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Abstract

A knowledge exchange programme exploring the role of art in relation to the planning context of the Holy Island of Lindisfarne, this paper explores the role of artistic knowledge in making landscape. During 2013, 25 artistic workshops were developed in collaboration with residents and planning officials, resulting in an exhibition of works produced. From a pragmatist perspective this paper draws on ethnographic accounts of the realisation of the exhibition to reveal artistic knowledge exchange as ‘relational knowing’. The contribution of the paper is to recommend we account for artistic work as an ingredient of landscape planning. Although specifically drawing on fieldwork in Holy Island the experiential nature of this article makes a novel contribution across the field of rural planning.
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Island Perspectives

At 7 pm on a bright Tuesday evening in September 2013, a resident of Holy Island leaves her house, taking a short walk to the St Cuthbert Centre. A plastic sign tied on the gate to the church garden says ‘Exhibition: Island Perspectives’. After entering, she waits to hear a click to ensure the heavy door has closed against the wind. In the lobby are sonic recordings of birds, seals, waves and voices playing from ‘Sounding the Island’, a CD compilation. Moving to the main vaulted space hung on an office room-divider are landscape photographs and portraits of residents framed in card.

‘Island Perspectives’ (18–22 September 2013) resulted from a one-year Knowledge Exchange project on the Holy Island of Lindisfarne. ‘Knowledge Exchange’ looks for new ways of thinking about knowledge and its social impact (Hudson, 2013). In collaboration with residents and island planners, the ambition for this knowledge exchange emerged as exploring ways to ‘get to know’ Holy Island in support of island development. As part of experimental fieldwork, artists developed workshops with and for, residents. The work and documentation produced was shown in ‘Island Perspectives’. From a pragmatist perspective, to explore how making art can make a difference to rural planning, this article tells the story of the fieldwork leading to the exhibition. Rather than objects in an exhibition, the work of art is revealed as a way of knowing landscape relationally. The contribution of this paper rests in recommending the consideration of art as an ingredient of rural planning practice (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Opening reception of Island Perspectives, Holy Island (Source: Author).
A tidal island with a resident population of 150, Holy Island lies off the Northumberland coast, a rural region in the north east of England. Famous for its priory, castle and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (Tristram, 2009, p. 144), the island’s significance is reflected by the number of strategic agencies with governance responsibilities locally and the 500 000 visitors who check the timetable to cross the twice-daily tide every year. In 2009 the Holy Island Partnership (HIP) was developed to facilitate discussion between the community and organisations with a purpose to develop a coordinated response to island issues. Specific interest lies in: ‘visitor management’, ‘landscape’ and ‘community and cohesion’ (Holy Island Partnership, 2011, p. 4). The agencies included in the partnership are: Natural England, English Heritage, National Trust, Northumberland Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Northumberland County Council, Holy Island Parish Council, church representatives and the Holy Island of Lindisfarne Community Development Trust. Informed by a consultation exercise (April/May 2010) three themes for joint focus were developed (HIP, 2011, p. 4): visitor management—including car parking, visitor flow and access, visitor services (including a community archive room) and interpretation and information plans and materials; landscape—including ‘island interpretation’ and the development of a Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) Landscape Partnership project including ambitions for increasing community participation in local heritage; and communication and cohesion focused on improving partnership relationships and the way the island promotes itself to the ‘outside world’.

The academic partner for the Knowledge Exchange project is with the Holy Island Partnership (HIP). Concerned by a level of disconnection between residents and the island planning processes, HIP was keen to explore ways to re-engage the resident community. In response to community concerns about decision-making processes, HIP saw this research as a way to support community engagement. To assist me in introducing the emergent fieldwork processes as one of ‘getting to know’ the island, the next section draws on early ethnographic episodes. In agreement with the coordinator of the HIP, I am positioned as a planning assistant-cum-advisor, considering some sort of art project in relation to the ambitions of HIP. My duties include contributing to monthly HIP
planning meetings and engaging with island residents. To begin, the coordinator, whom I call Tim, invited me to an island management community group meeting. All human names are changed or omitted.

**Being marked**


I follow the road, past a large car park to my left, to a crossroads. Turning right, driving along a stone-built High Street, passing the Post Office I take a second right. Noticing the school in front of me, I park up. A little early, I take a moment to take the place in. The bright sky is busy with chattering birds. There’s no one on the streets. Time to go in to the community meeting, I walk to the back of the school building and step into a vestibule area. Tim greets me with a smile and offers me a cup of tea, ‘before the others arrive’. Taking our mugs, we settle in seats around two trestle tables pushed together in the middle of the office. Seven people join us. We introduce ourselves as a Natural England officer; an environmental specialist from the main land; and residents who have come to live on the island for reasons including marriage and ‘natural beauty’. I say I’m a researcher with a background in the visual arts appointed to see whether the island community would be interested in exploring art or artistic processes as part of a larger project called ‘Northumbrian Exchanges’.

The group tell me that they have had prior experience of researchers. Documents that inform current development plans have been written by consultants, but with limited experience of the island themselves. When academics have spent time there, their focus on ‘taking stories and pictures’ has left people unclear of the benefit for the island. They tell me if the research is to continue it would have to be developed from the ‘island’s perspective’. I agree and suggest that we talk further about how to progress.

Afterwards Sophia invited me to her house. Taking a ring binder from a shelf in her dining room, she shows me a pile of consultancy documents, saying, ‘One of these even suggests ‘pop-up artworks’, I mean what do you think we thought of that?! This place is wild we want to keep it like that’. She offers me advice, ‘to get to know the island you need to come here’. On her recommendation, in negotiation with academic colleagues I stretched the small project budget to cover room hire costs for up to seven nights a month. Tim booked my first visit. I then selected the cheapest options.

A few weeks later I drive the causeway again. I pass the car park, drive through the village and park in my previous space. This is the first time I will stay over. It is 2.30. The booking information states that check-in is from 3 pm. However, I’d had an email exchange with the owner who explained that ‘in reality, it depends on the tide’. So I presume it will be okay to be early. It was fine.

The next day is sunny. Deciding to explore the village, I go in to a craft shop. ‘It’s busy’ I say to the owner. ‘Oh, we get them all. High heels and walking boots in here!’ I tell her I am working with HIP. She looks concerned, ‘I don’t want the island to be spoiled by signs. People shouldn’t be told what to do, they should have their own experience’. ‘Go and explore’ she says, suggesting I look for ‘a hut’ she has heard about but never visited: ‘You could go there and take a picture for me’. Leaving the village I walk for about three hours along the north shore of the island. I photograph the views of the coastline, and the ground as I leave footprints in my heavy boots in sand and grass. I find ‘the hut’
and re-visit the craft shop to share my pictures. A little burnt, I go back to the B&B. Seeing me, my landlady smiles, ‘You’ve been marked!’

**Planning, landscape, art: a pragmatist orientation in support of knowing**

In its form as a governance activity, planning ‘comes to earth in the complex flow of practices’ (Healey, 2009, p. 287). As coordinator of the HIP theme delivery Tim’s role is ‘practical’ involving interaction between multiple forms of systematised and experiential knowledge (Healey, 2008, p. 863). In considering governance practicalities the pragmatist tradition makes a major contribution: by focusing on ‘the challenge of ‘acting in the world’ recognising the human capacity for social learning and for discovery through the flow of life lived in association with others, and paying attention to the situated-ness of practices’ (Healey, 2009, p. 287). As a ‘practical’ practice, governance/planning is not only concerned with managing existing relations but with opening up future possibilities (Healey, 2007). A founding principle of pragmatism is to understand the world as ‘in the making’ (James, 1910). The ‘real world’ practical-ness of this research is not just about observing what happens in the island now, but planning practice to come. For reasons of ‘practicality’ and ‘future-ness’ I turn to pragmatism and particularly John Dewey (1859–1952).

Centred on ‘the empirical treatment of relations or dynamic continuities’ (McDermott, 1973/1981, p. 65) pragmatism promotes the study of everyday procedures. Dewey particularly stresses that ‘developing knowledge of the world and acting in the world [are] all part of the same process of learning and discovering through experience’ (Healey, 2009, p. 280). To summarise this complex concept (Bruner, 1986), we might say that experience ‘underscores the on-going-ness of life [...] yet it also encourages us to see actions as units of behaviour that can be separated from the rest of the action and talked about later’ (Abrahams, 1986, p. 49); acknowledging there is no stable ‘human’ experience, as the sensorium is constantly re-invented (Thrift, 2008, p. 2). Dewey’s project understands that the search for the structure of experience is the lived experience.

Of particular interest for this study is Dewey’s view of the art experience: that we are familiar with the notion that physical materials such as marble and pigments are changed, but not so much that ‘a similar transformation takes place on the side of ‘inner’ materials, images, observations, memories and emotions’ (Dewey, 1934, p. 15). ‘Memories and emotions’ of lived immediacy remind us that the way forward is not to jettison the more phenomenological before any reflection on it (Thrift, 2008, p. 6). To support the development of a closer conversation with the lived immediacy of my fieldwork as aiding ‘the performance’ of pragmatism (Dewey, 1929c/1958, p. 278) I also turn to anthropology.

Experience is of as well as in nature (Dewey, 1929a/1958, p. 252). Following this ‘interactive’ view (e.g. Ingold, 2011; Merriman et al., 2008; Wylie, 2007) as the European Landscape Convention (http://www.coe.int/en/web/landscape) HIP define ‘landscape’ (as coupled with seascape) as ‘an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction [emphasis added] of natural and/or human factors’. Landscape is not simply a surface to walk on, but is in continuous formation; perhaps, above all ‘thanks to the immersion of its manifold surfaces in those fluxus of the medium we call weather’ (Ingold, 2011, p. 130). From this interactive position we note both skin and land can be scorched by the sun; there is not a ‘knower’ outside of the world to be known, but a knowing experience that takes place in the relational fabric of being in the world. In other words, ‘the world is known to those who dwell therein, who inhabit its places and journey
along the paths connecting them’ (Ingold, 2007, p. 193). We know as we go as we journey through the world.

As dynamic, knowledge is ‘made through differences in knowing’ (Dewey, 1931/1963, p. 217)—‘in the making’. Indeed, as part of any inquiry Dewey insists upon ‘something in the way of actual physical making—be it only a diagram [because] knowing in its honorific sense, is experimental, involving physical construction’ (Dewey, 1931/1963, p. 221). ‘Making things is making knowledge’ (Marchand, 2010, p. 112). This knowledge exchange programme is an exploration of the possibilities of making and doing art in relation to planning practice. Art, as encompassing music, performance, theatre and visual and literary art, are all a process ‘of making the world a different place in which to live’ (Dewey, 1929b/1958, p. 307). By tracing the causal sequences produced by art’s processes of relational associations, theories of what art does as a mediator of ‘social-ness’ are well established in the ‘action’ and ‘network’ theories of anthropology (e.g. Gell, 1998; Morphy, 2009) and sociology of innovation (e.g. Hennion, 1995). How can doing art make a difference in Holy Island?

Fieldwork development

The fieldwork was developed in collaboration with residents and HIP. Early visits shaped the project. A resident’s early suggestion that to ‘get to know’ the island required ‘being there’ initiated the consideration of residential periods. As tidal, standard working hours are interrupted by the tide timetable; and if you leave with the tide you only experience the island when busy with tourists, rather then when residents are ‘off duty’ with time to commit to other activities. As the focus of the research was to engage with resident as well as HIP officers, I decided to scope options for staying ‘across the tide’. The initial project budget had not included provision for extended accommodation. After negotiated re-shaping of the budget allocation, there was allowance to cover five to seven nights per month over a one-year period. The HIP working group met once a month. In order to participate I settled my schedule as undertaking monthly visits of between 5 and 7 nights. As a knowledge exchange project in partnership with HIP, my role in the fieldwork was developed with the HIP coordinator. I conducted ‘being there’ as a planning assistant-cum-advisor with specific responsibility for engaging residents in considering the possibilities for an art project. Rather than other options for ‘being there’ such as studying or volunteering, for example, I was on the Island ‘working’ with HIP in liaison with residents; through participating in community group meetings and HIP working group meetings. To trace the development of the project, I kept an ethnographic diary. Through early fieldwork, an artistic programme developed with the ambition to explore the island from the ‘island’s perspective’. The experimental fieldwork combined ethnography and artistic practice as a way of knowing through lived experience.

As knowledge exchange, the research ambition is not simply the development of knowledge, but for making action; and as ‘applied’ research, perhaps more challenging than its ‘pure’ cousin (Campbell, 2015). As an ‘arts-based knowledge exchange researcher’ (Crawshaw, Rowe, & Hudson, 2015) I drew on my prior professional experience as well as subsequent interdisciplinary academic pathway. Alongside my prior professional experience as an arts and community development practitioner (e.g. Edwards, 2008), to support the challenges of applied practice I drew on collaborative perspectives from planning (e.g. Healey, 1997/2006) and anthropology (e.g. Marcus, 2010), expanded notions of ‘the curatorial’ (e.g. Martinon, 2013–2015) and ‘socially engaged’ art practice (e.g. Bowman, 2013). As ethnographic-artistic dialogue, the ethnography traces: the day-to-day of island life; the
development of artistic workshops and workshop delivery. Material is drawn from a field diary, photography, video documentation and diagrammatical sketches. Due to resident’s views of research, I judged that interview requests might be interpreted as prioritising ‘scholarly’ rather than ‘engaged’ outcomes. I therefore did not undertake interviews.

The form of the ‘art project’ was developed with residents and HIP as a series of artistic workshops. At community group meetings residents clearly stated they did not want artists ‘parachuted in’ or to be ‘told what art is’; however they would be interested to explore art processes through workshops. During early island visits two workshop approaches emerged: ‘resident-led’—to explore traditional processes for making lace, proggy mats (rag rugs), lobster pots, flower displays and kneeler tapestries; and ‘artist-led’—to explore the island through a range of artistic disciplines. The ‘artist-led’ option attracted more immediate interest. Due to the limitations of the project time-scale, we therefore developed that orientation; including two resident artists as workshops leaders: a professional landscape photographer and a visual artist with a family holiday home on the island. An HIP officer suggested a sonic recording of the island might be of interest to the island’s archive group focused on the collection of photographs and oral histories. When I spoke to group members they hadn’t thought of collecting sounds, but thought it was an interesting way to ‘map the island’ and would like to get involved. Other residents suggested dance and some sort of theatre or performance workshops, ‘because teenagers would be interested’.

Through professional networks, based on the disciplinary interests of residents I contacted a sonic artist, dancer-choreographer and theatre/performance director to develop workshops alongside the resident photographer and visual artist. I scheduled an orientation day for artists to meet with residents to develop ideas during which the brief for the workshop programme was shaped as ‘exploring the island from the island’s perspective’; later the exhibition took that title. I had no prior experience of any of the artists involved.

Twenty three-hour photography, sonic mapping, dance, theatre-performance and drawing and painting workshops took place over July and August 2013. Advised by a-n (https://www.a-n.co.uk) artists were paid £250 per day. As emergent field activity, this additional budget was fundraised from a competitive university budget in support of social renewal. The programme was promoted to residents by email, hand delivery and posters. Attendance ranged from one to ten. Of 150 island residents, twenty-five participated in the workshops. Tim and another HIP officer attended one sonic mapping workshop. There were two sonic workshops un-attended. Workshops were broadly designed in the mode of preparatory rehearsals for making work. The dance workshops were particularly described as ‘improvisation’.

In support of community engagement participatory art is well debated across the broad interface of planning literature. In discussions of the role of the academy, considerations of the relationship between knowledge and the public good, and how creativity can be pressed into productive use, have intensified (Strathern, 2004, p. 45). This research did not set out to press art in to public use via participatory work as a methodology for engagement. Rather, participatory workshops emerged from engaged fieldwork. As such, this project can be considered more as an experiment in conversation between ethnography and artistic practice towards planning action.

The next section draws on ethnographic episodes spanning the workshop programme. My intention is not to compare sonic, performance or visual disciplines; but simply trace the exploratory experience with and through the artistic programme in the landscape. There are many philosophical paths to build an argument for human-nature relations as the fabric-context for exploring knowing landscape (e.g. Thrift, 2008, p. 6), such as William James (1842–1910), or Alfred North Whitehead
(1861–1947). I have chosen pragmatism, as being in support of the ‘practicality’ and ‘future-ness’ required. I have stationed with Dewey because of the centrality of the body as ‘living organism’ acting in the world and his particular influence across the multiple disciplinary fields of this study. As bodily practice I acknowledge there are many rich lenses available for exploring the artistic fieldwork including performance (e.g. Goffman, 1959) and performativity (e.g. Butler, 1988). As a pragmatist study this research contributes to an extended project (Crawshaw, 2015) considering art in planning practice.

In describing knowing with and in the artistic experience the descriptions span two registers: (1) in Dewey’s terms, what is taking place on the ‘outside’—as human and non-human exchanges and associations; and (2) what is taking place on the ‘inside’—emotionally. Until taking my shoes off to become a dance participant I describe the ‘outside’; the dance episode however includes an auto-ethnographic (Denzin, 2014) description of what I feel emotionally on the ‘inside’. Dewey regards emotion as ‘indication of intimate participation’ (1929b/1958, p. 324). My justification for including this short personal exploration is because the art experience is one of ‘inner’ and ‘outer’ alterations we should take account of both material ‘sides’. The final ethnographic episodes explore their relational interchange.

As part of the research collaboration I shared ethnographic material with key informants. A year after the ‘Island Perspectives’ preview, I was invited to present the research as part of a small seminar on the island: for academics, island residents and island managers. To avoid alienation (Moskowitz, 2015), I undertook an additional research stage (post funding): to arrive a day early to ‘rehearse’ a draft paper with key resident-collaborators, and stay overnight with Sophia to reflect on the seminar experience. The paper presented (Crawshaw, 2014) included revisions arising from these ‘rehearsals’. This article builds on that paper.

The workshops

At the first workshop eight participants turned up for the ‘introduction to photography’. One is a visitor, the others are residents including people born on the island. The photographer handed out information sheets explaining photography basics. We set up SLR cameras and tripods I loaned from the university. One of the tripods had a ‘stiff’ leg. We all laughed. In the evening the photographer asks participants to walk to the Priory and set up tripods to focus on their favourite part of the building before going to the harbour and choosing an area to photograph there. The light is dimming. A teenage girl who had introduced herself as being born on the island sat by the shore taking close shots of the sea. Turning to me she said ‘you see things differently when you look through the camera’.

A few weeks later, I am in the kitchen of Rosella Cottage. The dancer phones to tell me she has arrived. I walk round and meet her outside the Post Office. She shows me that she has sticks and a rucksack of stuff that might be useful in the car. We walk round to the St Cuthbert’s Centre to put down her things and discuss the morning and late afternoon sessions for that day. The resident who had suggested dance came along five minutes early. ‘Is it just me?’ she asks.

‘Yes’. We get in to the dancer’s car to drive to the North Shore as planned. The resident started laughing, ‘we won’t be able to get to that beach. The tide will have shut the road’. We see water, turn back and go to a little pebble beach on the other side of the island instead. After parking we walk down the side of The Priory, to the beach facing a small island in the sea, named after Saint Cuthbert. The resident asked me to take part. She didn’t want to be the only one. I stand next to her.
We take our shoes off. After some preliminary stretching, the dancer handed us large bamboo poles. We are asked to hold these at each end and develop movements in rhythm with the water. Next she asked us to hold them out straight and trace the headland with the stick.

The workshops had been developed for residents. I had assisted the photographer with her workshops, and had predicted I would continue in this assistant role throughout the programme. I had not considered participating myself.

I feel the damp cold grains on my feet. Standing straight, I sense rising fear. I’m not a dancer. I’m quite nervous of being here, I realise, and equally annoyed with myself for being so. I try to push away this inner voice of worry by listening closely to the directions. I hold a bamboo stick out in front of me and trace the contours of the headland. I feel a sense of connecting with the land in a way I hadn’t before. Rather than simply ‘looking’ with my eyes, my full body is engaged in a process of knowing actively as part of the working landscape. My feet in shifting shingle, the cool wind on my face, the lapping sound of water and my bodily rush of being there amidst the exchange.

The next afternoon I meet with the sonic artist, Tim and the Natural England Officer. The artist suggested we go to the harbour to collect recordings. Passing large earphones to each other, we sat watching fishermen, dogs and tourists. When wearing the earphones my experience is like a weave of sounds. Something much more stretched and fine than what we are looking at. After each of us take our turn, we talked about how we are surprised: ‘there is so much more going on’, we say, than we had previously been aware. In conversation we acknowledge a feeling of surprise.

A few days later the teenager and myself are asked by the performance artist to wear earplugs and not speak. She explained we were to go for a walk. Without planning where we were going we departed. Without speaking or making eye contact, we directed our journey through slight nudges. We walked from the school, through the village to the pub, behind The Priory, down to the beach facing St Cuthbert’s island along the pebble beach where I had participated in the first dance class, up to the graveyard at the side of St Mary’s Church, through the village and back to the school. In the afternoon we decided to repeat the walk. This time when we got down to the pebble beach we were met by water. The tide had come in. We hovered together before turning around to walk back the same way that we had arrived. When back at the school building myself (‘Assistant Planner’), the participant (‘Teenager’), theatre-performance director (‘Artist’) and resident (‘Photographer’) who had been commissioned to document a few of the workshops, sit round a table in the entrance to discuss our experience of meeting the water on our second walk. This was some of our exchange:

**Teenager:**

There was an obstacle. I was like, ‘oh no’. And I just imagined when it was still sand, and how you were just floating through it all.

**Assistant Planner:**

There was something I was thinking about when we did it the first time, when the tide was open. The island was really busy, the busiest I have experienced it. We were in a bubble, moving through all these people.
Artist:

But this time the island was closed and it was really quiet. The island had hugely changed because there was no one there.

T:

I could imagine all the people and who we had to dodge. That experience of remembering the last time you did it and how that changes those places are and every time I do that journey it changes. I just love that idea of that place that you have never been there before, and now it isn’t there. It’s like a book. We can’t physically get there now!

A:

It is really exciting it feels magical.

AP:

I really love the fact that we are going through this real process.

T:

It’s not like we are pretending, we are really trying to collaborate.

A:

That is really exciting and something that I hadn’t predicted. You share a version, and now we are really doing it and this is really exciting.

Photographer:

Sorry that I kept talking, but I can’t go through this village without saying ‘hello’!

T:

It probably looks like any other walk. All we were doing was walking.

AP:

The three of us just felt our way.
It was really great. Trying to re-walk the same walk. I wasn’t expecting it to be that different.

P:
I knew when you got to the bottom the tide was out. I could tell by your body language.

T:
There is so much going on, but it is really strange, because normally when you do something you expect everything to be the same; or us to act differently; but we were trying to be the same but the landscape was acting differently.

P:
I was behind you and I could see that you were shocked. I took the feet walking and you in the landscape as we went round.

A:
I love that idea of repeating something and trying to do it again.

T:
Trying to do it again and again and again. The landscape changes.

AP:
It feels, because of the tide, this island has such dramatic change.

P:
Well, we always say, ‘the strongest force is nature’.

For the final workshop we meet at the bird hide on the way to the castle. The artist distributes the drawing pads, pencils and charcoal she had asked me to get for the sessions. She asks us to choose a spot to sit and draw. I sit on grass with my back against a rock. In my notes I write that I am conscious I am looking out from the island but drawn to my surroundings. We walk back to the bird hide to paint what we have drawn.

Getting to know
Abram (2011, p. 39) suggests when presented as plans and other objects, planning knowledge gives the impression of being ‘dis-embodied’ from the planner person. As an academic-planner, the shop owner suggests I embark on a more embodied way of knowing. When walking (in boots) I document my trails through the landscape as ‘a rooting of the social in the actual ground of lived experience’ where ‘the earth we tread interfaces with the air we breathe’ (Ingold & Vergunst, 2008, p. 2). My writing is inspired by the immediacy of the lived experience.

I did not arrive on the island to press participatory workshops in to use. HIP’S interest was in developing some sort of art project with residents in support of engaging with planning island development. Residents did not want artists ‘parachuted’ in or to be told about art; but wanted to engage in artistic activities in support of exploration. Ingold (2013, p. 8) proposes we ‘regard art as a discipline which shares with anthropology a concern to reawaken our senses and to allow knowledge to grow from the inside in the unfolding of life’. The artistic research was collaboratively designed as an inquiry to get to know the island with and through art as unfolding from the inside of island life. The ‘art project’ developed as a way of exploring the island ‘from the island’s perspective’.

Informed by a consultation exercise, to facilitate discussion between the community and official agencies HIP produced an action plan. This plan defines landscape as an interactive area ‘perceived by people’ (HIP, 2011, p. 7). ‘Perception is primarily an act of adjustment of organism and environment’ (Dewey, 1910, p. 202). As the case in everyday living, adjustments appear throughout the ethnography. When arriving at my first B&B for example, I change my schedule in line with the tide. Later on, when we can’t get to the North Shore, we go to the pebble beach to dance instead. As the research progresses, rather than taking place in such obvious turn-around we notice more intimately scaled adjustments; footsteps making tracks in sand and sun marking skin. As the philosophy of inter-relation, in reading these micro-tales we are reminded of the way-we-make-human-nature.

Just prior to undertaking this fieldwork HIP activity had been focused on the development of a significant Heritage Lottery Fund bid. Authored by the Peregrine Lindisfarne Landscape Partnership Board (PLLPB), the resulting report, Peregrini Lindisfarne Landscape Conservation Action Plan (2013) outlined a series of twenty-two projects in service of a strategic vision: ‘to protect, restore, enhance and manage this special place […] by drawing on the community’s close connection with its landscape, seascape, heritage and history to make the area a better place to work, live, and visit’ (PLLPB, 2013, p. 10). In developing the bid the PLLPB ‘experienced historic distrust between the local community and “outside” agencies’ (PLLPB, 2013, p. 67). HIP report that competing perceptions, objectives and ideas caused tensions in the process.

That the ethnography tells an interactive story is perhaps commonplace; ‘but until they are commonly employed in their evidential [author’s emphasis] significance for a theory of nature’s nature, there is no cause to apologise for their citation’ (Dewey, 1929b/1958, p. 305). As HIP’s concerns with resident’s disconnection from development processes, we see that development plans and documents are not understood by residents as evidencing ‘nature’s nature’. Sophia does not think the plans account for the island’s ‘wild-ness’. The shopkeeper’s reading of the development strategy is one of telling people what to do on, rather than as part of, land. Without apology I therefore continue to explore relational ‘evidence’ by turning to the workshops: because art ‘solves more problems which have troubled philosophers and resolves more hard and fast dualisms than any other theme of thought’ (Dewey, 1929b/1958, p. 325). How can the workshops resolve the disembodied planning ‘problem’ of Holy Island?
In the workshops, participants perceive landscape in negotiation with nature’s nature. During the evening photography workshop, the teenage participant notes that she sees the landscape differently. Later in the week, when discussing the performance workshop she notes ‘strangeness’, saying: ‘Normally when you do something you expect everything to be the same or us to act differently but we were trying to be the same but the landscape was acting differently’. The sonic workshop participants acknowledge they are surprised by the relational complexity. In the dance workshop I talk of my own experience of perceiving the landscape as one of working-with; and note my feeling of being-in landscape whilst participating in the drawing and painting session. Participants get to know the landscape as ‘interior knowers’. Knowing is a series of transactions that changes reality; ‘the more knowing reveals this change, the more transparent, the more adequate, it is’ (Dewey, 1931/1963, p. 211). We can trace the workshops weaving alterations as a ‘knowing practice’.

Dewey proposes that art ‘throws off the covers that hide the expressiveness of experienced things; it quickens us from the slackness of routine and enables us to forget ourselves by finding ourselves in the delight of experiencing the world about us in its varied qualities and forms’ (1934, p. 208). The workshops throw off the covers. The transactional ‘evidence’ is revealed. Bodies are shown at work with landscape. Participants are found to be bedded in.

This article set out to explore the role of art in relation to the development of Holy Island. HIP’s priorities for development are focused around the themes of visitor management, landscape and communication and cohesion. In collaboration with residents and HIP officers the fieldwork was designed as a way to explore the island from the island’s perspective. By drawing on ethnographic episodes from the workshop programme, I propose that the artistic interventions can be understood as a way of getting to know landscape as a process in the making. As knowledge exchange the research is not only concerned with scholarly knowledge but action. So, what can be done with our knowledge of the work of art as revealing human-nature?

Island development: making a difference

In rural policy discourse the arts are most often discussed in terms of economic development narratives (Arts Council England, 2015). Over four days, around 200 people attended the ‘Island Perspectives’ exhibition. Feedback sheets show that attendees included participants, island residents and visitors. Encompassing visitors perhaps supports an economic argument: their purchase of lunch and accommodation surrounding their exhibition visit will contribute to the visitor economy. Perhaps I could also argue that the artworks could be sold or the images could support the development of an island income through printing postcards. These may be valid arguments, however by exploring the making of the exhibition there is a story of engagement to be told. By telling the story of the exhibition, we notice art is not contained as sonic or visual pictures of landscape; but works to reveal the workings of landscape. As a ‘knowing practice’ I therefore recommend we can understand artistic work as an ingredient of landscape planning.

What is the contribution of this research to island life? The doing of the workshops revealed the doing-ness of landscape. In planning practice, what difference might that make? The European Landscape Convention calls for a better understanding of the interactivity of landscape. To this end, in support of preparing future plans, this work provides evidence of the relational ‘nature of nature’. So, in support of those preparing plans, the type of artistic collaboration described here can provide experiential evidence as relational knowledge from which to move from. Although specifically
drawing on fieldwork in Holy Island the experiential nature of this article makes a novel contribution across rural planning practice.
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