble of twelve performed this piece. The choral work included an orator, a role performed by a geomorphological advisor to the Jurassic Coast who provided Marc with much of the information that inspired Sturzstrom.

Yeats initially became involved with the networks of JCAP through PVA MediaLab as a part of Universal Value (explored above [section 4.3]). However, it was through the

77 For more information on the Bindon Landslip event and the resultant wide variety of contemporary and continuing creative responses see Chapter Six.
initial planning stages of the *Coastal Voices* project that Marc began to become involved in the structure and policy of the arts programmes. He wrote, with the support of the team and other advisors, an Artist Taking the Lead proposal for a *Coastal Voices* project, which was submitted in April 2009. In this proposal, Marc was to be the sole composer for a choral project that would span across the length of the Jurassic Coast and reach many of the communities along it. However, the proposal was not short-listed. It was a highly competitive fund with only one project sponsored for each of twelve regions. However, it is one of the difficulties of working as freelance public arts practitioner when considerable time and effort is put into funding bids with limited chance of success. Nevertheless, Marc’s efforts were recognised by the Jurassic Coast team who kept him closely embedded within the production of the *Coastal Voices* project through its multiple iterations.

At one point it looked as though *Coastal Voices* would not find the funding support it required to go ahead despite the years of deliberation and planning. However, in a final meeting of interested parties, Lighthouse Poole suggested that the Jurassic Coast plans were adapted into an application they were putting forward to the Paul Hamlyn Foundation. This was a collage approach to the funding application as several pre-designed projects were amalgamated into one, which was named *Coastal Voices*. *Coastal Voices* therefore became a large project within which the Jurassic Coast was a supporting partner. This contribution, as already mentioned, took the form of commissioning new musical work. As the other projects were already devised, the

---

78 Artists Taking the Lead was an initiative by the Cultural Olympiad which encouraged artists to submit a proposal for a "big idea" to celebrate activity surrounding the London 2012 Olympic Games.

79 Another project associated with the JCAP and CC2012 was Desert Crossings which was shortlisted for the Artist’s Taking the Lead fund in the southwest. The Jurassic Coast team advised on both proposals. However, the final funding for this region eventually went to *Nowhereisland* led by Alex Hartley and was germinated from the successful *Cape Farewell UK* project. Available at: http://nowhereisland.org/ [Last accessed 03/12/2016].
ability for the Jurassic Coast team to influence the direction of these commissions was limited. However, recognising his previous work on the Artist’s Taking the Lead application, Marc’s name was put forward for one of the composition opportunities. This enabled his continued participation in the project:

[T]he Lighthouse became involved in the Coastal Voices project and they managed to pull in large chunks of money. They also took over the project. I’m not saying in a good or bad way but just because they had a much larger stake in it. They took over and sort of managed the project and I was left working quite closely with [the Jurassic Coast team] because the project that I did was the most geologically related project and also the most radical one. The other three choral projects were more about people’s feelings about the coast. Whereas I was sort of looking at sourcing aspects around the geology. So that’s sort of how that project kind of happened via osmosis and chance. (Yeats 2014, pers. comm., 22nd April).

Due to his previous work in the planning of a choral project with the Jurassic Coast, Marc’s positioning within the final project became one that most closely aligned with the aspirations of the site. He was allocated the area of East Devon to inspire his composition. This was mainly due to the location of collaborative partners working on the other performances, which had already been set in motion. It was not an easy task, as it required a number of challenging strategies both to the subject matter and approaching the local community:

The three other Coastal Voices projects were all um based around choirs that were already established. [Marc] was, I’ll use the word relegated to East Devon where the World Heritage Site barely exists in the minds of people because there ain’t fossils. So once you kind of go East of Lyme Regis you know people don’t know what it is. Whereas they’re very well connected from Lyme Regis right the way through and, you know, use it as a selling point and all that sort of thing. So there was no choir and [Marc] was doing a project that was off the wall. So that was a big issue because you had to recruit people into something that didn’t previously exist either as a choir or group or as a concept. Because you were trying to sell an experience that people had no experience of. (Yeats 2014, pers. comm., 22nd April).

It is interesting to note the musician’s opinion on the variability of public consciousness of the WHS and available geological subject matter along the site. The Lyme Regis commission was given to B Sharp a choral youth charity based in the town. They were, therefore, a pre-existing choir and a partner in the project. It could be argued (as
that they were allocated the richer geological location along the WHS. However, working within existing networks in Lyme Regis was probably preferable for the production of Coastal Voices as a whole. Likewise, the other choirs operated within their pre-existing networks and locations. Additionally, although there have been some disparities in the ways that the Jurassic Coast is presented in East Devon, it is still very much a key presence in the tourist industry of the district. Although it doesn’t have as many popular fossil hunting areas, the iconic red cliffs of the coastline are a vital part of the identity of the region. Starting a new choir in East Devon, however, had meant that a part of the project, unlike the other three commissions, involved recruiting community participants. Furthermore, Yeats’ composition style made this a more difficult task, ‘because you were trying to sell an experience that people had no experience of’ (Yeats 2014, pers. comm., 22nd April). Additionally not knowing who the choir performing the piece would be during the process of collaboration was described by Yeats as an unnerving experience.

After a period of research and consultation with local experts, the piece that Marc composed became Sturzstrom. The piece employed a combination of texts both from the WHS’s application document, a historical petition to the King from the town of Lyme Regis in 1533 due to loss of land caused by the sea, and the Great Bindon Landslip of 1839. Professor Vince May, who had assisted in the research process, was invited to perform as orator in the performance of the piece. Sturzstrom was an unusual and adventurous vocal composition that simulated the movement of the Bindon landslip. It was therefore also a challenging piece to produce due to its unique content and logistical demands. There were also further demands from the wider objectives of the Coastal Voices project to reach new communities and audiences through the use of “the voice”. This meant that not only would the piece be unique and inspired by the site, it also needed to be accessible to first-time choral performers, including those who
couldn’t read music. In response, Marc designed a new form of musical notation so that performers who could not read music were still able to participate [Fig. 17].

The world premiere of *Sturzstrom* was performed in Beer Quarry Caves on the 1st June 2012. It was an atmospheric choice of venue as the Caves have been used for excavating Beer Stone (a chal limestone) at least since the Roman era. Furthermore, due to the complex histories and unique geology here, the Beer Quarry Caves hold significance for the local community. It was therefore employed not just as an atmospheric location befitting the experimental nature of Yeats’ composition, but also as an attraction in itself for local audiences. Alongside the choral piece, Yeats arranged a pebble percussion composition. Some students from the local Seaton Primary School led by Elfyn Jones were recruited to perform this as a prelude. Having been preceded by this pebble orchestra, *Sturzstrom* was first performed live by a chorus of twelve vocalists including Vincent May as orator.

Field note: Listening to a recording of Sturzstrom – 30th January 2014

A spattering of pebbles sounding somewhat like rainfall begins the piece increasing in pace and volume reaching a frenzied crescendo and then quickly dying down again. A slow crescendo again builds and again is quickly halted. This is repeated several times. A rhythmical, unified, steady tapping beat then deep male voices join the rhythm. Chanting an unperceivable word: Higher male voices and female voices join in with different equally indiscernible words and a more flowing sound to the same rhythm. A final group of females join the milieu with a word that sounds like hissing. The initial uniformity of each section of the choir begins to separate with their words being chanted at different times creating a choral milieu. These words change as the pebble chorus crescendos and then stops. On top of this new chanting high women’s voices hold a sound rising in an upward smooth scale, which is topped by a staccato shrill note. Meanwhile the lower voices continue a deeper, faster chanting. When this chanting stops the higher voices continue their crescendos. There is a moment of pause and silence. This is followed by a bombardment of voices loudly reciting a text. The sound is so disjointed that it is hard to make out any of the singular words from the choral sound. This recitation quiets down to a whispered murmur...
Figure 17: Part of the Sturzstrom commission illustrating Marc Yeats’ new style of musical notation, Creative Coast archive (music: Third Party Copyright)
Coastal Voices was an opportunity through the structure of the arts programmes for the Jurassic Coast organisation to embed itself alongside creative responses to the site. The project was located not only at the centre of the local community but within the national context of the Cultural Olympiad. The opening performance of Sturzstrom occurred during the peak of public art engagements linked to the Creative Coast in the summer of 2012. Yeats, in his own words, described the experimental and risk-taking approach of Sturzstrom as challenging but ultimately rewarding:

Whereas all the other performances came and went and, you know, they had a very satisfactory community involvement. But they didn’t - I don’t know what do you say - They didn’t have that extra dimension of weirdness. When we did a big performance at the Lighthouse Poole in their huge arena and everybody was there - There must have been about a thousand people there and there were the three other pieces. Huge choirs I mean absolutely like ranks and ranks of people and when it was my turn to get up with our lot. I think we only had about twelve people there. And we were like a tiny little group. But they all sang fantastically well and I was really proud of them. Just because we were doing something very different you know. Which shows that you don’t always have to toe the line to get a good result when you’re working with the community; if you’ve got the right level of engagement from the person who is dealing with it and the right level of support from the project management around it. Then you can I think approach arts projects in the most abstracted and contemporary and challenging of ways with normal people and get a good result coming out. My little proselytising. So there you go. (Yeats 2014, pers. comm., 22nd April)

As described by Yeats, Sturzstrom involved the local community in the public arts in innovative ways and engaged with the world heritage status of the Jurassic Coast. In many respects this project was an example of how engagement between the WHS and the public arts were able to fit the agendas of JCAP and CC2012. The commission involved scientists from conception through to performance and it engaged with specific historic events and locations on the site. It was original, innovative and unique work embedded within the practices of the Jurassic Coast WHS, which met many of the objectives of both ACE and UNESCO.
Furthermore, by being embedded within the Jurassic Coast team there were opportunities for spill over of practice into other areas of the site’s management.\(^{80}\) Additionally, it was one of only a few projects within JCAP and CC2012 to gain the attention of the national media (one of the stated aims of the programmes). A reviewer from *The Guardian* wrote:

> It certainly sounds *different*: the volley of shrieks and bellows have a feral quality to them and create genuine excitement. At the same time, crescendos can disappear into whispers just as quickly. (Jonze 2012: np. Original emphasis.)\(^{81}\)

It was also described as part of a review for the most unusual music venues of the year as ‘the most bonkers story I came across’ (Jonze 2012: np).\(^{82}\) *Sturzstrom* therefore, it seemed, achieved the objectives set out by the *Creative Coast* programme. It had been developed in collaboration with the local arts sector, it was a nationally recognised work of “great” art that was directly related, and inspired by the site. Furthermore, it had engaged science advisors and members of the local community in contemporary choral composition.

4.5.3 *Discord: the difficulties in defining successful engagement*

However, *Sturzstrom* did not receive a positive response from all its live audiences. Comments from the concert at the Lighthouse Poole stated preferences for the pieces performed by the established choirs (and the more popular songs by well-known musicians) over what became known as “the voices” performing *Sturzstrom*. One

---

\(^{80}\) Creative spill over and the building of the Jurassic Coast’s creative capacity are explored in Chapter Six [section 6.3].


audience member described the work as, ‘emperors new clothes’ another stated that it was, ‘not my cuppa tea!’ (Audience feedback, Coastal Voices, 8th July 2012). Interestingly, the audience members who provided less enamoured comments about Sturzstrom were attending at least partly to support a participant, whereas those who stated their motivation for attendance solely due to an interest in the arts or natural sciences did not single out the Sturzstrom performance in the same way.

In contrast, the audience at Beer Quarry Caves seemed much more receptive [Fig. 18]. One even stated the piece was, ‘the best thing since sliced bread’ (Audience feedback, Sturzstrom, 1st June, 2012). However, some stated that they wished it had been specifically commissioned for the Beer Caves rather than the nearby coastline. For example, one audience member described the work as:

Very adventuresome. A shame not to be more place specific (for the caves e.g. echoes etc). Lovely bits, others not very soundscapey. Quite liked the narrative. Some soundscapes. (Audience feedback 2012, Sturzstrom, 1st June)

Although this audience member commented on the limited employment of the structure of the cave and its acoustic influence, others were disappointed with the dampened acoustics at a site where they expected the sound to reverberate. These mixed responses demonstrated the subjectivity of any audience to this kind of work. The audience at Beer especially enjoyed the pebble orchestra, which one portrayed in the following words:

Pebble choir excellent – lots of different rhythms and sounds. Liked bass sound at start – rolled down the tunnel and round my head. [Whereas Sturzstrom was] Lots of vocals sounded repetitive and very unstructured and went on too long – like banshee wailing. (Audience feedback 2012, Sturzstrom, 1st June)
Figure 18: Audience feedback from the performance of Sturzstrom at Beer Quarry Caves, Creative Coast archive (photo: author)
Even the responses gathered the performance in Beer suggest that *Sturzstrom* was a divisive piece for audiences. However, it did stimulate discussion as to the place of performance both within the site of the Beer Quarry Caves and as a response to the Jurassic Coast WHS. Nevertheless, it’s hard to ignore that many members of the audience disliked the piece, both in its compositional form and its siting within the Caves. Furthermore, there was a general disappointment that the idiosyncrasies and histories of the site were seen by many to have been overlooked within the composition. This was unsurprising as the performing in the Caves was an opportunistic decision after the composition had been written and the rehearsals were in their final stages. Mixed responses were likely, as experimental art and popular culture collided, especially when performed to an audience attuned to the local area and inclinations of contemporary music.

The mixed audience responses prompt a wider larger question for this kind of experimental practice. Did the artworks produced through the arts programme and responding to the Jurassic Coast need to have been liked to be engaging audiences with the site? Ascertaining the ability of contemporary arts practice to communicate histories, values and issues surrounding the natural heritage of the coastline is a subjective task. Especially if the experiences one is trying to understand were uncomfortable. In this sense, *Sturzstrom* questioned the very objectives of the arts programmes and their influence upon the interpretation of the Jurassic Coast site.

For example, one of the central aims of JCAP was to develop nationally recognised arts based on the earth sciences at the site. For this *Sturzstrom* was recognised as successful. However, the work was less effective at engaging audiences from both the arts and science sectors, another stated aim of JCAP. Defining success therefore
becomes an elusive and complex process. One member of the team stated the following about the project:

I’m really pleased about Coastal Voices because it was one thing that [the Arts Coordinator] really wanted to do. I was really pleased that happened because Marc was bonkers and people were saying that but it was a piece of work that directly related to the site in a fascinating way and it was out there but it probably got people involved... it did have a very good community involvement. Well that mass choir had the highest community involvement. But the Coastal Voices as a whole, I thought it was great and I was really pleased for [the Arts Coordinator] that that happened. (Jurassic Coast team member 2013, pers. comm., 12th November)

However, on later reflection the same team member reflected that Sturzstrom didn’t do enough ‘in terms of ticking the UNESCO boxes’ (Jurassic Coast team member 2014, pers. comm., 15th May). Sturzstrom therefore remained a contested piece of work within both Coastal Voices and the Jurassic Coast arts programmes.

Despite the mixed reception, this piece of experimental vocal work engaged a small choir and was performed in a unique setting. In many ways this challenged both participants’ and audiences’ perceptions of what it means to engage with the Jurassic Coast WHS. What is most apparent is that this piece was the result of a culmination of influences congregating at a very specific moment in the culture of artistic practice on the Jurassic Coast. This kind of experimental work, performed as public art, was something that required large amounts of resource to create the music and to facilitate rehearsals and performances. The Cultural Olympiad had supported a culture of funding that brought various kinds of artwork into the public setting and engaged with organisations across the public sector along the Jurassic Coast.

4.5.4 Making noise about the Jurassic Coast

In conclusion, Coastal Voices erupted right at the epicentre of activity during the Cultural Olympiad in the summer of 2012. In doing so it enabled the Jurassic Coast to take a prominent position in the hive of activity by the public arts organisations in the
region. The project however, took several years, and a long series of steering group meetings, failed applications and dispersed networks to develop. Finally a funding opportunity provided by Lighthouse Poole and the Paul Hamlyn Foundation allowed the choral project to go ahead. *Coastal Voices* became an embodiment of the collaborative working practice advocated throughout the Jurassic Coast arts programming with a wide network of different organisations, individuals and musical works coalescing under a broader thematic umbrella. However, this particular stream of funding led the project in a direction which was perhaps not at first anticipated by the Jurassic Coast whose Arts Coordinator especially had invested a lot of time in getting it off the ground. Furthermore, the ‘relevance’ and direct ‘response’ with the ideas and issues of the natural WHS were seen to be lacking in three of four compositions.\(^83\) At times the Jurassic Coast was arguably blinkered to the needs and restrictions of other organisations (this is a theme that we will return to as this chapter develops) who after all were providing the majority of the funding. Furthermore, there is evidence that within *Coastal Voices* the Art Coordinator lost track of the objectives of the arts programmes themselves. It became a project of passion and additional days were allocated to the project to bolster the admin of the project but not necessarily to aid the strategic networking potential of CC2012.

Out of the four *Coastal Voices* commissions, the piece that was acknowledged by the team to relate directly to the geology and geomorphology of the Jurassic Coast was Marc Yeat’s *Sturzstrom*. Marc’s work was a more experimental, avant-guard approach to the subject matter of local coastal retreat. The lack of established choir in the area he was allocated required a different approach to community-led working, which was a

---

\(^{83}\) This was at a moment when the Jurassic Coast team would use the term the ‘Coast’ to signal to the site as tightly prescribed by objectives laid out by UNESCO and in the management plan. However, this shortcut conflated the site with the coastline it occupied and its myriad stakeholders.
central aim to the *Coastal Voices* agenda. Two of the twelve participants in *Sturzstrom* were an integral part of the Jurassic Coast management, a founding member of the Trust and the Arts Coordinator who worked on the team. Perhaps because of this integration with the Jurassic Coast management *Sturzstrom* was able to converse with the idiosyncrasies and dynamism of the site as well as introducing a new and different form of choral composition. It also created opportunities for spillover of creative practice into the organisation of the Jurassic Coast through the involvement of personnel in the piece. However, a significant proportion of the audience responses were negative. The feedback comments present some of the inherent tensions in the JCAP and follow-on CC2012 agendas. Furthermore, *Sturzstrom* precariously sat within an awkward logistical context. There were geographical tensions with the East Devon location, in the setting of the Beer Caves, which suggested an atmospheric stage for the piece but in fact left *Sturzstrom* feeling out of place and disjointed.

### 4.6 Exploratory Laboratory: dialogue day 24th October 2012

The fourth event explored in this chapter is a dialogue day for practitioners working on the *Exploratory Laboratory* (*ExLab*) project. *ExLab* was a large project produced by Big Picture, a collaboration of seven visual arts organisations based in Dorset. It ran in two stages, known as *ExLab I* and *ExLab II*, from autumn 2010 until late 2012. Big Picture was set up to address the fact that there are no major visual arts venues in the county by ‘commissioning innovative new work to be displayed in rural non-gallery locations, reaching out to new audience for the visual arts’ (Big Picture 2012). The *ExLab* project also had developed around several objectives concerning ‘art-science’ collaborative working, which coincided with the aims of JCAP and CC2012.

The *ExLab* dialogue day came at an important moment in the context of this archival research [Fig. 19]. It was a project that I had engaged with from the outset of the PhD.
Figure 19: The Exploratory Laboratory (ExLab) handbook, Creative Coast archive (photo: author)
There were already connections with the Geographies of Creativity and Knowledge Research Group in my own department and the University of Exeter, who had worked with Proboscis on their commission based at Hive Beach. However, I had only begun my studentship earlier that month, October 2012. Negotiations to allow me to attend the dialogue day had to be made and as a result I arrived that Wednesday morning apprehensive and allocated the role of note-taker. Coincidentally this was the only exhibition of work still showing as I started in October 2012. It was therefore the only artwork from the arts programmes that I was able to witness first-hand when it was exhibited at the Bridport Arts Centre (BAC) after the works were collected together, following their individual showings in multiple ‘site-specific’ locations. Exlab therefore emerges from the archive, brought to life in a different way through my own lived encounters with its production.

4.6.1 The structure of the Ex-Lab dialogue

The primary phase of ExLab, ExLab I included a symposium, field guide and exhibition and ran in October 2010. This work highlighted some of the new techniques and technologies employed in the field of geology and geomorphology to monitor the Dorset coastline. It also included the presentation of work from artists around the country interested in observation, earth sciences and data visualisation. Additionally, a symposium and field guide opened up opportunities for visual artists and audiences to have conservations with earth scientists and environment managers working in the Dorset region. The second phase, ExLab II, ran from 2011-2012 and involved the commissioning a series of new visual artworks inspired by the Jurassic Coast WHS.

---

84 The timing of this research (planned or otherwise) to begin at the end of the planned creative work of Creative Coast 2012 is another example of how this research is entangled within its subject, namely the policy and practice of the arts programmes. For example, if I had been researching during the height of exhibitions and performances over the summer of 2012 this would likely be a very different research project.
(Big Picture 2012). By October 2012, *ExLab II* had produced five arts commissions, three artist bursaries and 307 exhibition days, with an estimated 25,494 visitors (Arts Producer 2012, pers. comm., 24th October). The dialogue day I attended in the autumn served as an evaluative opportunity for discussion amongst the various participants, artists, producers and partners of the project. It was held at BAC where the theatre space provided the setting for presentations and discussions.

On the day itself, the *ExLab* producer began the reflection session with an introduction to the project and the aims of the meeting. This was followed with audience comments read by the stewards of each exhibition. The five commissioned artists then each gave a presentation about their commissions and their own reflections on the process. After lunch we formed break-out groups, one commission for each group. A list of questions had been provided to structure discussions about each project. These included themes such as: ‘response to location’, ‘impact influence’, ‘expectations’ and ‘art-science collaboration’ (Arts Producer 2012, pers. comm., 24th October). This dialogue day was a final formal meeting for participants at the end of the 3-year project. However, many of the partnerships, and therefore the discussions extended further back. For example, the producing body, Big Picture, is a network of visual arts organisations that first began discussions about collaboration as early as 2008. This meeting was therefore the latest in a much longer process of partnership working for many of these practitioners.\(^{85}\)

---

\(^{85}\) The formation of Big Picture coincided with the inception of Dorset Loves Arts (latterly Dorset Arts Together - DAT), a county-level network of artists and organisations, hosted at the time within Dorset County Council. So there was a move during 2008 and 2009 within the arts community in Dorset towards explicit strategies of collaborative working (Arts Coordinator 2012 at Coastal Voices Beer). In these early discussions visual arts organisations and curators in Dorset expressed an interest to increase the profile of the visual arts within the region (Arts Producer 2013, pers. comm., 13th February). This was partly in acknowledgement that the county didn’t have, and was unlikely to build, large gallery or exhibition spaces. These discussions led to more formalised collaborative partnerships supported by DAT. The visual arts group called themselves Big Picture. Shortly after its inception, the idea to run a project based on the Dorset coastline with various ‘staging posts’ was conceived (Arts Producer 2013, pers.
ExLab was funded by ACE and also supported by, amongst others, JCAP in the form of match funding. It was interesting the term match funding was again used to describe the support from the Jurassic Coast. Alongside support in kind from members of the Jurassic Coast team, who advised individual projects on the geology and geomorphology of the site, £10,000 was allocated to the project. However, as these funds came from JCAP, they too were ultimately from ACE. Therefore the description of match funding ExLab by the Creative Coast actually means boosting ACE funding with further funds from ACE. As a result, during the evaluation day in October 2012 there was criticism at the absence of a holistic approach for reporting back to the Arts Council. One participant noted that ACE had funded both ExLab and Creative Coast. Therefore when both projects reported back to ACE there was likely to be circularity and a ‘double counting of things’ (Arts practitioner 2013, pers. comm., 8th July):

And is it strategic use of what was supposed to be seed funding if actually what you’re doing is becoming a normal mainstream sort of match funder? (Arts practitioner 2013, pers. comm., 8th July)

Circularity of funding was a recurring problem that caused tension between partner arts organisations and the Jurassic Coast throughout the JCAP and CC2012. Using the funding on larger, already established projects meant that when JCAP and CC2012 needed to evaluate the outputs from these projects, they met with significant challenges. The shift in policy from acting as seed funder to match funder also created tension with partner organisations as the ownership and accountability of projects became even less clear. Therefore, the new strategy didn’t ingratiate the Creative Coast with the arts sector in the region as organisations felt that the Jurassic Coast team were taking credit for their work and claiming ownership over entire projects that

comm., 18th March). The Big Picture network was subsequently led by one or two individuals with an interest in the sector and as the group developed the Jurassic Coast organisation became involved as a funding partner.
the arts programme was in fact a supporting funder for. These tensions magnified when it was decided that JCAP would substantially support six projects rather than continue to seed fund numerous small-scale arts projects. In terms of reporting back to the ACE to account for the funding, these larger projects including ExLab formed the main output from the arts programme, despite being mostly conceived and produced by other arts organisations.

Another issue discussed at the dialogue day originated in 2011 when ExLab I transitioned into ExLab II. One discussion participant stated that they had expressed concerns at that point that the project had become too ambitious for its resources:

I had severe reservations at the end of project I, phase I, that we’d actually achieve what we set out to achieve and we were in a position to do Phase 2... And that’s not in any way sniping. I just think it’s down to capacity and timing. (Arts Producer 2013, pers. comm., 18th March)

Resource capacity and project timescales were two of the most significant constraints identified when evaluating the ExLab project. These were exacerbated by the desire in the region to create work for the Cultural Olympiad and the summer of 2012. However, during the discussions another participant acknowledged that the producers always knew that ExLab II would run on a short timescale to fit in with the Olympic activity. Time was tight: the artists were commissioned in October 2011 for a project that was to be delivered by July 2012. In addition to this, project producers and commission managers needed to know what the artists were planning on doing by May 2012. These six months were not considered long enough bearing in mind the collaborative requirements built into the commissions. Participants stated this as one of the reasons that the collaborations between practitioners were not all as successful or in depth as initially hoped by those involved (Arts Producer 2013, pers. comm., 13th February).

Another reason for these difficulties across the sectors of visual arts and geology was the temporary redundancy of the Jurassic Coast Arts Coordinator during 2011 in-
between the end of JCAP and the start of CC2012. It was recognised that networking and relationship building for collaborations might have been restricted due to a lack of resources from the Jurassic Coast team at the right moment in the projects. However, this transition period in the Jurassic Coast arts programming was foreseeable from the outset of ExLab. Instead, the lack of support might have been due to a lack of preparation or an over commitment by the JCAP whilst its continuation into CC2012 was still uncertain. It is unfortunate that resources were expected that, in the end, when time was tight, were never provided.

4.6.2 The dialogue: ambitious project scale and the practices of collaboration

The discussion on the ExLab dialogue day can be divided into two themes describing tensions within the planning and practice of the project:

1. the size of the project
2. working in collaboration.

Firstly, the ambitious size of ExLab and the desire to exhibit during summer 2012 to coincide with the Cultural Olympiad was seen to have a large influence upon the arts practice of the commissions. To achieve a geographical spread, the five arts commissions were spread across Dorset, a county that is notorious for its limited road infrastructure. This had been intended from the outset and the commission applications had been based upon the places in which they would be exhibited. This gave each project a suggestion of practice similar to that of an artist in residence and meant that ExLab encompassed locations across a large region with restricted options to travel between them.

Despite the broad reach of ExLab the individual works were localised and site-specific. This embroiled ExLab within broader arguments of the definition of site-specific art and the politics that surrounds such work (Warren 2012; Morris and Cant 2006). Although
perhaps not fitting with the staunchest definitions of the term, the artists had worked at their respective locations for extended periods of time to develop their pieces. As a result, on the dialogue day, many spoke of the influence of the local place and people upon their art. Not only was the location of each commission significant to the development of the artwork, it seems the length of exhibition times also had an influence on their development. One artist mentioned that working outdoors provided several other opportunities and difficulties by enabling a different kind of interaction with visitors and locals on the beach (Artist 2012, pers. comm., 24th October). Exhibition location also influenced the materials needed to maintain artwork, especially those installed outside. The particularly wet weather of summer 2012 was also mentioned as an influence not only upon the practical installation of the artworks but also upon limited audience numbers (Artist 2012, pers. comm., 24th October). In this way the coastline itself and the environment of the site collaborated in the making of the artworks and in their exhibited materiality.

With five place-based (if not site-specific) individual commissions, unifying the artworks together into a single project became, at times, a difficult task. Attempts were made to connect the commissions, notably through a series of bus trips touring each of the exhibition sites. However, it was acknowledged in the dialogue discussion that on average it took two hours to travel between each artwork exhibit. This was stated to have enabled audiences to experience the wider Dorset countryside, which had supposedly influenced the work. Yet it required a commitment from audiences to travel for around 8 hours to see each artwork in situ. Therefore, it was suggested in the evaluation that these long journeys reduced the engagement with each work in relation to its immediate environs. The logistical difficulties in the ExLab project associated with the Dorset location formed a direct response to the original purpose of the Big Picture collaboration: namely to find new ways to exhibit the visual arts in the county.
Therefore, although these commissions were perhaps not always seamlessly linked, they demonstrated significant development in the arts offering in the region.

Furthermore, the influence of the Cultural Olympiad was certainly significant to ExLab. The exhibitions ran for several weeks over summer of 2012 to tie in with the Olympic Games at Weymouth. This may have drawn in additional audiences from the increased tourism in the region at the time. The strategy aligned with one of the stated aims at the start of the project which had been ‘to reach out to and sustain new audiences for the visual arts (Big Picture 2013). Both project partners and volunteers on the ground deemed this to have been achieved during the six weeks of exhibitions. In total the five commissions received an estimated audience of 25,494 people (Big Picture 2013). The emphasis on audience numbers, demographics and reception is to be expected in the strategy of publically funded arts programme such as ExLab, who have to report this information back to ACE. It also demonstrates that the project was able to engage with the audience sizes anticipated by the Creative Coast programmes. They too were able to report back this information to ACE (another example of the circular reporting associated with this “match-funding”).

The second central focus of the dialogue day was a discussion on working collaboratively across different sectors. Collaboration was described as the ‘ethos behind ExLab’ (Big Picture 2012: 40). This had also been a key theme within JCAP and had CC2012. A debate about “art/science collaborations” dominated the afternoon

---

86 Methods of reporting back to the ACE and other funders as well as the roles of evaluation are a much-discussed topic within the public arts field. Audience figures are an important consideration for funders when considering who to fund again or further support. This therefore was at the forefront of practitioners’ minds in the autumn of 2012 as ACE’s Regularly Funded Organisations (RFOs) were coming under review in the spring of 2013.

87 Big Picture 2012, The Exlab story: documentation of the exploratory laboratory project 2010-2012, Wincanton: FWB.
amongst a combination of people from the visual arts and (broadly speaking) earth science sectors. This facilitated a discussion from many perspectives. However, several of the artists who had worked on the commissions stated that the notion of “art/science collaboration” had not been helpful. They noted that there had been high expectations on both sides that “art-science” relationships would break down boundaries and establish new ways of working, as well as creating public art. It was also acknowledged the relationship between the ‘artists’ and ‘scientists’ had been ambiguous from the outset. Therefore, with limited resources and unplanned outputs the collaborations between artists and scientists were seen to have had a mixed success within ExLab. Furthermore, one of the dominant discourses within the conversation was that collaboration was based upon the personal relationships of the individuals involved. Although this was of course important, there was a darker undertone to this conversation including the suggestion that those who had not felt their collaborations had been successful were personally responsible themselves due to their personalities not being companionable or likeminded (field notes 2012, Bridport Arts Centre, 24th October).

An additional demand associated with “art-science collaborations”, which was reinforced by participants several times not just on the dialogue day but in further interviews, was the amount of time these working relationship took to develop. It was thought that these difficulties were amplified due to an inequality of payment amongst practitioners. Within the budget of the commissions the artists’ time was explicitly paid for whereas the scientists were not. However, one artist did state that they had used money from their project budget to pay the scientists they worked with for their time. A later conversation with a member of the Jurassic Coast team expanded on these issues of cross-disciplinary collaborations between the visual arts and earth sciences. They suggested that many of the scientists working on ExLab hadn’t felt valued for
their time within the project (Jurassic Coast team member, pers. comm., 12th November). Additionally, there was an implication that the artists had been "mining" the team for science rather than wishing to work in process with a scientist. This again might be due to a lack of strategy and resources made available to the formation of these collaborative relationships by JCAP and CC2012. A member of the Jurassic Coast team also questioned whether the artistic outputs had reflected the initial ‘intentions’ of the Creative Coast strategy.

That’s not what our organisation does... I mean we’re not there to do arts for its own sake. (Jurassic Coast team member, pers. comm., 12th November)

This viewpoint demonstrates a misunderstanding of the role and position of public arts within the UK. However, this was most likely associated with the confusion from the shift from seed funding to match funding, where the Jurassic Coast team raised the influence of the site within larger arts projects but lost some of their strategic oversight. JCAP and CC2012 supported pre-existing and pre-funded projects, such as ExLab, to integrate the interpretation of the Jurassic Coast within the artworks in addition to their already established objectives. Additionally, to reiterate, JCAP and CC2012 were both predominantly funded by ACE who ultimately guided the policy structure for the programmes and the work they produced and evaluated.

In terms of funding collaborations across different sectors, the structural difficulties involved with employing individuals in different organisations were highlighted in the evaluative discussion. Questions were raised as to how it might be possible to apply for funding across multiple disciplines for a similar project in the future. It was broadly agreed that there was support for another project with greater structural equality between the artists and scientists. However, to support this aim it was suggested that funding would need to be supplied from both an arts funding body and a scientific one.
Despite the practical difficulties of collaboration explored on the \textit{ExLab} dialogue day, it is again important to emphasise the initial experimental intentions of this project. Therefore, it was acknowledged that one of the major collaborative conversations to emerge from the \textit{ExLab} project was the beginning of conversations rather than just the production of new artworks. This fits well with sociologist Richard Sennett’s distinction between dialectic and dialogical co-operation (Sennett 2012). For dialectic cooperation a product must emerge whereas dialogical co-operation is defined by discussion, which in itself is the aim. However, there is no winning formula as to how this may be achieved within the structures of public organisations such as those involved in \textit{ExLab}, instead co-operation is developed after a long period of development, planning and experimentation.

4.6.3 \textit{Creating visual artwork that converses between the arts and sciences}

The dialogue day for \textit{ExLab} provided an interesting insight into the nuances and complexities of working in collaboration across the arts and environment sectors. The long timescales and dedication required for such work were discussed several times during the day and were evident from the variety of work produced. At this evaluative moment there was a feeling that there wouldn’t be any further collaborative projects for a while within this network. That winter RFO arts organisations were submitting applications and reviews to ACE in anticipation of their funding review in the following year. Furthermore, after the Cultural Olympiad and its associated promotion of cultural events, many of those working within the arts industries were entering a period of great employment insecurity. Funding for the arts had been pre-allocated and extended until 2012 for the Cultural Olympiad. However, under a new government and strict austerity policies nationally (as a knock-on effect of the global recession triggered in 2008) large cut backs to local authorities were due to be felt in full force. Also, across the sectors there were public funding cuts forecasted in many areas. Since New Labour’s Creative
Britain agenda ended when they left government the arts had retreated in political influence (McRobbie 2016). Additionally, the demands on the ACE’s limited funding increased with the inclusion of Museums, libraries and archives into their remit in 2011. Within this context, and at the end of several years of large projects, it looked as though many arts organisations needed to plan for their own futures and to consolidate their own policies and aims in a tougher funding environment.

4.7 Extending the Jurassic Coast Partnership: the final Creative Coast forum

8th May 2013

Field note: Creative Coast forum, Barclays Building Poole – 8th May 2013

It is a grey and drizzly day.

In Poole, we arrive at a large roundabout and on to the road where the Barclays House is on. It takes a couple of redirections to realise that this is the enormous, grey multi-story building in the centre of the roundabout. Again we go in circles trying to find the entrance to the car park. Eventually we find it and park up.

We are guided through a maze of corridors to a large conference room at the back of the building. It is a corporate room with large glass windows facing west and overlooking Poole Harbour as well as the busy roads below from which we have just escaped. We are several stories up and when the clouds clear for brief moments it is possible to see across to Studland. On the east side of the room there is another wall of glass forming French windows onto a concrete patio with the black, spongy rubber tiles that remind me of adventure playgrounds.

This field diary entry above was written during the final Creative Coast forum held at Barclay’s House in Poole. The event marked the end not only of series of forums but also it was the final event scheduled for CC2012. For this reason, it is the final event detailed in this account of the Creative Coast programming. The corporate setting provided the setting for some troubling discussions about the future possibilities of partnership between the Jurassic Coast and the arts organisations they had worked with over the past five years.
4.7.1 Putting the forums into the context of the Creative Coast

The Creative Coast forums were a series of events established at the start of the second Jurassic Coast arts programme: CC2012. They were designed in response to aim one of the programme:

To pioneer a mechanism where partners from science, conservation, tourism, transport and education can work with the arts sector to maximize their resources in the delivery of shared objectives. (Schwarz 2013: 8)

Four Creative Coast forum events were hosted by the Jurassic Coast team to provide opportunities for networking, sharing information and learning, critical debate and legacy planning. In total, over 120 practitioners attended the forums. These delegates defined themselves as working in the arts, museums, environment, science, and tourism sectors (Schwarz 2013). The forum in Poole was the final event, concluding the activity of the previous three years, which included the following topics:

1. EARTH – ART = EH 26th November 2011
2. Arts, Festivals and Tourism 16th March 2012
3. Arts, Science and Environment 10th September 2012
4. Widening the Jurassic Coast Partnership 8th May 2013

The format and structure of these events was devised to be flexible to allow for a range of themes and interest groups to coalesce at different times in a variety of locations. It was hoped they would foster conversations between practitioners from the public arts, natural heritage, tourism, academia and education. In doing so the forums encapsulated much of the Creative Coast agenda by integrating the Jurassic Coast site and its management within arts networks [Fig. 20].
Figure 20: A collage of Creative Coast forum agendas and arts programme speeches, adapted from the Creative Coast archive (collage: author)
4.7.2 Extending the partnership?

In the latter stages of CC2012, the final forum event was re-scheduled and redesigned several times as the aims for the legacy for Creative Coast were negotiated. It had also been decided that this final event would be ticketed and charged to encourage attendees to attend. This was evident in the archive. Despite detailed archiving of the first two events the latter two were recorded mainly in digital form. The gap in this archiving reflects the additional demands placed on the Arts Coordinator and multiple shifts in procedure at the end of the programme [Fig. 21]. Eventually it was decided that the day should be planned as a structured discussion around the subject, ‘Extending the Jurassic Coast Partnership’. It was therefore advertised as an opportunity for delegates to explore how the arts sector may continue to work with the WHS and to form ideas for the legacy of the Creative Coast. The day was designed to include presentations from various participants in the arts programmes followed by a panel and group discussion session after lunch. Being the final event of CC2012 it was also the Art Coordinator’s final public day in the role.

The morning’s presentations were split between those who had produced projects for Creative Coast and other interest groups such as a ranger from the National Trust and a tourist manager from Visit Dorset. Additionally, the three University of Exeter collaborative doctoral students, including myself, had been invited to speak. The Arts Development Manager from Dorset County Council concluded the presentations by speaking about the new approach to the public arts in Dorset. The Jurassic Coast Site Manager then outlined the future priorities for the heritage site looking ahead to the formulation of the new management plan (2014-2019). Consultation with partners was part of the iterative formation of management policy to guide the work of the Jurassic Coast team for the next few years.
Figure 21: Absences in the material ad hoc archive, Creative Coast archive (photo: author)
4.7.3 Adopting an instrumental approach

A policy shift in how the site might work with the arts was described throughout the day as a turn towards the instrumental. In this context, the setting of this final forum was in many ways revealing. No longer were the discussions of partnership occurring in small rural locations such as the first forum at Monkton Wyld Court in 2011, which functions as an ‘education centre for sustainable living’ (Monkton Wyld Court 2016: np). The high rise, penthouse corporate room in the grey Barclays building dominated a corner of the Poole landscape. It provided a constant juxtaposition of the turbulent funding times ahead for many public services; it was ironic to be having these conversations in a bank. To amplify this further, the day concluded by a talk from a representative of Barclay’s recommending that the small arts organisations visit them for advice on how to budget and raise funds for their work. The final Creative Coast forum was an end point for JCAP and CC2012. Expansive ACE projects that encompassed the whole site were becoming rare.

During the forum presentations the Dorset Arts Development Manager aimed to clarify some of the shifts in the County Council strategy towards the public arts as arts development was filtered out from their core supported services. In the process of becoming a Community Interest Company (CIC) under the format of the new Dorset Arts Together (DAT) network, the public arts in Dorset were approaching their work with the arts in a way they described as “outcome-based” and “instrumental”. The Jurassic Coast Site Manager also took the opportunity to suggest a couple of the ways

---

88 Monkton Wyld Court. 2016. Available at: http://monktonwyldcourt.co.uk/. [Last accessed 03/12/2016].

89 Dorset Arts Together (DAT) is a collaborative network of artists and arts organisations based in Dorset. Further information about the network and its previous iterations is available in Chapter One [section 1.4: Thesis Outline].
in which he saw the arts as being able to provide valuable input into the management of the WHS including several "outcome-based" projects.  

Consequently, the next planned arts project would use funds already allocated from the CC2012 budget. However, it would not benefit from the high levels of time investment by the Jurassic Coast team as previous projects had. The structure for the project had already been steered by ACE who wanted the project to be channelled through the existing arts development networks. The forum discussions in May were therefore foreshadowed by the presentation of a "commission" by the Jurassic Coast Trust to the environmental hub of DAT a month earlier in March. The Site Manager referred to this commission as indicative of how the Jurassic Coast wished to work with the local arts sector in the future.

The transition was clear; the relationship between the Jurassic Coast and local public arts organisations (both present and absent) was now going to need to meet new agendas, goals and aims set out by the site. Reduced funding for both the Jurassic Coast and any potential arts initiatives meant that future work would be required to run on reduced resources in the future. A joint strategy document written by the Creative Coast Group shortly before the event outlined many of the motivations for this resolute shift in approach. This document began by outlining the Jurassic Coast’s work with the arts since the 2005 Interpretation Action Plan through to the completion of CC2012. It revealingly stated:

We are now close to completing this project. We are very grateful to ACE for their support, and the match funders, which largely comprised Local

---

90 The Jurassic Coast team in a meeting earlier in the year had discussed these issues and felt the arts sector would be able to contribute to their practice.

91 This project will be explored in more detail in the next chapter (Chapter Five, section 5.3: Artfully communicating risk to the public) as it shows a transition in the agendas supporting creativity on the Jurassic Coast.
Authorities, and the projects have been successful... but we have not always explored as to whether objectives of the projects **perfectly matched** those of the Site Management Plan. (Where Now for the Arts 2013. Emphasis added)

The statement above demonstrates the disjuncture between the priorities of the WHS as set out by the management plan and the policy and practice embedded within the arts programmes. As outlined in the start of this chapter, JCAP was set up from the dedicated Creative Coast Group, a steering group targeted at addressing the arts in this context. However changes in the culture of funding and networks and the cut backs in local government resulted in a national trend of the public arts being seen as an indulgence (Hewison 2014; Tusa 2014). Despite the mismatch between the aims of the *Creative Coast* agenda and the Jurassic Coast management objectives, it was unfair to say at this late stage that the arts did not match the management plan as *Creative Coast* had been designed by Jurassic Coast practitioners. Making sure that programme objectives harmonised was never the task of the local arts organisations.

Nevertheless, the acknowledgement that the Jurassic Coast felt that the aims of local arts organisations and networks had not always aligned with their own had been something that had been increasingly on the minds of the team in 2013. This was especially prevalent as restrictions and reductions in funding and the insecurity of resources became more and more apparent. Furthermore, the latent wealth of funds available for the arts seemed at odds with other projects being undertaken by the team on much lower budgets. In addition, many roles on the team were funded by external organisations (such as Natural England) on an annually renewed basis. These roles were looking increasingly precarious especially as Dorset County Council was projecting another round of cuts (perhaps shaving off as much as 30% of the financial budget). In this climate it was not hard to see why there was a perceived need to
restrict against “indulgent” arts projects that strayed too far from the agendas of the Jurassic Coast site whilst using its branding and resources.\(^{92}\)

The sentiment of the Jurassic Coast team was revealed in the strategy document under the heading: ‘Areas that could have been improved’.\(^{93}\) These were listed as:

- Some partners, to some extent possibly used the Jurassic Coast name but failed to fully engage with the aims of the arts programme and the values of the [Jurassic Coast] Partnership.
- Community involvement could have been stronger
- More thought could have been given to strategic targeted audience development and marketing of projects at the planning stage
- Some of the art has been seen as not very accessible to a lay audience.
- The sci-art collaborations have been artist-led, and without scientists actively involved, sometimes demonstrated a lack of understanding of the science. (Creative Coast Group 2013: 1)\(^{94}\)

The critiques outlined by the Jurassic Coast team suggested that many arts organisations had been using the funding for ‘their own agendas’. The document also questioned the Creative Coast programme’s limited community involvement, exclusion of some lay audiences and imperfect identification of participants. These issues were seen to conflict directly with the management aims of the site. However, they were conflicts that had been set in place by the policy decisions at the end of JCAP and start of CC2012.\(^{95}\) As explored above, the transition from seed funding new projects to match funding existing projects aligned with the site’s tradition of working in partnership

\(^{92}\) For example, a palaeontologist who worked with the Jurassic Coast team expressed disillusionment that more money had been allocated to create a plesiosaur out of paper mache (referring to Emerald Ant’s *Horace the Pliosaur* project at the Fossil Festival) than for preserving and housing fossils found on the coastline (palaeontologist 2013, pers. comm., 2\(^{nd}\) May).

\(^{93}\) Creative Coast Group, 2013. What next for Jurassic Coast Arts? 14\(^{th}\) March, Creative Coast digital archive, Dorchester

\(^{94}\) Ibid., p1.

\(^{95}\) See section 4.4 [Shifting strategies from JCAP to CC2012] earlier in this chapter.
with others. However, on evaluation, and despite meeting many of the objectives set out in the initial CC2012 strategy, Creative Coast did not align with the site’s overarching objectives in ways the team would have preferred.\textsuperscript{96}

Additionally, perceived misunderstandings of the “science” of the Jurassic Coast was a problem for a heritage site that orientates itself around scientific understandings of geological and geomorphological coastal landscapes. Part of this shift in approach indicated that the management team wanted more control over the kind of artistic responses that were produced. Yet, to a certain extent, they remained committed to continuing including the arts within the site management strategy: ‘[t]he arts are now embedded as a possible approach to managing the site’ (Creative Coast Group 2013).\textsuperscript{97} Through JCAP and CC2012, the Jurassic Coast team had increased their capacity for working with the arts. But in 2013 they were ready for a more flexible relationship with local arts organisations. Especially as they no longer had the capacity to host the expansive arts programming developed over the previous years. The team in their positioning document expanded on this:

The approach we have taken to date has been one based on partnership and collaboration, rather than direct commissioning. This approach puts the creative decision making mainly in the hands of the artists, with only a loose set of parameters that they have had to fit into in order to ‘be a part of the programme’.

Compared to commissioning it is a risky and bold strategy, but which, when the right partnership is achieved, can produce outstanding results; they are the artists after all, we are not. There are many positive and some less positive outcomes of the approach, but the fact is, some parts of the work just would not have happened without being collaborative.

\textsuperscript{96} There is also the issue that art projects were often designed with a flexibility of output in mind to see how the creative response would develop. In this context it meant that the Jurassic Coast team and Trust did not know what the outcome of projects would be until they were complete. Therefore, a narrative supporting “outcome-based” projects emerged.

\textsuperscript{97} Ibid., p1
What is clear, however, is that sometimes the collaborations have led to the work moving away from our core messages and desired outcomes, and more towards the interests of the artists. Some works have seemed more like *arts for arts [sic] sake*, than for management of a natural area. Occasionally, it has felt like a partner has used the Jurassic Coast to help themselves leverage in more funding; something done without intent, but that happened as an artifact of the funding environment. (Creative Coast Group 2013: 2. Emphasis added)

The phrase ‘*arts for arts [sic] sake*’ was an interesting choice of terminology for this document and exposed some of the Jurassic Coast team’s greatest concerns and frustrations at the end of JCAP and CC2012. With resources increasingly tight, the public sectors were required to report their practice in ever more detail (Belfiore 2009). Within this funding climate, resentments grew as did the perception that the Jurassic Coast was working to the agendas of the arts organisations keeping them in funding to "do what they like" rather than meet the agendas, issues and requirements of the WHS. Although the Jurassic Coast team did contribute considerable resources, especially through staff time and administration, this was not necessarily a fair reflection. Both JCAP and CC2012 had been supported by ACE and therefore had to meet corresponding objectives of arts development.

Nevertheless, the implication that the arts were not focused on Jurassic Coast site objectives was particularly damaging and provided the steer towards "outcomes-based commissioning" for the following project: *Exploring Erosion*. These attitudes were expanded upon further on in the positioning document:

> The Jurassic Coast Partnership is first and foremost a conservation organisation, and the arts organisations with which we have been collaborating are looking to develop great art. They do not have mutually exclusive aims, but roles and desired outcomes for future projects need to be clearer when working in partnership. (Creative Coast Group 2013: 2)

---

98 Ibid., p2.
99 Ibid., p2.
In many ways the ethos of the forums had been abandoned in this final meeting. It was less focused on possibility and reflection and more an opportunity to communicate future approaches and practices. These had had been pre-decided by the Jurassic Coast team and the Creative Coast Group. Therefore, it was suggested at the final forum that any further collaborative work with the Jurassic Coast would be channelled through the environmental hub of the DAT network. The new structure was also outlined in a working paper delivered to the Creative Coast Group in March:

The Dorset County arts team is planning to set up an arts development unit outside the Local Authority under the title Dorset Loves Art [sic] (DLA). Dorset Loves Arts [which would become DAT] us a [sic] currently a loose collaboration of key arts providers across Dorset, Poole and Bournemouth. The group has over fifty participating arts organisations and artists members, is seen in a positive light by ACE, and will have a remit to work outside of Dorset.

One final part of the current funded project is a commission for an organisation(s) to develop, test and pilot a major arts project for 2014/2015 around a piece of work directly relevant to the Management Plan aims. This project will be about communicating erosion, and we have put this commission to the DLA partners. (Jurassic Coast 2014: 2) ¹⁰⁰

DAT and the Jurassic Coast described this new approach to the WHS working with the arts sector as a turn towards instrumentalism (Arts Development Manager 2014, pers. comm., 15th May). By channelling their partnerships with the arts through DAT the Jurassic Coast team were able to reduce their efforts and resources in finding arts organisations to work with. It also enabled the team to be more implicit and directive in what they hope to achieve with any pieces of work. Conversations between the Jurassic Coast and local arts organisations were to be mediated, at least initially, through the arts development team originating from the County Council. Communication channels in the absence of a designated Arts Coordinator were to be streamed across different departments in the County Council (at least until DAT became a separate body).

¹⁰⁰ Jurassic Coast. 2014. ITEM 7 What next for Jurassic Coast Arts paper for SG meeting, 5th March, Creative Coast digital archive, Dorchester: 2.
The use of the term commission for the next project sealed this new attitude and approach. Control, direction and patronage were applied to future artwork linked explicitly with the site. It also highlighted some of the biggest tensions experienced by the Jurassic Coast team throughout Creative Coast, where conflicting agendas and working practice led to miscommunication over discussions of ownership and outcomes. Unfortunately, this event was not really able to function as a forum for discussion as to how the immediate legacy project would be practiced. The new approach had already been designed and applied.

4.7.4  End of an era

The final forum meeting indicated the start of a turn towards small, focused and instrumental projects. Outcomes were to be decided upon at the outset of the “commission” and space for conversation and large-scale networking, as targeted objectives, were to become far less common luxuries of the past. Feedback from the event suggested that although many understood this new way of working several were unclear how they might go about this and turn ideas into projects. There was no longer a formal structure to develop art in relation to the Jurassic Coast site and the mechanisms of communication remained unclear, apart from channelling enquiries through the DAT environment hub. What the practical mechanisms for continuing this work, aside from the commission already underway, were unclear. Space and resources for conversations and experimental collaboration on the scale that they had been undertaken over the previous five years were becoming scarce. These developing limitations were patently apparent at the final Creative Coast forum.

Field note: Creative Coast forum, Barclays Building Poole – 8th May 2013
A member of the Jurassic Coast team suggests that there probably won't be another forum and so the best thing to do is to join the [DAT] and Jurassic Coast mailing lists. This feels like a massive anti-climax and actually a waste of all the discussions of the day. They finish the event by saying, ‘you can always pick up the phone because most of you know where I am anyway’, before mentioning an October consultation for the management plan in which they can all get involved. And so the formalized Jurassic Coast Arts Programme was closed.

4.8 Chapter conclusion

This chapter has examined the history of formalized arts programming which established the Jurassic Coast as a Creative Coast. The JCAP and CC2012 through funding by ACE and the local authorities supported partnership between the WHS and local arts organisations. Launched during the Creative Britain agenda this art programming was set in a context of generous funding for the arts and a national culture of creative practice fostered by the Cultural Olympiad in the lead up to the Olympic Games of 2012 (Gilmore 2012). Through a site-specific approach, this research has examined creative policy as it happened in practice to elicit the day-to-day mechanics of national and international policy “on the ground”.

Tracing thorough six events provided cornerstones to the vast and wide-ranging activity, which was adopted into the Creative Coast arts programming. Set amongst complex production networks, the arts policy provided mediated arts engagements through performance of place and heritage. This enabled the Jurassic Coast to develop their interpretative reach beyond the conventional narratives of the earth sciences. It also enabled the site to construct itself as “creative” and to make claims about being the first WHS to do so (Dorset and East Devon WHS Steering Group 2006). Innovative arts practice was supported through Creative Coast, but was often restricted by limited resources and conflicting objectives amongst partners. Eventually the focus of policy shifted from seed-funding new projects into substantially supporting continuing arts
projects to integrate the site into their work. Working in a site-specific way has enabled in-depth analysis of some of these tangles through archival analysis and ethnographic techniques of participant observation and interviews.

In the following chapter I examine how the legacy of this arts programming developed through collaborative partnership with the local arts networks of DAT. An issue based commission on erosion provided the opportunity for the Jurassic Coast to continue working with partnerships that had already been established through the structure of DAT. However, a shift in policy had arisen from reflections by the Jurassic Coast team that partner arts organisations had focused on their own objectives over those of the Jurassic Coast site. This was a criticism with little grounding as both JCAP and CC2012 were designed to foster arts development linked to the Jurassic Coast and on the whole these objectives were met. However, there had been some consternation during Creative Coast that the time and resources provided by those in the science and conservation sectors had not been properly accounted for or reimbursed. In response to concerns amongst the Jurassic Coast team, the Exploring Erosion commission was designed to speak directly to the aims and objectives of the site.
5 Chapter Five: the erosion paradox

5.1 Introduction
This chapter confronts what it means to practice heritage on a constantly changing and eroding site. Firstly investigating this paradox itself, the tensions between beauty, heritage, science, and safety are explored to elucidate some of the issues inherent in the management of the Jurassic Coast. This is demonstrated through the tragic example of Charlotte Blackman who died in an unexpected rock-fall near Burton Bradstock whilst on holiday with her family. Catastrophic events such as this reignite questions as to how to best educate the public on the issues and risks of erosion. Recognising that the complexities of coastal processes were not being communicated effectively, the Jurassic Coast team commissioned artists to explore the theme of erosion. Working though the existing networks developed during JCAP and CC2012, this project shifted the dynamics of the relationship between the WHS and the local arts sector. Two pilot projects were produced in the summer of 2014 under the commission Exploring Erosion: Erosion Zone and Operation Lunar Sea. These were launched to public audiences in the spring of 2014. Erosion Zone was an installation by visual arts duo, ArtSpark. Their kiosk re-worked popular commodities so they depicted contradictory messages about erosion. Simultaneously, London-based performance and digital artist Richard DeDomenici created Operation Lunar Sea. The project involved constructing a feasibility study into the influence of blowing up the Moon on reducing tidal erosion on the Jurassic Coast. Both these artworks therefore formed an issue-based arts approach to the dynamic environment and heritage of the site. Analysing how these projects were produced and their interpretations of the erosion paradox on the site provides useful insight as to the development of creativity on the Jurassic Coast.
Exploring Erosion was, on the surface, an instrumental approach to arts commissioning as a way of managing some of the greatest challenges posed by the dynamism of the Jurassic Coast. Change is an integral part of this site to the extent that the actual boundaries of the Jurassic Coast are mutable and mobile. It is this conception of changing natural heritage (distinct from other cultural heritage sites in England) that makes the Jurassic Coast a fascinating example of managing the demands of natural and cultural expectations at heritage sites. Furthermore, landslide and rock-fall events expose perceptions of risk and personal accountability on the public spaces of the coastline. The consideration of the erosion paradox provides a response to DeSilvey’s understanding of anticipatory history and the ability to ‘respond to change creatively’ (2012: 50). It demonstrates how the heritage of the Jurassic Coast is processual and performed (Duncan 2002). Furthermore, the Exploring Erosion commission example demonstrates how heritage sites might allow for a plurality of voices when undergoing change (Morris 2014). This in turn illustrates how organisations such as the Jurassic Coast can creatively plan for adaptive futures (Harvey and Perry 2015).

Furthermore, the erosion paradox exposes the fallacy of separating the cultural from the natural. Instead, naturecultures are entwined and embedded within the policy and practice of the management of the Jurassic Coast (Hinchliffe 2007). This extends even to the details of the site designation. Landslides and rock-falls along the Jurassic Coast also illustrate conceptions of risk on changing environments. They reveal contradictory expectations of the public to remain safe whilst having access to beaches and coastlines that are, in legal terms, privately owned. Exploring Erosion therefore reveals the perceived roles of ‘creativity’ on the WHS, as the Jurassic Coast team integrate it into their management through the local public arts sector.
Through *Exploring Erosion* creativity was placed within a new arts development context as ideas of Creative Britain were adapted to fit new political agendas. A tightening of purse strings meant that collaboration by the arts sector with other organisations was not only encouraged but almost a requirement for those wishing to work in the public sector (McRobbie 2016). Funding pots were increasingly allocated to multidisciplinary projects capable of addressing multiple agendas at a time. However, in practice these projects were less well resourced with a greater range of cross-sector objectives. Due to reduced funding and the fewer resources available to *Exploring Erosion* it became a much smaller project than its arts programme predecessors. Advised by ACE, the Jurassic Coast designed a “soft-commission” model with clear objectives and outcomes from the outset. This was a response to evaluation from JCAP and CC2012 where the team felt their resources had been stretched too finely to meet the objectives of public art on the Jurassic Coast focus from “what they are about as a site”. Terms such as “instrumental,” “legacy,” “outcome-based” and “soft commission” were employed by the practitioners involved in Exploring Erosion to demonstrate this shift in approach from the previous arts programmes.

Continuing site-specific engagements with policy, this chapter unpicks the *Exploring Erosion* commission. This approach to policy continued to enable a contribution to the understanding of the everyday entanglements of practice as a result of decision-making in heritage and the arts. Being embedded in the *Exploring Erosion* project from the outset gave insight into formational discussions about what the project should be and who should manage it. These seem entangled and protracted at times. However, these detailed accounts are significant as they demonstrate the lived experiences of the practitioners working and are essential for understanding when and how creative policy is effective and when it is not. Despite not falling within an organized programme of events, the commission worked through many of the established partnerships and
networks developed over the previous years parallel to JCAP and CC2012. This also continued a practice of working with both science and arts sector practitioners in the planning and development of creative outputs. However, despite significant re-structuring in policy and approach, some of the tensions as to the configuration and ownership of the Jurassic Coast as a Creative Coast remained. Despite an increased ownership over these creative outputs by the Jurassic Coast team and Trust there remained divisions between the different working practices of the arts and natural heritage sectors.

5.2 Landslips, heritage and change: an erosion paradox

When it comes to erosion there are a couple of important principles about the JC we’re always trying to get across to people – firstly to behave responsibly ‘out there’ but also that ‘erosion is a good thing’. (Earth Science Manager 2014, pers. comm., 24 February)

As described by the earth scientist in the quotation above, the Jurassic Coast WHS is established on a paradox. As a natural WHS, it was designated in part due to the outstanding universal value of the coastline, which represents major stages in earth’s history and the record of life. Significantly, the site was also designated by UNESCO for the ‘significant on-going geological processes in the development of landforms, or significant geomorphic or physiographic features’ (UNESCO 2015: 16. Emphasis added). Features such as Durdle Door, Black Ven landslide and Old Harry Rocks provide textbook examples of the landforms that develop as the coastline retreats. This makes the site not only significant for its geological succession and fossil record but also for these geomorphological features shaped through different forms of coastal erosion that are dynamic and on-going. The Jurassic Coast therefore is situated in a fairly unique position in the UK, which is dominated by cultural WHSs. The conundrum is that it is a WHS where the policy works to preserve and recognise the value of the processes of change, including erosion.
The paradox of preserving processes of erosion creates a tension within the fabric of the management of the site. World heritage is often sought after not only for the conservation status it affords but also its ability to attract tourists to the area. The Dorset and Devon coastline has long been a tourist site, however the World Heritage designation brought further economic benefits by supporting the tourism industry in the area (Ash Futures 2015). Encouraging visitors to access and experience the coastline form a part of the Jurassic Coast management plan, as a central tenet of the designation policy. The erosion paradox is therefore a quotidian, yet challenging, part of the Jurassic Coast team’s work. The Jurassic Coast team must foster the continuing erosion of the coastline whilst ensuring, as far as possible, visitor safety and negotiating issues of loss of land on the 95 miles of coastline. The active movement of the landscape is very apparent here.

It is for this reason that the Jurassic Coast team looked towards other, less traditional, methods of communicating the paradoxical risks and benefits of erosion along the site. Having seen some of the benefits of communicating through artistic means during the arts programmes, the team saw an issue-based approach as a strategic way forward to work with the arts sector. They hoped that the arts might be able to provide a thought-provoking approach that challenged preconceptions on the role and nature of erosion on the Jurassic Coast.

Field note: St Oswald’s Bay – 30th April 2013

There is a buzz as we arrive at the cliff-top car park. A large white television van thunders past with a satellite ominously poised on its roof. It is then that we learn from one of the Lulworth rangers that there has been a large rockfall over night. She tells us she is just heading down to take a look. It is around two in the afternoon; the sun is high with only a light breeze to relieve us from the spring heat. We descend the hill – the Jurassic Coast
team on an outing to the site to discuss its management. After a morning meeting, now is our chance to see the sea.

It is a steep descent down the path towards a green field with tall, dry grass – prickly to the touch. We approach the scar; it is an empty void. Where only last night a footpath trail had traced along this precarious edge – now there is nothing [Fig. 22]. The steps drop away to an incomplete destination, although the track further on gives an indication to the previous footpath. Standing at the scar, a disorderly line bitten out of the smooth cliff edge, an adrenaline rush hit me. The realization that the ground beneath was all but solid was reinforced by a series of dark, thick cracks slashed across the eroded tracks. Paths that had been worn by the continual passage of walkers making a pilgrimage towards the popular tourist destination: Durdle Door. We gasp, we take photos, we speculate particulars of the movement, and one of us remarks that a large school group walked this very route only the day before.

I ascend the grassy hill (it is tough work - the climb is steep) and I conscientiously remain outside the posts hectically delved into the soil by the rangers to demarcate an area of danger for passers-by. The view from above the scar is spectacular: the steps descend into the sea yet the raggedy coastline continues along past Durdle Door to the steep hills and deep valleys beyond. Below, a line of bright yellow chalk sediment traces through the clear blue sea highlighting the motion of currents across the bay [Fig. 23].

As a group we later descended down towards the renowned archway of Durdle Door. We discussed – as planned – the difficulties of access to the site due to the continuing erosion of the pathways and steps. The coastline here is owned by the Lulworth estate that is, along with the South West Coast Footpath, responsible for maintaining the stepped access to the beaches here. However, the heavily tilted Wealden Group stone, a group of variegated sands and clays, is soft here and continually eroded by visitors scrambling down the slope to the beach below.101

---

Figure 22: View of the collapsed footpath and streams of sediment in the sea below (photo: author)
Figure 23: The scar at the top of the rock-fall cutting across eroded footpaths on the cliff top: St. Oswald’s Bay, Lulworth (photo: author)

Figure 24: View of the rock-fall from across the bay: St. Oswald’s Bay, Lulworth (photo: author)
Stood at this lower perspective the landslide looks even more magnificent [Fig. 24]. Looming over St. Oswald’s bay it looks enduring, sturdy and sure; a direct contrast to the reality. Within a few hours it feels like it has become a part of a new landscape – forming a new profile. Its bulk dominates the coastline, creating an impression of permanence. Although in fact the boundary of the Jurassic Coast designated site has shifted onto this freshly exposed surface of rock. Retreated by feet onto the new cliff face.

Durdle Door is one of the leading tourist attractions along the south coastline of England. This section of coastline is described as a “honey-spot” as it attracts 500,000 - 700,000 visitors a year (Lulworth Estate 2008). They marvel at the blue seas lapping against the arched stone walls, lie on the beaches and swim through the archway [Fig. 25]. However, Durdle Door is not just an ornamental arch set into the landscape, it is an archetypal example of cliff retreat in process. The action of the waves and other erosional processes here break down the rock, taking advantage of cracks and points of weakness creating holes, caves, and archways which eventually collapse into the stacks and stumps evident in the chalk pillars of Old Harry Rocks at Swanage [Fig. 26]. These processes of retreat are studied in many school syllabuses and students ranging from school to university level are regularly seen measuring and observing Durdle Door for this reason.

The fact that this busy tourist spot encountered an unexpected rock-fall was not unusual. This was one of the many rock-falls and landslides of varying sizes and mechanisms that occur along the site on an annual basis. However, some are more predictable than others. High and steep cliffs are undermined in the most part by the action of the sea.

---

Figure 25: Tourists and students making the most of a warm day at Durdle Door: Lulworth (photo: author)
Figure 26: The white chalk pillars at Old Harry Rocks: Swanage, Dorset (photo: author)

Figure 27: A landslide at Charmouth beach: Charmouth, Dorset (photo: author)
However, there is no way of telling exactly where and when the cliffs will collapse. This is even true further west where clay-based shales tend to form landslips as the material flows down slope towards the sea rather than falling in a sudden event [Fig. 27]. These unpredictable movements of earth pose risk to person and property and yet simultaneously they are a part of the constant shifting and re-settling of material along this coastline, which has occurred since the English Channel was flooded. Thanks, in part, to that television van, the media extensively reported on the rock-fall event at St. Oswald’s bay in April 2013. One headline the following day pronounced it as ‘the path that fell off a cliff’ (The Independent 2013: 2). Furthermore, the Press Association published the headline: ‘Walkers warned over cliff collapse’ (Merz 2013: np). Two local newspapers adopted this verbatim: the Western Daily Press based in Bristol and the Western Morning News in Plymouth. However, perhaps most theatrically, The Times declared: ‘Beauty spot slips away’ (The Times 2013: 18).

The rock-fall had therefore created a certain media narrative of loss and risk. The event also inspired the television presenter and geographer Nick Crane to write an article in The Telegraph with the headline: ‘The desperate battle to save our coastline’ (Crane 2013: 16). In it he described the coast as ‘under continual attack from tide and tempest’ (Crane 2013: 16) and expanded with:

106 Crane, N. (2013) The desperate battle to save our coastline; You don’t have to live on a cliff top to be at risk – millions of Britons face danger from the sea, The Daily Telegraph, 7th May: 16.
Last week, a small part of it, at the base of a cliff on the edge of St. Oswald’s bay, fractured in the night. The result was a thunderous explosion, as tonnes of Cretaceous chalk were dumped into the sea, creating a gash in the coastline 80 to 100 metres long. Perhaps the long, wet winter had weakened the joints in the chalk – but there were no warning signs, no cracks across the coastal path that skirted this part of the bay. (Crane 2013)

Alongside, Crane described other examples of the coastal ‘landscape under threat’ (Crane 2013: 16). He even divulged a spoiler from one of his episodes of Coast concluding that the expense of coastal management was rising by stating: ‘Everyone loves Britain’s coastline – but the cost of holding the line is increasing all the time’ (Crane 2013).

This sensationalist response is part of a common discourse of landslides and rock-falls along the coastline as destructive and disastrous events. Crane emphasised loss of land, a time of crisis and a call for human action (Crane 2013). However, the erosion of the coastline does not only destroy, it forms the iconic and scenic landforms such as Durdle Door for which the Jurassic Coast is renowned. Responses to coastal retreat are therefore plagued by tensions, contradictions and conflicts of interest. This is a more complex debate than funding the rising cost of sea walls to protect regency seaside towns. However, the anticipatory histories of these structures under threat create new heritage narratives for this coastline (Holtorf 2015; DeSilvey 2012; DeSilvey 2010). The paradox of erosion on the Jurassic Coast is therefore its agency to destroy and endanger but also its ability to create and inspire.

5.2.1 Heritage designation and change

The management of the Jurassic Coast does not only need to account for the uncertainty of this coastal environment, its designation is bound by it. This is outlined in the Jurassic Coast management plan:
Because soft cliffs erode and in some places the break in the cliff moves back irregularly, it is this written definition, rather than a line on the map, that should be used for all formal purposes. Therefore, the maps are only correct as of stated point in time, and UNESCO recognise a moving boundary that keeps pace with erosion, and which needs periodic monitoring to ensure changes are registered. (Jurassic Coast World Heritage team 2014b)

Due to the volatile shoreline, visual illustrations of the site boundaries are deemed inaccurate and unreliable. The WHS is therefore held in the written word of policy and the ever changing and unpredictable natural process that shape its extent and form. In short, it is mapped in the mind.

As I witnessed at St. Oswald’s bay in April 2013, the shifts in the coastline are an integral part of the day-to-day management of the Jurassic Coast. Not only does erosion constitute an inherent tension within the designation of the WHS it fundamentally shifts the location and shape of its boundaries, which are:

…defined by natural phenomena: on the seaward side the property extends to the mean low water mark and on the landward side to the cliff top or back of the beach... Due to the high rate of erosion and mass movement, it is important to periodically monitor the boundaries of the properties to ensure that significant changes to the shoreline are registered. (Jurassic Coast World Heritage team 2014b)\(^{107}\)

The actual site of the Jurassic Coast is therefore narrow and liminal. The exposed surface of the cliff-face and foreshore are under continual change from the movements and oscillations of the sea and tides and the erosion and deposition of material on the cliffs and beach. Crucially the designated site shifts as the land retreats so that when there is a landslide the Jurassic Coast actually moves.

---

In many ways the Jurassic Coast can be seen as a ruin. Through the continual processes of erosion and deposition, ‘the debris of the past [form] the foundation for subsequent building’ (Lyons 1997: 79). Although designated as natural heritage, the landscape here is a preserved artefact, both as a record of the past and as an example of how environments change over time. The cultural tensions between ‘melancholic beauty’ and ‘violent destruction’ explored in ruinous landscapes (Merewether 1997: 32) are therefore pertinent for dynamic heritage sites such as the Jurassic Coast. The contradiction between transience and persistence over time is a crucial component in the constitution of a ruin, where objects and places are transformed into physical traces of the past (Roth 1997). Furthermore the coastline, although described as a part of natural heritage, is a culturally constituted site. Therefore witnessing the change evident at the site is often described as a humbling experience, creating a kind of reverence as identified in our relationship with ruins. As described by DeSilvey and Edensor:

The current fascination with ruins may thus be part of a broader aesthetic premised on sensationalism and anticipation; we are attracted to ruins to play out possible futures (and pasts), including violence and devastation, but also pleasure and excitement. (DeSilvey and Edensor 2012: 478).

In fact, the tensions associated with contradictory experiences of stability and change are inherent in many of the practices and manifestations of heritage sites:

Ruins merrily transgress and collapse a whole set of binaries: transience/persistence, nature/culture, attraction/repulsion, power/vulnerability, potential/purposelessness, abandonment/appropriation, presence/absence, aestheticization/abjection. Their oscillating identities ensure that no stabilized meaning can endure unchallenged, as long as the process of ruination continues… There are multiple ways of making sense and use of these sites. (DeSilvey and Edensor 2012: 478)

Describing coastlines and other dynamic heritage sites as ruins provides some agency for the material processes that influence them. It also opens up the dialectic between nature and artifice, especially in sites where it is the processes of change themselves that are being valued and designated. As described by Roth; ‘the disappearance, the
threat of loss, is key to the attraction of ruins and to their essential ambiguity’ (Roth 1997).

The flexible designation of the Jurassic Coast sits within the more formalised boundaries of UK legal environment protection. The narrow band of the WHS is encased within a patchwork of nationally designated sites that act as a legal buffer against development. There are three forms of designation that provide this form of protection to the site (these have to be established separately from the World Heritage designation to ensure that the site has protection from development within the laws of its host nation). These are Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) identified under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, and sites from the Geological Conservation Review (GCR).\textsuperscript{108} Additionally, the world heritage designation excludes the commercial port areas and manufactured seafronts at many of the Gateway Towns along the site.\textsuperscript{109} These include, Sidmouth, Seaton, Lyme Regis, West Bay, Weymouth and Swanage. As a result there are very few residents (around ten) living on the actual WHS and its designated regions.

Within these natural and scientific forms of protective designation, erosion can be valued for its action in forming the landscapes that attract visitors and are commonly understood to be a part of the inherent value of the beauty of the countryside. However, this value increasingly has to be justified in a climate of reduced public funding and pressures for infrastructure development, especially residential building in

\textsuperscript{108} The GCR was conducted between 1977-1990 and identified 69 sites, which now fall within the boundaries of the Jurassic Coast site. Many of these protective designations overlap and there are some exceptions. They are listed in detail in Appendix 2 of the management plan for 2014-2019 (Jurassic Coast World Heritage team 2014a).

\textsuperscript{109} Gateway Towns are the urban areas, which provide infrastructure and access points for the Jurassic Coast. They are explained in more detail in Chapter One [section 1.4].
rural regions such as Dorset and Devon.\textsuperscript{110} In fact, an extensive survey evaluating the economic value of the Jurassic Coast conducted in 2015 estimated that annually the site influences £111 million in economic output and up to 2,000 jobs in the surrounding Dorset and East Devon area (Ash Futures 2015). Reports such as this help to justify the designation and work of the Jurassic Coast within policy settings.

Furthermore, from a heritage perspective, it is significant that for the Jurassic Coast it is seemingly destructive natural processes, such as erosion, that reveal the geology and geomorphological features inherent for WHS designation. Therefore it is important to recognise that conceptions of change sit differently amongst natural heritage sites such as the Jurassic Coast when compared to their cultural counterparts as natural processes are protected at the expense of cultural cost. However, understandings and definitions of value are different for the tourist, the resident, the artist and the policy maker. Yet it is these notions of value that influences how the boundaries of the WHS are both identified and protected. Breeze describes the process of defining buffer zones for WHSs as subjective (Breeze 2011). These buffer delineations are even more fluid on the Jurassic Coast where boundaries are not officially marked on a map.

Buffer zones are conventionally defined as, ‘the physical extent of the landscape that is visually and perceptibly linked to the perception of the WHS and that can still be practically protected or managed’ (Breeze 2011). For this reason UNESCO usually requires that an environmental conservation agreement is already legally in place before the designation of a site. However, conflicts with this designation policy come to the fore when its boundaries are challenged. Recently plans for a large offshore wind

\textsuperscript{110} Political pressure for developing affordable housing must be balanced against existing protected environments. This is something Dorset and Devon County Councils must negotiate in their planning processes (See for example The Dorset Strategic Partnership 2007).
farm near Swanage (the Navitus Bay project) were overturned. The petition to cancel the farm was aided by statements from UNESCO and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN). Technically the wind farm was not physically located on the WHS, which has no protective buffer zone to legally protect it from such developments. The lack of formalized buffer zone for the site had been agreed as part of the negotiations with local landowners when the application for world heritage status was being developed. Despite this, IUCN’s statement implied the importance of maintaining a buffer zone for uninterrupted views from the site. Additionally, the IUCN concluded that Navitus Bay would have an adverse impact on the underlying geomorphological processes, although further research would be needed to assess the extent of potential damage. They stated:

Furthermore, IUCN considers that the [Navitus Bay] Project will have a significant impact on the natural setting of the [Jurassic Coast], in that it would adversely impact on important view [sic] from the [Jurassic Coast]… This is likely to significantly impact on visitors’ experience and appreciation for the [Jurassic Coast] in its wider natural setting, which could in turn compromise the long term sustainability of the management of the property, through a loss of revenue and reduced opportunities to present the property in its natural setting to a wide audience. (IUCN 2014: 1-2)

This statement was highly significant as it revealed how world heritage policy is enacted when a site is perceived to be under threat. This approach is not only limited to the Jurassic Coast. For example, in the summer of 2015 UNESCO acknowledged the need to recognise the effects of climate change on their sites (UNEP, UNESCO, and UCS 2016). The document includes consideration of future impacts of climate change on sites whilst they are being considered for designation onto the world heritage list.

111 Although it went through various iterations in the planning application process the Navitus Bay project applied for 194 wind turbine generators with tip height of up to 200 metres located in The Solent, approximately 14km south of Durlston Head (on the Isle of Purbeck) and 17km from Scratchell’s Bay (on the Isle of Wight) (Challenge Navitus 2015; Navitus Bay Development Ltd 2013: 1).
Remarkably, the statement above argues that the wind farm is being objected primarily due to its adverse effects to the views from the site. This is noteworthy as the site was refused designation under criterion seven which would have recognised the ‘exceptional natural beauty’ of the coastline (UNESCO 2015). The Jurassic Coast therefore was only designated on the world heritage list for its outstanding universal value with regards to its examples of geology and geomorphology. Arguably there shouldn’t be a case from the world heritage agenda for refusing the wind farm, particularly due to the international considerations of reducing carbon emissions in countries such as the UK that are having adverse affects on World Heritage Sites across the world. Besides, the objection from IUCN seemed to mainly focus on definitions of the difference between natural and human-made settings:

The completion of the [Navitus Bay] Project would result in the [Jurassic Coast] being presented and transmitted to future generations in a form that is significantly different from what was there at the time of inscription and until today. Specifically, the property will change from being located in a natural setting that is largely free from human-made structures to one where its setting is dominated by human-made structures. (IUCN 2014)

It is the perceptions of change from the originally designated site and purpose of its setting that guides the official objections to wind farm development in this case.

The Navitus Bay example demonstrates some of the conflicts and contradictions in demarcating and protecting the Jurassic Coast. The distinction made in the statement by IUCN makes clear distinction between natural settings and human-made structures. This is indicative of how the cultural and the natural are separated within world heritage structures. However, these distinctions are now largely rejected within critical heritage studies (Harrison 2012b; Solnit 2001). The relationship between the human and the natural is understood to be complex and multifaceted so that an environment cannot simply be described as being ‘free from human-made structures’ as above (IUCN 2014). The designation of the Jurassic Coast is therefore flexible, not only in the policy
setting where it may be implemented in unforeseeable ways (as with Navitus Bay) but also in the demarcation of the site itself. As the Jurassic Coast is a WHS that is constantly in flux, the agency of processes such as erosion become prevailing issues in its management. This management is riddled with paradoxes and unpredictable issues that make notions of protecting and preserving the heritage here incongruous.

5.2.2 The fatal volatility of landslides and rock-falls

Almost simultaneously I saw about half of the cliff face collapse. It happened so fast, as in the blink of an eye. We had no time to get out of the way. I grabbed Mitchell and ran into the sea. A large dust cloud appeared and I couldn’t see for 20 seconds. I went to the area where the cliff had fallen. I sent Mitchell away.

There were boulders the size of haystacks. I couldn’t see Charlotte.

Me and Kevin were calling for her and trying to move the rocks. I was aware people were shouting and telling me to get away. It was complete chaos. All I could think was I wanted to find Charlotte and try to get her out of there. I tried for five minutes. I couldn’t move any more of the rocks. (Matthew Carnell in the Mirror 18th December 2012)

The environment is constantly shifting on the Jurassic Coast. However, although this forms the geomorphic form of the coast that UNESCO recognises as of Outstanding Universal Value, this dynamic coastline has its risks. This was especially apparent in the summer of 2012. On the 24th July 2012 the 22 year old Charlotte Blackman was walking along the beach at Burton Bradstock with her father, younger brother and boyfriend (Gerryts 2012). The quotation above is Charlotte’s boyfriend Matthew’s account of the incident. Having just been for a swim they wandered alongside the dramatic, orange, sandstone cliffs on this part of the coast, which glow on a sunny day. Unexpectedly, with a loud crashing sound and dust cloud, 400 tonnes of Bridport sandstone fell down onto the beach. Kevin, Charlotte’s father, and Matthew (carrying

her younger brother) managed to run to safety. However Charlotte was buried under the rock-fall that an eyewitness claimed was the equivalent of 3 or 4 skip loads (Burnett 2012). Despite extensive rescue efforts that lasted into the night, the rock-fall had been instantly fatal. The transformation of this holiday beach into a place of danger and loss was shocking and tragic.

After the initial shock of Charlotte’s death questions began to arise as to why and how she was placed in danger in the first place. Kevin Blackman, Charlotte’s father exclaimed in the media that there was no warning as they arrived on the beach that day and that they therefore didn’t realise it was dangerous. In the height of summer the reasons for the rock-fall had not been immediately apparent. Therefore, a petition was launched by Charlotte’s family for better warnings at the access points of the beach and the incident was investigated thoroughly for a Coroner’s Inquest held in Dorchester the following December (2012). The cause of the rock-fall was unknown. There had been a sustained period of rainfall in the preceding weeks but it was likely that the rock-fall was the result of the continuing action of the sea undermining the cliff at its base. Wet weather is a more visually apparent contributor to rock-falls than the ongoing erosion of the cliff by the sea. Therefore, ascertaining the predictability of the event was crucial to establish the liability of landowners to warn visitors of the risk they were undertaking.

5.2.3 Legal issues of uncertainty and liability with changing landscapes

The inquest into Charlotte Blackman’s death investigated the placement of signs on access to the beach and challenged the landowner (the National Trust) on the extent to

---

which they warned visitors of the possible dangers of the towering 100-foot cliffs. As the family had accessed the beach from the Freshwater Bay Caravan Park, where they were staying, they argued that they had seen no warning signs and therefore were not aware of the danger. The inquiry included testimony from the landowners of Freshwater Beach and the Burton cliffs where the rock-fall occurred to determine whether duty of care had been established to visitors of the beach that day. If the risk of rock-fall events were increased by rainfall, for example, the landowners would have to notify visitors of this additional risk.

The inquest however established that on 24th July 2012 the risk of rock-falls was constant on this stretch of coastline. The rainfall might have contributed to the event but this would be hard to predict as the last rock-fall here occurred in February 2012 during a period of drought. Furthermore, there had only been one rock-fall since the rainfall in the summer of 2012 (by December 2012) and none had followed a heavy rainfall period that November. In short, the likelihood of rock-falls along this stretch of coastline was rare and didn’t obviously correspond directly to periods of rainfall, which would make the events more predictable. In a report circulated amongst the Council an Earth Scientist stated:

> There is still a great deal of confusion in the media between landslides and rock falls but that is quite significant as landslides obviously do respond to rainfall while the Burton-West Bay cliffs are undercut by the sea to cause rock falls. (Earth Science 2012, pers. comm., 19 December)

This would suggest that there was no need for additional signs as the risk of rock-falls along this stretch was no higher than usual and there was no increased likelihood of danger, hidden or otherwise. However, popular representations of rock-fall and landslide events paint a confusing picture. Therefore, the family’s view that the warning signs were ineffective was in many ways a reasonable one. At the inquest the father of Matthew (Charlotte’s boyfriend) stated that the reason they had chosen to go on
holiday in Dorset was due to the Jurassic Coast site and that they had not thought it would be anything other than safe. An internal report circulated amongst the County Council anticipated that any legal case might be based on the association of safety with the site.

Mr Sheriff Payne, coroner for West Dorset, ruled a verdict of accidental death stating:

This was a sudden act of nature that nobody could have expected, in particular those poor members of her family. The only warning was a couple of stones coming down and then the substantial rock fall occurred. The post-mortem report confirms that Charlotte died instantly, there was no chance of her surviving or of anyone being able to pull her out alive. I would like to extend my sympathy to the family. I'm so sorry for your loss. (Burnett 2012)\textsuperscript{114}

Charlotte's tragic and sudden death opened up a lot of questions for the Council, the National Trust and the Jurassic Coast as to how best to manage visitor risk along the site. In his ruling the coroner wrote to Freshwater Holiday Park recommending that they add supplementary signs in the location where Charlotte and her family had got onto the beach back in July. This triggered discussion on how the various stakeholders along the coastline might be able to develop a coordinated approach to warning visitors as to the risks of the coastal environments along the Jurassic Coast.

The legal responsibility for keeping visitors safe on the stretch of beach on which Charlotte died is set out by \textit{The Occupier's Liability Act 1957}.\textsuperscript{115} This is applicable to both the National Trust, as owners, and the Jurassic Coast, as managers, of this stretch of coastline. The Occupier’s Liability Act states that the owner of a premises


owes the “common duty of care” to any visitor or visitors who are on their property by agreement or otherwise.\footnote{116} The common duty of care in English law is described in the following way:

The common duty of care is a duty to take such care as in all circumstances of the case reasonable to see that the visitor will be reasonably safe in using the premises for the purposes for which he [sic] is invited or permitted by the occupier to be there. (Occupier’s Liability Act 1957, ss 2, 2)\footnote{117}

Charlotte’s case therefore had rested on whether it was considered that the landowners of Freshwater Beach, the National Trust, had executed sufficient measures to ensure visitors were reasonably safe. Interestingly, one of the cases that set the precedent for the way The Occupier’s Liability Act is employed in these environments was a case against West Dorset District Council following an incident on the Lyme Regis Cobb.\footnote{118} This case was significant not only because it occurred on the Jurassic Coast WHS, albeit before designation, but also because it set precedent for how the Occupier’s Liability Act works to protect both visitors and landowners from

\footnote{116} This has interesting ramifications for landowners where visitors are trespassing – but this is beyond the scope of the discussion here.


On the 5\textsuperscript{th} April 1995 an appeal was raised on behalf of West Dorset District Council against claims made by Paul Staples. Staples had fallen from the Cobb seven years previously (14th February 1988) fracturing his hip; an injury that would trigger another fall the following year. Although it was acknowledged that Staples was 40% responsible for this incident he had been initially awarded damages to the sum of £95,102.40. The Judge had ruled that as there had been no warning notice for visitors the Council were responsible for the accident. However, the appeal case argued that the Council were not liable and had not caused Staples to fall. The case hinged on whether the Council had been negligent to the individual according to the 1957 Act, which burdens the common duty of care on the landowner. The Council argued to the contrary that the visitor did not need to be warned as he aware of the relevant danger of the Cobb at the time of his fall. In the hearing it became apparent that Staples was aware of, and had accepted, the fact that the Cobb was sloping, wet and especially slippery due to algae before walking along it. However, when asked if he had recognised the hazards he replied, ‘There didn’t appear to be any’ (Staples v West Dorset District Council [1995] EWCA Civ 30: np). This is revealing as it uncovers some of the underlying assumptions made by visitors when negotiating locations along the coastline. Despite being able to recognise the risks when walking on the Cobb, Staples did not acknowledge that he himself might be in danger. The appeal was successful and West Dorset District Council was not liable for the accident and injury of Paul Staples.
unanticipated coastal risks. Namely, there is no duty of care to the visitor where the
dangers are deemed obvious. In Charlotte’s inquest it was decided that the risk of rock-
falls was constant but low, therefore the incident was sudden and unpredictable.

Although not a legal requirement, the Jurassic Coast, by attracting visitors to the East
Devon and Dorset Coast, adopts a duty of care. Warning against the risks of these
coastal environments involves effectively warning the public of these dangers. As
shown in the unfortunate cases of Charlotte Blackman and Paul Staples,
communicating the risks of the site to its visitors is not a simple task.

5.2.4 Managing the volatility of the Jurassic Coast: the issue with signs

Charlotte’s family reinforced the Coroner’s recommendation for more signs at the
Freshwater Holiday Park in their statement after the inquest:

If anything can be taken from this tragedy we hope that improved signage
along the coast line [sic] is installed and raises awareness of how
dangerous and unpredictable the coastline is. (The Charlotte Blackman

The concerns raised at the inquest included the extent of warning of rock-falls given to
Charlotte and her family as they walked along the beach that day in July. Specifically,
the placement of the warning signs was focussed on as it had been possible to access
the beach from the Freshwater campsite without passing any. However, because of the
location of the River Bride on this stretch of beach it is very hard for the National Trust
to maintain signs for visitors as they enter the land owned by the Trust. A National
Trust Manager explained this in their report at the Coroner’s Inquest into Charlotte’s
death:
Since the incident, the NT [National Trust] has kept a detailed log of signage and salient changes/challenges. The signs were inspected twice a day until the end of October. The signs were then inspected twice a week as the season finished and stormy conditions ensued. Since the incident on 24 July 2012, the NT has had to replace the signs on 14 occasions at Freshwater; approximately 42 signs have been replaced across both locations... The NT have battled with weather, tides, site conditions and storms and have concluded that signage on the beach itself cannot be sustained at either the Hive or Freshwater end. The NT must continue to rely on the signage and information points further "inland". (National Trust Manager 2012: 2)\(^{120}\)

It was apparent that signs were not sufficiently resilient to the environment to provide a constant and clear warning to visitors. Therefore, following the Inquest, the Jurassic Coast became involved in a series of conversations about how best to communicate the risks of rock-falls and landslides along the coastline. The problems with the current signs were identified to be their inconsistency and as described above the difficulty to maintain them in the volatile coastal environment. Furthermore it was understood that where signs were installed not all visitors to the coast engaged with them. This left Dorset County Council and the other organisations based on the coastline with a difficult predicament. It was hard to measure how visitors engaged with the warning signs along the coast. In addition, historical cases such as that of Paul Staples mentioned above demonstrated that even if visitors recognised the risks they may underestimate or misestimate the levels of danger they placed themselves in. This could be ascribed to what psychologist Tali Sharot defines as the optimism bias (Sharot 2011). This is particularly applicable to assessing how best to communicate the risks on the Jurassic Coast. Sharot suggests that where risks are most unknown or uncertain, individuals are more prone to judge that they are safe (Sharot 2011).

Consequently, there was a lot to consider in the policy response to Charlotte’s death at Freshwater. After testifying at the Inquest a Jurassic Coast earth scientist

\(^{120}\) National Trust Manager. 2012. National Trust Report for Coroner’s Inquest of Charlotte Blackman, 18th December, Dorset: National Trust.
recommended that a combined approach to landslides and rock-falls needed to be developed along the site. It was imagined that this would involve a wide partnership of local authorities, the Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA) and landowners along the Jurassic Coast. The team advised the following:

We now should review of [sic] the signage and also consider how we may respond to extreme weather events in the future. As I have said before: I think we are much stronger for working together rather than playing pass the parcel and it is the right thing to do and in line with the Counties [sic] aims and objectives for protecting the environment and the economy. (Earth Scientist 2012, pers. comm., 19th December)

In January 2014 this had been developed and the official response of Dorset County Council to extreme weather events had been formalised within the Dorset Landslide and Rock Fall Protocol. The Protocol specified three levels of risk linked to landslides or rock-falls following extreme weather: low, medium, and high. Identifying a site as low risk would mean that no immediate action needed to be taken. Whereas, high risk was invoked when people and property were in danger and this would result in Police involvement. It was the second level of medium risk where additional action would need to be undertaken by the partnerships along the Jurassic Coast. This was described in a team meeting as:

There are additional needs to warn the public particularly around level 2 [medium risk]. Proactive toolkits have been developed consisting of signs that can be put out to warn people (NE, West Dorset, Purbeck DC funded). The signs are stored in Coastguard stations. But the signs cannot be maintained; even large signs have been washed away. This is not a sustainable practice. (Jurassic Coast team 2014: 1)\textsuperscript{121}

This means the safety message was still reliant on the permanent signs, which had been deemed out-dated and ineffective. Therefore, the Jurassic Coast continued to gather with landowners, District and County councillors to come up with a new plan for signs along the coast. At the same time as the Landslide and Rock Fall Protocol was being designed and put in place, the National Trust was developing new ways of

\textsuperscript{121} Jurassic Coast team (2014) \textit{Team Meeting Minutes}, 14th January, County Hall, Dorchester.
communicating the dangers of the eroding cliffs to its visitors. New deckchairs, windbreaks and beach shelters were designed with simple messages about beach safety [Fig. 28]. A manager from the National Trust, who had given testimony at the Coroner's Inquest into Charlotte Blackman's death, said the following about the initiative:

We want our visitors to have a wonderful time at the coast, but also ask them to respect the nature of this wild and special place. We advise people not to walk or sit directly under the cliffs, and these new deckchairs, windbreaks and beach shelters will not only make their day even more relaxed, but also help them decide where best to set up and unwind. (Jurassic Coast World Heritage team 2015: np)

The issue of warning visitors about the risks of erosion, rock-falls and landslides was at the forefront of the Jurassic Coast team's discussions during the winter of 2012-2013. It was, and continues to be, a regular item on team meeting agendas and is a topic that is often wrestled with amongst these practitioners. Encouraging personal responsibility and accountability amongst visitors to the site requires narrating the risk of the coastline in clear ways. However, simultaneously it was also recognised that positive learning messages are more effective at creating a culture of respect, care and safety.
Figure 28: National Trust and Jurassic Coast tents, windbreaks and deckchairs with cliff safety messages, Jurassic Coast website (photo: Third Party Copyright)
5.3 Artfully communicating risk to the public: the *Exploring Erosion* project

5.3.1 Using public arts to communicate heritage, erosion, and risk

I am rapidly coming around to the idea that information should come second to much broader aims like being challenging, provocative and encouraging reflection. If each person’s subjective perception of landscape is as individual as we think then actually the real value will come from targeting the individual and not the subject matter…

There is always a temptation to be diverted by interesting details, and geology and geomorphology is chock full of that kind of information. All I would encourage you to consider is that a clear focus on challenging people with their own misunderstandings or poorly thought through perceptions, however innocently held, is actually the most effective way to get people to walk away from your works thinking and not just trying to remember.

It’s a bit of a rant, I know. Apologies for that, but this actually matters because in many ways that other nature conservation isn’t, rocks and their associated natural processes are routinely taken for granted and misunderstood. Geo-conservation is poorly valued by society and is in dire need of fresh ideas and approaches. Enter artists. (Earth Science Manager 2014, pers. comm., 24th February)

In early 2013, set in the background of the discussions on safety and risk along the retreating coastline, the opportunity for the team to combine their increasingly nuanced understandings of geo-interpretation and communicating risk arose. The quotation above demonstrates the thoughtful considerations within the Jurassic Coast management team on how they might best work with the public arts sector. This was in part a result of the partnerships and projects that individuals within the team had participated in throughout JCAP and CC2012. Therefore, whilst developing the Landslip and Rock Fall protocol it was acknowledged that there was space for different interpretations and responses to the specific heritage requirements of the site. This recognition coincided with the opportunity presented by the legacy arts project allocated from CC2012 funds. The team developed a commission around the issue of erosion and this was presented to the Dorset Arts Together (DAT) network where it became the *Exploring Erosion* project.
Meanwhile, the structure of public arts provision within Dorset was shifting with arts provision being externalised into the DAT organisation. To complement these structural changes, the Dorset County arts development team had attended various training events run by the national government. These had encouraged a stronger emphasis on business growth in their approach to arts projects, which they as a team would facilitate. In terms of policy this was beginning to be narrated as a shift towards an instrumental and outcome-based approach to the public arts in Dorset. A member of Dorset arts team explained the motivation for these changes in a very open way:

[W]e’re obviously in a very different place than [we] were five/six years ago. And that’s all to do with the budget business you know. I mean whether you go with the narrative of the present national administration or whether you don’t, or whatever problems you have with that, pragmatically you know it’s – you can’t really do anything except run with it. Now, and that means from my point of view trying to find out how we – how do we change in order to deal with this and you know loads and loads of stuff has changed around you know, we’re working on an outcome-based position these days… how do you serve other people’s agendas?

…So it's serving the membership and it shouldn't in that case do anything irrelevant [laughs]. That’s the theory… Because I think and continue to think that that’s the way we work now, that we no longer can afford the luxury of just having an arts programme. It’s great but you know the current situation calls for clarity and real guidance on what should be [produced]. (Arts Development Manager 2014, pers. comm., 15th May)

This shift in approach meant that the arts development team was changing how public arts in the area might work with partners specifically within the public sector. As a part of an increased “business” approach the focus of the organisation changed from a primary focus on producing new and ground-breaking art for the public, to identifying alternative sources of funding and making sure that this art met some of the needs of any partner organisations involved. Identifying alternative sources of funding was especially pertinent during a period of substantial public funding cuts. This therefore

---

122 As a reminder, this organisation was originally called Dorset Loves Arts (DLA) until it became the Dorset Arts Trust (2014) and then Dorset Arts Together (2015).

123 This shift to outcome-based public art in Dorset is explored at the end of Chapter Four in section 4.7: Extending the Jurassic Coast partnership.
signified a change in the objectives for the public arts in Dorset in association with changing demands of national politics and funding. This reflected wider changes in the public arts sector across the country. The arts, which had already been set up as the problem-solving sector for the economy, were tested further as funding and political influence were reduced (McRobbie 2016; Hewison 2014; Banks and O Connor 2009). As a result the public arts developed strategies of policy attachment to support their work (Gray 2002). These approaches also addressed some of the Jurassic Coast team’s frustrations that the art produced during JCAP and CC2012 not being “about the coast”, namely the site’s aims and objectives. However, they too were suffering from reduced resources and were unable to provide as much support as they had in previous years.

The Exploring Erosion project went ahead despite the cuts because funding had been retained from the CC2012 budget for a ‘Major Commission’ or ‘Big Project’ in 2014. The project had undergone several iterations during CC2012 as the Creative Coast steering group navigated a shifting public arts context. The process of determining what shape this legacy project would take is rather longwinded and convoluted. However, it reveals some important practices of decision-making as CC2012 practitioners interpret the present and future directions of the arts sector to align the future of Creative Coast arts programming within contemporary policy.

£10,000 was initially earmarked as seed funding and to support the development for ‘a large scale community focused outdoor celebratory commission for 2014’ (Creative Coast 2012). This was originally designed to lead on from the carnival stream of

---

124 As was established in Chapter Four, this was a criticism with little grounding.

work developed through JCAP using the links and partnerships already established through the programme. As early as March 2012 the confidence in this delivery group was so strong that it was reported to the Creative Coast Group that, ‘the group that delivers this project will be the group that takes forward the Creative Coast work beyond 2012’ (Creative Coast 2012). However, by July it seems that confidence in this project had begun to unravel. Although local carnival and outdoor arts organisations were meeting in relation to a possible project in 2014, the following caveat was made in the form of this question:

   How do we ensure that the project group can take the project forward with minimal input from the scientists of the Jurassic Coast Team? (Creative Coast Group 2012)

The tensions between the requirements of the arts programme and the management of the site were already under question by the team. This was an especially prevalent question at the very busy moment during the build up to the London 2012 Olympic Games that summer when resources and practitioner time was thinly spread. However, the desire that any future art programme would not impinge or rely on the team’s time and resources was to remain constant from this point onwards. In addition, concerns were raised by the arts development managers and ACE at setting up a new infrastructure to deliver the work rather than working with existing organisations, specifically Inside Out, a biannual festival of outdoor art and performance:

   I wonder whether the same thing applies to the thought of producing a major work... We seem to be setting up a new steering group for this when we really need to be working with the existing Inside Out team. I am concerned that if we go ahead with this we will be competing for funding with the existing projects and this will not be healthy for anyone. I don’t think we should talk to any particular artistic organisations until we have had a discussion with Inside Out programmers about what we want to achieve. I don’t necessarily think that this means the event has to be a part of the

---


Although it was hoped earlier in the year that an Artistic Director for the larger project would be employed by the autumn of 2012, no one was appointed. This was another example of how arts delivery failed as optimistic policies were met with limited resources and conflicting agendas. In November it was agreed that an Artistic Director role should be discussed with the ACE in a planned meeting later that month. Although the Arts Coordinator did state the following preference at this point:

> Looking at the profile and quality of artistic input needed for the project to succeed and the time frame and budget available, Chris and I recommend that the best way to develop this is for me to take on the role of Director of the project with external Creative Advisers specializing in digital work, outdoor spectacular work, international networks, production and community engagement. (Creative Coast Group 2012)

Despite the requirements of the envisioned carnival project to encompass digital and outdoor artworks, restrictions of time and budget led the group to the conclusion that the Arts Coordinator would be best placed to continue the role. The decision, however conflated the planning for the future art programme with the on-going activity. Plans for a large outdoor carnival event fizzled out.

Additionally, at this point in the development of the legacy project, the Steering Group suggested an independent Jurassic Coast arts organization should be set up as a Community Interest Company (CIC) under the DAT structure. This structure was posited along with three suggested streams of work to follow on from CC2012. These included international artist residencies, the “Big Project” outdoor work and a sculpture arts trail that could also provide fundraising and publicity opportunities. The independent arts organisation also never came to fruition. By the next meeting of the

---


129 Creative Coast Group, 2012. Creative Coast 2012 Steering Group Meeting Minutes, 16\textsuperscript{th} November, Little Keep Meeting Room, Creative Coast digital archive, Dorchester.
Creative Coast Group in March 2013, after conversations with ACE, the entire strategy for the commissioned legacy project had changed drastically.\(^{130}\)

It was agreed at the meeting of the Steering Group with ACE on November 26\(^{th}\) 2012 that the seed funding should be 'soft commissioned' through the Dorset Loves Arts [Dorset Arts Together] Environment Hub in order to mainstream the activity with the key arts development initiative in the region. (Creative Coast Group 2013: 9)\(^{131}\)

Structural and organizational concerns meant that the steering group were advised to redirect the project so that it worked within the existing networks and infrastructure provided by DAT. In addition, it was suggested that the focus was shifted so that it would be more closely directed by the management needs and concerns of the Jurassic Coast site (rather than as a separate arts programme).

It became acknowledged by the Creative Coast Group at this point that the previous arts programmes had developed quite distinct objectives to the Jurassic Coast management plan. One member of the group stated to me soon after that this diversion in interests possibly originated with the development of the arts policy for the Jurassic Coast. They believed that having a specific arts policy separate from the structure of the management plan was one of the causes of tension as resources, personnel, and agendas were split. In contrast to earlier ambitious aspirations, it was decided that the "soft commission" would be a pilot project with smaller immediate fundraising needs but the ambition to apply for further funding for a larger project once the scope and approach had been tested. This approach demonstrates the careful balance struck in arts decision-making between aligning work with others in the field without conflating the specific aims of the policy so that it is no longer distinct from others. In this case, this involved determining whether to combine with existing structures or to continue the

\(^{130}\) This coincidently was the first Creative Coast Group meeting I was invited to attend as a researcher.

\(^{131}\) Creative Coast Group, 2013. Creative Coast 2012 Report, March, Creative Coast digital archive, Dorchester.
aims of the Creative Coast arts programmes, which had gained decision-making momentum independent of the surrounding arts sector.

From the original CC2012 funding, £10,000 for the commission was supplemented by £3,300, which had been allocated for science labs. However, there were requirements attached to the funding, specifically the requirement to lead two “art/science labs”. These were supposed to have been produced as a part of CC2012, but only one had been undertaken. This was in part because it was thought that these labs would be a good setting to discuss the possibilities for the 2014 project. However the labs were a listed aim to the ACE and therefore became a condition attached to the funding for the commission, as they had not been completed through the CC2012 activity.\(^\text{132}\)

As a theme for the commission, the Jurassic Coast team focused on the issue of erosion (partly in response to the difficulties and tensions arising since Charlotte Blackman’s death as discussed in the previous section). This coincided with a forcefully worded position report by the Jurassic Coast team summarizing some of the outcomes, benefits and limitations arising from the arts programming so far.\(^\text{133}\) This signalled, therefore, a movement within the Jurassic Coast team towards working with public arts on projects that closely aligned with the agendas of the management of the site.

\(^\text{132}\) In addition the team that went to take on the production of the project raised £2,000 from the West Dorset District Council’s Leisure Development Fund and £1,000 from Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). This resulted in a total budget for the project at £15,300.

\(^\text{133}\) This was examined at the end of Chapter Four [section 4.7.3: Adopting an instrumental approach].
5.3.2 Writing the outcomes: the Exploring Erosion commission

A commission brief for Exploring Erosion was sent out at the end of January 2013 and was given the emotive catchphrase ‘Erosion is a good thing...’ (Jurassic Coast 2013: 1). It set out the background to the issue of natural processes and specifically erosion on the Jurassic Coast:

The extreme rainfall events of 2012 and into 2013 highlighted the dynamic nature of some parts of the cliffs of Dorset and East Devon. Those cliffs prone to mass movement responded to the high rainfall, generating a number of significant landslides, rockfalls and mudslides. The full effects of that rainfall may not yet have manifest themselves as there is usually a delay between heavy rainfall and large landslides. That said, it is impossible to predict what will fall or where and although the risk is very low, the consequences can be very high as illustrated by the tragic fatality caused by a rock fall in the summer of 2012. Moreover, if the unexpectedly high rainfall in the summer is symptomatic of wider changes taking place to our climate, particularly the increase in extreme events, then we need to be better prepared to warn about and respond to such events. (Jurassic Coast 2013: 1)

The ‘soft commission’ reflects the Jurassic Coast team’s concerns about communicating the risks of imminent rock-falls, landslides and environmental change on the coastline. Additionally, it reflects the dynamism of the site and the difficulties in managing dynamic natural heritage. The uncertainty of when and where these events may occur was one of the biggest concerns and prompted a site-wide approach. Furthermore, the fatality of Charlotte Blackman was at the forefront of the team’s minds during the conception and writing of this commission in early 2013. The commission was also timely as it recognised that, as a result of the global effects of human-induced climate change, there would be an increasing likelihood of extreme weather events such as the wet winters of 2012 that triggered several large-scale landslides along the site.

---

134 Jurassic Coast, 2013. Erosion art commission, 31 January, Creative Coast digital archive, Dorchester.
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The Exploring Erosion commission sought to address the conundrums the team had encountered in managing risk and uncertainty on the site. It is clear that dynamic natural processes are fundamental issues for the Jurassic Coast with its status as the only natural WHS in England. The relationship between rainfall events, undercutting by the sea, and mass movement on the site especially contributes to its unpredictability. Due to the high numbers of visitors to the coastline, especially in the summer months, there is also variability in the understanding of the cliffs and their behaviour. Therefore, the team identified in the winter of 2012-2013 that communicating the risks and uncertainties associated with the site's dynamism was something they were having some difficulties to do effectively:

Many people, visitors or residents, are not aware that it is the erosion of the cliffs that make them so important and beautiful, and that this erosion is natural, a positive feature of the area, and to be respected. Raising awareness of natural processes and erosion and deposition, and their positive and negative consequences, is a fundamental requirement of the Jurassic Coast Management Plan (Aim 3 Policy 3.12). Because this has been shown to be a difficult task to do by traditional means, we would like to explore an artistic approach to helping people to more fully understand the natural processes that make the coast what it is, and particularly erosion. We would like them to understand how it relates to them, whether they are on holiday, walking their dog or living on the edge of a cliff. (Jurassic Coast 2013: 1. Original emphasis)

There is an attention-grabbing thread within this commission brief that assigns moral values to erosion. Due to the sensitivities towards the subject of coastal erosion as a result of the events of the previous summer the promotion of erosion as a 'good thing' is an interesting choice (Jurassic Coast 2013: 1). However, in response to the conventional media approaches to landslide and rock-fall events, the Jurassic Coast team sought to complicate the narrative by illustrating the contradictions of erosion. They wanted to communicate that rather than simply being a dangerous process, coastal erosion forms the WHS and reveals fossils and formations of geological interest. It is an example of the Jurassic Coast team seeking to imprint the World

\[136\] Ibid.
Heritage values upon perceptions of the natural world. As Massey would term it, the coastline was being ‘culturally mediated’ (Massey 2006: 36) both by the media and the Jurassic Coast team. Through the Exploring Erosion commission the Jurassic Coast team sought to promote UNESCO’s designation criteria and how these influence the way the site is practiced and performed. However, by employing the term erosion the complexities of geomorphological processes along the site were essentialised and pigeonholed.

The commission brief also made clear that the arts were seen as an alternative approach to the ‘traditional means’ of communication (Jurassic Coast 2013: 1). As a part of a wider movement towards an outcome-based approach to the public arts, signified by the development of DAT itself, this commission set out a required outcome rather than detailing the specifics of the work itself. The arts development team described this process in the following way:

So you then put together that commissioning process which actually allows the arts organisation more freedom because you say I don’t care how you do this. I’m not interested in the art, I don’t want to know about it particularly but what I do want is this result. And so the arts organisation has then to start from that result and go backwards’…

No arts projects in history or very few have actually started from the outcome. (Arts Development Manager 2014, pers. comm., 15th May)

The outcome-based approach was therefore a new way of working with the public arts in the region and was framed as a legacy resulting in part from the learning and partnerships developed during the Creative Coast arts programmes. As the commissioning body for this project, the Jurassic Coast Trust was described as being more concerned with raising awareness than in managing in detail the process by which this would be achieved. One member of the arts development team described the tensions around this shift in approach:
I don’t want to downgrade that I think that’s a legitimate concern in that not all art is about outcomes and neither should it be. But the fact remains that if you want public money now that money is directed at outcomes…

We are very clear now that the new CIC is not about art for art's sake. That’s not our job. That’s not our job that’s the job of the arts organisations. And if they’re funded by the Arts Council to deliver that's their job. We are not about that. We are about arts development. About providing the opportunities for arts organisations either as individuals or as a group to develop their work and access alternative strands for funding that work. (Arts Development Manager 2014, pers. comm., 15th May)

Some argue, as above, that this approach allowed for a working relationship that gave the arts organisations and artists’ freedom to work in their own way. However, restrictions placed on this form of public arts and the limitations on the available sources of funding were significant. This is a core debate within the public arts in the UK and questions surrounding the ideas of “art for art’s sake” are again a much larger debate than there is space for here. Nevertheless, it is interesting that the term becomes shorthand for certain types of arts development (specifically linked to ACE) and not others (at the local county level) in this context. In fact it is conventionally seen as a response to the way value and capital is assigned to art (Benjamin 2008).

5.3.3 Precarity in practice

The commission specified that the environment hub of DAT should produce the artwork. A series of meetings brought interested organisations and individuals together and they explored their aspirations for the project. This included, for many, ascertaining how they might fit with the project and whether it was in their (or their organisation’s) interest to be involved. A final production group was therefore mostly established through processes of self-elimination rather than selection. Considering most of the interested parties were either freelance workers or representing small organisations, the incentive to attend multiple meetings to discuss the appropriate process to manage the commission dwindled. One interested party who attended DAT to represent a small arts organisation described this:
But the days where you sit round there with no resources and no time and no pay are sort of over, I think everybody’s got a point. You can’t do it. You can’t do it. There is a point where you can do it once or twice or three times but you can’t keep doing it. (Arts Development Manager 2014, pers. comm., 15th May)

Through a lengthy process of meetings the number of practitioners reduced and established how they might work with other interested members of the DAT network. Eventually, the Bridport Arts Centre (BAC) was established as the lead organisation for the project and a core group was formed including a full-time member of staff from DAT and the Jurassic Coast Learning and Participation Manager.

Once the fundamental structure of the production group had been established it was decided that artists would be invited to a “science lab” day. This was an important starting point as a significant aspect of the project would be the ways in which artists developed their understanding of coastal erosion and its paradoxes. The initial science lab was planned so that invited artists could begin to learn about the Jurassic Coast and the complexities of the dynamic coastline on the management of the site from members of the Jurassic Coast team, a coastal geomorphology and conservation expert, and a tourism provider and local resident. It was hoped this would enable the artists to develop more informed proposals that closely aligned with the objectives of the commission.

Twelve projects were eventually proposed and the DAT project group met in November 2013 to discuss the selection. It was at this meeting that two art proposals were selected so that two different approaches to the aims of the commission could be tested. Although no one from the Jurassic Coast team was able to be at this meeting they sent on their comments and recommendations about the proposals in advance. In particular, the team highlighted sensitivity issues in some of the proposals and were cautious of how the projects might be received by visitors and residents along the site.
After considering this feedback from the Jurassic Coast team the project group selected two artists to carry out the commission who were also the top two preferences listed by the Jurassic Coast. These were artistic duo Julia Warin and Jeff Pigott (known collectively as ArtSpark) who proposed an erosion kiosk and performance artist Richard DeDomenici who devised a performance piece referred to as the lunar project (this became *Operation Lunar Sea*). Having been selected in the autumn of 2013, they were asked to deliver their work during the summer of 2014. Once the artists had been selected, two producers from the project group were selected according to their specialisations.

The arts producers provided multiple opportunities for the artists to meet to discuss ideas with the Jurassic Coast team. These meetings however illustrated some of the continuing difficulties in working across the two sectors with multiple partners. For example, the first of these meetings was particularly tricky, taking place in two locations and without full guidance from the Jurassic Coast team as to the full extent of resources and networks that the projects could tap into. To address this, it was arranged that there would be a second science lab event. This was structured as a meeting at the Little Keep in Dorchester between the artists and science and conservation partners linked to the Jurassic Coast. These were the “usual suspects” including two Professors and geologists from the Jurassic Coast team.¹³⁷ It was a long discussion where the artists presented their work and asked detailed questions to the scientific advisors about the influence of erosion on the coastline and coastal management. This was a significant meeting for the development of the projects.

¹³⁷ I refer to these consultants as the “usual suspects” as the group comprised members of staff for the Jurassic Coast team specializing in geology and two academics that had been instrumental in the designation and management of the WHS from the outset.
However, the practitioners present gave mixed feedback afterwards. For example, one questioned the specifics of each project suggesting their own preferences for an approach:

I really like the idea of an Airfix type kit; the Coastal engineers tool kit with concrete sea walls, rock armour, gabion baskets, beach recharge, groynes (concrete, rock or timber). I think the box could carry some reasonable descriptions about what it is and what it does (a lot of people, for instance, don’t know what rock armour is). (Earth Science Manager 2014, pers. comm., 24th February)

This comprehensive response and attention to detail was a trait that the arts practitioners found a little prescriptive and restrictive to the conversation. However, it was in part due to an unclear description of the role these “scientists” were being asked to play in this context. All four practitioners present at this meeting had been involved on multiple occasions in both JCAP and CC2012. Therefore, there was some frustration with being “wheeled out” as advisors which was voiced by one science advisor:

Well what are they really going to do? What are they doing? …There was a lot doing this last year. I didn’t think much of … this stuff recording people like me talking and then playing it you know boringly at a presentation rather than taking the ideas out of it. And I don’t know, there was just one that really excited me [in Creative Coast 2012]. (Geomorphologist 2014, pers. comm., 27th March)

However, the Jurassic Coast team’s Earth Science advisor, who had previously worked on other projects as a part of the arts programme, responded with a more reflexive and conceptual response, which was seen as encouraging by the arts practitioners working on the commission. These words opened this section and detailed the importance of an individual and personal response to landscape.

Rather than creating new collaborations or starting mutually beneficial conversations in this second science lab, the focus was for the artists to expand their knowledge of erosion and coastal processes on the Jurassic Coast. The discussion instead provided nuanced deliberations of the paradox of erosion and how it is investigated and
managed. It was the artists’ increased understanding of the complexity of this issue, which the meeting facilitated. Rather than the dialogical collaborations sought for in previous JCAP and CC2012 projects this event worked more like a consultation to assist the artists to respond to the objectives laid out in the commission.

Additionally the artists set up further meetings with experts to continue their research for their projects. This was partly facilitated by the Jurassic Coast team and their networks. It was also arranged that the artists would join one of the professors who specializes in geomorphology for a trip to Ringsted Bay to discuss coastal retreat [Fig. 29, Fig. 30 and Fig. 31]. The geomorphologist explained the processes in action at the Bay and some of the onshore and offshore reasons for the fast rate of retreat. This was contextualised by a history of cultural responses to the loss of land by those living in the area. In addition, they brought photographs visualizing this retreat over several decades. A particularly lively discussion arose over piddocks, a type of coastal bivalve that burrow into rocks creating holes, and bio-erosion. This was an opportunity for a more extended conversation between the artists and an expert on the subject of erosion.

Unlike previous projects tied to the Creative Coast programmes, there was no expectation of collaborative relationships to form during the Exploring Erosion project. In many ways restricting the scientific practitioners to the role of expert advisors clarified expectations for the participants. This was reinforced in the project’s evaluation:
Figure 29: Explaining the formation of the coastline for the Exploring Erosion project: Ringstead Bay, Dorset (photo: author)

Figure 30: Exploring the retreat of the coastline at Ringstead Bay: Dorset (photo: author)
Figure 31: Dramatic coastal retreat evident by the abandoned and raised staircase at Ringstead Bay: Dorset (photo: author)
The generous input of the Jurassic Coast team scientists was vital to the development of the artists’ ideas and built on the understanding between artists and scientists developed through the various Creative Coast projects. (Bridport Arts Centre 2014: 3)\textsuperscript{138}

Despite the fact that most of the participants of the Exploring Erosion project had been involved in the previous iterations of Creative Coast arts programming, this was a new way of structuring partnerships and developing the artworks. The “soft commission” model had clarified the expectations of practitioners within the project and in relation to one another. However, some residual issues remained in regards to sharing information concerning resources and expectations, as well as a complex and extended planning process. In the project evaluation this was described as, ‘a valuable process to go through with some useful lessons about how to undertake the process in the most equitable way’ (Bridport Arts Centre 2014: 2).\textsuperscript{139} In particular, the clarity and openness between partner organisations from DAT as to their desired outcomes had been particularly effective in ensuring that the project remained focussed and achievable within the available resources. This was in no small part down to the attentive and thoughtful directing by BAC as the lead organisation.

5.4 Putting a price on coastal heritage: the Erosion Zone

5.4.1 Artists learning about the erosion paradox: ArtSpark

Artist A: But we’ve learnt more as we’ve gone along and so we’ve had to kind of, you know, redirect some of it and trying to come up with things that were, you know, giving a positive message without it being too preachy or too educational. It’s been more difficult you know than making jokes about safety.

Artist B: I think a lot of my thinking right at, you know, before the info day. My knowledge of coastal erosion was pretty minimal and I would have said yeah cover it in concrete you know to stop the sea doing it. You know. So I mean for me it’s been a learning curve really you know. Which has been a


\textsuperscript{139} Ibid., 2.
bonus for me - sort of gaining that knowledge and insight into what's going on down here. (Artists 2014, pers. comm., 18th May)

One of the most significant aspects of the commissions was the ways in which the artists' interpretation of the subject of erosion on the Jurassic Coast shifted. Correspondingly, their work also changed to align with their more nuanced understanding of the paradoxes of coastal change on this site. This shift in focus through the production of the artwork was especially apparent with ArtSpark. In many ways their work reflected the dilemmas and curiosities of the artists who strove to find a balance between two contrasting messages about erosion; that it is destructive and constructive at the same time.

ArtSpark is a partnership of artists Jeff Pigott and Julia Warin who have worked together for several years. Through ArtSpark they, ‘have found a genre which reaches audiences through humour, irony and shared frustration’ (ArtSpark Proposal 2013: 2). ArtSpark's art often tackles issues to do with consumer culture by “commodifying” issues.141 After attending the first science lab event in September 2013, Jeff and Julia proposed to make a stand in a similar style to their project Kiosk, which they describe as being inspired by:

Our fascination with the kitsch, mass-produced, impersonal detritus of the gift shop, contrasted with the wide-open beauty of the shore. The mysteries of chance finds and washed up debris made beautiful by the elements were treated as special and became our souvenirs and memories of that moment. (ArtSpark 2014)142


141 Some of their other work along this theme has included a subversive retail experience called Kiosk, a sculptural installation of recycled and waste objects called Objects of Desire and the art supermarket a-mart (these examples can be found on the artist's website http://new.artspark.net/amart.html [Last accessed 2/09/2016]).

They included a long list of possible products to include on the erosion stand, which demonstrated the blend of humour and irony in their work. These complex objects display the subject at tension with itself, for example by contrasting the unique and bespoke with the mass produced.

The responses to the topic of erosion by Art Spark followed three strands. The first, as identified above, was the issue of safety along the coastline. Art Spark felt attuned to the dangers of the Jurassic Coast from early on in the commission designing many objects relating to this theme. The second thread was the celebration of erosion, something specified within the commission brief. This required the artists to engage more with the processes of coastal retreat themselves and those who study them.

Finally the kiosk contained several objects, which suggested to the audience about their own agency to influence the shape and processes along the Jurassic Coast. The kiosk held these three perspectives on erosion in tension whilst attuning to other narratives about the value and commercialization of erosion along the WHS.
It is a boiling hot day in May. I have just arrived and parked in the gravel car park under the cool shade of a tree. I walk down the wide path that winds down to the front of Durlston castle. As I walk inside it takes a while for my eyes to adjust. All the doors are open to the warm May air (and the views out to the sea). Inside it is a cool and much darker in contrast to the glaringly bright sunshine beyond the doorframe. At first glance I miss it, but looking again I spot the kiosk, which is stood just inside the entrance. It stands against the wall opposite the visitor reception desk and only slightly removed from the shop - a thin, circular tower.

On it hangs a multitude of brightly packaged products [Fig. 32]. Calendars, boxed activity kits, chocolate bars, tourist mementos. It is only on closer inspection that I start to notice the slightly unusual names and descriptions adorning each one. Some are funny and others invite slower contemplation. Many play on puns associated with the original product. There is a magazine named Vertigo, a chocolate bar called Sacrifice and a Coastal Ranger Action Man. It is nice to see these objects in the flesh. We have talked about them since Jeff and Julia submitted their proposal last September.

Julia now comes to join me as I look through all the objects on display. There is a large and eclectic selection, plenty to look at and read. Whilst we talk about the work, a lost dog, which is being kept at reception, whines in the background. Its piercing, distressed whimpers echo along the high smooth walls as Julia explains the process and inspiration behind each object. We discuss her knitted piddocks, which apparently were the hardest to make. What should they look like? What should they be made out of?

Wood-effect wallpaper lines the boards to gives a crude effect of a driftwood beach display. It is barely convincing but it does mimic many of the tourist souvenir stalls along the coast. Alongside, on the exposed brick wall, is an exhibition board explaining the piece and its commission to those who look for long enough. This requires longer commitment from the passer-by as it is tucked away behind the kiosk. However, it is one of the few clues that this is a piece of art. Below it, at a jaunty angle, hangs a wooden arrow, a take on the ‘to the beach’ signs often sold in clean, white fragrant shops that sell an arrangement of scented candles, floral mugs and expensive gifts.

Underneath the array of products there is a small slip of paper stuck to the shelf of the kiosk. It reads – PLEASE DO NOT TOUCH THE ART WORK. However, Julia has given me permission to touch – and I do. I lift, tilt and stroke objects whilst asking how they were made and reading the text typed onto them.
Figure 32: The *Erosion Zone* kiosk by ArtSpark at the entrance to Durlston Castle (photo: author)
5.4.2 Safety against erosion, loss and destruction

ArtSpark’s re-worked objects concerning issues of safety along the coastline were largely tongue-in-cheek and irreverent. For example, a product on display as a suggestion for protection whilst on the beach was a sunbathing safety cage. This displayed a Barbie doll behind a metal gridded cage in her bikini with some sunscreen. The accompanying museum note stated: ‘Model prototype sunbathing safety cage trialled in 1964 but quickly abandoned due to resulting griddled tan lines’. Another beauty product was the “Oolite collection”, which sought to ‘fight the 7 effects of erosion’. There was also a cream for the relief of ‘Terminal Groyne Injuries and Longshore Drift’. These products imply that erosion is a process, which can be resisted, either through structural protection or a good moisturizer.

“Knit your Own” kits provided other forms of safety notice; the range included an, ‘Anti-Gravity Cliff Safety Net’ and ‘Anti-Erosion Coastal Defences’ [Fig. 33]. These were seemingly absurd responses to the action of landslides and rock-falls. However they do gesture to the guerrilla knitting or ‘yarnbombing’ movement, which seeks to enhance public places (especially with cities) within knitted art. These forms of “coastal protection” suggested an individual agency for visitors of the coast to control their own safety, albeit through ridiculous methods. Accompanying the kiosk were series of collectable badges with the messages “Safe Tea First” and “Mind How You Go”. These were phrases that were used repeatedly on products on the kiosk imitating public safety messages. The slight mocking in these safety messages was drowned out by the irony of a ‘Coastal Walking for Dumbos’ book, which described

---

143 The Knit the City website outlines its agenda as the following: ‘our squishy street art does many things. It takes a woolly hold on forgotten public spaces and gives them soul. It treats the whole world as an art gallery. It encourages others to bring their own city to life in ways only they can imagine’ Available at: http://knitthecity.com/why/ [Last accessed 28/11/2016].
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Figure 33: The "Knit your Own Cliff Safety Net" kit. *Erosion Zone* by ArtSpark (photo: author)
itself as providing ‘the Ups and Downs of Coast Paths for the Unaware’. Furthermore, its selling point was to ‘save hours of time: waiting for cliff rescue, sitting in A&E, trapped by tides’. There were clear sensitivity issues linked to these objects in light of the events of the previous summer, especially with regards to the sunbathing cage. However, the artists, team and arts producers did not to my knowledge identify these. It is likely that the use of humour separated these “warnings” from the serious implications of rock-falls on the coastline for audiences. These tensions indicate the inherent difficulty with tackling the subject of the erosion paradox through art.

Additionally, several newspapers, magazines and calendars hung from the kiosk with memorable names including Daily Coast, Vertigo, GeoScientist, Sensational Groyne and Cliff Erosion (with a picture of Cliff Richard on the cover). A newspaper article that stood out with the dominant headline was: “Killer Cliffs Attack Puppy!” This was a direct response to an event recorded in the *Dorset Echo* in March 2014 when 20-week-old cocker spaniel puppy fell 200 feet down a cliff east of Weymouth. Marley the dog was recovered. The spoof article on *Erosion Zone* included a quote from a “local councillor” stating: ‘This danger to society must be imprisoned without delay, before any more innocent lives become imperiled!’ [Fig. 34]. This headline mirrors the tone and style of many of the media reporting of landslide and rock-fall events on the coast. However, the official response here takes the criticism one step further by blaming and hoping to punish the dangerous cliffs. The article was complimented by a “Cliff Walkies Bungee Dog Leash” to protect wandering dogs hung on an adjacent wall of the kiosk. It is these conversations between items juxtaposed with each other on the kiosk that reduced some of the more outlandish statements made by each

---

Figure 34: Issue of the "Daily Coast". *Erosion Zone* by ArtSpark (photo: author)
individual object. In the context of events in which this commission was situated many of these objects seem inappropriate and tactless. However, within the context of the artwork it was one of many headlines and taglines bombarding the audience. Within this context some of the stronger statements were contrasted by opposing statements of equal veracity. With this the erosion paradox was brought to life on the kiosk shelves.

5.4.3 Celebrating erosion and the sciences involved in understanding it

The ArtSpark artists indicated that learning about the processes of coastal erosion was one of the most valuable parts of the project for themselves. Their developed understanding of the processes is evident on Erosion Zone. For example, hanging from the top of the kiosk is a selection of “Erosion Rocks” jewellery. These are aesthetic pebbles turned into pendants ‘Made by Artists and Surf’ and demonstrate how erosion processes produce objects that we deem beautiful.

ArtSpark also played on the concept of perishable, souvenir foods that were linked to the tourist destinations along the Jurassic coast. They developed a “Lulworth Crumple Cake” and “Sacrifice”, a ‘Jurassic Luxury Dark Chocolate’ with the message ‘because sometimes letting go of the things we love isn’t easy’. These items especially celebrated the moment of loss resulting from coastal erosion. They provided a physical embodiment of the proverb you can’t have your cake and eat it. The message of pleasure in loss was also portrayed by a self-help styled book titled: “Feel the Fear And Live Here Anyway: How to Let Go of Certainty And Live For The Moment”. Described as ‘an upbeat, and exhilarating guide to life on the edge, coping with change and learning to enjoy the view now’, the book recommends the liberation of living with uncertainty. A bookmark attached to the spine of the book had a die attached to encourage this ethos of chance. In contrast, another set of products encouraged the
audience-consumer to accept the changes caused by coastal erosion as on-going processes. For example, a collection of bathroom products called “Flux” displayed the tagline: ‘nothing lasts forever’. Around the corner hung an “interactive” jigsaw puzzle, which contained ‘extra pieces of sea and beaches to reposition erased land and keep your puzzle up to date with shifting shorelines and coastal changes’ [Fig. 35]. These products presented coastal change as in a matter of fact style rather than emphasizing the difficulties of loss.

The final way in which ArtSpark commemorated erosion on the kiosk was by celebrating the work of those who study it. This was evidenced by “Ask an Expert” sticky notes in the shape of speech bubbles, which, the artists told me, were in dedication to the scientific experts who had assisted with the development of the project. ArtSpark also made scientific versions of Barbie and Action Man dolls [Fig. 36]. These adopted occupations undertaken on the Jurassic Coast including a coastal ranger, a marine biologist and a geography teacher under the logo: “role models”.

At the same time as the Erosion Zone kiosk was being displayed in Durlston Castle an interesting political movement was gaining traction online. The social media organization TrowelBlazers, which seeks to highlight the influence of women to traditionally viewed masculine disciplines, had begun working closely with the creators of the Lottie™ Doll, Arklu. The Lottie Doll is a toy that aims to be relatable and age-appropriate for children from three to nine years of age. They are branded as: ‘award-winning, childlike dolls, that empower young minds and nurture individuality through play’. Although the male range is still nominal, the creation of a doll to the, ‘realistic proportions of a 9 year old girl’ is one that has been particularly commercially popular. The Lottie Doll is designed according to a wide range of activities and corresponding outfits, from stargazing and karate to horse riding and lighthouse keeper. A Fossil Hunter Lottie Doll was released on the 21st May 2015, the birthday of Mary Anning (the famous fossil hunter from Lyme Regis). Accompanying activities and information sheets were designed by the Jurassic Coast team Learning and Participation Manager and posted on the website.
Figure 35: "Shifting Shorelines" jigsaw puzzle. *Erosion Zone* by ArtSpark (photo: author)

Figure 36: Action Man and Barbie dolls with new Jurassic Coast occupations. *Erosion Zone* by ArtSpark (photo: author)
Above these dolls were a collection of “scientific” toys for detecting cliff fall probability, mudslide viscosity and a rock movement nano-sensor. There was also a soft hammer with a sponge on the end and a label that read: ‘the best fossil hunting tool is your eyes’. These objects display some of the enhanced understanding of coastal processes that the artists gained through their research for the Exploring Erosion project. Their fresh exposure to the ideas and scientific concepts helped them develop unconventional approaches to the topic of erosion.

5.4.4 Highlighting how the public are active agents in the erosion paradox

Erosion Zone presented perspectives both celebrating and warning of the processes of erosion. However, ArtSpark also included objects that signalled to the agency of people on the coast in shaping and altering it. One such design was the “Cutting Edge Artikit”, which enabled the user to ‘design your own coastline’ [Fig. 37]. This played to the value the Jurassic Coast places upon erosion in forming geologically and geomorphologically “valued” landscapes. However, it also indicated how erosion was not simply a natural process. As the packaging suggested, using the “Eroser” the coastline could be transformed – ‘just rub out the boring bits…’

The “Do It Yourself” (D.I.Y) trope is a common approach within ArtSpark’s work and was a recurring theme across the kiosk.146 Another example was the “Natural Sea Defences Starter Kit”, which were filled with ‘locally sourced’ sand, aggregate and Portland cement [Fig. 38]. The tagline for this product was ‘Healthy beaches have abundant sand’ and the products were branded with ‘King Knut: Brings you the wisdom

146 For example, ArtSpark developed a D.I.Y fracking kit with the sub-heading ‘The land beneath your home is YOURS! SO FRACK IT!’ Available at: http://www.artspark.net/DIY_fracking_kit.html [Last accessed 28/11/2016].
of the ages to protect your homes and families’. The instructions are simple: ‘just add water’. D.I.Y. objects suggested that audience-consumers had creative power over the physical coastline. Both these objects addressed the paradox of erosion by holding the agency of people to change the environment and the fruitlessness of these endeavours in tension. They reinforced the audiences’ agency to influence their environment but simultaneously made a mockery of efforts to do so.

The most striking example of this influence over the coastline was two pairs of “Cliff Face” shoes. These were located underneath the archive section of the display, in an embedded shelf so that the boxes sat neatly with the walls of the kiosk [Fig. 39]. The shoes were exhibited as single items but placed alongside one another. One pair was heeled with eroding sandpaper, its companion with protecting sponge. These contrasting functions performed and intersected with each other in many ways. Although the joke could be made with one pair, it is re-enforced with two. The “Scuffers” were essentially a pair of shoes with sandpaper strapped to the soles making them more erosive. They were labelled as “D.I.Y. Erosion Overshoes” with the tagline, ‘Why wait for Nature to take its course?’ This connected the shoes with the other products, which enabled audience-customers to alter the coast according to their will.

\[147\] King Knut is used here to reference the proverb in which he failed to stop the sea after ordering the tide to halt.
Figure 37: "Design your own coastline" kit. *Erosion Zone* by ArtSpark (photo: author)

Figure 38: D.I.Y. "Natural sea defences". *Erosion Zone* by ArtSpark (photo: author)
Figure 39: "The Cliff Face" lightfoot and scuffers shoes. *Erosion Zone* by ArtSpark (photo: author)
*Erosion Zone* reminded its audience that human influence over the coastal landscape can be both constructive and destructive. The sandpaper on the Scuffers signified an intention of encouraging the process of erosion through the repeated use of sandpaper to erode the ground that the consumer-audience walked on. However, this art-product went further. The “Erosion Overshoes” were framed as a part of an active, adventurous engagement with the outdoor environment. In another nod to the endeavours of exploration mirrored in the marketing of some of these outdoor activities, as the fictional “League of Dangerous Sports” endorsed the product. The box was also adorned with a figure in active clothes, stood astride rocky terrain. Perhaps this was a cliff top as the pose of this silhouette suggested a conquering achievement and a gaze across a vista. The packaging therefore complemented the narratives of exploration, which threads through the brand messaging of the company from which this design has been adopted and occupied: The North Face.\(^{148}\) North Face is an outdoor clothing brand, which like many others channels an adventurous lifestyle ethos as a part of its marketing and branding.

The “Cliff Face” logo adopted by ArtSpark thinly veiled the connotations of The North Face Logo. ArtSpark’s blocks are vertical rather than curved and the name gives a sense of irony to the project. The art object therefore was indicative of encounters with the unknown, of discovery and adventure across difficult terrains and challenging environmental conditions for the human body. The packaging set up a romantic aesthetic of exploring the coastline, which was deflated by the ridiculous notion of

\(^{148}\) To give some insight to the commercial agenda of The North Face the company history is outlined on the website – alongside images of figures in their clothing scaling mountains often in landscapes of snow and ice. Under the title: Over 45 years of exploration” they set out a “mission statement” for the company:

‘The North Face® fundamental mission remains unchanged since 1966: building the best gear for the outdoors, supporting the preservation of wild places, and inspiring a global movement of outdoor exploration’ (http://www.thenorthface.co.uk/tnf-uk-en/brand-history/).
walking with sandpaper strapped to your shoes. Despite its aesthetic symbolism, sandpaper is unlikely to do significantly more erosional damage than say hard-soled shoes, steel capped shoes or animals digging along tracks. However, the imagery is clear: putting sandpaper on the soles of the shoes denoted intentionality by the wearer to wear away at the surface beneath them as they walked. The shoes successfully created an aesthetic of activity for the consumer-audience linked to erosion. They were symbolic of the movement of bodies on and in the landscape. In particular, the shoes reinforced the suggestion of the interaction of our feet (or more specifically the soles of our shoes) with the surface of the ground. In doing so, the shoes stimulated the imagination towards the different ways of walking, types of walking and perhaps even forms of contact with the ground that do not require feet. The “Cliff Face Scuffers” were designed so that the wearer must not tread softly but loudly and relentlessly onto the footpaths of the coast to continue human agency on the complex geomorphological topology of the coastline.

In direct contrast, placed alongside the “Cliff Face Scuffers” was the “Cliff Face Lightfoot” shoe with ‘Anti-erosion soles’. The sponge soles were shaped into a platform design attached to floral patterned shoes that hinted at a hippie aesthetic. This was flower power for the walking world. The thick layer of sponge with its carefully crafted “shock-absorbing” tread elevated the walker from the surface of the ground on which they stood giving the sense of a light or soft interaction. The silhouette on this art-product packaging differed suitably from the “Cliff Face Scuffers”. Instead of a lone explorer astride a rocky mountaintop, these shoes were associated with a couple holding hands and walking away, perhaps into the distance.

One male and one female figure were suggested with a pair of shorts on one figure and a thigh length skirt on the other. This was a leisurely product for ambulation as
opposed to the active adventurer on the neighbouring box. The tagline “leave not even your footprint” reinforced the visual aesthetic of the art-product whilst nodding to the infamous symbol of British Identity: The Countryside Code (Natural England 2016). Except with these shoes one could go a step further than the “leave only your footprints behind” mantra. The implication was that with these soles the audience-consumer could even avoid leaving footprints upon the surface of the ground. Through a more considered relationship between skin, shoe and stone, the shoes suggested that recreational invasion into the landscape could be removed and human were able to interact with nature without leaving a trace. All you needed was the right pair of shoes.

5.4.5 Commenting on cultures of commodities and the Jurassic Coast

In Erosion Zone, ArtSpark questioned and undermined conventional moments of encounter between the product and the consumer. The work consisted of a souvenir stand not unlike the countless others resident in local visitor information centres and tourist attractions. However, Erosion Zone was a kiosk that packaged erosion as commercial products. Here the products were repurposed, their names and packaging altered to reflect the agency of erosion along the world heritage coastline. Erosion was packaged into the form of commercial toys, souvenirs, calendars, trinkets, food gifts and magazines. They described it in the following words:

Employing the commercial phenomena of "shopping" Erosion Zone replicates seemingly familiar products, advertising, marketing and the popular media to present an important message - that we cannot own, control or stop nature - or turn it into neat packaged commercial products. We have to learn to live with a changing landscape and embrace the opportunities that this offers us. As individuals we need to form our own personal and unique relationship with the natural environment and come to realise that erosion is the process by which the land is formed and how it continues to evolve. (ArtSpark 2014)149

The piece also spoke to the different ways the site is subject to commodification. This was a familiar way of connecting with audiences, as Jane Bennett suggests that much of our enchantment with the world is framed within mass culture and provided through the lens of commercialization and markets of capital (Bennett 2001). According to her argument, the new and the novel become something to own, to consume, rather than something to be all absorbed by. *Erosion Zone* also prompted questions as to what happens when ‘natural processes’ such as coastal erosion become the epicentre for the circulation of capital and funding. By placing the process of erosion into the cultural world of the commercial and kitsch souvenir the work destabilized understandings of value along the Jurassic Coast.

However, despite recreating the visual culture of the mass-produced commodity these objects were individually crafted, bespoke pieces. This work therefore contrasted the mass production of items in tension with the value of the unique object. This was especially complex considering the food items displayed (within which there is no food). The packaging symbolized and represented perishable items, which over time would decay, except within the fallacy of the artwork they of course never would. This was another example of how the kiosk artwork performed as art within its commercialized retail setting. *Erosion Zone* played on the experience of being a consumer. Therefore the kitsch and the uncanny are threaded through the work as it performs and constructs the space and the audiences that come into contact with it (Freud 2003 [1919]).

Likewise, the Jurassic Coast in many ways turns the coastline into a commodity for the tourism and heritage industries. Contemporaneously (during the summer of 2014), the management team was becoming very aware of this role and the need for alternative sources of fundraising as public resources for the site became increasingly scarce.
One such source was selling ammonite pin badges for a suggested £1 donation in local retail sites and visitor centres. These not only provided some income for the Jurassic Coast Trust, but they also reinforced and circulated certain images and logos to be associated with the brand of the Jurassic Coast, namely that of the ammonite. This fundraising therefore became a technique of tourism souvenir collecting, place-making and arguably in the commodification of the site. This also has ramifications for the imaginative geography of the site, which can be put up for sale both as a concept and a destination. An example of this is the Jurassic Coast business scheme where local shops and brands can use the Jurassic Coast logo if they donate a certain amount from sales to the Trust. Although the Trust is strictly separate from the management team itself, they are symbiotically and intrinsically related to one another through their aims and objectives.

As it was commissioned, the artwork of the Erosion Zone was a commodity in itself. Furthermore, it was constructed of familiar, re-worked products and was therefore a commodity built of commodities. By the altering of their appearance these products took on an uncanny quality (Freud 2003). They invited the audience to consider the construction and branding of everyday products more closely. Furthermore, Erosion Zone’s employment as commissioned public art worked to communicate a specific message in an instrumental process of production and consumption. It both worked within and challenges these economic networks. This of course was not exempt from forms of resistance, which were signified by the perceived need for a “Do not touch – art work” sign. Consumers were able to explore the multiple pieces of Erosion Zone but these interactions remain guided and restricted. As it became a part of the social world of the tourist and tourism it was both familiar and unfamiliar to the souvenir consumer who is usually able to hold and examine items as they shop.
5.5 Performing coastal management: *Operation Lunar Sea*

The other commission for the *Exploring Erosion* project was awarded to performance artist Richard DeDomenici. He proposed *Operation Lunar Sea*, a feasibility study into the effects of the Moon's gravitational pull on erosion on the Jurassic Coast. Alongside publishing a pamphlet, Richard performed at various coastal festivals over the summer of 2014. DeDomenici has been described as ‘the thinking man’s Ashton Kutcher’ (Trueman 2012: np). His irreverent style provided a fresh approach to the paradoxical issue of erosion on the Jurassic Coast. This was an unconventional investigation to see if the blowing up of a portion of the Moon might reduce the erosion effects of tides.

The project used farce and the absurd to question perceptions of value, coastal engineering and erosion. Richard used the platform of local science festivals to perform his petition; he also handed out small booklets and developed a webpage stating his arguments. *Operation Lunar Sea* was planned to be a big spectacle event with an integrated PR approach. However, in reality the limited infrastructure for the project left it unsupported. Although the performances employed jaw-dropping ideas in the hope of captivating the public’s imagination, they failed to reach a wider audience. Furthermore, it was difficult to ascertain the project’s success at meeting the commission aims, as most of the public audience did not complete the online feedback form. Although a very interesting concept which addressed the contradictions of erosion in a fresh and engaging way, *Operation Lunar Sea* failed to lift off the ground.

5.5.1 Advocating lift off for lunar destruction: the handbook

An *Operation Lunar Sea* handbook included a detailed survey of previous space missions, engineering approaches and calculations as to the amount of moon necessary to be removed in order to reduce the tides sufficiently (Richard settled at 1%). The printed material was a small white booklet, no larger than A6 and printed in black and white [Fig. 40]. There were 1000 printed and on the back each one was
given an individual number. The text read almost as a stream of consciousness describing how Richard had researched and gathered together evidence for the feasibility of blowing up a portion of the moon. This neat document with "TOP SECRET" stamped on its front cover guided the reader through a rationale for destroying part of the moon. It was a detailed study including engineering facts and underlying political messages as to the interruption and engineering of the Moon:

Thus the scope of this study is more prosaic – to remove a mere 1% of the moon.

Such mass would equal 810,000 tonnes – the amount of wheat exported from the EU each season, the rice imported to the Philippines in 2014, one tenth of the earth displaced by Crossrail, or the same weight as five extremely large container ships. (Operation Lunar Sea 2014: 7. Emphasis added.)

Here Richard attempts to put the scale of material displacement in context with other commercial global practices. The use of “1%” is iconic as it correlates the proposal of Operation Lunar Sea with the Occupy movement and its rousing motto “we are the 1%”. Strikingly the centre page of the booklet was a double spread picture of a flooded woodland landscape also making the statement "We are the 1%".
Richard DeDomenici is the same age as Space Invaders. He hasn’t flown to the moon, but does live in Watford, which is often compared to the moon, as it orbits a far larger body called London, which sustains far more varied and interesting life than Watford due to its atmosphere. Richard has a first class degree in Fine Art, a grade C in A’ Level Geography and B’s in GCSE Maths and Science. He will return to the Jurassic Coast for the b-side festival in September 2014.

Figure 40: Extract from the Operation Lunar Sea handbook by Richard DeDomenici
(image: Third Party Copyright)
It is clear that this is being presented as a global initiative for the benefit of humans internationally. However, the echoes of such a politically powerful movement afford the proposal with suggestions of activism and equality. Above the document highlighted the movement of an equivalent mass of matter across the earth and the logistical efforts to do so. In doing so, 1% of the moon’s weight was put into perspective on an earthly scale. These arguments also highlighted what was considered to be mobile matter and what was thought of as immobile, preserved or unmovable by human agency. This encouraged the reader to question: what do we consider to be permanent and what is in process? On the geologic scale the lives of these materials contain mobility and as Bennett would suggest, vibrancy (Bennett 2010). Often these mobilities occur on incomprehensible timescales rendering them invisible to the human experience. The Crossrail analogy included above became a recurrent theme in the book. For example, whilst discussing what might be done with the removed Moon material, the reconstitution of London’s underground excavation was referenced:

4.5 million tonnes of material excavated during Crossrail’s tunnelling operations is being used to create one of the largest new wetland nature habitats in Europe, a 1,500 acre RSPB nature reserve in Wallasea Island Essex. (Operation Lunar Sea 2014: 14)

The comparison demonstrated that large quantities of material are in motion on the surface of the planet continually. Therefore, the feasibility study fitted with particular scientific and political cultures reminding the reader that humans design and arrange the world around them constantly to fit with their ideals and values. Furthermore, the propositions in the document were underlined by a subtle critique of past human exploration of the Earth’s nearest celestial neighbour:

To reduce the weight and cost of the mission I propose to reuse some of the material already left on the lunar surface by previous space missions. Humans have already left over 170 tonnes of material on the moon, and have removed only 382 kg of rock.

The Moon is getting heavier and it’s our fault. (Operation Lunar Sea 2014: 11).
This comment on humanity’s interference with the Moon was underlined by outlining past bombings of the Moon. Richard contextualised his project alongside other – often militarized incentives – for destroying and exploding portions of the Moon according to scientific and political ideals and objectives. Richard emphasised examples from the USA, possibly because these are the most prevalent, but also, perhaps to demonstrate the American manipulation of the Moon to influence geopolitics.\textsuperscript{150} He also placed his own research alongside named professors and space scientists. For example he referenced Alexander Abian’s 1991 “moonless Earth Theory”. The theory suggested that the Moon causes extreme weather events including heat waves, snowstorms and hurricanes as its motion generates the changing seasons.

5.5.2 \textit{The costs of managing the coastline}

Richard’s study took a more sombre tone when it considered the current policies in the UK for flood defence and coastal engineering strategies. This importantly engaged with how decisions of coastal preservation and managed retreat are decided through a cost-benefit analysis:

\begin{quote}
\textdollar2.36 billion has been spent on flood defence over the last four years by the UK Government, and this will decrease to \textdollar2.1 billion in the next term. Even were we to generously assume that displacing 1\% of the moon could reduce existing spending by 1\% this would save only \textdollar23 million, which is less than half of Beagle 2... We must also consider Defra’s recently introduced 8:1 targets: Under new rules Defra requires an average of \textdollar8 of damage avoided for every \textdollar1 they would spend on schemes, up from an average of \textdollar5:1 under the last government. (Operation Lunar Sea 2014: 19)\textsuperscript{151}
\end{quote}


As investigated in the previous chapter, national policies can be enacted in many different ways due to the everyday geographies of decision-making. There have been significant coastal defence development and strategies implemented in Lyme Regis and Portland since the designation of the WHS. Other towns, such as Sidmouth, have not had interventions despite land and property being endangered and lost. The issue of flood defence along the heritage coastline is therefore a sensitive one.

Additionally, considering the importance of phrases such as Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) in world heritage discourse, the introduction of the Moon to these discussions creates revealing tensions in heritage value and preservation politics. For example, it is from the well-documented image of “earth rise” that many western environmental aesthetic discourses emerged. Furthermore, the Moon is considered vital for maintaining the earth in its orbit around the sun and with a rotation speed and seasonality, which is largely considered to be essential for life on our planet. Without suggesting it explicitly, *Operation Lunar Sea* set up intervention through developing on the concept of Moon heritage. If we are talking about OUV – the Moon is surely at the forefront. Richard’s concluding remarks:

> Peter Nixon, the National Trust’s director of land, recently told the BBC: “We’re expecting more extremes, less predictability, more stormy events, combined with an underlying issue of rising sea levels.” He warned against the trap of believing “we can engineer our way out of this”.

> Perhaps he’s right.

> Anyway wouldn’t a less massive moon simply be pulled into a closer orbit by the Earth, and thus its gravitational pull remain the same?

> Oh yeah. What a Piddock. *(Operation Lunar Sea 2014: 27)*

---

152 Piddocks were a topic of discussion on the fieldtrip to Ringsted Bay where they captured the imagination. It is probably for this reason that they appear in both the *Exploring Erosion* projects.
By leading his audience-readers through detailed arguments and reasoning for undertaking hard-engineering on the Moon, the project destabilized engineering practices back on Earth.

5.5.3 *Convincing the masses: performing eccentricity*

To accompany the published arguments, Richard prepared and performed a speech at the Lyme Regis Fossil Festival and at Spring Tide at West Bay during May 2014. His performances at these events took two forms: a more structured soapbox speech that he had written as a script to outline his proposal contrasted with when he walked around amongst the crowds and petitioned for their support [Fig. 41]. For the speeches he stood on a plastic step next to the clock tower at the focal point of Lyme Regis beach promenade close to the entrance for the festival marquee. Richard dressed in a spacesuit, with yellow trainers poking from underneath the fabric shoe flaps and had taken off his helmet off due to the extreme heat. Like with many street performances, this was a zany project. I gained my own experience of this whilst dressed as his assistant in a blue 70s space suit myself. These were attention-seeking tactics, designed to draw the eye and engage the audience. However, at the already eclectic Fossil Festival, Richard almost seemed to blend in.

---

153 He called this plastic step his ‘small step’ referencing Neil Armstrong’s famous line when he first set foot on the Moon in 1969.
Figure 41: Richard DeDomenici presenting at the Lyme Regis Fossil Festival. *Operation Lunar Sea* by Richard DeDomenici (photo: author)
The event was tailored for children so that there were many colourful, eccentric performances already occupying the spaces of performance. His speech was inflammatory and mildly ridiculous but was nevertheless presented by Richard with an engaging sincerity:

So what I’m proposing is a rail gun it’s an electromagnetic gun which can fire things at speeds of up to two and a half kilometres per second. Extremely fast, extremely powerful, and the exit velocity of the moon is about 2.4 kilometres per second. So theoretically this gun could shoot chunks of moon rock out of the Moon’s atmosphere and if the bits are small enough they will hopefully burn up in the Earth’s atmosphere before they hit the earth. Because we don’t want that; that could be quite dramatic and devastating (DeDomenici 2014, lecture at the Fossil Festival 3rd May).

Although Richard articulately weaved scientific discoveries with seemingly crazed ideas, the performances mostly encouraged audiences to reassess the heritage of the Moon rather than that of the Jurassic Coast. For many Operation Lunar Sea emphasised how much they valued the Moon as a part of their environment. Several audience members became angry at the thought of destroying or altering it with nuclear bombs. It was revealing that audiences viewed the Moon as something universally important for all of humanity automatically - without the need for heritage designation or scientific explanation.

The way in which Richard presented the ideas for Operation Lunar Sea was an essential element influencing how the audiences received them. The boundary between the eccentric scientist and the crazed lunatic is thin in the public imagination. In this way, Richard’s performance also interrogated the legitimacy of science through his act. Legitimacy enables support and support enables action. In his performance, Richard pronounced things incorrectly – on purpose – unsettling his audience. In doing so, he played on the uncanny so that science was made strange, eccentric and unrecognizable to its audience through its framing (Freud 2003). For this reason Operation Lunar Sea was especially well situated at the Fossil Festival.
5.5.4 Creating a buzz and missed opportunities: identifying April’s fool

Questioning the motivation behind the style of Richard’s performance is especially important as crucial avenues of publicity were avoided during the production of the piece. In initial meetings for the commission it was suggested that Operation Lunar Sea would be publically launched on 1st April (April fool’s day). This would have set the tone for the artwork from the outset and, it was hoped, provide widespread publicity. However, I gathered from one of the Council personnel that it was decided that officially none of the publicity could come from them:

> My manager really, really wanted to get onto the blowing up the Moon project because he really, really wanted to issue a press release saying Dorset County Council plans to blow up the Moon as a way of combatting flood prevention… That would be such a good headline it would hit the Sun immediately… But probably wouldn’t be a good career move for some of us. But it would be funny. (Arts Development Manager 2014, pers. comm., 15th May).

Announcing the Operation Lunar Sea project from the County Council offices would have set up a formal and official tone to the artwork narrative creating discussion on the comparative heritage values of the Moon and global coastlines. Instead, Bridport Arts Centre managed the publicity. Channelling the project publicity through an arts organisation meant the sense of ironic deception was undermined and barred.

It was a particularly unfortunate missed opportunity as Richard is an artist renowned for attracting attention from the press. Capturing the imagination of the media is a tactic that Richard has developed through his previous work. For example, his project in 2003 based in Edinburgh investigated the possibility of directing the cannons of Edinburgh castle towards the buildings of the newly constructed Scottish Parliament at
Holyrood. This gained widespread media coverage and was at one point on the cover of the Scotsman newspaper.\textsuperscript{154}

…the project I'm sort of modelling it on and hoping it might go a little bit like is this project I did in Edinburgh in 2003. In which I did a study into whether or not the cannons at the very top of Edinburgh Castle could be... elevated to a forty-five degree angle, rotated ninety degrees and used to fire projectiles at the new Scottish Parliament building that was being built at the other end of the Royal Mile... because it was at the time of the hunt for weapons of mass destruction so this project was about trying to find weapons of mass destruction closer to home than Iraq...

The project got condemned by the Conservative Party and it was like in the Tabloids and stuff which was you know bad really cause not all publicity is good publicity but it was good in terms of it being an Edinburgh Fringe project so we got on the front cover of the Scotsman newspaper the day of the show and the day that Andrew Gilligan was giving evidence to the Hutton enquiry about WMD. We were the next article on the front page of the Scotsman so it’s a very interesting juxtaposition…. Sometimes these ideas kind of capture people's imagination and then they sort of take on a life of their own and it just disseminates in a way that you know you can’t control anymore. Which sometimes is good, sometimes is terrible, but is always interesting. (Artist 2014, pers. comm., 17\textsuperscript{th} December)

Yet Operation Lunar Sea never seemed to garner the political agency of its predecessor project. Much of Richard's work depended upon spoof humour: fooling people into thinking that he was genuinely considering blowing up the Moon to reduce its erosional effect. However, unlike the original hopes there was no major marketing campaign or media coverage. The project didn't, when it came down to it, have the support of the County arts team or in fact the Jurassic Coast to run it as a scam. This is perhaps because the Dorset County Council didn’t want to send out statements that might be misconstrued and therefore undermine the spoof element. People were also worried of the about effect upon the reputation of the site as a scientific and environmental trust. During the earlier consultations many experts had pointed out that the tides didn’t really have a significant influence upon coastal retreat. Some in fact dismissed this project on the basis it was established on bad science.

The *Exploring Erosion* project was designed to be a pilot and so support was limited. However, the art could only go so far before organisational restrictions were put in place to restrict its impact. This indicates at some continuing conflicts between the Jurassic Coast and the local arts organisations with collaborative projects. The organisations continue to have differing aims, infrastructures and protocols, which can lead to occasional incongruities or oversights.

An additional limitation was that the leaflet and evaluation forms were both made available digitally as it was hoped that much of this project might be played out online. However, this conflicted with the public’s experience of the event outdoors on the beach with limited Internet access. The limited ability of evaluation materials prevented *Operation Lunar Sea* from making claims that it had changed the public’s perceptions of erosion and met the objectives of the commission brief. Furthermore, this project was less specific to the site of the Jurassic Coast. The artist had developed the idea a few years before and saw this commission as a good opportunity to develop it (Artist 2014, pers. comm., 17th December). *Operation Lunar Sea* was therefore less site-based than *Erosion Zone*. This might be why the team and Trust seemed less enthralled by this work as opposed to the kiosk, which was bought from the artists at the end of the commission.

Nevertheless, *Operation Lunar Sea* is interesting to consider especially within current discourses of the Anthropocene (Yusoff 2015; Davis et al. 2015; Brown et al. 2013; Lorimer 2012a). The idea to blow up the Moon ridiculed the extraordinary efforts already being made along the coastlines of the UK. The project therefore challenged how heritage and arts communities determined value. This was especially prevalent on a WHS. *Operation Lunar Sea* questioned whether it was more important to preserve property or to allowing the continued natural processes at the coastline. Richard used
the catch phrase: “think locally, act astronomically”. In many ways his work made a mockery of pitiful human attempts to manage the environment and to hold the sea back. He ridiculed large-scale engineering solutions to human conflicts with their habitat. In some ways it is yet to be seen what this performance and publication might do for public awareness and their own responses to the risks of erosion.

How effective Richard’s performances were at actually drawing out these debates in a meaningful way for his audiences was always something that was difficult to determine. His work demonstrated a playful understanding of the uncanny (Freud 2003). He presented science, but not quite as audiences might have expected, and in doing so these scientific performances challenged the culture of science that they enacted. Richard was a scientist and yet he was not. He was an astronaut and yet he was not. He was an artist and yet he was not. It was on the boundaries of these different performed identities where audiences could critique conventions of heritage, art and engineering. It was the tension between the not quite scientist, not quite explorer, not quite artist that showed the holes of the argument being presented. In doing so Richard performed eccentricity and yet his argument was clear.

Residents are not happy with the retreating coastline of the WHS and they require hard engineering to defend the coastline against the encroaching tides. *Operation Lunar* Sea’s solution was universal and permanent (not unlike the encroachment of sea defences). Yet this study did not meet an understanding audience. Most passers-by valued the Moon, its symbolism, its presence, and its symbiosis with Earth. However, in challenging the heritage of the Jurassic Coast against the heritage of the Moon, Richard met mixed responses from his audience. Some got angry, others laughed, and more were dismissive. The proposal was provocative but it only developed properly through investigating the accompanying booklet and the arguments within. The
audiences Operation Lunar Sea encountered had little opportunity to engage with this material leaving the Jurassic Coast unsure as to whether the project met its outcome-based objectives.

5.6 Conclusion

Field note: Burton Bradstock – 17th May 2014

After holding the fort for a while next to the National Trust Hut, Richard asks if I would like to head down to the beach with him to hand out leaflets. As it is too hot for the spacesuit he is dressed in a white printed Operation Lunar Sea t-shirt but perseveres with the eye-catching astronaut’s helmet. We walk together down the steep tarmac road towards the beach. When we reach the sand it is hot from the sun. I remove my shoes and walk quickly looking for shade to pause in along the route. We pass a Punch and Judy stall. Richard says hello to the couple sat in front for what is apparently the second time. They implore us to make it back for their 3 o’clock showing. We make empty promises and continue on.

The sand is peppered with various bodies grouped together on large colourful beach towels. We pass out the small paper handbooks and have short chats about the project. As usual some are passionately against damage to the Moon whereas others jovially agree that coastal erosion needs to be reduced by any means possible. One group constructing an elaborate castle of sand seems particularly perplexed by the notion. A man sat with them accepts the leaflet, furrows his brow and begins to read.

Richard carries on towards the sea, so I follow. Still in performance mode he moonwalks through the sand walking directly up to the sea and pausing looking out at the vast expanse of blue. After a pause he unties the laces to his bright yellow shoes and rolls up his crisp, white trousers. With slow deliberate steps he paddles into the gently lapping waves. Ever eager for research material - I begin to film. However, I quickly tire of watching Richard in the water so I begin to look around the beach for myself. About 50 yards to the right of me there is a large, metal sign like those that line the edges of roads [Fig. 38]. I approach it, noticing its firm officiousness in this informal, leisurely setting of sunbathers and picnickers. In bold, black type it reads:

DANGER – Rockfalls

Serious risk

of injury

or death

Stay away from the cliffs
You remain at risk even at low tide

Beyond its bright yellow metallic surface I see groups of sunbathers splayed out next to the brightly striped windbreaks and under the vivid orange overhang of Bridport sandstone and Inferior Oolite. I am concerned for their welfare. Yet on this still, lazy, hot day the sudden threat of tumbling slabs of stone feels somehow distant and unimaginable.

I think of Charlotte Blackman, take a photo of the sign, and turn my back on the beach - climbing the hill to catch up with the astronaut.
Figure 42: Rock-fall warning sign at Burton Bradstock beach (photo: author)
5.6.1 Final thoughts

Geomorphologists describe landslides and rock-falls as formative events shaping the coastal landscape, however in the minds of many these coastal processes are destructive and dangerous. This chapter has unpacked the various vernacular and formal responses to the erosion paradox along the Jurassic Coast. Creative responses can examine how we come to terms with these sudden forms of landscape change. The Exploring Erosion commission set out to develop on the collaborative practice promoted through JCAP and CC2012. However, in contrast to previous projects, this was based upon the objective to communicate the complexities of erosional processes on the Jurassic Coast. However, with limited funding and time for delivery this was only ever meant to be a pilot project with the ambition of applying for funding to support a larger, more resourced set of activities.

*Erosion Zone* sought to challenge the “value” of the coastline and the influence of erosion in regard to this. The kiosk displayed what on first glance appeared to be mass-produced items retailing souvenir products. However, these souvenirs were re-worked to demonstrate the diverse understandings of erosion on the Jurassic Coast. *Erosion Zone* also employed the use of toys, play and the imagination to present the multiple and conflicting perceptions of erosion on the site. This allowed it to hold the contradictions of the erosion paradox in tension by allowing a plurality of voices (Morris 2014). The kiosk also drew on the significance of the site to scientific practice. This enabled it to highlight the role of humans in constructing the WHS.

*Operation Lunar Sea* also used playful techniques of the absurd to construct certain narratives hold about erosion on the Jurassic Coast. Richard DeDomenici performed the role of researcher and scientist on the site. In doing so his work explored how the “natural” resources of the Moon (and by proxy the Earth) are exploited and
manipulated by cultural and political networks. Interestingly, the Moon was automatically viewed as something for all of mankind - without the need for heritage designation or scientific explanation. *Operation Lunar Sea* was therefore a performance of the responses to risk that spoke to the narratives of management for changing environments.

Creative policy on the Jurassic Coast after the Cultural Olympiad emphasised legacy through what was termed as a “soft commissioning” model. This essentially was envisioned as a way in which the Jurassic Coast could steer the direction and objectives of the arts whilst allowing artists the freedom to do work that was exciting and fresh. Rather than being “art-science collaborations”, the continuing partnerships in *Exploring Erosion* were in fact between the managers of the Jurassic Coast and the production coordinators of the public arts. Being a heritage site designated with the certainty of future loss and change provides some unique challenges for the management of the site. Through *Exploring Erosion* the team looked to the arts for an alternative way of approaching the challenges of risk perception and to increase the public appreciation of the dynamic shifts on this coastline.

However, the art produced in the commission perhaps did not manage to challenge these visitor assumptions in quite the ways in which they had hoped. Despite being a pilot project there were continuing difficulties with *Exploring Erosion* that had been experienced in the earlier arts programming. These included poor resources, mixed objectives for the work, and insufficient time and space to account for the learning processes of the artists (or in fact the scientists). Site-specific policy helped illuminate some of these issues as to why things didn’t quite happen and examined how relationships were formed which was very important to the overall project.
Some of these issues might have been mitigated by allowing for more of a gap between the end of CC2012 and the start of this project. In late 2013 and early 2014 there wasn’t the resource or energy to create a dialogical community around the issue of erosion. Once *Exploring Erosion* was complete there was little momentum, and no funding, to immediately continue the collaborative relationship between the Jurassic Coast and DAT. Rather than using the remaining funds in the budget to develop the pilot projects into a larger funding application, they went towards purchasing *Erosion Zone* from ArtSpark so that the Jurassic Coast team could continue to display along the site. At this point in its history the formalized *Creative Coast* arts programming linked to the Jurassic Coast was drawn to a close. However, this did not mean that there was no creative practice on the Jurassic Coast. As the next chapter will explore, the coastline now demarcated by world heritage status has been a creatively constructed place for much longer, and in more diverse ways, than was suggested by the Jurassic Coast’s arts policy.
Chapter Six: everyday creativities

6.1 Introduction

We have already seen how the Creative Coast programme has not been limited to work within the arts sector – although it does have a very important part to play. The previous chapter detailed how working with arts professionals allowed the Jurassic Coast team to engage new publics with the complex and sensitive question of erosion in distinctive and enchanting ways. This chapter extends this thread by exploring creative practice on the Jurassic Coast beyond the arts programmes. I argue that the suggestion that the arts programmes brought the arts to the Jurassic Coast (and naming it the Creative Coast) overlooked some of the ways that creative methodologies and approaches have overlapped multiple disciplines and practices along this coast throughout its history.

This chapter will explore everyday creative engagements along the coast, demonstrating how the Jurassic Coast has developed a practice of creativity over many years outside the remits of the JCAP and CC2012. This offers an alternative dimension to current ideas by suggesting geographies of everyday creativity. This chapter, therefore, explores some of the more momentary and tangential fragments of creativity on the Jurassic Coast, beyond the activity of the formalised arts programming. These creativities fit multiple disciplinary traditions and methods of engaging with the coastline. Combining the everyday engagements of practitioners, professionals, amateurs and enthusiasts with the Jurassic Coast, illustrates the mosaic of creative heritage in practice here. Creativity is seen as that which emerges or addresses something being missing (Csikszentmihalyi 1996). It therefore occurs in moments of tension and we have already seen the Jurassic Coast as a WHS infused with contradiction and conflicts of interest.
Giving agency to the everyday creators of the Jurassic Coast enables a new discussion of the formation and continual construction of the WHS by its many participants. In doing so, this transition in approach helps to break down the boundaries between the social and the natural. Because, in the words of Anderson:

[W]e urgently need to overcome the still lingering idea that human reason, meaning, knowledge-making and creativity – what humanists call culture – lies in rising above our worldly and indeed our animal existence. (Anderson 2014: 12)

Despite being a natural WHS, the Jurassic Coast is culturally constructed in a multitude of ways. This chapter will therefore also explore acts of creativity that form a part of people’s day to day lives and encounters with this section of heritage coastline. Acknowledging that there are many different creative practices and creative communities performing and making the WHS exposes the day-to-day processes of decision-making. The difference in these approaches illuminates some of the tensions and contradictions of the site through the variety of cultures of knowledge at work here. Therefore, the Jurassic Coast is more than the work of the Jurassic Coast team and their high profile creative projects such as the Jurassic Coast Arts Programme (JCAP).

Everyday creativities illuminate the multiple ways in which “users” of the Jurassic Coast engage with environments of the past, present and future.

This chapter is divided into three sections, which continue the event remapping style employed in the previous chapters. These sections narrate three arguments:

1. The Jurassic Coast team has developed creative capacity beyond the work of the formalised arts programmes to communicate the heritage of the site
2. This creative work not only re-presents the site but forms different kinds of knowledge (constructing the site in different ways)
3. This kind of creative work, which spans the arts and sciences, can be seen in action by a diverse range of actors working along the heritage coastline both within and beyond the remit of the Jurassic Coast.

The first section, therefore, examines creative practices of the Jurassic Coast team that were separate from, but inspired by, the arts programmes. This includes work commissioned by, created by, and fostered by a management team with a greater creative capacity developed through their exposure to the arts sector. Secondly this chapter explores ways in which the team was already employing creative practice as a part of the development of the Jurassic Coast, specifically through their education and learning programmes. This section demonstrates how these ways of working had always been a part of the team’s skill set, as is evidenced by the way that creativity and learning have been integrated since the designation of the site. Drawing on examples from the varied education programme and its partners allows for an analysis of how creativity has been employed to draw on curiosity as well as highlighting the art within the earth sciences. Finally this chapter gestures to creativities beyond the realms of public arts programming. Three examples illustrate that in fact creativity is practiced along this coastline everyday in many diverse ways. Exploring these other forms of creativity provokes important questions as to who is able to shape the Jurassic Coast and in what ways.

Furthermore, this thesis is attuned to the coming together of past and present. This disposition to look to the past along the coast includes the geological past but also a curiosity and passion in the place of the Jurassic Coast in the history of science. The mobilisation of the history of science in the narration of the Jurassic Coast includes exploring the way this gets enrolled through creative practice. Within the performances of creativity to follow over the subsequent pages are three historical interludes. These interludes examine the Great Bindon landslide of 1939 and the acts of creativity
embedded within the various responses to this momentous, yet localised, landscape change. The interludes, like the other sections, explore the landslide through a series of events. In doing so, the historicity of creative practice along the Jurassic Coast is revealed placing the Creative Coast agenda within a much longer tradition of creativity along this coastline.

6.2 Telling stories of landscape change. The Great Landslip 1839

Engagement with the changing environment on the Dorset and East Devon coastline extends far beyond the designation of the Jurassic Coast WHS. In fact, part of the OUV designation acknowledges the role of this section of coastline in the history of the earth sciences. This shifting coastline has inspired curiosity and creativity for centuries. Telling these historical stories enables comparison with creative responses to the changing environment over time. This first interlude focuses on one such event when the land slipped.

On Christmas Eve 1839 after their traditional celebrations the residents of the Chappell cottages, which perched on the raised Undercliff landscape near to Axmouth, awoke to a shuddering and a ripping sound ‘like the rending of cloth’ (Conybeare et al. 1840: 3). With difficulty they managed to open the door, which had been twisted out of joint with the frame, and climbed out of the house. They were not yet aware that their homes were in the middle of one of the most significant landslides in England of the century. Overnight tens of millions of tonnes of material shunted seawards opening up a large chasm behind, half a mile wide and up to 210 feet deep (Arber 1940). The result was a dramatic and jagged landscape with white chalk pinnacles rising up from the depths of a rocky chasm and displaced fields teetering in new arrangements further down the slope. Additionally, the weight of the landslide had pushed up a coastal reef at its foot forming a natural harbour, three-quarters of a mile wide [Fig. 43]. The event became
Figure 43: Plate I – Ground plan and sections of the Great Landslip (image: Philpot Museum, Lyme Regis)
known as the Great Landslip and was a scene that perfectly fit the romantic sensibilities of the early Victorians. One account declared:

Scarcely any one, a travelled person or not, fails to be greatly struck, and to have his expectations more than realized at this view. Many are breathless and bewildered at the sight. One individual from Honiton, was taken home to a sick bed, from which he was with difficulty recovered. (Roberts 1840: 7)

I have already argued that the Jurassic Coast can be thought of as a ruinous site.\textsuperscript{155} It sits on a boundary in between the geological past and the future change. Similar to a ruin the Jurassic Coast evokes nostalgia through traces of the past (Roth 1997). Furthermore, the kinds of reverence witnessed in our relationship with the aesthetics of ruins are certainly evident along the coastline, including by witnesses to the landscape created by the Great Landslip. In fact, the landscape at Bindon was even described as the 'most stupendous feature of ruin' (Conybeare et al. 1840). This most recent event was described as complementary yet prominent alongside the surrounding coastline:

The recent convulsions which, …in the imposing scenes of ruin they have produced, have thus added new features of the most striking interest to a line of coast which before was singularly rich in its wild, romantic, and picturesque character. (Conybeare et al. 1840)

The romantic landscape that beheld its Victorian observers was accompanied by suitably dramatic and awesome accounts of how the land had slipped. Many were quick to provide accounts to the local press:

On the night of the 25th (December 1839) one of the Coast Guard men, whilst on duty near the Undercliff, observed the sea to be in an extraordinary state of agitation. The beach on which he stood rose and fell. Amidst the breakers near the shore, something vast and dark appeared to be rising from the bottom of the sea amidst the noise of crashing rocks, flashing lights, attended with an intolerable stench... In the morning, immediately in front of the Undercliff, which though still much rent and shaken, still retains its former position, there appeared a stupendous ridge of broken strata of blue lias, together with rocks of immense size immovable by human power, covered with sea weed, shell fish and other marine productions. The elevation of this monstrous reef, extending more

\textsuperscript{155} See Chapter Two [section 2.2.3: Heritage in the face of oblivion] and Chapter Five [section 5.2.1: Heritage designation and change].
than a mile in length, and in some places two hundred yards in breadth, is
not less than forty feet from the level of the sea. (Bath Journal 1840)\textsuperscript{156}

However, it was Reverend William Conybeare, Professor William Buckland and his
wife Mary Buckland (née Morland) with the assistance of William Dawson who
undertook the task of surveying the landslide structure and form. It is a generously
illustrated account with the lengthy title:

Ten Plates comprising a plan, sections, and views, representing the
changes produced on the coast of East Devon, between Axmouth and Lyme
Regis by the subsidence of the land and elevation of the bottom of the sea,
on the 26\textsuperscript{th} December, 1839, and 3\textsuperscript{rd} February 1840. (Conybeare et al.
1840)

Unsurprisingly it is mostly referred to by its abbreviated nickname of the Ten Plates
account. This is a beautifully illustrated recording of both the event and an assessment
of the possible cause.

As a result of this document, the Great Landslip at Bindon has become widely
acknowledged as the first to be scientifically described and continues to be used in
studies of the site (Brunsden et al. 2003). However the, shorter and cheaper to
produce, version of the Ten Plates document was later developed by George Roberts
a local schoolteacher and historian. This more affordable version was apparently
popular as five editions of the booklet were published within a year and it had
expanded from nine pages to twenty-eight (Powell 2010).\textsuperscript{157}

Several accounts of the landslide were eventually written, but the Ten Plates by
William Conybeare and William Buckland became the most famous. Their account
relates the movement at Bindon to other known landslides and embraces

\textsuperscript{156} Bath Journal, 1840, on the night of the 25th, Bath Journal, 20th January, in (Campbell 2006: 20).

\textsuperscript{157} Powell, C. 2010. William Buckland (1784-1856) His Family and Axminster, Sheffield, Private
publication.
methodologies from the embryonic disciplines of geology and geomorphology. The *Ten Plates* records the details of the landslip and how the geology of the landscape at Bindon is composed. It includes an extensive survey of the Great Landslip and contextualizes it with other landslides studied throughout Europe (and the wider world). By combining local narratives of the event, the account demonstrates how people experienced the landslip to support their theories of its cause.

The document’s list of contributors and initial recipients was large and included many of the well to do both locally and further afield. This was probably a result of Conybeare’s and the Bucklands’ notoriety both within the Church of England and as important members of the increasingly popular science of geology. William Buckland himself was the first person to study and lecture in the subject of geology at Oxford University (Oke Gordon and Buckland 2010 [1894]). He was an eccentric character in many ways and was very influential in the development of geology as a science.

The *Ten Plates* provide a considered narrative of the landslip event:

Previous symptoms of the approaching convulsion were not altogether wanting: cracks had been observed for more than a week opening along the brow of the Downs; but they were not remarkable enough to attract much attention, as in this situation such fissures are not uncommon; until about midnight of the 24th of December, as the labourers of Mr. Chappel, who occupies the farm of Dowlands… were returning from a supper, with which, in compliance with the local custom of burning the ashen fagot on Christmas Eve, he had entertained them, and descending the steep path which wound down the brow of the cliff to their path, had sunk down more than a foot since they had crossed it since their ascent to their work in the morning. They retired to rest, however, but were disturbed about four o’clock in the ensuing morning by observing the walls of their tenements rending and sinking, and fissures opening in the ground around them. They repaired before six o’clock to alarm their landlord at the farm above, and then found their usual path nearly cut off, as the subsidence near the brow of the cliff had received a fresh accession of several feet since midnight, and they had to scramble up with difficulty. (Conybeare, Buckland and Dawson 1840: 3)

As evidenced in the extract above, the authors took care to relate anecdotal information from local residents such as the eyewitness of resident Mr Chappell. For
example, the event of the landslide was related to the traditional events of Christmas to give context. However, despite these cross-references, not all witnesses accepted the official conclusions of Conybeare and Buckland. Their account was challenged by many at the time, for example by this writer in a letter to a local newspaper:

Now, if any importance may be attached to my opinion, as well as that of the sea-faring men of Seaton, who from their maritime occupation are intimately acquainted with the localities of the shores and cliffs of Axmouth, I will take leave to say that this is a mistake.

... I must beg to correct a geographical error into which Mr. Conybeare has most unaccountably fallen. Speaking of the land-slips that have occurred at different times, he says- "Another took place in 1789 or 90 near " Beer, at the mouth of the Axe, on the South down." I beg to refer your readers to any map of Devon, which will show that the mouth of the Axe is on the eastern side of the Bay, formed by Beer head, and Haven cliff, nearly three miles eastward of South down. (J.H.H. 1840)\(^{158}\)

This writer goes on to use this incorrect observation to discredit some of Buckland and Conybeare's more substantial claims about the cause and movement of the landslip. It is clear that in order to justify the theories they were putting forward the Victorian scientists needed to find ways to justify and evidence their ideas in an age when many of their explanations upset conventional popular thinking.

One method the authors employed to support their descriptions was through the use of maps and diagrams in the *Ten Plates* document. William Conybeare was one of the first to use the technology of the geological cross-section to illustrate the subsurface geology and geomorphology (Encyclopædia Britannica 2009; Oakes 2007). He included an example in the *Ten Plates*, which also served to communicate the proposed cause of the landslip (a layer of saturated Fox Mould) [Fig. 44]. The image demonstrates how Conybeare diagrammatically represented his theories of the organisation and orientation of the underlying geology through colour and line. Aesthetic elements have formed an inherent component of the science of

---

\(^{158}\) J. H. H., 1840. Late Convulsion in the Axmouth Cliffs, *Western Times*, 22\(^{nd}\) February: 2.
Plate III - Geological section of the chasm by the Rev W D Conybeare (image: Philpot Museum, Lyme Regis)
geomorphology since its formalization (Tooth et al. 2016; Dixon, Hawkins, and Straughan 2012). The responses to the 1939 Bindon landslip demonstrate some of the ways early geologists and geomorphologists navigated the task of communicating the movement of the earth. They combined illustrative narratives with diagrammatic illustrations to communicate their theories on the underlying geological structure and cause of landslide here. Working in the field involved using skills of observation and various methods of recording for the Bucklands, Dawson and Conybeare.

Despite their notoriety and influence in the history of geology and geomorphology, it is important to recognise that the Ten Plates document is not just the work of the more notorious geologists William Buckland and William Conybeare. William Dawson a civil engineer and surveyor based in Exeter provided a large amount of the material and illustrations. William Buckland’s wife Mary is also credited for two of the plate drawings.\textsuperscript{159} However, even these recognitions fail to acknowledge the silent work of countless other assistants, printers and locals who certainly provided much of the hidden labour towards this document.

6.3 Building creative capacity along the coast

One of the greatest successes acknowledged from the JCAP has been the adoption of creative practice and the arts into the management of the WHS by the team. The openness and curiosity of the Jurassic Coast team developed as they supported the formal arts programmes between 2008 and 2014. However, they also increasingly embraced conceptions of creativity through artistic practice within their own work over the same period. They were receptive to the arts programming partly because it enhanced their own creative learning, practice and experience. It is, in part, the team’s

\textsuperscript{159} These illustrations will be explored in more detail later on later in this chapter [section 6.4: Drawing the changing landscape].
receptiveness to the formalised arts programme that empowered creative practice beyond it.

6.3.1 Storytelling with fossils: “standing at one end of a thread of existence”

One of the most significant ways in which the arts programmes have influenced the Jurassic Coast site is the influence that exposure to creative practices had on the team. As of 2014, the arts have become a cross-cutting theme in the site’s management plan meaning that, where appropriate, the team has committed to draw upon the arts sector to address their aims and objectives (Jurassic Coast World Heritage team 2014b). However, alongside the more formalized influence of the arts programming upon the site, the Jurassic Coast team themselves have recognized and developed the creativity within their own practice. One example is the recently published *Fossils of the Jurassic Coast* (Scriven 2016) which concludes with:

> Human creativity and imagination is a product of roughly 3.5 billion years of evolution. As our more recent apelike ancestors developed an increasingly complex way of relating to their surroundings their powers of perception, thought and imagination intensified. Today, as the current generation occupying that small branch of the tree of life, we can use those acute abilities to contemplate our origins. Standing at one end of a thread of existence, we can use fossils to reach back along the cord into ancient deserts, seas and swamps. The evidence is lying at our feet – the fragmented pyrite ammonites or the worn ichthyosaur vertebrae. Such objects have been delivered into our hands after millions of years in darkness. They tumble from the rocks of the Jurassic Coast, out into the sunlight, bringing with them the possibility of a brighter understanding of our world and our place in it. (Scriven 2016)

This closing paragraph describes an important relationship between creativity, perception and geology. Although the book is a guide to the fossils found on the Jurassic Coast according to the strata of rock in which they are found it adopts an imaginative approach. This was an opportunity to communicate some of the heritage value of the coast to new audiences. *Fossils of the Jurassic Coast*, (hereafter referred to as *Fossils*), was structured so that readers trace the evolution of life, evident from the geological record at the Jurassic Coast, as the environment changed through the
Mesozoic. A pull-out poster placed at the back of the book, which details the tree of life for the Jurassic Coast, further illustrates this.

The publication of *Fossils* was a significant milestone for the interpretation message of the Jurassic Coast. For the past few years, as a part of the development of their own role within the Jurassic Coast team, the Earth Science Manager has been developing their ideas of geo-conservation and geo-interpretation. These are notoriously difficult practices as the value of geology is not immediately apparent to the general public (especially when compared to popular sectors such as bio-conservation and cultural heritage). Although a key part of ecosystems and human activity, the rocks beneath our feet are all too often portrayed as static, immobile and immutable. Additionally, methods of geo-conservation are not always visible or aesthetic, for example some precious or rare rock exposures are buried to protect them from tampering and weathering.

However, through exploring the difficulties with engaging audiences with the heritage value of the geology of the site, the Earth Science Manager has turned to certain creative practices to strengthen his interpretation toolkit. Having worked as a part of projects such as *ExLab* (one of the larger projects of JCAP) the Jurassic Coast team have experience of working with a variety of creative practitioners and methods for many years. However, most recently the Earth Science Manager has trained to develop their skills in storytelling creative writing. This included attending storytelling sessions and writing mythical, fictional accounts to tell stories of the geological past. This creative writing practice is very evident in the *Fossils* book. The writing style is very different than what one might expect from what is essentially a palaeontological

\[160\] For more detailed discussion on the *ExLab* project JCAP see Chapter Four [section 4.6: *Exploratory Laboratory*].
reference guide. The book employs imaginative scenes and relatable facts in clear and expressive language to illustrate the lives of the fossils described. This style of interpretation is especially important for a public-facing organisation such as the Jurassic Coast, as they need to engage audiences beyond those inspired by and knowledgeable of scientific language and interpretation.\textsuperscript{161} Using imagination and storytelling, the writing develops an ethos of care for the geology of the Jurassic Coast beyond the authorized heritage discourse of OUV (Smith 2006; UNESCO 2015: 11).

The stories written in \textit{Fossils} are illustrated by a variety of photographs, maps and drawings. Most of the illustrations used are images from the \textit{Fossil Finder} database and website.\textsuperscript{162} The \textit{Fossil Finder} was developed by an alliance of Dorset museums along the Jurassic Coast who sought to collate and make accessible the wide variety of fossils within the County’s collections. Launched in 2014 the website enables visitors to search for and learn information about around 1000 fossils. The process of photographing and digitally scanning the specimens for the website was a large undertaking which took over a year. However, the free resource now available to the public is unprecedented. It also provided the museums and the Jurassic Coast with a wealth of images of the fossils found along the coast for their engagement work. In addition to a printed version of these images of fossil specimens, the book provides visual imaginations or reconstructions of what the creatures and their past habitats might have looked like. These all serve to illustrate the way that life changed through the changing environments of the Mesozoic period.

\textsuperscript{161} The vision of the site includes inspiring people to ‘celebrate, understand and enjoy it’ and Participation and inclusion is also listed as a cross-cutting theme in the management plan (Jurassic Coast World Heritage team 2014b).

\textsuperscript{162} Although the project was developed by a partnership of Dorset museums The \textit{Fossil Finder} database is hosted by the Jurassic Coast and can be found at: http://jurassiccoast.org/fossilfinder/ [Last accessed 27/11/2016].
This creative style of geo-interpretation is not limited to the *Fossil* book. The Jurassic Coast team employ creative and literary approaches to geo-heritage and geo-interpretation more widely in their interpretation work. For example, the interpretation boards located on viewpoints at the top of cliffs encourage visitors to imagine the sights, smells and sounds of the past environments. The Earth Science Manager has a rule that they don’t use any images of the visible view on the board itself. These are instead spaces for imaginative responses and storytelling to engage the visitor with what they can see beyond the sign. Additionally, this storytelling style for approaching fossils and geological interpretation is evident in the team’s many talks, blog posts and interviews. The team’s creative practice goes beyond the arts programmes and the *Fossil* book to the various and multiple forms of engagement he practices daily on the WHS. Most importantly this includes openness to new ways of engaging with geology.\(^{163}\)

Communicating geology through creative practice is a task the Jurassic Coast team is increasingly being recognised for. This is partly due to the exposure and publicity provided by the activity of the arts programmes. However, alongside this the team has developed their creative capacity to communicate the OUV of the Jurassic Coast. These approaches enable the Jurassic Coast as an organisation to reach new audiences and to create an ethos of care for the heritage of the Jurassic Coast. Like Conybeare, and other geologists before them, the team has looked to alternative and illustrative techniques to communicate the interpretation of the WHS.

\(^{163}\) This is something we saw in Chapter Five where the Earth Science Manager’s response to the *Exploring Erosion* projects detailed not only their appreciation for the project itself but for artistic approaches to the issues the Jurassic Coast faces.
The Jurassic Coast team have demonstrated how practitioners working in the heritage sector can adopt and engage with creative practices as a part of their interpretation of the site. This has been achieved through their own creative and professional development and by working in partnership with others (including the artists they have been introduced to through the arts programme). When these creative relationships are developed successfully they are long lasting and fruitful. The Jurassic Coast team has several examples of having achieved these kinds of creative partnerships. Additionally, they have arguably become more comfortable in these relationships through working as a part of the Jurassic Coast Arts Programme as this gave the opportunity to work closely with artists to develop projects linked to their expertise. It has also, in the subsequent years, led to many spinoff projects such as the Fossil Book.

6.3.2  Confidence commissioning art

Another way in which the Jurassic Coast team can be seen to have embraced creativity is through their increased confidence in commissioning. This is a strategy that fits with the aforementioned addition of the arts as a cross-cutting theme within the management plan. Alongside the work they undertook connected to the arts programmes the team identified project requirements and commission opportunities. JCAP and CC2012 did not have the space or infrastructure for targeted commissions directly arising from the management of the site. For this work the team had to look beyond the mechanisms of the ACE funded programmes. An example of this was the animated short film Jurassic Coast: A Mighty Tale. This piece of work demonstrates the increased creative capacity for the team through arts commissions.

After seeing other examples of this kind of work at Durlston Country Park on the WHS and having worked with them before, the Jurassic Coast team commissioned Forkbeard Fantasy to create the film: A Mighty Tale. This was in part due to the
recognition by the Jurassic Coast Site Manager who saw that there was space in the
team’s talks and public engagements for an interesting yet informative introduction to
the core messages and themes of the Jurassic Coast WHS. The resulting film is a
comical, engaging and colourful narrative of the Jurassic Coast:

“The Jurassic Coast: A Mighty Tale”, 250 million years and 95 miles long…
all told in 5 minutes by this pencil this brush and this hand… It’s a long thin
narrow steep and rocky tale to tell told from the tops of cliffs… down to the
shoreline at Low Tide. It’s the story of the making of ROCK from soft
beginnings… piling up layer upon layer… and hardening into stone, of vast
red baking deserts of oceans rising … and falling… of eroding landscapes
of ancient plants and primeval trees and early life cavorting… A tale of huge
rivers and the beds they left behind now strewn across the pages of this
script (The Jurassic Coast: A Mighty Tale 2012)\(^{164}\)

Through animation and narration the film explores the geological formation of the
heritage coastline, why it is significant to humans in the present and speculates what
the coast may look like in the future. The live-action animation technique gives the film
dynamism as it whisks the viewer through the history and significance of the site
according to its OUV. The drawings are filled with interesting characters and surreal
juxtapositions of metaphors and landscapes [Fig. 45 and Fig. 46].

Forkbeard Fantasy’s style combines multimedia (videos, animation, sound and lighting)
with the human body to create spaces of investigation, curiosity and exploration. The A
Mighty Tale animated video communicates the OUV of the WHS in an engaging and
fresh way. In A Mighty Tale, geological timescales are measured according to human
generations and the cyclical process of life and death on the Jurassic Coast is
emphasised. Using “grannies” as a measurement of time enabled the artist to
communicate timescales in an engaging and amusing manner. In their own words:

\(^{164}\) The Jurassic Coast: A Mighty Tale. 2010. Animated film, Forkbeard Fantasy and Jurassic
Coast Trust, Dorset. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3eMUdqSu2Kc [Last
accessed 28/11/2016].
Figure 45: Extract from *A Mighty Tale* by Forkbeard Fantasy (image: Third Party Copyright)

Figure 46: Extract from *A Mighty Tale* by Forkbeard Fantasy illustrating “the Unconformity” (image: Third Party Copyright)
It’s really good actually because it does put it into perspective. It makes you suddenly realize that there are two grannies every 100 years and so 2,000 years is nothing in terms of generations. It is so helpful, because its’ really scary the way science and well anything – the financial markets – they do everything in millions and you just go argh I don’t understand any of that. And time is an awful thing to try and comprehend and especially for children I think. (Artist 2014, pers. comm., 12th May)

The Jurassic Coast team and Forkbeard Fantasy began working together through JCAP when they developed the *Cabinet of Curiosities*. Since then they built up a trusting and productive relationship with one another. The artist described the process of working with the Jurassic Coast team during the production of *A Mighty Tale*:

They were really good they never asked to see even the storyboard. I did take it to them once but they just thought it was all coming together really well. They’re terribly good, they give you the benefit of the doubt as an artist. You have to keep checking on the science as well but you can make things up to a point. (Artist 2014, pers. comm., 12th May)

The relationship described between the artists creating *A Mighty Tale* and the commissioners and collaborators on the Jurassic Coast team was convivial. This was essential to projects like this as trust in one another enabled the scientific practitioners to build confidence in the artists with whom they were working. At the same time the artists were able to use their own creative license or imagination to free up the language of the science or to create new perspectives on the topic. The structure of this relationship is reminiscent of Sennett’s concept of dialogical cooperation where practitioners are able to come together without needing to reconcile their differences (Sennett 2012). For example, although the illustrator of *A Mighty Tale* refers to the Jurassic Coast Earth Science Manager as his ‘dedicated Personal Science Trainer’

---

165 The *Cabinet of Curiosities* is an interactive museum exhibit, which was produced in 2009 in association with the Dorset Museums network. The research and development of the project was partly funded by JCAP and formed a part of the programme’s early output. It is an interactive cabinet that displays the history and formation of the Jurassic Coast through peephole displays, drawers and films.
they remain free to ask any questions and make their own interpretations because of the trusting relationship (Forkbeard Fantasy 2014b: np).

These relationships are highly important for small arts organizations working within the public sector and Forkbeard Fantasy has developed several similar films since the A Mighty Tale commission. Exposure to new partners and commissioners is an important benefit for the arts organisation that lost their Regularly Funded Organisation (RFO) status on the Arts Council Portfolio in 2011 (Arts Professional 2011). The organisation has had to change its ways of working and has increased its profit earning projects in the region. A part of this work included creating new networks and new work portfolios to fit with the creative industries agenda. Through the Jurassic Coast, Forkbeard Fantasy has extended its portfolio to heritage and conservation interpretation and is increasingly working with the public and charitable sector. Commissions such as the A Mighty Tale film provides the Jurassic Coast team with work that they know how to employ within their practice and suits their needs. Additionally, the A Mighty Tale book was published by the Jurassic Coast Trust in 2014 as a part of their fundraising strategy (Forkbeard Fantasy 2014a). Despite being a different working style to that advocated within the formalized Creative Coast, the Jurassic Coast has demonstrated the capacity to commission artistic work that suits their ways of working. It also enables creative ways of communicating the geological interpretations of the site, illustrating the coast in a different way and reaching new audiences.

### 6.3.3 Supporting creative interpretation in the community

Alongside embracing creativity within their own practice and through their work with artists and arts organisations, the Jurassic Coast team has also encouraged creative

---

166 When compared to the relationships between the artists and earth scientists in the Exploring Erosion project, this form of commissioned partnership seems to foster a companionable relationship shared on joint aims.
responses to the site within the wider community. This has included increasing the agency for those living in local communities along the coastline to have ownership over the interpretation of the site. For example, the Jurassic Coast ambassadors are a team of volunteers fulfilling various roles along the world heritage coastline. They help deliver the aims of the management plan through their own strengths and passions. The current model of working with the community developed from a group of passionate residents from the small fishing village of Beer in East Devon. The ways in which these ambassadors of the WHS have interpreted the geology here has shaped and constructed the site itself.

I first met some of the Jurassic Coast ambassadors at a science festival in Seaton in 2013 where I was working with the Youth Hostel Association (YHA) to deliver a day of children’s activities. The ambassadors had arranged a colourful stand and what drew me in were some coloured wooden blocks [Fig. 47]. These were homemade and arranged to convey a peculiarity of the geological sequencing on the Jurassic Coast, known as the Great Unconformity. These ambassadors had travelled over from the neighbouring village of Beer where the steep chalk harbour and fishing village nestled alongside red sandstone headlands at Seaton. The chalk of Beer Head stands out from the coastline and as I have learnt over the past few years, many think it is this quirk of geology that makes Beer such a unique place on the south Devon coastline. In Beer a promontory of chalk protrudes into the exposed coastline due to a fault in the rock. This

---

\[167\] The Great Unconformity is the name given to the gap in the geological record of time in the record of the Jurassic Coast. After the rocks of the Triassic, Jurassic and early Cretaceous were laid down the whole expanse of land was tilted eastward during the Variscan Orogeny (a mountain building period in France). After this followed years of net erosion at the surface so that no sediment was laid down. When the Upper Greensand of the late Cretaceous was deposited in some locations it was placed directly on top of the exposed Triassic and Jurassic rocks creating a gap in time of between 90 and 130 million years in the geological record. It is this gap that is known as the Unconformity, although it is much easier to describe with the help of colourful wooden blocks!
means that not only does the harbour at Beer display cliffs of a chalky white colour; it is also of a different distinct shape [Fig. 48]. It was the Jurassic Coast ambassadors who identified how this distinct geology had influenced the community here in a myriad of ways throughout history. Working with the Jurassic Coast team they were able to develop this idea into an interpretation strategy for the village and to communicate it to their community and its visitors.

When I first met them, the Jurassic Coast Ambassadors formed a small band of enthusiasts based in East Devon who met fairly regularly to hear a talk about the geology of the Jurassic Coast and to walk sections of it. The ambassadors based in Beer were central to the links between the Jurassic Coast and the local East Devon community. They worked closely with the Beer Heritage organisation that runs the visitor centre on the beach and aims to communicate the heritage, wildlife and geology specific to Beer to residents and visitors. They invited me along to their events and it was with them, meeting team members regularly, that I learnt a lot of the idiosyncratic geological detail of specific localities on the coast. I also joined them for a walk through the village of Beer where various locals took it in turn to narrate the history of the village’s fishing, lace-making and mining heritage.
Figure 47: Jurassic Coast ambassadors stall at Seaton Science Festival (photo: author)

Figure 48: Beer village harbour with its steep chalk cliffs (photo: author)
On one such trip, the Earth Science Manager took us onto the beach to explain the unique geology of Beer; its chalk cliffs nestled between the older red Triassic rocks of Seaton and Sidmouth. We also walked up to the new visitor information sign, which narrates a history of Beer “written in stone”. This was an idea developed with the ambassadors. Unlike other interpretation along the WHS, the board in Beer focused on the significance of the geology to the local population. This interpretation traced the relationship between the peculiarities of the chalk headland here and the people who had travelled through and inhabited this tiny section of coastline. Rather than simply describing the formation of the chalk at Beer or the Cretaceous environment in which it developed, the new interpretation board told the history of the stone in this place. It traced the significance of the stone on the lives of the people in the village, something that seemed apt for the place where the Jurassic Coast ambassadors were formed. Here is an account of this interpretation written by an ambassador for the Jurassic Coast blog:

Today, local stone in Beer is still making history. Small pieces of greensand from the village have recently returned after 18 months in space. Scientists have ascertained that the microbes in the greensand have survived their epic journey. So, when your great-grand children blast off on a journey to Mars or Venus, where they will have to grow their own food, you will know that Beer provided the evidence that organisms can survive and grow in space.168

This interpretation not only links the geology to how humans live in the present but also indicates how these pasts may influence the future. The blog post includes the remarkable fact that organisms from Beer stone have been launched into space. Cyanobacteria from limestone collected at the cliffs of Beer was launched into a low Earth orbit (300km high) for ten days to see if it could survive the trip (Olsson-Francis, 2014).

de la Torre, and Cockell 2010). It did providing the study with further information about the ecosystem and the environmental tolerance of the cyanobacteria population.

The interpretation board details how the chalk at Beer has been a significant resource for people living or travelling through here since Neolithic times. At that time Beer was the last site on the journey west where it was possible to collect flint for tools (Hart 2009). Beer flint has been recovered as far to the west as in Carn Brea in Cornwall. Additionally, Beer Stone has been an important resource for building and it is a part of the fabric of twenty-four cathedrals in the country (Hart 2009). Famous landmarks constructed with Beer Stone include the Tower of London, Westminster Abbey, St. Paul’s Cathedral and Exeter Cathedral. The latter also owned the mining rights and mined the stone to build and maintain the cathedral.

The influence of the stone at Beer on how people locally and nationally have lived is significant. However, there was another motivation to finding an alternative and creative geological interpretation for Beer. Compared to the bounty of fossils unearthed at nearby Charmouth and Lyme Regis, there are fewer on this stretch of coastline and fossil hunters are discouraged from searching for them here. East Devon has therefore had to find other things to develop itself as a tourist attraction and a distinctive part of the WHS. The Beer ambassadors were keen to communicate that there are fossils in the cliffs and beaches of East Devon. However, this is something that conflicts with the Jurassic Coast’s fossil hunting policies. These encourage fossil hunters to the limestone cliffs further east in Dorset where there are more abundant specimens that are easier (and often safer) to find.

Despite these small conflicts of interest, the ambassadors at Beer have formed the structure for a much wider engagement between the WHS and communities living along the coastline. The initial group of Jurassic Coast ambassadors, with the support of the Jurassic Coast team, has therefore not only helped in shaping the interpretation but also the ethos of community work for the Jurassic Coast. A Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) grant was awarded to the Jurassic Coast Trust in 2014 for a project titled *Growing Our Community*. This project aims to develop the Trust’s work with local communities and residents as they expand and take on more of the infrastructure of the Jurassic Coast. This led the community engagement work to be channelled through a devoted member of the Jurassic Coast team and a Community Coordinator was appointed. However, this shift towards the HLF agenda not only added to the resources available for working with the community, it also increased the agenda for the Jurassic Coast Trust (as opposed to the Jurassic Coast team) to develop community work that would provide income for the WHS. The Community Coordinator now works to expand the Jurassic Coast community through trained ambassadors, with an eye to the fundraising and publicity potential of having a network of supporters.

The work of the ambassadors at Beer has allowed new forms of interpretation to emerge through conversations and walks as a part of regular interactions between the Jurassic Coast team and a small group of local residents. In this way, the practice of creativity within the management of the WHS is achieved through everyday conversations and relationships with the coastline and the communities that live and

---

170 The growing role of the Jurassic Coast Trust is explored in Chapter One [section 1.3.3: Performing policy].

171 The difference between the Jurassic Coast Trust and the Jurassic Coast team being that the Trust works to maintain the aims of the WHS whereas the team, hosted by the Dorset and Devon County Council work to maintain this work as set out by the Trust.
work along it. Yet these can spawn unexpected responses and different approaches to the site. The importance of the individual curiosity, passion and enthusiasm exhibited by each of these early ambassadors at Beer cannot be understated. By finding new ways to talk about the Jurassic Coast as a site, they constructed it, slowly but substantially.

The Jurassic Coast team has developed their own creative practice both as a part of the formalized arts programming and beyond it. Furthermore they have gained confidence in commission and developed their understanding of the value of commissioning art. Alongside their own practice, the team has encouraged others linked to the Jurassic Coast community to do similarly. Creative engagements with the geological OUV of the site have enabled new perspectives to develop as to how it is interpreted and communicated. However, these creative engagements not only provide engaging forms of communicating earth sciences, they shape the kinds of knowledge formed.

6.4 Drawing the changing landscape

Dr. and Mrs. Buckland were both quickly on the spot, and while the Professor made careful investigations into the cause of the catastrophe, his wife, with her clever pencil, made a series of drawings of this curious phenomenon. (Oke Gordon and Buckland 2010)

Creative approaches can provide new ways of communicating existing ideas and concepts. However, they are not simply conduits for reproducing existing knowledge and information; they are the processes of constructing knowledge and ways of knowing.

Artistic methods are therefore a way, but not the only way, of performing creativity. For example, returning to the Bindon Landslide in 1839, the document produced by the
Bucklands, Conybeare and Dawson used a combination of approaches to the event to describe it. These included geological cross-sections, coloured maps and detailed illustrations of the view. Some of the most remarkable elements of the *Ten Plates* account are these striking illustrations. George Roberts in fact concluded his written account of the Bindon landslip with the following:

> The singularity and picturesque effect of the new combinations produced by this remarkable convulsion must be sufficiently evident from the above description, without fatiguing the reader by any vain attempt to delineate by the pen that which were fitter subject for the pencil. (Roberts 1940: 8)

It seems that the affect of the landscape on those who witnessed it left a sense that it was only partially describable by written portrayals. Mary Buckland and William Dawson’s illustrations continue to be referenced in modern studies of landslides. They provide insight not only to the mechanism of the landslip but also to the viewpoint and context of the artists themselves.

Although married to prominent geologist William Buckland, Mary Buckland was a respected geologist and illustrator in her own right. She had been an active fossil collector prior to her marriage to William and had prepared illustrations to accompany the work of French palaeontologist Georges Cuvier (Kölbl-Ebert 2012; Oke Gordon and Buckland 2010). Creese and Creese describe her work as under the category of ‘talented wife-assistants’ (Creese and Creese 2006: 55). However, it is possible that her work extended far beyond simply the role of assistant. Mary spent many nights transcribing and re-writing work for her husband’s publications (Oke Gordon and Buckland 2010). Although, official contributions by female amateur geologists were limited they held considerably more influence at this early stage in the discipline’s development compared to when it became professionalised later in the century.

---

172 They supposedly met whilst travelling down to Lyme Regis in the same carriage and were both reading Cuvier’s latest book (Oke Gordon and Buckland 2010).
However, the evidence of female labour was limited in geological publications as they were often restricted to assistant roles. One exercise many amateur female geologists could practice, which Mary Buckland was accomplished in, was illustrating:

Drawing and watercolour painting thus became part of elementary female education, ranking in line with music and dancing. The rationale was the cultivation of female delicacy and women’s sense of beauty. (Kölbl-Ebert 2012)

Mary was an established illustrator so, whilst her husband and Conybeare scaled the chasm of the landslide to examine its structure, Mary drew a number of views of the scene.\textsuperscript{173} Her drawings were translated to lithographs. This is a technology notorious for its honesty in reproducing the exact movements of the drawer’s hand and lithography is therefore considered to be the most autographic of print-making processes. Its record of the movement of the hand of the artist enables a certain freedom with the drawing process. William Dawson most likely conducted this translation. It was probably his combined knowledge of engineering and mapping alongside his artistic skill that made Dawson a valuable contributor to the document.\textsuperscript{174}

\textsuperscript{173} There is a revealing section in Robert’s guide to the Bindon landslip published a short time after time Mary Buckland was scaling the undercliffs. This outlines the gendered routes allocated for visitors, limiting women to the less strenuous although seemingly longer routes to view the landslip landscape:

Gentlemen may go on and descend from the summit beyond the end of the chasm to the undercliff; and by steep climbing ascend to the west end of the chasm, or continue to the beach not much beyond the western basin. Ladies must walk back to Dowlands farm; continue some distance beyond the spot where they first reached the edge of the cliff, and keeping close to the precipice they will come to a road-way leading to Dowlands lime kiln, and the undercliff. (Roberts 1840: 8)

Presumably this meant that women and men viewed the scenery of the landslip from different perspectives. Perhaps Mary studied the landscape as her husband William and friend William Conybeare went off to investigate the chasm and pinnacles without her.

\textsuperscript{174} Dawson’s contributions included several longitudinal sections (featuring his unique marker seagulls), plus three artistic views. This apparently increased his notoriety as a decade later he was invited to undertake a much more extensive surveying work. He provided a complete record of Brunel’s Atmospheric railway between Exeter and Totnes whilst it was under construction (Garnsworthy and Dawson 2013).
Mary’s illustrations created for the *Ten Plates* account show a variety of vistas of the newly shifted undercliff landslip at Bindon [Fig. 49]. These observational drawings are labelled as being made only 5 days after the landslip occurred and show the multiple blocks of land that had moved. These pillars eventually coalesced more or less into one landform, which is now referred to as Goat Island. Although, some pinnacles of land remained as detached entities and a couple of these remain standing today. The techniques and technologies of drawing employed in this document therefore provide useful insight into the landscape of the landslip directly after the event. The *Ten Plates* included the still-life skills of Mary Buckland, the surveyor techniques of William Dawson (also used for Brunel’s atmospheric railway), and Conybeare’s recently developed technology of cross-sections. The communications through the pencil in the *Ten Plates* defined and therefore constructed this new landscape and how the wider public would view it. The drawings determined the contemporary imaginations of the landslip and continue to influence today forming some of the most significant documents in the history of the earth sciences.

Images from the Great Landslip are not limited to the *Ten Plates* document as Mary created a large watercolour painting of a similar view to plate V in the published account [Fig. 50]. This was designed for William to use in his famously animated lectures to his students at Oxford University (Oke Gordon and Buckland 2010). Similarly to the lithographs, Mary used lines to indicate the form and folds of the landslide suggesting movement. Curved flicks gesture to moss green bushes and grass blades overhanging the chalk white slopes of freshly broken cliff. However, the use of colour provided a new dimension to the view of the landslip. Umber browns, chalk whites and bright blues dominate the scene [Fig. 51]. Additionally, broad black brush strokes mark out the distinction between the headland on which the artist stands and the landslip beyond. The turquoise blue sea is marked with thin grey lines.
Figure 49: Plate V - View of the Axmouth Landslip from Downlands (image: Philpot museum, Lyme Regis)
Figure 50: Full view of Mary Buckland's watercolour painting of the Bindon Landslip (source: Oxford University Museum of Natural History)

Figure 51: Detailed view of Mary Buckland's Bindon Landslip watercolour (source: Oxford University Museum of Natural History)
depicting the motion of the water. In contrast the darker blue (almost purple) of the newly formed lagoon is smudged and lineless. Mary did not know at that time that the protective barrier of sediment would wash back into the sea and this would be one of a few representations that remained to attest to its existence.

In comparison to the lithographs from the published document the watercolour served a different purpose. The style was markedly different from Mary’s other illustrations, especially her widely published lithographs (both of landscapes and studies of fossilized bones). Her other work was detailed and precise with an astute use of light and shade to give an otherwise flat, colourless image form and texture. The watercolour however, was more fluid. The drawn shapes were therefore looser, more abstract and less defined. Some of these shapes seem formative in comparison to some of her other studies of the landslide. Perhaps this was intended to be a quick work.

Drawing was a formative practice in geology and in the process of separating itself from artistic practice. Therefore, Mary illustrated not only because through these images different information could be shared with their readers, although this is the case. Rather, different ways of knowing were constructed through the tool of the pencil rather than that of the pen. The combination of image and text in the Ten Plates was a crucial part of the representation of the Great Landslip. The use of images provided crucial information as to the social context of the event within the burgeoning earth sciences. It also contributed to a heritage of knowing this particular place, through navigation, “exploration”, describing, mapping and drawing.
6.5 Learning and creativity

Ever since Mary Buckland’s interpretation of the Bindon landslip, the importance of artistic methods has been apparent in the science of palaeontology. The learning and participation work of the Jurassic Coast encourages residents and visitors to engage with the interpretation of the site by creating a spectacle from some of the ordinary skills of enquiry they already have. Using artistic techniques can help to communicate and open out information to new audiences by displaying this information in new ways. However, these artistic approaches also create different kinds of knowledge enabling the curious to understand the world in new ways. The learning programmes developed for the Jurassic Coast have embraced this notion of creativity, which encompasses different disciplinary ways of doing. The following section will address the ways that learning on the Jurassic Coast has been creative and how this has structured knowledge and practice.

6.5.1 Encouraging creativity in the classroom

Changes in curriculum brought into effect in September 2014 made earth sciences a required element of primary level teaching. Addressing a lack of knowledge on the subject amongst teachers, the Learning and Participation Manager recognized the importance of creative approaches to teaching earth science in UK classrooms. This enabled teachers to gain new knowledge and skills to communicate and teach science subjects in an engaging way. At the core of this work is the notion that imagination is a crucial part of geology, as the past is conceptualised from fragments of information and evidence collected in the present. Therefore, creative approaches to teaching science were a natural fit as they complemented the thinking required in the practice of doing geology and palaeontology.
One artist that the Jurassic Coast team has collaborated with for many years is Darrell Wakelam. Although included in some of the earlier Creative Coast arts programming through JCAP, Darrell’s work did not meet some of the grander and international ambitions of the later programme. However, his practice involves using the processes of making and skills of creativity to communicate the concepts underlying the site. This may not be conceptually “ground breaking” modern art but as a process of exploring complex ideas through making it is popular within the region. As a result Darrell’s work is prolific and almost ubiquitous in schools along the coastline. I first met Darrell at a teacher-training day organised by the Learning and Participation Manager at Damer’s First School, Dorchester. I was joining the Jurassic Coast Superteachers for a training day to make creative resources from their placements. As I arrived into the large sports hall, Darrell stood with a cup of tea welcoming everyone. The far wall was already adorned with large cardboard constructions of giants, which I learned had been made with the school children on previous visits with Darrell.

Darrell works mainly in Primary Schools and so several of the teachers attending the workshop had met him before. His work employs creativity and making to explore a variety of cross-curricular subjects in an accessible way. The development of his career in the educational arts relies upon creative flexibility, establishing networks and pragmatic professionalism. On his website he describes his practice:

> I’ve been interested in art for as long as I can remember and I’m lucky enough to spend every working day devising and delivering creative art projects for children and young people. I love what I do and I hope that is apparent in the work that I create. I enjoy working with children, I admire their adaptability and resourcefulness, I appreciate their honesty and I am

---

175 He had worked on the educational aspects of The Land that Time Forgot creating props with school children for a performance by Herbie Treehead at the 2009 Fossil Festival [Appendix 5].

176 The Jurassic Coast Superteachers was a development upon the Big Jurassic Classroom (BJC). Funded through the Primary Science Teaching Trust from 2013, the Superteachers were put on placements with expert practitioners from the earth sciences. Placements included fossil handling at the Natural History Museum and swath bathometry at the University of Southampton.
always amazed by their energy and enthusiasm. In return I try my best to match these attributes.\textsuperscript{177}

Darrell’s craft is cardboard. He makes 3D structures sculpting with paper, card and tissue to construct imaginative and creative forms - masks, monsters, and dinosaurs. He described this to me as earning a living through ‘cutting and sticking’ and his tools are scissors and sticky tape (Wakelam 2014, pers. comm., 9\textsuperscript{th} May).

At the training day, as a group we arranged ourselves around the grey school tables. Together, we made masks: snipping to create cones, spirals and protrusions which in turn formed nostrils, ears and eyes: the shape of a face. Darrell pulled out picture examples of the shapes of different dinosaur heads. He encouraged us to use our imagination and if we didn’t know the method to get there he would show us. He facilitated as we created.

After making simple 3D dinosaur masks Darrell showed us how to create cross-sections of the coastline. Relatively quickly, in pairs, we compiled sections of coastline adding in details such as caves and rock strata with coloured layers of tissue paper on top of the cardboard structure [Fig. 52 and Fig. 53]. I worked on recreating the rock-fall I had witnessed with the Jurassic Coast team at St. Oswald’s Bay in 2013. Quickly I felt that I was acquiring skills for using cardboard to not just structurally shape this simple sculpture but also to create texture and depth to my cross-section [Fig. 54]. Later we each made a tile towards a group “JURASSIC” collage. I had been allocated the letter ‘I’ and so made an ichthyosaur falling out of a crumbling cliff [Fig. 55].

\textsuperscript{177} Wakelam, 2016. \textit{Jekyll & Hyde}. Available at: http://www.darrellwakelam.co.uk/ [Last accessed 02/12/2016].
Figure 52: Moulding the structure of a rock-fall out of cardboard (photo: author)

Figure 53: Finished sections of cardboard coastline made by the Jurassic Superteachers (photo: author)
Figure 54: Adding further detail with coloured tissue paper (photo: author)
Figure 55: Creating the 3D structure for a group "JURASSIC" mosaic (photo: author)
When I met him a few months later he described the flexibility and versatility of this form of making:

(T)he techniques I use are pretty much the same. And I often say to people who don’t really understand what I do or haven’t seen it. It’s a bit like being a chef right. It’s the same 10 ingredients and so if you give a top chef 10 ingredients, flour, eggs, whatever, they’ll make 100 different dishes because that’s what they do. So if you give me cardboard, tape, straws you know tissue paper. Then I can make 300 things and I can make up new ones. So it’s like a chef. If you’re working with those materials all the time you learn the properties of them, before you know it no-one can throw a curve ball at you. Oh someone goes “we need you to make an Eiffel Tower this afternoon” and you go OK and you just do it you know. And that is just like being a chef. (Wakelam 2014, pers. comm., 9th May)

Darrell’s way of making is materially and technically accessible. It therefore unsettles notions of the artist expert in the classroom and is different to the conceptions of public art developed through the JCAP. That is not to say that his craft is not highly skilled - it is. However, the methodology and process of making like this is simple, understandable and reversible. The materials are cheap and the results are quick.

Darrell told me that this way of making allows students to create even if they do not define themselves as artistic. Tying these processes of making to scientific concepts allows him to develop ideas with his students. He has strong views about making practices of making and scientific subjects accessible for multiple audiences stating:

If you’re going to marry art with science I think it’s got to be more tangible for people to grasp. (Wakelam 2014, pers. comm., 9th May)

Darrell has therefore built a successful career by working along this boundary in educational settings along the Jurassic Coast. His projects have explored a wide variety of complex scientific theories, such as the physiological similarities between Jurassic ichthyosaurs and modern day dolphins for discussions on convergent evolution. He also constructed a Chickenosaurus at the 2014 Fossil Festival with participants to explore genetic research that suggested that by combining dinosaur DNA with chicken foetuses the ancient creatures could be brought back to life (creating
a real life Jurassic Park) [Fig. 56]. In other years at the fossil festival, Darrell has reworked Andy Warhol’s iconic ‘Campbell’s Soup Cans’ [1962] to create *Jurassic Fish Soup*. This piece was a culinary reworking of the sea life present in the tropical Tethys Ocean during the Jurassic Period.

These projects are inventive and imaginative. Importantly they are all built up from Darrell’s ‘chef’ formula, mixing the ingredients of cardboard and sticky tape. In many ways his work democratises and unsettles conventional ideas about artistic knowledge and practices. Furthermore, an elasticity of process across subjects is essential for Darrell’s professional portfolio. He needs to be flexible to curriculum changes and the specific needs of each school:

> It changed politically every so often because every time there’s a new government and a new education department, they’ve got different priorities. (Wakelam 2014, pers. comm., 9th May)

Through this versatility, Darrell has developed a niche within the educational arts along the Jurassic Coast. His name appears time and again when people talk of creative approaches to the coast. His work is accessible, conceptual and fun.

For many Darrell’s work defines collaborations across the arts and the sciences on the Jurassic Coast. However, rather than being introduced through the arts programmes, his practice is already embedded within the work of the Jurassic Coast especially in their education programme. For many reasons therefore Darrell’s relationship with the Jurassic Coast occurs beyond the boundaries of the arts programme despite his local reputation as an artist. The engagement with creativity that Darrell facilitates in his workshops operates through a different narrative to the policies and ambitions of the public art sector.
Figure 56: *Chickenosaurus* at the Lyme Regis Fossil Festival. (photos: Darrell Wakelam)
For this reason most of the support for Darrell (both financial and in resources and networks) comes from the education and interpretation aspects of the team rather than the arts programmes. In short, Darrell is an artist who has been supported by the WHS and has developed a relationship with the team, which exists beyond the aims, objectives and networks of the arts programme.

However, the Jurassic Coast team doesn’t only rely on bringing in artists to provide creative educational resources. The Learning and Participation Manager also designs activities to combine the interpretational aims of the Jurassic Coast team with engaging ways of communicating STEM subjects.

6.5.2 Encouraging creativity beyond the classroom

The Jurassic Coast team also inspires creativity beyond the classroom. They use creative activities to encourage curiosity and learning about the coastline in many settings. This forms a part of their interpretation plan by presenting the geological and palaeontological insights of the Jurassic Coast in an accessible and enchanting way. Science festivals are one of the most common ways in which the team interact with the public and encourage learning outside the classroom.

*Crime Scene Investigation Jurassic Coast (CSI Jurassic)* is an activity that was originally commissioned by the Youth Hostel Association (YHA) and developed by the Jurassic Coast team Learning and Participation manager. It was designed to be a part of a Jurassic Coast specific residential package for schools (and youth groups) that included educational activities linked to the area around the hostel. A Jurassic Coast network of hostels was being set up within the YHA with the hope to serve a portion of the large number of school groups of various ages that visit the coast for residential
field trips. This form of educational tourism is one that the Jurassic Coast is able to engage with on many levels.

The Learning and Participation Manager devised CSI Jurassic, a murder mystery activity inspired by the recent boom in forensic science and detective dramas on the television. CSI Jurassic aimed to be a problem solving exercise with flexibility to cater for students through Key Stages 1 to 3 (Age 5 -12 years old). The staging was fairly simple to set up but created an imaginative space for the activity. A green tarpaulin was taped to the ground. On it was sprinkled branches, twigs and foliage and in amongst these garden offcuts were hidden small white (plastic) bones, white feathers and a dark grey model dinosaur tooth. All these objects were all spattered with bright red blood (paint). Beneath these clues, on the green mat were three trails of footprints from a three-toed creature. Surrounding this whole area was bright yellow tape that pronounced: ‘Crime Scene – DO NOT CROSS’ [Fig. 57]. Children dress-up in fluorescent bibs labelling them as detectives or forensic scientists before they entered the crime scene. They were then introduced to the following story: In order to enter the crime scene they will be travelling back in time almost 200 million years in time and there is an unsolved mystery that we need them to help us solve. Whilst we gather evidence and think of theories as to what has happened we must be wary that the culprit is still at large and may return.
Figure 57: The CSI Jurassic set dressed and ready for detectives at the Lyme Regis Fossil Festival (photo: author)
The activity is divided into two tasks. These are either carried out by two groups or by the group all together depending on numbers and ability. The first collected and logged the evidence into evidence bags. From this the detectives must analyse the evidence and devise theories of what they think might have happened. The forensic scientists were armed with a worksheet to measure the footprint tracks. Measuring the length of the footprints and the length of the stride between the footprints the worksheet guided the students to calculate the size of the creature that left the footprints and the speed at which they were moving. The game was immersive and it required a certain amount of performance and animation by the activity leaders.

Despite its young target audience, CSI Jurassic was grounded upon palaeontological research and based on the concept of trace fossils. These are the preserved marks, imprints and movements of prehistoric life. Palaeontologists use trace fossils as evidence to piece together the habits and habitats of dinosaurs and other prehistoric creatures. Within this category of preservation, footprints hold a particular power as indicators of behaviour. The CSI Jurassic activity was loosely based on published research into fossil footprint trackways (e.g. Parkes 1993). To mark this, CSI Jurassic often finished with the activity leaders showing the detectives a real fossilized footprint from the Jurassic Coast allowing them to trace the curves of an imprint made by an iguanodon up to 175 million years ago. The prehistoric game was therefore transported back to the present-day as the children encountered a tangible form of the past.

The themes explored in CSI Jurassic became even more pertinent as a sauropod footprint trackway was re-exposed at Keat’s Quarry in Purbeck not long after the activity launched [Fig. 58].\textsuperscript{178} The Jurassic Coast team was concurrently in discussion

\textsuperscript{178} As a part of the second year of the Jurassic Coast Superteachers programme the University of Manchester worked with a primary school teacher whilst they researched the trackways. It
with the National Trust who owns the site as to how the trackway might be used for public engagement. This also provided an amazing resource for research. Although the footprints were originally discovered twenty years ago, they had been surveyed and then reburied for preservation. However, since then technology has developed to allow 3D surveying and reconstruction of the impressions. This provided a much more detailed understandings of the geometry and mechanics behind the footprints, enabling a closer appreciation of not just where the sauropods walked but how. In terms of examples of trace fossil trackways these were unusual, as they were left in situ. When they are opened to the public they will allow people to stand on the exact spot on which a sauropod walked during the Cretaceous period.

was hoped that the surveying data would be available as a part of the produced teaching resources. This was therefore expected not just to inform primary school students about research into dinosaurs using 3D scanning techniques, ‘but more importantly how they can actually get involved with looking at this kind of data and getting much closer to literally walking with dinosaurs’. More information is available at: http://www.nerc.ac.uk/latest/publications/planetearth/aut15-dinosaurs/ [Last accessed 02/12/2016]
Figure 58: Sauropod footprints and the suspected drag of a tail at Keat's Quarry, Purbeck (photo: author)
CSI Jurassic therefore, although seeming like a straightforward learning activity containing simple mathematical problems, applied many of the techniques used by palaeontologists. It also had the ability to tap into deeper questions of the changing environment, preservation of life in the fossil record, and the problem-solving uncertainty of scientific methodology. As a part of the various education projects along the Jurassic Coast, the blend of the arts and sciences is employed to communicate ‘scientific’ methodologies and concepts. The education and learning strategy of the Jurassic Coast management team demonstrates a variety of approaches to creativity both within and beyond the classroom. Creative activities are an accessible way of communicating the complexities of geological and palaeontological science especially to young audiences. However, through these forms of practice the Jurassic Coast team also creating new forms of knowledge of the coastline mediated through the lens of its specific heritage interpretation objectives.

6.6 Everyday creativities responding to environmental change: the Landslip Festival 1840

Not only does the creative heritage of the Jurassic Coast lie beyond the management team, there is a longer tradition of communities occupying and celebrating “scientific” spaces on this coastline. For example, after the Great Landslip at Bindon many members of the public flocked to the area to observe the ruinous scenery for themselves. These audiences found their own way to respond creatively to this new landscape. It is evident therefore that it was not just scientists who were absorbed by the new scenery that the landslip had folded and crumpled into being. At the start of the nineteenth century and the beginnings of the tourism industry, the Great Landslip provided a magnificent landscape that appealed to the en vogue trends of romantic and wild scenery. The morbid fascination with the event and the newly formed scenery is evident in many of the written accounts.
The concourse of persons which has flocked to the scene of devastation is incredible; many thousands have been there, congregated from almost every county in the kingdom, even the most distant (Peter 1940).  

An infrastructure was developed to support this sudden rise in visitors. Roberts provides a detailed account of the event in the form of a tour guide (Roberts 1840). This publication includes specific instructions about how to navigate the landscape (and who was able to). As it was privately owned land, the Bindon and Pinhay farms charged a fee for visitors to access to view the landslip and great chasm. The local media criticized this at the time. In fact, access to the coast has continued to be contested and Muriel Arber highlighted this with her research into the site when she uncovered appeals to the government for public access to the paths that led to the landslip (Arber 1940).

In any case, by the summer 1840 the wheat had grown and ripened. Despite the wealth already brought by visitors to Great Landslip it is likely the farmers saw another opportunity to profit from their loss of land. They held a landslip festival:

("Landslip Festival --) A field of corn having fallen two hundred feet at the landslip, and ripened in its new abode, is to be reaped by visitors on the 25th inst. Of which fact a correspondent has sent us the following note: -The great chasm of the slip, extending from the sea cliffs more than a mile in length by 500 yards wide, and this large portion of the surface having sunk, throughout the whole of its course, full 200 feet; on the bottom of this yawning recess stand a succession of pyramids of rock, crowned with their surface mold, and vegetation undisturbed; but what is still more remarkable, a considerable part of an adjoining wheat field, after falling to so great a depth, with its crust unbroken, and bearing a luxuriant crop, fast ripened into maturity, and is to be reaped on the 25th inst. by all visitors who may desire to join in the operation, and is to be sold in handfuls on the ground. A large concourse of visitors is expected, and steam vessels are to sail to the spot from Plymouth, Dartmouth, Exmouth and Southampton". (Western Times 1840)  

179 Peter, 1940, An account of the extraordinary convulsion and land-slip, near Axmouth, Devon (Extracted, by permission, from the Saturday Magazine). Philpot Museum 81/34.

180 Western Times. 1840. Landslip Festival, Western Times, 8th August: 2-3
This newspaper advertisement used the vogue trends of landscape and exploration when describing the ‘yawning recess’. There is also something interesting here about how the resilience of the crop is emphasized as a steadfast element caught up in the dramatic movement of the ground beneath it. The stoicism of this wheat is perhaps partly what attracted the visitors of the time [Fig. 59]. Here was a chance to witness life surviving after great physical disturbance. Visitors were able to stand on the very ground where the crop had grown despite these adversities to be ‘luxuriant’ and ‘ripened into maturity’ (Western Times 1840: 2).\footnote{ibid.}

The newspaper article continued on to describe the practicalities of the best routes to get to the landslip by coach and accommodation arrangements. Here were the logistics to enable visitors to participate in the landslip event but at a price. There was undoubtedly something significant in being able to stand at that particular place at the particular time when the crop was harvested. This was reinforced by the presentation of certificates from the ceremonial harvest. Below is one such example that is framed and housed in the Philpot Museum at Lyme Regis [Fig. 60]. Visitors to the museum today are reassured that although the wheat crop attached looks meagre, it was considered a substantial crop in 1840.

The souvenir certificate demonstrates an interesting relationship between the crop, the visitor and the farm owner. The enterprise shown by the farmers in charging for access to the land and fostering the sense of spectacle and event at the crop harvesting formed a particular kind of relationship between the visitors and the landslip. Not only were those interested encouraged to come and visit in person, rather than just read about it in publications, such as those mentioned above. They were also invited to
actively participate in the scene of the landslip. The event of harvesting became a celebratory performance and the crop became a souvenir.

William Dawson, co-author of the *Ten Plates* account, was a witness to the festival and wrote of the event in a letter:

> It was really a beautiful sight - the day warm and bright - and I should think a full six thousand spectators. I have heard them estimated at ten, but from the best estimation I could make, I think six thousand about the number. They got up a procession which was in my humble opinion not in good taste – a committee with Blue Ribbands around the neck - six lady reapers in white kid gloves and wreaths of artificial flowers, the sickles tied with blue, and six gentlemen to match in blue vests and white trousers. They had however a good Band of Music, the effect as they wound down the Zig path into the valley of the chasm with banners, and the assembled thousands, lining the cliffs on both sides was picturesque and fine… I heard of no accident whatever and all looked pleased and happy- the young ladies were however a failure – with the first stroke of the sickle, one of them cut her hand and they were so crowded upon that they soon gave over and the corn was consequently reaped by the labourers.¹⁸²

In fact, some of the residents of the Chappell cottages lost in the landslip, returned to sell cakes and refreshments to visitors over the months after the slip. It may have been described as wild but this landscape was never a wilderness. However, as mentioned above, the profit made by the local farmers and others as a result of the landslide did not go unnoticed:

> In this way it is supposed that they are reaping a silver harvest, far richer even than if the catastrophe had never occurred.¹⁸³

The Great Landslip festival demonstrated how the people congregated in creative response to the Bindon landscape as the land slipped. These performances constructed a response to the movement of the earth through serendipity and embodied engagement. In many ways, the festival exemplified how the people and the place of the Jurassic Coast are under continual change.


¹⁸³ Peter, 1940. *An account of the extraordinary convulsion and land-slip, near Axmouth, Devon* (Extracted, by permission, from the Saturday Magazine). Philpot Museum 81/34.
Figure 59: View of spectators overlooking the Landslip Festival (source: Philpot Museum, Lyme Regis)

Figure 60: A copy of the certificate given to those who participated in the Landslip Festival (source: Philpot Museum, Lyme Regis)
The landslip festival at Bindon demonstrates that creativity is not just practiced by official practitioners and “experts”. The role of creativity in the public response to the landslip created events and activity in a location where before it was not inspired or permitted. This is therefore a form of everyday creativities emerging from loss and change in the landscape. It is perhaps not dissimilar to more recent understandings of community response to landscape change at the coastline (Morris 2014; DeSilvey 2012). Acknowledging this historical event as creative gives authority to lay and alternative creativities and understandings of the coastline aside from the official interpretations.

6.7 Placing everyday creativities on the Jurassic Coast

6.7.1 Combining geology and the arts

Although there are many professional and amateur artists working along the coastline, there also are many with multiple hats on. Geoff Townson is one such person. Now living in Charmouth with his wife Jane he spends most of his time painting. However, he forged his career in geology before picking up the paintbrush alongside the geologist’s hammer. Geoff is an example of several geologist artists based along the coast. In fact the village of Charmouth has an active community of retired practitioners of both the arts and the sciences. Many geologists and geomorphologists studied these sites during their education and career and chose to settle here in retirement.

Geoff explained to me how he likes to see the influence of geology on the landscapes he paints:

I like to see the underlying structure there and then movement - I mean especially here: the changes, because here the changes are daily. You’ve got the weather. We don’t have climate we have weather. You’ve got the sea you’ve got a fortnightly full tidal cycle, you’ve got the seasons and if you’re living inland – OK you’ve got the seasons – but you don’t have the tides coming in and out and you don’t see in such a spectacular way the process of erosion. And everything eventually due to gravity will end up
coming down hill whatever the maximum slope or the weakest direction is. (Townson 2014, pers. comm., 13th February)

His knowledge of form and the patterns of change in the landscape are reflected in his painting style, which abstracts movement and shape. Geoff mainly paints landscapes and these are composed of bold colours and vivid movement. Many of his subjects are local landslides and cliffs, which suit his large style that enables a depth in the landscapes he paints. He even encourages some viewers to look at the painting with one eye through a tube so that its three dimensional qualities are enhanced. In some of his more recent work the shapes of the landscape spill around the edge of the canvas to form a kind of ‘barcode’ to the image on the surface (Townson 2014, pers. comm., 13th February).

Geoff combines scientific and artistic approaches to his subject fluidly and without distinction. Recent work, which illustrates Geoff’s combination of understanding the underlying structures in a landscape and his artistic flair, is his work on the Bindon landslide for the Lyme Regis Arts Festival 2013. Using William Dawson’s model of the landslide, Geoff sought to “recreate” or “recollect” the views that would have been seen in the immediate aftermath of the landslide. Geoff used interdisciplinary techniques to establish what these views might look like, including flying a camera through the model to get an oblique view of the cliffs from the model. He also used colour precisely to illustrate how the debris from different layers of rock strata are thought to have fallen.

Meeting Geoff at his studio on the coastline it is apparent that his movement between and through these identities is subliminal. He put this into words when he described how he likes to view the process of painting and the effect it produces:

All I’ve done is shoved some chemicals on a bit of canvas. So this is communication. Many people have written about this but if I experience something and then put some chemicals on something and you look at it and get a similar experience. Then that’s a sign of success in my view.
Because that's worked – you've had the same experience or similar experience that I have. Just as I have looking at this stuff so you get a sense of motion or a sense of depth or a sense of being there then that's a tick in the box for me. (Townson 2014, pers. comm., 13th February)

Describing the process of painting as a form of communication resonates with Geoff's approach to his work. I originally met him on a walk along the beach with the Jurassic Coast Earth Science Manager on a particularly cold and wet afternoon. We bumped into Geoff and began to speculate what underlying structures in the cliff had caused the most recent landslide at Black Ven.\(^{184}\) Geoff picked up a twig and drew his ideas for the movement in the sand communicating his ideas in an instinctive way [Fig. 61]. One of the limitations with the Creative Coast arts programmes was the binary categorisation of practitioners by their sector. For example, the forums were designed with the objective that:

Collaborations which develop through the network will provide opportunities for both artists and scientists to explore outside their comfort zone, stimulating their creativity (G4A application 2011: 11).

This structure at times caused tension within projects and restricted the possibilities for the work. Working with everyday creativities, however, enables contributions to the construction of the site without the need for disciplinary binding.

\(^{184}\) Black Ven is an infamous and intensely studied series of landslides in between Charmouth and Lyme Regis. Any fresh landslides often cause an amount of speculation and discussion between local geologists and geomorphologists.
Figure 61: Geoff traces landslip theories in the sand at Black Ven beach, Lyme Regis (photo: author)

Figure 62: The slipping steps and footpath at the Axmouth-Lyme Undercliffs (photo: author)
6.7.2  Creatively past and present: measuring the movement of Goat Island

It is evident that people exhibit creativity in a variety of ways. Through these creative practices the Jurassic Coast is constituted and constructed by those who occupy it both figuratively and imaginatively. Recognising the complexity of naturecultures involves accepting that disciplinary knowledge can be thought of in multiple ways. The following field notes describe two days working on Goat Island and in the chasm at the Bindon Landslide in 2014 and 2015. These illustrate the “scientific” practice of surveying and measuring hedgerows to ascertain the direction and extent to which the land moved when it slipped in 1839. The creativity and inventiveness required during this process demonstrates that the creative coast extends far beyond the arts programme.

Field note: A mile east of Axmouth - 24th October 2014

With the sea lapping against our feet we turn inland to look up at the foot of the landslide. Geologists K and C point out the steep cliffs of the island and the chasm around it. Most of the form of the landscape has been masked and blended by the new ash forest. It has been protected as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a National Nature Reserve (NNR).

We head back up into the depths of the forest. Grasping at old, faded, tatty blue ropes, we cling to the steep track back up to the path [Fig. 62]. Feet slipping on the mud and grasping onto rogue branches for support. We reach the footpath and climb back towards the way we came in before turning right into the green tapestry. With thick ivy underneath, spindly trees overhead and us somewhere in between. This is an animal track rather than a path. Scattered with slippery roots and chips of chert. A thorn punctures a straight cut through my waterproof trousers with a loud rip. It begins to fray immediately. Scrambling along in a line we continue to discuss the landslide, geology and what we’ve brought for lunch.

Within this temperate jungle the greens are deep and saturated; bugs, dung and brambles surround us [Fig. 63]. The climb requires work and exertion. It is humid and I get hot very quickly. We are a band of walkers – I am by far the youngest but my companions are agile, they know these routes, the twists and turns, ducks and dives necessary to follow deer trails and avoid hidden crevices. Biologist A has been working here for decades. Asked by K, he said he probably spends up to 200 days of the year here. These are the experts of this twisting, knotty place. And you need an expert to navigate here. The usual presence of the sea in all the locations along the coast is lost. I am disorientated, hot, sweaty, tired and yet I am elated by awe and
curiosity. It is easy to forget the touch of humans here. But gentle reminders are provided by the occasional silver Carlsberg beer can nestled amongst the bluebell leaves at the foot of a large ash tree, or the rusted steel bucket you use as a hand hold to pull yourself up a steep buckle in the ground slippery with mud.

Eventually we came around the bend of the hill so that we were again facing the sea. Here there were steps that E, who manages the site, had built with volunteers the previous summer. We ascended out of the canopy of the trees and onto a flat, clear meadow: Goat Island. The slipped mass of headland surrounded by land. At the top the ground undulates gently. A tells me that in the summer the short grass is stippled with orchids. I vow to return.

We circle around to a field facing inland. Here the scar of the landslide is staggeringly apparent. The deep foliage and tall ash trees hide the depth of the chasm. However, the white chalk cliffs from where this field, we are now stood on, originates are extremely distant. We sit on the burnt ground, unpack sandwiches from Tupperware and begin to eat, watching the chasm.

Here it is about 80 yards between Goat Island and the 'mainland'. Between these two promontory headlands there is a gap with drops of up to 150 feet. Goat Island is lower and so we gaze up at the cliff line from which it became detached almost 200 years earlier. K continues to question C about the mechanism of the landslide, the direction of the movement and the underlying cause. K supposes that the movement here suggests a much larger landslip system delving much deeper into the surface of the earth than previously understood. It is a matter of contention. C has published on the subject. The debate continues as I hand out squares of brownie and try to absorb the scale of the white cliffs in front of me.

Field note: Goat Island – 25th February 2015

I tune into the hum of chainsaws in the background – I realise this is an unusual sound here. Yet the metallic thrum helps orientate me to the direction of the activity behind and the location of the sea ahead, beyond a matt curtain of leaves. Despite the apparent wilderness this is not an abandoned landscape. It is a site of conservation with SSSI status, carefully managed to maintain the climatic climax of ash woodland, which is now so rare in England. The combination of engines strumming the foliage and the muffled bashing of falling branches fills the landscape with the sound of this management activity.

It was E’s idea to attempt to trace the lines of the ancient field boundaries using GPS technologies. So today is a day of activity. This they hope will indicate the movement of Goat Island as it tore away from the headland creating the steep dramatic chasm behind. We delve between branches. A is carefully pruning a passageway so that S (the land surveyor employed for the task) may battle through with the surveying equipment. S is measuring the GPS location at several points along the hedgerow to later map onto an OS map for reference. K hopes to compare the location of these hedges
with the aerial photography of the landslip, and ancient maps of the area to help establish what might have caused this mammoth and sudden movement of land. We realise that we don’t have the historical map with us. We were hoping to use it to give us some indication of where to look for field boundaries. S has left his copy in the car. I try to access the email attachment I sent the group from my phone – up here it is obviously a fruitless endeavour.

The hedgerows are thick, straight and distinctive. They look like archaeological ruins in this landscape. It is hard to imagine that they once formed a part of cultivated agricultural land dividing rows of turnips and corn. There is a solid feel to these ridges - I feel I am drawn to standing on the top of them when possible, feeling the robust time and effort beneath my feet. The labour involved in building the hedgerows in this area is still being appreciated as their sturdiness has lasted not only the test of time but the sheer, buckling movement of the enormous landslide.

The surveyor carefully places the point of the long surveying pole into the ground, holding it level and waiting for satellites orbiting past us in the sky to pick us up. This is a specific point of reference, a pole standing vertical amongst a dense, wild, forest. The careful negotiation of fallen tree branches, twists of bramble catching and tripping as we walk and deep gloopy mud all provide a new sense to the embodiment of technology here in the field. K also talks of the impossibility of using GIS whilst out collecting data on the foreshore. It is too complicated, too long and the location is too remote.

The surveyor speaks of the need to return and process the information he is collecting later at his desk. To wait for the return of the data before he can analyse it and decide how to present it to the customer. In response to the fractured complexities here the surveyor has had to use quite complicated methods to relay the GPS data. Usually he would establish a base station as a point of reference for the rest of the data points he collects. However, even though he and E discussed setting up the base on Goat Island it was decided that that would require carrying a lot more equipment up there and still might not provide the correct results. Instead S has rented a particular piece of kit from a company who are holding the base station somewhere in “the cloud”. The combination between real, visceral, tactile, challenging spaces and the digital, remote but equally complex spaces of data collection and reference are a fascinating part of this type of fieldwork. I wonder if these sorts of logistics and technological problem solving were a part of the considerations made by the Bucklands, Conybeare and Dawson when they surveyed this fractured and knotty landscape back in 1839-1840.

After heading into the chasm and recording a “kinky” hedgerow, and one running parallel to the shoreline to the west, we ascend Goat Island once more. We are in search of a corresponding hedgerow to the kink. I wander off in search of it in the location I suspect it might be. I find two mounds with a ditch in-between. I think surely this might be it. However, there are none of the old field maples that we have been looking for on the other banks as an indicator that it is indeed an ancient hedge. I re-find the group and K says, “I think I have found something but I am not sure it is a hedge”. I say the same. He responds – “well let’s see if it is the same thing”.
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It is!

To add to the excitement it looks like it is in a plausible alignment with the one in the chasm according to S’s digital map. K suddenly exclaims maybe it was a double hedgerow and that is why the one in the chasm has a kink. He rolls a cigarette in celebration as E clears the path and S records the data points. Perhaps we have found a new clue to the mechanism of the Bindon Landslide [Fig. 64]. Almost 200 years after the work of the Bucklands, Conybeare and Dawson the research here continues [Fig. 65].

As a designated SSSI and NNR the undercliff between Axmouth and Lyme Regis is a selected location for the practice of science. Many argue that scientific research is an act of creativity and is well established that the division between the arts and sciences or the “two cultures” is a complex and modern phenomena. With this in mind, it is interesting to see how processes of curiosity and breakthrough still occur along the Jurassic Coast by groups of geologists and geomorphologists. Despite developments in the technologies of measurement, the discourse and imaginative spaces occupied by these thinkers construct the Jurassic Coast in important conceptual ways. The Bindon Landslip continues to be a location where creative practice thrives.
Figure 63: The messy, tangled undergrowth at the Axmouth-Lyme Undercliffs (photo: author)

In order to accommodate the northward movement of the hedge, the inland edge of the slipping block must degrade against the back scar. Dunster’s illustration shows a drag feature at the back of the slipped block.

A rift opens up on the southern side of the Chasm, also illustrated by Dunster.

A void is forming under the block. Filled by the drag material from the top back of the block?

The unconformity has to be breached

Figure 64: Theory for the way in which the land fall slipped at Bindon in 1840 (image: Third Party Copyright)
Figure 65: The chimney of one of the lost cottages emerges from the overgrowth at Bindon where it is interpreted for visitors (photo: author)
6.7.3 Who gets to participate in the Creative Coast?

A final encounter with the everyday creativities of the Jurassic Coast involves a writer who highlights the need for the Jurassic Coast to do more work to acknowledge creative engagements with the coastline that are currently hidden from the authorized heritage discourse and policy circles.

Louisa Adjoa Parker has lived and worked in Devon and Dorset for over 30 years. As a writer of Ghanaian and English descent Louisa's view and creative perspective of the coastline on which the WHS sits is one that is not often seen within the official Jurassic Coast discourse. She writes to express, amongst other things, her experiences and feelings of growing up and living in a rural area:

I started just writing because I wanted to express how I felt as a child. And I hadn’t really been able to express those feelings. All my friends have always been white apart from one, well I’ve got a couple of friends now that aren’t but, as a young woman all my friends were white. So when, I couldn’t really talk about what I felt because they would be like oh, you know, a chip on your shoulder or whatever, sort of thing. Or just not get it. Which is fine because you can’t expect them to get it because they’ve not been through that experience or really related to it in any way. But I just have this need to kind of like write about what it felt like to grow up in a very confusing sort of situation in the seventies when it was, you know, racism was just accepted as part of society. (Adjoa Parker 2013, pers. comm., 12th March)

Louisa writes poetry, fictional and non-fiction prose and has written about Dorset and Devon in many ways through her range of styles. These include poetry pamphlets such as *Salt, Sweat and Tears* published in 2007 and a novel that she is writing titled *Letting in the Light*. Alongside these projects are research projects including her research for *All Different, All Dorset* and *1944 We Were Here*, a project on the African American GI soldiers who were posted in Dorset for a short period during WWII.\(^{185}\)

\(^{185}\) More information on *All Different, All Dorset* is available at: https://alldifferentalldorset.wordpress.com/ [Last accessed 02/12/2016].

Information on *1944 We Were Here* available at: https://www.hlf.org.uk/our-projects/1944-we-were-here-african-american-gis-dorset [Last accessed 02/12/2016].
Writing about *All Different All Dorset* she states:

I haven’t felt that I belong for a lot of my life and I haven’t felt that I’m at home and it’s quite a strong feeling and I think that a lot of people who are migrants or second generation may feel something similar, I don’t know, but I feel I’m not quite sure where home is…

I think for me it is important to tell the stories of a range of marginalised voices, particularly of black and mixed-heritage characters living in the South West, as so often the Black British experience is told from an urban point of view in contemporary literature. This can provide a new perspective and also a new background against which stories can be told. Place is a very important part of writing for me, and I have a very strong relationship with the rural South West, having lived here for most of my life.\(^\text{186}\)

Louisa’s work portrays alternative, not always sublime, viewpoints of the Devon and Dorset environment. A poet and creative writer living in Dorchester whose work connects her identity to the Dorset landscape Louisa would perhaps be seen as an important facet to any engagement with *Creative Coast* on the WHS.

However, she has not, to date been linked with the site’s arts programming, despite being a part of other high profile projects in the region. When I spoke to her Louisa mentioned several projects that she would be interested in pursuing along the Jurassic Coast. She was aware of many of the links into doing work, such as through the Arts Development team (who was then still a part of the Dorset County Council). However, none of these projects have yet got off the ground. That may be due to where Louisa seems to have decided to focus the next steps in her career (notably publishing more short stories and poetry). However, it seems a shame not to have more voices like hers shaping the form of the Jurassic Coast as a site and a community. This longing for connection between identity and place is articulated throughout Louisa’s work and without doubt is a voice that many, who currently do not have any affiliation with the heritage site, would affiliate with.

\(^{186}\) Available at: http://literatureworks.org.uk/features/louisa-adjoa-parker/#sthash.inYbjr2T.dpuf [Last accessed 02/12/2016].
Furthermore, one of the acknowledgements in the evaluation was that only one of the projects in JCAP had been ‘community generated’ (Schwarz 2011). The research undertaken by Louisa demonstrates that artists can find interesting and important ways to give underrepresented communities a voice. Her work demonstrates that the Jurassic Coast still has a lot of potential and space to integrate with creative communities they have not currently reached. JCAP and CC2012 were by no means meant to be all encompassing. However, there are many established creative practitioners whose work might enable different kinds of engagement with communities along the heritage site. This would enable those who have not had agency with the construction of the site to date to begin to shape what it means to be creative on the Jurassic Coast.
Velvet Dresses

I want to climb under Dorset’s skin
curl up in her folds, wrap her around me
like a patchwork quilt, stained
yet stitched with years of love,
taste the colours of green and gold,
rack my fingers over rough textures
of ancient earth.

I want to crawl under her pavements,
her roads, lift great slabs of tarmac,
limb every craggy, awkward hill,
every cliff like a tooth capped with gold;
trek for miles through woods
and green fields like velvet dresses
with skirts fanned out wide;

I want to sink my fingers into the earth
let the tiny stones and grit and bones
run through my hands;
search for the past along with
fossils spiralling to dust
in clay-rich soil.

I want to let Dorset’s past soak
like cocoa butter into my skin,
let her history merge with mine:
talk of Africa and her slaves.
I want to know it will be fine
for anyone with not from here
etched like tribal markings into their skin,
to sink into Dorset like a warm rock-pool,
with fingers stretched out towards the sun,
to walk her beaches, green-velvet fields
with pride, say

I live here, belong here, she’s mine.

Louisa Adjoa Parker
6.8 Conclusion

In this final empirical chapter I have explored the ways in which creativity is practiced on the Jurassic Coast beyond the bounds of the official arts programming. This has democratised the authority of creative practice by expanding it beyond the formalised structures of creativity linked to the Jurassic Coast. One of the greatest difficulties of this project has been the multitude of creative practices constantly occurring on the WHS. The final section of this chapter nods to these creative practices of the everyday and everyone. In doing so, this final section elicits some of the ways in which creativities and heritages are political processes prompting exclusion as much as inclusion. In many ways the arts programmes added authoritative power to creative practices, for example, through highlighting them (one way being through this PhD project). However by being attuned to the site-specific workings of policy, more complex geographies of creativities on this coastline emerge.

The Jurassic Coast is constructed and performed by a variety of communities and their different interactions with creativity. Firstly, examples of capacity building through the work of the team demonstrated the ways that creative practice enabled alternative approaches to interpretation and communicating the heritage messages of the WHS. Secondly, the relationship between creativity and learning was explored, within the classroom and beyond it. These practices showed that creativity is not just a method for communicating but constructs knowledge in particular ways. I have argued that understanding the creative arts constitutive to the Jurassic Coast, in the same way as the sciences, gives agency to multiple and varied ways of knowing and making heritage. Finally, examining everyday creativities has illustrated some of the limitations of the arts programming by exploring practices that were beyond its reach. This demonstrates future possibilities for the Creative Coast that includes scientific process, multiple and fluid identities and community generated creativity.
Alongside contemporary examples, the historical story of the Great Landslip at Bindon demonstrates that these creative ways of interpreting and understanding this coastline have a much longer history than the designation of the WHS. Examining how these practices shaped the ways of knowing the undercliffs landscape provides a fresh perspective on the makings occurring in the present day. Placing and engaging with these creativities of the everyday exposes how the Jurassic Coast is continually constructed in small yet significant ways.
7 Chapter Seven: creativity, heritage and change

7.1 Introduction

Since being designated as a natural World Heritage Site in 2001 the Jurassic Coast has worked to be recognised as a Creative Coast. This thesis explores the entanglements of policy and practice in the process of the site becoming creative. Through archival research, interviewing and ethnographic methodologies, this project has sought to develop a site-specific approach to policy. Research has integrated the embodied and quotidian geographies of decision-making within the policy discourse analysis. By following formal and informal, and public and private, artistic practices this research has traced how the Jurassic Coast is constructed by the creative activities of those who inhabit it.

The relationship between creativity and the Jurassic Coast Partnership (the team and Trust) site has evolved through different forms over the past ten years. Roles for the Partnership have included being a seed-funder, a match funder, a supportive partner and a commissioning body. The different dynamics of these partnerships have been explored in this thesis, especially in Chapters Four and Five. Furthermore, this research troubles ideas of creativity on the Jurassic Coast (Chapter Six). The critical approach to everyday creativity applied in the research encompasses more than the arts, and allows geographers to investigate how people engage with and construct places in a multitude of ways. This is especially significant as the heritage value of this natural site lies in the ways in which different communities engage with it. It is through these day-to-day creative encounters that the Jurassic Coast is culturally constructed.
The relationships between the arts, creativity, and geological heritage become further complicated due to the paradox inherent in the site’s designation. The geological heritage recognised for perpetuation on the Jurassic Coast is acknowledged to be under continual processes of change. This research has illustrated how creativity can be used as a tool to illuminate tensions between the need to preserve natural processes of erosion and coastal retreat and to simultaneously promote access and engagement with the site.

Through critical conceptions of everyday creativities this thesis develops current work on creativity in geography so that creativity is not used as shorthand for art and the geographies of art but instead represents broader geographies of enquiry, curiosity and investigation of the world. Everyday creativities analyse processes of creating knowledge and understanding and considers how these work to construct the site of the Jurassic Coast.

7.2 Provocations

In order to thematically conclude this thesis, three provocations emerging from the research will be addressed in the following section:

- How is creativity done institutionally?
- What does creativity achieve in relation to heritage management?
- What is creativity and where are its limits?

These questions provide a broad overview of some of the more timely issues that emerge from this research and as such they draw from examples from all three of the substantive chapters. They also illustrate how this thesis contributes to wider critical debates within cultural and historical geographies by contextualising this empirical work within contemporary scholarly conversations.
7.2.1 How is creativity done institutionally?

This thesis addresses a gap in current work on creativity in cultural geography by exploring the institutional mechanisms mobilized in order to practically do creative work. The institutional mechanisms of creativity have been explored in three ways. First, the formalised structures of creativity that are constructed through institutional and organisational collaboration have been examined. Second, the research has demonstrated how these structures endeavour to encompass the differing objectives of practitioners and to take strategic advantage of funding opportunities. Third, this research has explored how embedding creative collaborations within their structure allows other (sometimes unexpected) outcomes for the management and decision-making practices of institutions. Ultimately adopting ideas of creativity within institutional management can foster a re-thinking of how creative work is done and by whom.

A central focus of the research presented in this thesis has been the exploration and illumination of the extraordinary amount of work and resources that go into developing creative practice within formalised institutional settings. This, I would argue, has been largely overlooked in much of the work on creativity to date where institutionally collaborative work is often romanticised for its unifying and multidisciplinary possibilities (e.g. Hawkins 2013; Ede 2005). However, researching the ways in which the Jurassic Coast World Heritage Site has adopted creativity demonstrates the extremely long and complex processes involved in making space within institutions for creative activity. The role of producers within the local public arts networks (especially through Dorset Arts Together) played a significant role in shaping the ways in which the managers of the Jurassic Coast were able to align themselves with local artistic projects. A recurring theme for this re-alignment of the site as a “Creative Coast” was the acknowledgement that this work required a large amount of resources to develop projects with
practitioners from multi-disciplinary backgrounds, which also created space for
discussion and experimenting with new ways of working. In particular, Chapter 4
demonstrates how the high political expectations for the concept of creativity combined
with under-resourced projects led to recurring tensions within the Jurassic Coast Arts
Programme. Curating ways of working together became one of the skills, which the
Jurassic Coast arts programming promoted as its contribution to the region. Certainly,
projects such as the Creative Coast Forum was instrumental in bringing together
practitioners from a wide range of sectors together to discuss collaboration, creative
practice and of course to interpret the Jurassic Coast in multiple ways. The evaluation
of Jurassic Coast Arts Programme and Creative Coast 2012 demonstrated that
bringing creativity into the institutional working of the Jurassic Coast required
communicating across various specialist knowledges and the specific languages that
come with each. Not only were differences encountered between individual
practitioners, this research has demonstrated that creative collaborations also required
confronting some of the central contradictions and paradoxes within the site's policies
and practices.

In order to achieve creativity across the policy and strategic levels of the Jurassic
Coast, there was a need to institutionally recognise and account for the different
objectives within the same projects. This structural organisation required more than
simply common goals but instead the kind of dialectic cooperation that Richard Sennett
refers to was integral to the embedding of creativity into the site (Sennett 2012). These
limitations are partly a reflection of the limitations of public funding for the arts and
environment sector. As a result, policy attachment combining objectives of arts and
natural heritage management together was a strategic way to enable creative work
within the limited national funding structures. However, this method of opening up
space for creativity embroiled the Jurassic Coast and Dorset arts development teams
within discourses of instrumentalism and brought conflicts of the purpose of projects to the fore. These tensions between desired outcomes and objectives were explored through the Exploring Erosion project. This saw the development of an “outcome-based” model, which demonstrated an open and discursive structure of establishing the objectives of those working on the project. This was not only innovative in its approach to the changing nature of the heritage site but also developed on the learning from the previous working between the public arts sector and the environment sector through the Jurassic Coast Arts Programme and Creative Coast 2012. Therefore by examining the ways in which creativity is performed within institutional settings provides a nuanced understanding of how organisational structures mould the forms of creativity possible.

Not only has this research examined how creativity within institutional settings illuminates tensions of collaboration and public resource allocation, it has also shown how creativity can expand practice and develop communities. The benefits of bringing creativity into management structure of the Jurassic Coast not only expanded the site’s engagement with arts communities; it broadened the interpretation and scope of the site itself. Developing institutional creativity also enabled other creative communities to emerge in relation to the Jurassic Coast and its heritage. Creative spillovers from the project worked in between the lines of policies and decision-making to the extent that the Jurassic Coast management team included the broad notion of “working with the arts” as a crosscutting theme in the Management Plan. This was a step towards acknowledging the multiple and everyday ways in which communities along the site engage creatively with it. The acknowledgement of many different forms of creative practice included understanding how current ways of working in the management of the site were already creative such as the imagination required for geological
interpretation. These everyday creativities open up the perspective to a much wider provocation for what it might mean to be institutionally creative.

To conclude, there are many forms of creativity within the public sector (and beyond), which require various formal and informal institutional infrastructures to support the work. These resources include funding, networks and even inspiration. These institutional aspects of creativity are sticky and often overlooked in the geographical work on creativity. The institutional structures of creativity examined in this thesis have included crafting space for creative practice, acknowledging the different objectives of partners and practitioners, and widening the scope of what practices are considered creative. There is further work to be done to develop these ideas of institutional creativity amongst the wider UK and global research on creative economies. This should work to disrupt much of the neoliberal and political agendas assigned with the call to “be creative” and draw attention to the messiness of bringing creative practices into institutional settings.

7.2.2 What does creativity achieve in relation to heritage management?

Alongside examining the ways in which creativity can be done in institutions such as the Jurassic Coast it follows to examine what it can achieve. Without wishing to feed into a discourse of instrumentalism in regards to the arts and creativity more broadly, it is important to recognise how heritage management might benefit from creative practices. This thesis has argued that creativity has been able to engage with ambiguities and paradoxes within policy and management practice in ways that more conventional approaches cannot. In the context of the Jurassic Coast this has involved creativity as an agent for a discursive engagement with risk, uncertainty and failure within the interpretation of the site. Perhaps most importantly, creativity has re-
focussed the management of the site towards an emphasis on process rather than output.

Firstly, “becoming creative” helped raise the profile of the Jurassic Coast both nationally and internationally. By being named the “Creative Coast” the Jurassic Coast was able to advocate itself in national and international contexts in the following terms: ‘as far as we know we are the only one [WHS] which currently integrates the arts into strategic management’ (Jurassic Coast 2013: 13). By making claims to be the first natural World Heritage Site to have a designated arts programme the management team were therefore able to be present this work as innovative and pioneering as an approach to heritage management. Through the Jurassic Coast Arts Programme and Creative Coast 2012 the site also became intertwined with the national and international cultural movements linked with the London 2012 Olympic Games and the associated Cultural Olympiad. The site was also able to promote its activity within the local region in new ways. As creativity was enveloped into the site’s management through the arts programmes, networks were also developed to encompass a wider variety of sectors and practitioners locally. The arts programmes not only engaged with a variety of artists and arts organisations, they also involved local universities (including the University of Southampton, Bournemouth University, Plymouth University and the University of Exeter) and third sector organisations such as the National Trust. Many of these relationships continue with the Jurassic Coast management long after the arts programmes ran their course.

Not only has creativity broadened who the managers of the heritage site work with, it has also enabled the Jurassic Coast to be presented to new audiences on a variety of scales. For example, the research in this thesis has presented creativity in education
both through the arts programmes and beyond them. Creativity within their teaching practice has broadened the offering the Jurassic Coast management is able to make to local young people presenting the sciences in new ways to these young audiences. This has involved increasing the diversity of the interpretation messages of the heritage site to engage these new audiences. Approaches to the site are not only restricted to scientific measuring and calculation but focus on methods of enquiry, of asking questions of the environment and developing creative solutions to find answers. Workshops such as CSI Jurassic do this very effectively by incorporating paleontological methods within imaginative storytelling. In addition to the role of creativity in formal education outreach by the site it is important not to overlook the important role that developing creative practices within heritage management has played more informally. A key example of this is the increased engagement of arts communities with the scientific interpretations of the Jurassic Coast as a defined and discursive site. The Erosion Zone exemplified this as it was through the artists’ learning about the heritage of the site and the corresponding contradictions, which really brought these paradoxes to the forefront of the project.

Therefore creativity widened the Jurassic Coast’s appeal and relevance for new audiences but, moreover, in doing so heritage managers were also able to engage with and communicate difficult tensions in the management of the site. Creative practices were able to pose difficult questions using, often playful, techniques. An example of this was Richard DeDomenici’s Operation Lunar Sea, which brought the concepts and tensions of natural heritage and heritage value to public audiences in an unexpected way. Through Exploring Erosion, therefore the Jurassic Coast was able to find new ways to communicate environmental management issues (such as erosion). Managers of the site have also begun working creatively with local communities to democratise the processes of interpretation on the site. Understandings of heritage value and
environmental change at Beer, for example, were developed in partnership with the local residents. Interactions such as these demonstrate the ability for creative practices to open up the ways of doing heritage management.

Furthermore, creativity not only enabled the Jurassic Coast team to communicate some of the tensions within the site’s management, it also enabled them to engage with uncertainty and process in new (and arguably more transparent) ways. The PhDs themselves are a key example of this (enabled by the Jurassic Coast Arts Programme) on-going cultural and historical research of the site helped develop a practice of reflection within its management. Creativity has therefore encouraged working with uncertainty in the management of the site. By elevating the importance of process the management team are able to engage with tensions and problems that might not have a certain resolution. Harnessing creativity has also enabled the Jurassic Coast managers to develop new perspectives on its heritage interpretation. Furthermore, many of the partnerships and collaborations with those from other sectors has required learning new languages for this interpretation. In many ways this speaks to a way of working that is not simply the engagement with binaries (art/science, natural/ cultural, accruing/ eroding) but holding multiple perspectives (and therefore heritage messages) together. This in part was examined within the thesis by the engagement with the longer traditions of aesthetics and community performance within the environmental sciences (in relation to the Bindon Landslip for example).

In turn creativity has also allowed the Jurassic Coast management team to situate the site in a place that is not bound by “natural heritage” and encompasses complementary cultural practices that “enhance” the site. In doing so creative practices within heritage management have involved the breaking down of the boundaries between the “human” and the “natural” and ways of understanding both. Therefore this site’s engagement
with creativity has not simply been about developing the arts in relation to the science of the site. More nuanced and wide-reaching understandings of creativity have enabled many cultures of knowing the heritage of the Jurassic Coast to inhabit the site.

In summary, the creative structure of heritage management on the Jurassic Coast acknowledges that the interaction between our environment and ourselves is multiple and messy. The research presented in this thesis has demonstrated that both individual and organisational engagements with the site are able to find a home under the umbrella of creativity. This leads onto the final provocation which questions the term creativity itself and how it may be defined in relation to the multiple understandings of the term without losing meaning all together.

7.2.3 What is creativity and where are its limits?

At the outset of the thesis I outlined the creative conundrum as creatively asking questions and simultaneously about asking questions of creativity. As a term creativity is at a certain juncture as a concept within the discipline of geography. After the rise in profile of the sub-discipline of cultural geography, creativity became an outlet for geographical engagements with the arts and artists. Alongside the Creative Britain agenda and the rise in term more broadly, its prominence within geography is perhaps not unexpected. Interest in creativity (through the creative industries, art/science collaborations and more recently theories of aesthetics) has been a key constituent of cultural geography in the past decade. In many ways creativity can be seen to have had its moment, in a similar state as when Phil Crang described cultural geographies as ‘after a fashion’ (Crang 2010). However, again reflecting Crang’s argument, perhaps once the sheen of novelty has faded an established and rich field is able to develop. This thesis combines research into the relationships between artists and geography,
their art and also the organisational structures in place over the course of a particular movement of arts programmes connected to the Jurassic Coast, in doing so the research contextualises the arts at multiple scales. The discussion of this thesis has explored the intimate connection between makers and their materials as well as the wider context of these creative makings within the creative industries. However, the term creativity has been deliberately employed throughout not only to refer to artistic endeavours, organisations and networks. An expansion of the term creativity within this project has enabled a broadened insight into how it plays out in the everyday and in unexpected places. Yet in doing so I run the risk of spanning out the term so broadly that it encompasses everything and becomes meaningless. Therefore, this final provocation addresses the definition of the term creativity itself and where we might place its limits.

Drawing on research in philosophy, psychology and law, creativity has been understood within this research to be a product, a person, or a combination of the three. Csikszentmihalyi (1996) defines creativity as adding something novel to a domain. However, in acknowledging the power of everyday creativities, this project has sought to pay attention to the importance of the vernacular to the Jurassic Coast. I think creativity holds a stronger power when it is allowed to encompass those working in different disciplines as a description of process rather than a kind of output. In this context, creativity can be defined as a curious making. Driven by an investigation of the world and enacted through the performance of making, a commonality can therefore be found between the multiple modes of exploration along the site from fossil hunting and landslide mapping through to watercolour painting and musical composition. Sensing the scope of this understanding of creativity I am therefore reluctant to tie it down further to a set of rules or ways of doing. Rather I see the limits of creativity being defined in different places according to how and who is performing the practice.
The Jurassic Coast arts programmes employed creative artistic practice to re-think the site and how it occupies the heritage space of the coast. This was not always a deliberate intention and did not rely on the creative endeavours of any single individual creator. Instead it was through the collaborative effort of many, meeting across disciplinary boundaries to see the site in new ways and to hear it spoken of from different perspectives. These collaborations also began to focus on working together to find innovative solutions to communicate and address complex issues; a kind of problem-solving mechanism for the management of the site. However, it is in recognising the creativity in the work of many practitioners on the site (who might not have considered their fields to be “creative” or been recognised as such) that the scope of Jurassic Coast’s management is broadened. These creativities work at all scales from the intimate interactions of the body all the way through to international policy. Therefore, there can be no simple definition for creativity, no simple drawing of a boundary around the term. In many ways doing so would be a contradiction on the possibility of the concept of creativity itself. Instead engaging with the multiple scales and practices of creativity enable us to find its limits and its absences on a case-by-case basis.

7.3 Continuing questions and further avenues of research

7.3.1 Communicating “risk” on the Jurassic Coast

Throughout this thesis it has been acknowledged that there is an inherent conundrum embedded in the Jurassic Coast’s management and its physical landscape. Visitors are encouraged to go fossil hunting and to “get involved” along the coastline as a part of the educational experience, but in doing so they are sometimes putting themselves at risk from danger, and the WHS has responsibility for protecting them. As explored in Chapter Five, the litigation context in the UK is particularly important when
understanding how the management of the site negotiates complex laws of liability and complex networks of landowners and stakeholders in communicating the risks in coastal environments. How risk is managed is culturally dependent, and relies upon the ideas of personal responsibility and accountability. Communication requires immediate visual clues as to the danger people may encounter on the coast.

If framed as an educational experience or as “knowing how to read your landscape”, risk can be presented in a positive light rather than just in the forms of warnings and restrictions. The Green Cross Code and the Country Code are both examples of how risk can be communicated in a positive way (Department for Transport 2009; Natural England 2016). Additionally, this approach includes constructing an ethos of the social acceptability of risk-taking behaviour. In this case, responses to a coastguard callout might be that it is irresponsible for the ones who have taken the risk. Including positive learning messages and educational points onto signs can be powerful if the hazard is made visible in some way to substantiate the message. Such an approach actively works to counter the optimism bias explored in Chapter Five, where visitors commonly underestimate or misestimate the risks on the site. This is especially likely to occur when the cliffs look solid but are actually crumbling or instable. The research suggests that communication needs to address crosscutting themes between risk, geology and climate change.

Positive messages about coastal risk can work to generate a culture of respect, care and safety. This may require some re-branding for the site, and it is important to acknowledge that a change in culture will not capture everything or reach everyone.

187 Many of the ideas in this section were developed in conversation with Professor Stewart Barr (Barr 2016, pers. comm., 18th July), who has since begun conversations with the Jurassic Coast management team and colleague Dr Ewan Woodley on these issues.
(There is scope for further research into how risk is perceived and can be better communicated on the Jurassic Coast). Witnessing visitors to the coastline in precarious situations in relation to their own safety is an all too common sight [Fig. 66]. The continued urgency required for new approaches to communication of the hazards indicates that this remains a highly topical and timely issue for the site.
Figure 66: Tourists ignore signs and climb over the fence onto the precarious clifftops at Lulworth Cove (photo: author)
7.3.2 *Heritages of change: uncertain futures for the past*

This thesis has investigated the practice of heritage in changing environments through the specific case study of the Jurassic Coast. The research has exposed how World Heritage policy is complicated when the heritage being preserved and protected through designation is in fact acknowledged to be dynamic and under continual change. Further research could extend this work to explore how changing environments are managed across world heritage decision-making. In 2015 the World Heritage Convention formally recognized global human-induced climate change and became committed to mitigating its effects. Furthermore, in May 2016 UNESCO published a report titled ‘World Heritage and Tourism in a Changing Environment’ (UNEP, UNESCO, and UCS 2016) from which the following quotation derives:

> Because World Heritage Sites must have and maintain “Outstanding Universal Value”, the report recommends that the World Heritage Committee consider the risk of prospective sites become degraded before they add them to the list. (UNESCO 2016)

It is therefore timely to study how the prospect of environments changing in the future directs how we manage and preserve the past.

Further research developing from this thesis might therefore include exploring what these uncertain futures of the past, generated by climate change concerns, might mean for international heritage policy and practice. This would include studying how World Heritage Sites are managed to account for future environmental change and anticipated losses to material and intangible heritage. It also would analyse the implications of these uncertain futures for tourism and economic development. Future research might therefore engage with the contradiction in this policy strategy, where sites that celebrate international heritage are asked to alleviate or mitigate future environmental change. This stream of research would contribute to current work on transience and change in heritage studies, where decisions not to preserve become
acts of heritage practice (DeSilvey 2017; Harvey and Perry 2015; DeSilvey 2012; Harrison 2012a). For example, Holtorf recently argued that perceptions of destruction and loss are constitutive to heritage (Holtorf 2006; Holtorf 2015).

World Heritage Sites are often considered as a ‘litmus test’ for how we might respond to the changes in the environment resulting from climate change. However, the geographical bias of WHS distribution and the associated inequality in heritage resource will mean that climate change response will not be universal or uniform. Further demonstrating a limitation of the practice of WHS where designation is made internationally but managed nationally. Since the 2015 Paris Climate Change Convention the issue of human-induced environmental change has been formally adopted into the World Heritage Convention. There are therefore increased demands on World Heritage Sites to ensure that their practice is sustainable or “future proof”. This has significant influences on economies that depend on heritage, particularly the tourism sector, especially as this is a sector that has been recognized as a global contributor to climate change. Further avenues of research situated beyond (important) discussions of vulnerability would be able to engage with ideas of sustainable practice and policy. These are particularly timely considering recent political shifts in the UK and the USA and the troublesome implications of side-lining environmental policy within the nation state. Important questions need to be asked as to how acknowledging these paradoxes might influence the practice of international heritage and the development of heritage policy.

7.3.3 Critical creativities and site-specific policy

This thesis has presented a new approach to art/geography engagements by understanding the commonality between different modes of creativity across cultures of knowledge. It is argued that engaging with critical creativities provides new
perspectives to interdisciplinary working that do not simply emphasise the differences in identities and working practices. A site-specific approach to policy has enabled the re-thinking of the mobility of national and international arts and heritage policy through embedded and grounded research methods. This has demonstrated the everyday processes of decision-making that distort and re-work top-down policy and strategy-making. Critical creativities therefore are able to investigate creative economies through politics of identity and performance.

This is a methodology which can be expanded to further public arts strategies and public sectors more widely. Examples of where this work on policy might be useful include in local government settings, public arts evaluation and heritage management. Establishing the intertwined networks and performances involved in decision-making practice at the local governmental level provides a more nuanced understanding of the intersections between politics and place. Furthermore, this work could meet some of the already recognised gaps in public arts evaluation and the need to connect the outputs of public arts funding with the processes and policies through which they are developed. Highlighting practices of arts production and development in a flexible and embodied way, as is undertaken in this thesis may help funders assess projects and strategize more effectively. Finally, examining the processes of decision-making in heritage management lifts the hood on the mechanics of how organisations rework and make decisions about the past in order for it to be performed in the present and projected into the future. Examining how the past is engaged with on a day-to-day basis by heritage practitioners, as in this thesis, allows for a critical approach to UK organisational heritage.

Therefore, acknowledging the constructive power of everyday creativities could provide new perspectives to many different arenas of public policy making especially in the arts
and heritage sectors. The approaches to critical creativities presented in this thesis enables new understandings of how policy is geographically constituted and performed in institutional and informal contexts. These perspectives are particularly pertinent at moments of environmental, economic and political change.

Through examining the everyday “doings” of policy the processes of decision-making have been peopled in new ways. By seeing policy as performance this research has traced not only how practitioners interact with policy as they write, edit or resist policy, it has also shown how policy itself is performed and can be traced through multiple, intersecting interactions with place. Therefore, policy not only triggers certain performances it is a performance in and of itself.
7.4 Concluding thoughts

I have learned to value imagination in a much broader sense. Imagination is not only the uniquely human capacity to envision that which is not, and therefore the fount of all invention and innovation; in its arguably most transformative and revelatory capacity, it is the power that enables us to empathise with humans whose experiences we have never shared.

- J. K. Rowling

The imagination imitates. It is the critical spirit that creates.

- Oscar Wilde

Imagination is a form of empathy and understanding which connects us to that which is outside our immediate experience. Therefore, it is an essential tool for the heritage sector as they interpret place histories for contemporary audiences. Imagination is also vital for opening up to other communities and for placing ourselves within uncertain futures. However, the difference Sennett describes between dialectic and dialogical cooperation suggests that conversation across difference is not enough (Sennett 2012).\textsuperscript{188} To create requires disagreement, tension and interrogation. The link between criticality and creativity has been explored through this thesis and has become a tool for interrogating the considerable amount of arts activity linked to the Jurassic Coast WHS over recent years. Creative moments occur in many different contexts, experienced by a variety of practitioners from all walks of life. Yet, they have one thing in common: creativity emerges out of something missing or the perception that something is wrong, incorrect or insufficient (Csikszentmihalyi 1996). Finding spaces for these tensions is an important task for the Jurassic Coast management if it is to continue to lead the sector in the country and internationally. However, this is not a simple task. The preceding pages have described the lack of resources and increasing funding cuts that define this moment for the United Kingdom public sector. The

\textsuperscript{188} Sennett distinguishes between two types of conversation: dialectic and dialogical. The latter is described as a form of mutual exchange by Sennett. Dialogical cooperation therefore allows for failure whilst illuminating cooperation as a tool in itself.
management of the Jurassic Coast site is also undergoing significant changes as it moves outside the infrastructure of Dorset County Council to be hosted by the Jurassic Coast Trust. This is a significant move for an organisation that is still less than two decades old. Yet it is a sign of the times. In fact, by the time I began this research in 2012 Devon County Council was already removing the arts from its core services (Arts in Devon 2016).\textsuperscript{189} In many ways both the heritage and arts sectors in Dorset have done remarkably well to maintain services in a climate dominated by the reduction in public service funding, but a challenge remains to provide services to not only maintain the site but to enhance engagement and interaction with it.

The public arts sector is in a very difficult position since the collapse of the Creative Britain agenda. As a sector, the arts continue to be drawn on to solve some of society’s greatest issues whilst maintaining a world-class reputation for innovation and excellence (Crossick and Kaszynska 2016). However, increasing economic austerity measures have resulted in requests for support being met by fewer and fewer resources. The sector is stuck between a rock and a hard place and plagued by strict and often irrelevant auditing measures. Sadly, in many regions the Cultural Olympiad marked an end rather than a beginning. This contrasts with popular neoliberal economic discourse that suggests, “growth creates growth”. The arts and environment sector need to be maintained and resourced to be sustainable. They also need space to experiment with policy and practice and therefore (by implication) to be allowed to fail. Understanding of value must transcend economic measures. Unfortunately this is not the culture within which the UK public sector functions.

\textsuperscript{189} A shift in approach by Devon County Council to the arts was instigated in 2012 and significant cuts and reallocation of funds happened from this point. The Devon arts service and arts budget were officially closed at the end of March 2016 (Devon County Council 2016).
In this thesis, I have presented the heritage sector in a context of change. I have therefore understood the value of interpretations of the past in shaping perceptions in the present and future. The inclusion of creativity into heritage practice at the Jurassic Coast has facilitated refreshing responses to issues of interpretation, rock falls, environmental change and risk. However, with increasing funding cuts, the space to produce this kind of work is limited. It is unfortunate that this has occurred at the point where the Jurassic Coast has embedded the arts within the way it works as an organisation. Placing creativity at the core of heritage policy and practice has enabled new approaches to interpretation, partnership working and visitor safety. In the immediate future, the next focus for the arts on the Jurassic Coast is likely to be the programme of activity surrounding the tour of the Natural History Museum’s ‘Dippy’ dinosaur. The Jurassic Coast is the first destination on a national tour for the diplodocus skeleton cast, which dominated the NHM’s entrance hall since its opening. The Jurassic Coast team are already planning on hosting an artist in residence when the skeleton is housed at Dorset County Museum in February to May 2018. Continued work with the arts is likely to continue through short-term projects such as this.

In the immediate future, the Jurassic Coast team will continue their core services whilst developing project-based work enabling them to be flexible and open to opportunities as they arise. It is important that they have the resources to maintain this flexibility. The variability of project-based work means that in the short term (such as the span of this thesis) it appears that arts activity is booming and busting. However, over longer timescales, the trends of activity appear less volatile. Including the arts as a cross-cutting theme in the management plan is a suitable system as long as it doesn’t get ignored. A challenge remains to maintain the value of the arts within the ethos of the Jurassic Coast organisation, given personnel turnover and the significant structural shifts currently underway. The way that the policies are performed will determine the
success of the new approach. The best way perhaps to facilitate arts integration is to recognise the critical creativities already inherent in all aspects of the Jurassic Coast management practice. The arts therefore become another string to the site’s creative bow. A recognition that creativity comes in many forms and is practiced by all individuals regardless of professional field or training is essential as is continued funding for creative practice. The Jurassic Coast Ambassadors scheme is already going some way to achieving this. However, challenges remain in fostering creative and artistic practice in rural contexts and expanding audiences beyond the elite and upper-middle class.

Acknowledging the agency of creativity on the Jurassic Coast democratises the writing and practice of heritage policy, allowing more people to write the interpretations of the Jurassic Coast. It is through acknowledgements of these multiple imaginations that we find value in the past and appreciate how it might influence our uncertain presents and futures.
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## Appendix 1 - List of interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30/07/2013</td>
<td>Jurassic Coast team member</td>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>00:51:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/02/2013</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Antiques Showroom, Dorchester</td>
<td>00:15:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/01/2013</td>
<td>Jurassic Coast team member</td>
<td>County Hall, Dorchester</td>
<td>00:28:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/05/2013</td>
<td>Palaeontologist</td>
<td>Lyme Regis</td>
<td>00:15:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/02/2013</td>
<td>Arts Producer</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>01:03:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/03/2013</td>
<td>Arts Producer</td>
<td>The Bull Hotel, Bridport</td>
<td>00:44:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/03/2013</td>
<td>Jurassic Coast team member</td>
<td>Beach and Barnicott, Bridport</td>
<td>00:52:59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/07/2013</td>
<td>Stewart Barr</td>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>00:30:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/07/2013</td>
<td>Jurassic Coast team member</td>
<td>Beach and Barnicott, Bridport</td>
<td>00:18:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/07/2013</td>
<td>Arts Practitioner</td>
<td>Newton Abbot</td>
<td>01:35:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/11/2013</td>
<td>Jurassic Coast team member</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>01:28:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/03/2013</td>
<td>Louisa Adjoa Parker</td>
<td>Cups and Cakes, Dorchester</td>
<td>00:44:89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/2013</td>
<td>Arts and development officer</td>
<td>County Hall, Dorchester</td>
<td>00:40:06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/2013</td>
<td>Jurassic Coast team member</td>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>00:51:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/12/2013</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Toynbee Studios, London</td>
<td>00:26:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/02/2014</td>
<td>Geoff Townson</td>
<td>Charmouth</td>
<td>1:22:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/03/2014</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>West Bay</td>
<td>01:09:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/03/2014</td>
<td>Geomorphologist</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>01:10:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/03/2014</td>
<td>Geomorphologist</td>
<td>Charmouth beach</td>
<td>01:21:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/04/2014</td>
<td>Marc Yeats</td>
<td>Crewkerne</td>
<td>1:20:59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/04/2014</td>
<td>Creative Coast Group member</td>
<td>Ashburton</td>
<td>01:15:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/05/2014</td>
<td>Jurassic Coast team member</td>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>00:44:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/05/2014</td>
<td>Arts and development officer</td>
<td>County Hall, Dorchester</td>
<td>00:44:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/05/2014</td>
<td>Creative Coast Group member</td>
<td>Topsham</td>
<td>00:55:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/05/2014</td>
<td>Artists and Producer</td>
<td>Durlston Country Park, Swanage</td>
<td>00:55:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/05/2014</td>
<td>Education practitioner</td>
<td>Natural History Museum, London</td>
<td>00:48:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/05/2014</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>00:33:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/07/2014</td>
<td>Arts producers</td>
<td>Bridport Arts Centre, Bridport</td>
<td>00:25:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/05/2014</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Boston Tea Party, Exeter</td>
<td>01:09:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/2014</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Wellington, Somerset</td>
<td>01:06:10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2 – Research Field Diary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/09/2012</td>
<td>Workshop - Creative Coast</td>
<td>University of Exeter</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/10/2012</td>
<td>PO - Arts Event</td>
<td>Bridport Arts Centre</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/10/2012</td>
<td>PO - WHS Office</td>
<td>DCC Dorchester</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/10/2012</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Cups and Cakes Dorchester</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/10/2012</td>
<td>PO - Programme Meetings</td>
<td>Bridport Arts Centre</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/11/2012</td>
<td>Workshop - other</td>
<td>Phoenix Arts Centre Exeter</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/11/2012</td>
<td>Workshop - other</td>
<td>Exmouth</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/01/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>DCC Dorchester</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/01/2013</td>
<td>PO - WHS Office</td>
<td>DCC Dorchester</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/02/2013</td>
<td>PO - DLA</td>
<td>DCC Dorchester</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/02/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Antiques Storeroom Dorchester</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/2013</td>
<td>PO - WHS Office</td>
<td>DCC Dorchester</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/02/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/02/2013</td>
<td>PO - WHS Office</td>
<td>DCC Dorchester</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/03/2013</td>
<td>PO - Education</td>
<td>St. Michael's Exeter</td>
<td>Field Diary; Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/03/2013</td>
<td>PO - Steering group</td>
<td>Little Keep Meeting Room</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/03/2013</td>
<td>PO - WHS Office</td>
<td>DCC Dorchester</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/03/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Cups and Cakes Dorchester</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/03/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Beach and Barnicote Bridport</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/03/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Bull Hotel Bridport</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/03/2013</td>
<td>PO - Programme Meetings</td>
<td>Bridport Arts Centre</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/03/2013</td>
<td>PO - Team Meeting</td>
<td>DCC Dorchester</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/04/2013</td>
<td>PO - WHS Office</td>
<td>DCC Dorchester</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/04/2013</td>
<td>PO - DLA</td>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/04/2013</td>
<td>PO - WHS Office</td>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/04/2013</td>
<td>PO - Team Meeting</td>
<td>Lulworth Cove</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/05/2013</td>
<td>Workshop - other</td>
<td>Boston Tea Party Exeter</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/05/2013</td>
<td>PO - Education</td>
<td>Lyme Regis</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05/2013</td>
<td>PO - Education</td>
<td>Lyme Regis</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/05/2013</td>
<td>PO - Education</td>
<td>Lyme Regis</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/05/2013</td>
<td>Workshop - Creative Coast</td>
<td>Barclays House, Poole</td>
<td>Field Diary; Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/05/2013</td>
<td>PO - Steering group</td>
<td>Bridport; Hive Beach</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/07/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Newton Abbot</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/07/2013</td>
<td>PO - WHS Office</td>
<td>DCC Dorchester</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/07/2013</td>
<td>Archive</td>
<td>DCC Dorchester</td>
<td>Field Diary; Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/07/2013</td>
<td>PO - Team Meeting</td>
<td>Beer YHA</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/07/2013</td>
<td>Archive</td>
<td>DCC Dorchester</td>
<td>Field Diary; Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/07/2013</td>
<td>Archive</td>
<td>DCC Dorchester</td>
<td>Events list; field diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/07/2013</td>
<td>PO - Programme Meetings</td>
<td>Beach and Barnicote Bridport</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/07/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Beach and Barnicote Bridport</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/2013</td>
<td>PO - Education</td>
<td>Camp Bestival</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
<td>PO - Education</td>
<td>Camp Bestival</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/08/2013</td>
<td>PO - Education</td>
<td>Camp Bestival</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/2013</td>
<td>PO - Education</td>
<td>Camp Bestival</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/09/2013</td>
<td>PO - Team Meeting</td>
<td>DCC Dorchester</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/09/2013</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>Exeter to Swanage</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/09/2013</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>Swanage to Lulworth</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/09/2013</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>Lulworth to Portland</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/09/2013</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/09/2013</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>Portland to Abbotsbury</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/09/2013</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>Abbotsbury to Charmouth</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/09/2013</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>Charmouth to Beer</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/09/2013</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>Beer to Sidmouth</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/09/2013</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>Sidmouth to Exmouth</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/09/2013</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Wiltshire and Swindon History Centre</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/2013</td>
<td>PO - Programme Meetings</td>
<td>Beach and Barnicote Bridport</td>
<td>Field Diary; application docs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/10/2013</td>
<td>PO - Team Meeting</td>
<td>Portland YHA</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/10/2013</td>
<td>PO - Education</td>
<td>Seaton Science Festival</td>
<td>Field Diary; photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>DCC Dorchester</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>DCC Dorchester</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/11/2013</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Waterfront Bristol</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/11/2013</td>
<td>PO - Programme Meetings</td>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/11/2013</td>
<td>PO - Ambassadors</td>
<td>EDDC Sidmouth</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/12/2013</td>
<td>PO - Team Meeting</td>
<td>West Bay Café</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/01/2014</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>Lyme Regis</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/01/2014</td>
<td>PO - Team Meeting</td>
<td>Charmouth Council offices</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/01/2014</td>
<td>PO - DLA</td>
<td>DCC Dorchester</td>
<td>Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/02/2014</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>Exmouth</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/02/2014</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>Lyme Regis</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/02/2014</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Charmouth</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/02/2014</td>
<td>PO - Exploring Erosion</td>
<td>Little Keep Dorchester</td>
<td>Field Diary;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/02/2014</td>
<td>PO - Team Meeting</td>
<td>Swanage Dorchester</td>
<td>Field Diary;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/02/2014</td>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/03/2014</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>West Bay</td>
<td>Field Diary;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/05/2014</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/03/2014</td>
<td>PO - Exploring Erosion</td>
<td>Ringstead Bay</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/03/2014</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Charmouth</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/03/2014</td>
<td>PO - BJC gets creative</td>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/04/2014</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary; Photos; Videos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/04/2014</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Crewkerne</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/04/2014</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Topsham</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/04/2014</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Ashburton</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/05/2014</td>
<td>PO - Fossil Festival</td>
<td>Lyme Regis</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/05/2014</td>
<td>PO - Fossil Festival</td>
<td>Lyme Regis</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/05/2014</td>
<td>PO - Fossil Festival</td>
<td>Lyme Regis</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05/2014</td>
<td>PO - Fossil Festival</td>
<td>Lyme Regis</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/05/2014</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/2014</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Tiverton</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/05/2014</td>
<td>PO - Team Meeting</td>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/05/2014</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Abbots</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/05/2014</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/05/2014</td>
<td>PO - Exploring Erosion</td>
<td>Spring Tide</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/05/2014</td>
<td>PO - Exploring Erosion</td>
<td>Spring Tide and Durlston</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/05/2014</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Durlston</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/05/2014</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/05/2014</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Natural History Museum, London</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/2014</td>
<td>PO - Jurassic Coast</td>
<td>Bridport Arts Centre</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/08/2014</td>
<td>PO - Team Meeting</td>
<td>Ringstead</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/07/2014</td>
<td>PO - Exploring Erosion</td>
<td>Bridport Arts Centre</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/07/2014</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Bridport Arts Centre</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/10/2014</td>
<td>PO - Jurassic Coast</td>
<td>Sidmouth</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Type</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/11/2014</td>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/11/2014</td>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/11/2014</td>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/2014</td>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/11/2014</td>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/11/2014</td>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/11/2014</td>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/11/2014</td>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/11/2014</td>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2014</td>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/11/2014</td>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/11/2014</td>
<td>PO - Ambassadors</td>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/01/2015</td>
<td>PO - Caves to</td>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cathedrals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/12/2014</td>
<td>PO - Team Meeting</td>
<td>West Bay</td>
<td>Field Diary;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/02/2015</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Lyme Regis</td>
<td>Transcript; Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/01/2015</td>
<td>PO - Team Meeting</td>
<td>Durlston</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/02/2015</td>
<td>PO - Goat Island</td>
<td>Bindon Undercliffs</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/03/2015</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Lyme Regis</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/03/2015</td>
<td>PO - Jurassic Coast</td>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/03/2015</td>
<td>Archives</td>
<td>Oxford Museum of Natural History</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/05/2015</td>
<td>Archives</td>
<td>Lyme Regis</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/12/2015</td>
<td>PO - Team Meeting</td>
<td>Kimmeridge</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/01/2016</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Lyme Regis</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/04/2016</td>
<td>PO - Fossil Festival</td>
<td>Lyme Regis</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/03/2016</td>
<td>PO - Team Meeting</td>
<td>Abbotsbury</td>
<td>Field Diary;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/05/2016</td>
<td>PO - Team Meeting</td>
<td>Seaton Jurassic</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/06/2016</td>
<td>PO - CSI Jurassic</td>
<td>Natural Seaton, Seaton</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/06/2016</td>
<td>PO - Seaton Jurassic</td>
<td>Seaton Jurassic</td>
<td>Field Diary; Photos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3 – Invitation to Research

The Jurassic Coast World Heritage Site; a compelling landscape of outstanding beauty and universal value. Due to the early developments of earth science in the region it has been recognized as a key location in the history of scientific knowledge and understanding. But this is not the only form of enquiry. The Jurassic Coast is the only World Heritage Site with a formal Arts Programme. This landscape is a crucible of knowledge, a site of learning, discovery and exploration. It is a place viewed from many different perspectives and through many lenses. Often described as a giant classroom, this coast is a meeting point of individuals and organisations, scientists and artists. This research hopes to undertake an ‘inside-out’ study of the boundaries between these meeting points, exploring how they are negotiated, tested and broken down.

Initial research questions include:

- What are the different types of knowledge formed along the coast?
- How has the Jurassic Coast Arts Programme negotiated the idea of art-science practice?
- What are the politics of these collaborations?
- How does policy chart the course for creative practice and how might creative practice determine policy?
- How does the varied site of the Jurassic coast influence creative policy and practice?
- How is the Jurassic Coast perceived differently through the lens of art compared to the lens of science?

It is important to mention that I will be coming to the team as a researcher. In this sense, any conversations we have may help form the research project. I would really value your contribution. Confidentiality will be respected on request.

Thank you!

Frances Rylands
fer204@exeter.ac.uk
Appendix 4 – Interview Consent Form

The Jurassic Coast World Heritage Site; a compelling landscape of outstanding beauty and universal value. Due to the early developments of earth science in the region it has been recognized as a key location in the history of scientific knowledge and understanding. But this is not the only form of enquiry. The Jurassic Coast is the only World Heritage Site with a formal Arts Programme. This landscape is a crucible of knowledge, a site of learning, discovery and exploration. It is a place viewed from many different perspectives and through many lenses. Often described as a giant classroom, this coast is a meeting point of individuals and organisations, scientists and artists. This research hopes to undertake an ‘inside-out’ study of the boundaries between these meeting points, exploring how they are negotiated, tested and broken down.

Initial research questions include:

- What are the different types of knowledge formed along the coast?
- How has the Jurassic Coast Arts Programme negotiated the idea of art-science practice?
- What are the politics of these collaborations?
- How does policy chart the course for creative practice and how might creative practice determine policy?
- How does the varied site of the Jurassic coast influence creative policy and practice?
- How is the Jurassic Coast perceived differently through the lens of art compared to the lens of science?

It is important to mention that I will be coming to the team as a researcher. In this sense, any conversations we have may help form the research project. I would really value your contribution. Confidentiality will be respected on request.

Thank you!

Frances Rylands
fer204@exeter.ac.uk
Confidentiality

Interview tapes and transcripts will be held in confidence. They will not be used other than for the purposes described above and third parties will not be allowed access to them (except as may be required by the law). However, if you request it, you will be supplied with a copy of your interview transcript so that you can comment on and edit it as you see fit (please give your email below). Your data will be held in accordance with the Data Protection Act.

Anonymity

Interview data will be held and used on an anonymous basis, with no mention of your name, but we will refer to the group of which you are a member.

If you are happy to waive this right and be identified as part of the survey, please tick here.

Consent

I voluntarily agree to participate and to the use of my data for the purposes specified above. I can withdraw consent at any time by contacting the interviewers.

DATE…………………………

Note: Your contact details are kept separately from your interview data

Name of interviewee:...........................................................................

Signature: ......................................................................................

Email/phone: ..................................................................................

Signature of researcher.....................................................................

2 copies to be signed by both interviewee and researcher, one kept by each
Appendix 5 – Budget for the Jurassic Coast Arts Programme

JURASSIC COAST ARTS

PROGRAMME

INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
<th>Total per funder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CASH</td>
<td>IN KIND</td>
<td>CASH</td>
<td>IN KIND</td>
<td>CASH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon County Council</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td>£60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Dorset District Council</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purbeck District Council</td>
<td>£500</td>
<td>£500</td>
<td>£500</td>
<td>£500</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHS Jurassic Coast Team$</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWRDA$</td>
<td>£2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE SW Grants for the Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated match funding for projects$</td>
<td></td>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td>£40,000</td>
<td>£63,000</td>
<td>£123,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£216,000</td>
<td>£22,000</td>
<td>£91,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL INCOME

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>£394,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Kind</td>
<td>£66,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>£460,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>2007/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CASH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Coordinator$^6$</td>
<td>£35,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset County Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHS Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment costs</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Seed Corn$^6$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated match</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding for projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>£6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>£2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency$^7$</td>
<td>£3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL EXPENDITURE £460,000
INCOME

Dorset County Council
Cash – 2008/09 £17,000 from DCC Special Projects Budget
2010/11 £22,000 from DCC Special Projects Budget
In kind - Total £51,000 to cover 0.6 of Arts Development Officer post

World Heritage Budget
Cash contribution is made up 2/3 Dorset County Council and 1/3 Devon County Council investment.
In kind contribution includes WHS Team officer time as detailed in Expenditure as WHS Team Management Costs

SWRDA
One off contribution towards Evaluation of impact of Jurassic Coast Arts Programme in cross sector context

Anticipated match funding for projects
Based on discussion with external funders (see Section 3.3iv Expenditure of Project Proposal) the projected match funding increases incrementally as the project develops and gains momentum.

EXPENDITURE

Arts Coordinator
Post to be appointed in line with WHS Team structure. Based on second point of Dorset County Council salary scale 10 (£24,708). Travel and administrative costs have been included @ 22%. An additional £1,500 has been included in 2008/09 to cover set up costs.

Project Seed Corn
£123,000 will be used to initiate projects within the six themes of the Arts Programme and increase and develop the arts content of existing initiatives that fit the arts protocol. This budget item will provide leverage to attract additional funding on a pound for pound basis from external sources giving an overall project budget of £246,000 (see Appendix 2 for indication of these sources). The Seed Corn budget has been nominally allocated as £41,000 per annum but expenditure will be flexible across the term of The Project.

Contingency
This has been calculated as 3.5% of total Project budget.
CREATIVE COAST 2012 budget 2011-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011/12 (10 months)</th>
<th>2012/13 (9 months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE G4A</td>
<td>£35,000</td>
<td>£35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset CC</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDDC</td>
<td>£500</td>
<td>£500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Councils</td>
<td>£500</td>
<td>£500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>£42,000</td>
<td>£52,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL INCOME** | £94,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011/12 (10 months)</th>
<th>2012/13 (9 months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary and on costs</td>
<td>£32,521</td>
<td>£33,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>£4,000</td>
<td>£4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Coast Group costs</td>
<td>£550</td>
<td>£550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project support</td>
<td></td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>£42,071</td>
<td>£58,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EXPENDITURE** | £100,121
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### Appendix 6 – List of Jurassic Coast Arts Programme and Creative Coast 2012 projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurasssic Coast Arts Programme</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project</strong></td>
<td><strong>Details</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts and Earth Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Land that Time Forgot</td>
<td>Educational project with Darrell Wakelam supporting Herbie Treehead’s performance of Jurassic Underworld and inspired by the 1830 painting Dura Antiquior by Henry De La Beche. It was linked to the 2009 Fossil Festival. Received £3,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet of Curiosities</td>
<td>An interactive multimedia geology box by Forkbeard Fantasy commissioned by the Dorset County Council Museums Advisor. Received £3,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiration Aspiration Partnership</td>
<td>A project run by DAISI (Devon Arts in Schools Initiative) schools in East Devon, including 14 in Exmouth (autumn 2010) and nine in the Axe valley (spring 2011), explored their local environment through art, writing, drama, dance and music. Received £4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthscapes</td>
<td>A series of seminars, talks and workshops curated by Sherborne House Arts. This project did not receive funding and producers felt that expectations regarding profile raising were not met by JCAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossil Festival 2010</td>
<td>Funding specifically for B Sharp (musical workshops on biodiversity) and Herbie Treehead performances. Received £3,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossil Festival 2011 (including development support for Jurassic Coast Earth Festival in 2012)</td>
<td>Amongst other aims, this included support for creative projects during the 2011 Fossil Festival including Pliosaur, MEMO, Desert Crossings, Jurassic Journey and Purbeck Clay. JCAP also wished to support collaboration between the Jurassic Coast Earth Festival 2012 and other Creative Coast projects (specifically Coastal Voices, Exploratory Laboratory and processional events). It also supported projects specifically for Earth Festival 2012 such as 26 &amp; 27 bones, Battle for the Winds, MEMO and étude. Received £20,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploratory Laboratory</td>
<td>Led by Big Picture, JCAP supported phase 1 including an exhibition, symposium and learning programme. Received £10,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebration of Stone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurassic Journey</td>
<td>Created by photographer Ben Osborne and managed by Artsreac...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocks: from axe heads to Zennor Head</td>
<td>An exhibition of art and artefacts curated by artist Judith Frost at Bridport Arts Centre. Did not receive funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping the Jurassic Coast</td>
<td>Visual artwork created by Amanda Wallwork and Jeremy Gardiner and exhibited at Dorset County Museum, Bournemouth University and Black Swan Arts in Frome. Did not receive funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMO Festival</td>
<td>The Mass Extinction Memorial Observatory (MEMO) was a series of carving events linking Lyme Regis and Portland to St. Paul's Cathedral in London. It was rejected for funding as an individual project but was included as a part of the Creative Coast programme specifically through the Fossil Festivals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone, Paper, Scissors</td>
<td>An exhibition of contemporary craft inspired by rock strata, fossils, dinosaurs, cliffs beaches and wildlife along the Jurassic Coast and exhibited at Walford Mill, Wimborne. As it was already underway by the launch of JCAP the project did seek receive funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk of Life</td>
<td>Movement workshops by Helen Poyner in her 2010/2011 programme of activity. It did not receive funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Sharp</td>
<td>Workshops leading to a performance parade in Weymouth Carnival. B Sharp worked in collaboration with Magic Drum Orchestra (Dorchester) and Bideford carnival group. The project received £1,000 funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnival Conference</td>
<td>Planning a Festival of Carnivals 2012 initiative at Weymouth College. It was decided that further work would be led by a Carnivals and Processions Co-ordinator at Activate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processions development</td>
<td>Run by Activate this project involved the development of processional activity linked to the Olympic summer 2012. Received £11,500.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The practices of carnival and other PhD studentships</td>
<td>University of Exeter PhD studentship (2 others aligned with other themes including this one were also supported). Received £9,000 funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from JCAP and approximately £20,000 in kind contributions by the Jurassic Coast.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sounds of the coast</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera Circus developed a project involving young people, geologists and horticulturalists to grow, harvest, cook and eat local food. However, it was successful in major funding bid. Received £3,000 for the development phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coastal Voices</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A choral project led by Lighthouse Poole in partnership with B Sharp, SoundStorm, Voiceworks and Creative Coast. Received £30,000 for three new music commissions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site specific arts</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Universal Value</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three site-specific works created by Charlie Morrissey and produced by PVA MediaLab in West Bay, Bridport; Budleigh Salterton, East Devon; Lulworth Cove, Purbeck. Received £1,500 funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desert Crossings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A dance piece choreographed by Gregory Maqoma and commissioned by State of Emergency linking the Jurassic Coast to the Skeleton Coast in Namibia. JCAP supported research and participatory activities. Received £4,210 funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bog Standard or Beautiful</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuation of the public realm work undertaken by the Arts Officer including Newton’s Cove bridge, Charmouth Bridge, Durlston projects, Chesil Beach Visitor Centre, Public Art Code of Practice. Received £20,000 funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Rock Charmer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish accordion player Kimmo Pohjonen and Paper Cinema (Dorset) performed a site-specific piece as a part of Activate’s 2010 InsideOut festival events held at Winspit near Worth Matravers. Received £3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Schwarz 2011)
### Creative Coast 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim 1</strong></td>
<td>To pioneer a mechanism where partners from science, conservation, tourism, transport, and education can work with the arts sector to maximise their resources in the delivery of shared objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 1</strong></td>
<td>Develop and support a new Creative Coast Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 2</strong></td>
<td>Review the JC Arts Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 3</strong></td>
<td>Use review to explore with partners opportunities to integrate contemporary arts into protected landscape management plans and future projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim 2</strong></td>
<td>To use the global importance of the Jurassic Coast to stimulate the production of great art rooted in the JCWHS’s Outstanding Universal Value: geology, geomorphology and record of life, and the concept of World Heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 4</strong></td>
<td>Coordinate contact between delivery partners and the management of JC WHS to profile a collective programme of great arts and science projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 5</strong></td>
<td>Develop and co-ordinate arts and natural science labs for artists and natural scientists to explore ideas and methodologies together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 6</strong></td>
<td>Seed fund and support development of a large scale community focused project commission for 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 7</strong></td>
<td>Prepare an advocacy pack and deliver workshops for officers from UNESCO, IUCN, British Council, Visiting Arts and other natural WHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 8</strong></td>
<td>Prepare an advocacy pack and deliver workshops for officers from UKNC for UNESCO, LAWHF, EH, DCMS and their recommended contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 9</strong></td>
<td>Coordinate a national/international PR campaign using media attention from the Olympic and Paralympic Games to highlight this pioneering programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 10</strong></td>
<td>Monitoring meetings with JC Steering Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>