

You were asking me what I thought of the project and I said it was very interesting. For a start there are many ways of looking at an audience. One is to make something very deliberately for a marketplace, knowing the market and making for it. It can be satisfying making with the audience primarily in mind. Another way is to design something for production. That can be challenging for the artist, or designer and it can involve other people along the way, but it is still definitely made for a marketplace. Sometimes market research tells you what is wanted. Other times you hope for the best, but nevertheless what you make is intended for sale.

But what you are talking about is how things are actually read. What comes into play when in understanding, or responding to something? That's a different aspect of 'audience'.

*The 'designer' is predicting the wants of the audience.*

Yes, many people make for a marketplace. But it can also be ridiculous. I remember a newspaper article a few years ago where the tax department was complaining about artists who were saying they weren't making a living. Someone in the tax department said, "Well go and do landscape. People always want landscapes". That's not the point, is it?

*They're talking about product.*

But you're talking more broadly about how things are responded to.

*The artists themselves respond as first readers.*

The question then is will theirs be the reading that applies to everybody?

*As a curator given total control of putting together a show, what would you look for?*

I would ask what other exhibitions have been put on here that led to wanting this one? Have you had glass exhibitions before? Is this a new area for this gallery, or is it the continuation of a long commitment to this field? What other exhibitions are on around the country that this one might complement, or just duplicate. Who is your audience? Is it a local, regional, or national audience? Is it going to tour? Is it going to attract the general public, or is it for artists specifically? Is the purpose the promotion of glass, or glass artists, or education of the general public? Is this to further people's careers, or provide some broader experience?

I'm involved in a glass exhibition project right now and we have had to ask those questions. The theme I'm suggesting isn't a grand survey. It's not an award. I'm suggesting it should be a lesser number of people with more works. What I'm proposing is we get people to provide three works showing the development of an idea. That will be supported with photographs of them and their workshop. With the discussion of their ideas will also be a discussion of process and how the process integrates with idea; how they come together. I don't believe in throwing something in and saying, here this is my great idea. You have to take into account why they want it, who it's for and what impact it is going to have.

For example let's imagine a regional gallery that may have had nothing to do with glass. As far as I know it has no education program for glass. I don't know if there are

any glass artists there. I don't know if any of their audience has the faintest idea of how any glass process works. I would do a totally different exhibition there from what I would suggest for the *JamFactory* for instance. There is a different purpose for a different audience.

In that regional gallery you would be trying to introduce people to artists, to processes, to ideas and to the enjoyment of glass. In the *JamFactory*, *The Glassworks*, or the *National Gallery* – places where you know there is an informed audience within the wider audience – then it would be a different task, a different purpose.

A curator isn't just somebody who comes along to do a temporary exhibition in a state funded gallery, a regional gallery, or a dealer gallery somewhere. The meaning of the word curator was originally a 'keeper' of collections. So there are also curators in institutions with collections. That's where I have spent a long time. It's quite a different task when you are responsible for a collection and its development, and for preparing exhibitions out of that collection. There is a difference between curating a one-off exhibition and being responsible for a collection.

I'm really interested in the interface between public collecting institutions and collectors who amass huge collections, lets say in glass, who then need to work out what to do with them. There are many issues that go with the assumption that they will just automatically go into a public gallery, holus bolus, and go on display all the time.

In this paper I'm going to give you (*Consumers and collections: Who for? Who to? What then?* Notes for panel discussion, Design Island, Tasmania 2008), I've talked about why people collect and why institutions collect, and what is possible at the interface between the two. There are points here that you can refer to. Collectors, for example, have pleasure in the objects. They like to have them around. They like an association with the people who make them. They sometimes support a very particular person or field. They might collect for the thrill of the chase, or for investment. There is the pleasure of ownership: 'having to have' something.

These collections can be extremely important, as well-researched records of particular people, movements and places, but sometimes they are quite idiosyncratic. Sometimes they would be a perfect complement to an existing public collection; sometimes they are not (or not in their entirety). Some people collect for reference, or research – think about contemporary glass artists who collect say '1950s Swedish' or Italian cane work, because it informs their own work. Therefore these collections can be very important if they are gifted to a public institution. Many famous museums are founded on very important private collections. If you are working in an institution, there will probably be an existing collection – and there are all sorts of institutions – from local, regional, state or specialist, focusing on a specific field (like glass), to large national museums.

Museums and galleries might draw on their collections for display in different contexts. While maintaining the integrity of the story of its making, glass may be brought out to show in a glass exhibition, but it might also contribute to something about science, or something about artists in Italy.

A curator has a responsibility to be aware of the particular context or focus of their institution. Whatever the size or reason for being, all collecting institutions have to have a collection policy. That includes taking into account why the institution is there and its

relationships to other institutions. If you as a curator are going to recommend an acquisition, it has to suit the policy of the institution, and what that institution hopes to do with the collection. If it takes anything in (whether a single object or a large collection) the institution has to be responsible for it over time.

So those curators have to know the collection and what is already in it, and have to know the field beyond the collection. They have to know the strengths and also know the gaps and try to fill them. Sometimes in one blow a collection or a particular object will perfectly fill a gap, but sometimes institutions can't take whole collections because of duplication, or because it might weight the collection in one way or another. If there isn't a collection policy there is the issue of the changing balance within the institution's purpose. Let's say a huge collection of ceramics or textiles was offered to a small museum that was focussing on works on paper. A curator in that case certainly has to go through that whole process of asking who is it for, why do we want it, what are we trying to say here, and can we continue to develop this new field?

The curatorial role in these instances isn't to do with personal preference. It is largely to do with being able to apply what you know of the subject area to what the institution is there for.

*An intellectual decision?*

It has to be an incredibly well informed one. Of course there has to be an aesthetic preference and an aesthetic judgement. That is determined by the curator's long experience. It also has to do with spending a whole lot of time talking to people the way I 'interrogated' you before this interview. That's what curators do. That's why I did that, because now I know where you are coming from.

*What would make an object appealing to you aesthetically?*

I'll step back. I'll go back to what is important to that institution. These points would apply to our first case study of the regional gallery. It's the issue of significance. Why is something significant? It may be significant because it is absolutely amazing to look at. However that may not be the only reason to bring it into a collection (private or public). It could be a beautiful thing, but a curator of temporary exhibitions and a curator of permanent collections has to ask why this thing might be significant. Is it the best of its kind? Is this the best work of this maker in my experience over time – of watching them go from 'go to whoa'? Is it the first of its kind; the last of its kind? Is it a turning point in a series? Is it the significance of the maker: this artist has been around for fifty years and has taught here and had shows there, but we don't have their work in the collection, that's shocking! We need this piece. It could be for the maker's work, or it could be for their leadership, or influence. It could be that it is not such a great piece, but that it represents that truly amazing person. It could be that this piece was owned by someone truly important in our history or society.

*It is context.*

Yes, absolutely. I'm thinking of silver that might come into a collection from the eighteenth, or nineteenth century. It could be like any other set of silver knives and forks made in Birmingham, but if it was owned by a Governor of New South Wales – then it has a different significance. It could be the significance of the owner who commissioned it. It could be the conceptual significance of what it says, or the

brilliance of how it is made. This work may be saying something that we have never seen before in glass: this is something that has never happened in this way and could only be done in glass. It may be a new technology; this is the first work that was seen to use this technique.

There is also the level of documentation. If something comes in and you have no idea what it is, although it may look beautiful and you may guess at some things, it is really important to actually be able to say that this object was made by this artist at that date. He was working for blah-de-blah. It represents this and because of that it is significant.

Provenance, or the object's history of ownership, is important. As a curatorial colleague said once, you can only take so many 1920s beaded wedding dresses. The ones we want are where there is also a story to tell: where we know who designed them, who made them and the people who wore them, preferably with photographs of the person wearing it.

If I go into a gallery and I see a wonderful work, yes, I will acknowledge that as a first response, but it is an informed first response. I will know that I am saying that because I know what glass is and I know what it can do. I know something about blowing, about kiln working and casting and about flame working. I know enough about surface decoration to know what I am looking at. I know who key players are in Australia and around the world in most of those areas. I usually have a fair idea about where it is coming from, say Italian glass or Swedish glass, or American – or Australian. So my initial response might be, "Wow! It's great", or "That doesn't look so interesting", but I always, always, always want to know more about it because I want to know if it is a terrible work of a famous person who has gone off the boil a bit, or it's actually the best work of an emerging person who is clearly going to go somewhere. It might be the continuation of a long thoughtful project; it might be a copy. The same kind of piece could mean something completely different, depending on its context and the information you have about it.

So I always like information. I hate awards where there is blind judging. I always like to have a CV. I always like to read what the maker says they think they are doing. That is, not only their idea but also what they say about their working of the materials. Like you, I believe they go together. I do not believe in just looking at objects and making snap judgements.

It is understanding the work. It's associated with the work. I have been in blind judging; I judged a ceramic award a long time ago where I thought that one piece looked like so and so from [...]. It appeared to be quite a good work of hers. Then I discovered it was someone who had done a workshop with her a couple of months before and who had submitted a competent a rip-off.

The argument against blind judging is that, knowing who it is, you will give awards to the people you know – your friends or people who have a high profile. I actually think it works the other way. You can overcompensate in favour of those you don't know in order to be fair. Also, you always know half the works and their makers, so you may as well know the other half. I think it has to do with objectivity and responsibility, as well as having an informed aesthetic position. My personal preference might only be for blue glass, or blown glass, or vessels, but I wouldn't be much of a curator either for a temporary exhibition in a regional or commercial gallery, or a curator in a major institution or award, if I let my personal preference govern everything that came into

the collection, or went into exhibitions. You have to be objective. That is why I will not answer a question about 'my favourite work'.

The first crafts award I ever judged was in New Zealand and it was a long time ago. It was across all media, which made it even harder. Since that experience, I now always go into an exhibition and mentally decide which one I *think* is the best – not just the one that I *like* best. I'll choose one piece and give myself a reason for it. I will make myself make a judgement and make myself give a reason for it, but no one will know.

*That will be based in the context of what you know about the person's work?*

Yes. Where they come from and where they seem to be going.

Referring to your question about categories: immediately you say, well it's blown, or it's kiln work, or flame work. It's sculpture, or it's vessels. It's out of Canberra, or it's out of Sydney College, or out of the JamFactory. It's American, or it's Japanese. There are lots of categories – established person/emerging person.

*You use your knowledge to place the work?*

That doesn't mean that I don't have a personal aesthetic response, because I do of course. That is why we are in this field, because we like these things and we like the people. That's equally important to me; it's why I am involved. We are talking about objects, but for me it's the reasons for them being made. What drives the people to make them? How are they doing it? What's their interaction with the material? I love the way craftspeople interact with their material.

*But you could still look at a work and say it's good or it's bad?*

Significant still means significant, which includes whether or not it 'works'. Maybe that can come down to good or bad, but I don't often use those terms. I do look at formal elements like the shape, like the texture, like the skill of the decoration, as well as try getting some grasp on the concept. I know some people deliberately make things badly (and you have to know whether that's deliberate or not).

I often look at something and think that person has come a long way; it's truly beautifully made; it's a difficult process, or it's a brilliant simple solution – but it just doesn't quite work as it hits the table. It's too heavy, or it's too light. It's too something. It just doesn't quite do it. It's doesn't seem to work for one reason or another. Or it does – brilliantly!

The thing I'm always suspicious of is the artist's statement that says, "My work speaks for itself", because it damn well doesn't. It doesn't. Except at a superficial level, it only speaks for itself if whoever is looking at it has the same language. Then you can hear it speaking.

*You're talking as though the work has only one thing to say.*

That's right. What makes me really crabby in reading a thesis, or an artist's statement, is where the writer, or the student, or the artist will say 'the viewer responds by blah-de-blah, the viewer has the feeling that..., the viewer recognises that...something'. I just have to say, "It is not up to you to say what the viewer feels. You can say what you *hope* the viewer can feel, what you *intend* the viewer to feel, what *you* may feel, but

can't say with certainty is that the viewer experiences this". A reviewer might say that from the point of view of a reviewer. An artist's statement can't say that the viewer responds warmly to this 'whatever'. The artist might *hope* so, but they can't know.

It is very interesting. I'm working on a project for the Bundanon Trust. It's about Arthur Boyd's ceramics, and the ceramics of his father, Merric. The relationship between the two is a ripping yarn. Arthur made a large number of paintings and prints about his father in a series called 'The Potter'. He also brought in many elements from his paintings: figures from biblical and mythological stories, the symbols of burning chimneys and outstretched figures from the Second World War, and his father's illness. He puts them all together into strange hybrid figures and beasts, with butterflies and sheafs of flowers, watchers and lovers. Everyone writing about him, including myself, tries to work out what all these strange configurations might mean. Then you come across a little statement by Arthur that says, "Of course you might see these things, but they don't mean anything unless the person looking at it brings a story to it. And of course you do. It is the reader that has to make those readings".

*We are talking cultural context?*

We are. So regarding the notion of the object speaking for itself, take Arthur Boyd's 'Potter' paintings. You might know about Merric's black boots and Peter the Dog, what the butterflies are and what the 'RamOx' might mean. Or you can see something happening at the most basic level, things that are put together for some reason and you simply wonder what it is and bring your own experience to it. The artist can't necessarily be sure of the same reading from everyone.

*Is your strongest response intellectual or visceral?*

It's the presence of the work. I respond to how it appears. But it's more than that. It is how it makes you feel. I don't think I can separate visual from emotional; then there is the intellectual, or informed response alongside. It may be that we are so embedded, for example, in our familiarity with vessels, paintings, or various forms that you can't extract that knowledge from a first response. A vessel may have that feeling of containing something, so your first response may simply to do with form, but it could be the surface, the colour, the way the light behaves in it. It could be its size, its fragility. It could be to do with whether that form is associated with utility or ritual or contemplation. I don't think I can separate visual from emotional really.

That is the first response. Then I always say, oh who is this? What do they say about the work? Where is it coming from? Where is more work by this person? It is very difficult to separate an emotive response from the accumulated cultural readings you bring to it. I know it's glass, not ceramic. I know it's not textile. It's not metal. At its most basic level there is recognition of a language. I don't think just a basic emotional response can be separated out of that, but it doesn't then follow that all of those things I have said about context and significance means that you can't be wildly responsive when something moves you.

*What draws you into a work?*

Depends what it is. I'll tell you a few things that get in the way. Those are devices that turn works into something else, like 'framing' textiles. Textiles can be for wearing, or wrapping, or covering, and yes, they can also go on walls as well as floors. However,

the minute they are framed, to me they become a painting. It changes the meaning, or its status to put something in a frame. It presents it as something it may not have been in the first place. It makes me uneasy.

Another thing that sometimes happens is with works on plinths or stands. Plinths can imply of the work 'I am an important piece of sculpture'. It doesn't necessarily say 'I will fall over if I don't have this thing to hold on to'. You might remember when sculpture stopped using plinths. That was quite astonishing to see them just standing there. Putting glass on stands can turn them into something else; the stand gets 'read' as well, and can detract from the reading of the glasswork. Both have to be considered together.

*In the early seventies what did glass emerge as?*

It was emerging as part of the crafts movement. That was to do with coming out of the factories and making individual studio pieces in studios. I believe there was a strong idealism about the artist as an expressive individual, which was largely an American ideal. It was partly to do with the ethos of America, that individuals could make it 'on their own'. The crafts were, on the one hand, keen on the anonymity of what they meant, but at the same time they wanted 'dealer' galleries. They wanted to be artists.

Potters started to work like that, the textile people, the jewellers, but glass was left out because it needed teams of people in factories. Until they started to develop the technology where people could work on their own, glass people couldn't be 'expressive individuals'.

You can only go so far working on your own, in your own studio. You do need other people to work with, particularly blowers. As we know, it was Marquis and Chihuly who were among the first studio glass artists to go to Venice and say; "Hey these people do it in teams, that's all right".

What was happening in the seventies was that glass was becoming part of that broader crafts movement and people wanted to become studio glass people. Some came out of factories, like Julio Santos and Peter Minson. Others came out of ceramics, like Stephen Skillitzi. Others just started, following their example.

*It seemed that glass 'value added'.*

I think that happened especially in places such as America, where collectors have money and enjoy the thrill of the chase. Glass is expensive. Those collectors have been hugely supportive of glass artists. Glass artists have been able to do things they would never be able to do without the support of that rich and entrepreneurial market place. However this marketplace has been distorting as well, I think. Glass became a collector's commodity, although I'm sure they wouldn't see it that way.

*Is that moving it into the realm of a finer art?*

That's what they wanted. That's why they called it 'glass art'

*The labelling is important?*

Yes. Absolutely. I think there was a strong push by rich collectors, as well as artists, to be part of the art world. But you can't actually force that to happen. The art world decides what's art, and what art 'is', changes. I know glass artists who make one-off pieces and also make their living from production work, but they don't dare talk about the production work when the collectors are there because the collectors don't want to know that their artists are making production work.

*So they present themselves as 'artists'.*

Yes. The support of 'art glass' has been immensely important in enabling people to continue their work, but you wonder if it is a false marketplace.

What happens to those collections in terms of public institutions? At its extreme, they collectors have the money to build whole wings, in which to put their entire personal collection (which may represent a very personal view). They often want it on display the whole time. They'll fund curatorships and scholarships.

I think collectors tend to be very specific about what they are interested in. There is a huge new art museum going up in Hobart, funded by a very rich man who is contributing very much to the broader art scene in Tasmania. But the theme of his own collection, in his purpose-built museum, is Old and New Art, and the new art focuses (he says) on sex and death. Collectors can indulge in whatever preference they like. I think some like to be across the board and have the most significant people they know of across the country, or across the world. Others are quite specific about what they want.

*Are the buyers buying a 'mythology' that's created around the works?*

To a large extent that's true. These people (glass artists) are very, very good at what they are doing. It's fantastic work, but it is actually catering for a specific market. They may not be, for example, putting their work in public buildings, or in the domestic marketplace. People criticise Chihuly for the extent of his production, but Chihuly has done some amazing things. He has put glass in gardens, in public buildings, in opera houses and he has worked with teams of people to do it. I don't blame him for identifying work that he has got his team to make, as his own. There are many artists now in textiles, ceramics and metal who are contracting out part of the process, but it is still their work.

*Do the magazines add to these 'stories' created around work?*

Yes, and also exhibition catalogues, promotional brochures and now websites of various kinds. We need a range of different kinds of publications. Do you know the two ceramic magazines, *Ceramic Art and Perception* and *Ceramic Technical*? Janet Mansfield ran them for twenty years and she has just sold them; they are continuing well in an international coverage for this field. I find that of the two, *Art and Perception* is talking of ceramics as objects. It's exhibition and gallery information about ideas and objects. The other one is not just technical, it is also cultural. Stories of new experiences for people, how they have responded to being in the middle of China, how they have responded to a particularly new technology, where their research is taking them and how that affects others. I find myself equally interested in this because it has to do with relationships and context again I suppose.

Coming to grips with studio glass again, it was much harder to establish individual studios in glass than it was in most other areas I believe. In the seventies Marquis and Boysen were invited here to work and demonstrate, and people got started. The Australia Council was very supportive of the crafts. There was a Crafts Board and they had a review of glass, which resulted in bringing international exhibitions and makers. There was quite a push, to just to bring glass up to where everything else was. Have you got a copy of the craft enquiry of 1973? I think it was noticed in there that there were hardly any individuals anywhere working in glass.

I converted my 1992 book (*The Crafts Movement in Australia: A History*) into a PhD thesis and it needed a more specific argument and a title. I called the thesis *Truth or Trap: the Crafts Movement's Pursuit of Art Ideals*. The conclusion was the pursuit of art ideals from the sixties is very important. It was liberating. It was encouraging. It developed new galleries. It developed new collectors. It developed all sorts of new ideas with craftspeople, but was also a trap because in the pursuit of art ideals many of them denied relationships with for example, design and industry; it denied all sorts of other connections. These got dropped off along the way.

Art is not really the only way to go. Glenn Adamson in his new book, *Thinking through Craft*, seems to me to still measure the crafts in the context of art, despite his championing of the field. He hasn't really considered the other relationships that craftspeople can have, and the other forms of measurement of value. That's why I did the *Smart Works* exhibition, which is to do with design and the handmade. That is, it's to do with people who like to make 'one-off' works, but also want to explore possibilities for production.

*This pursuit of the label 'art' is quite strong in glass.*

Yes, it is interesting how some people call themselves 'ceramic artist', or 'glass artist', or 'textile artist'. Some like to identify as craftspeople; others will call themselves designers. There was a whole period in the eighties where people were talking about 'cultural production', 'cultural workers' and 'art workers'. People moved back from being artists. There are some people who still like to call themselves 'potters' or 'glass blowers' or 'weavers'.

*Or they just call themselves artists.*

There are various reasons for using generic terms like 'artist', such as in an organisation like Australia Council where 'artists' also means performers and writers. There is a new term, 'creative industries', that everyone is using at the moment. 'Creative industries' is wonderful generic term used across art forms; however when you really look into it, it tends to emphasise the sale of intellectual property rather than the making of the work in the first place. I am a bit nervous sometimes about how people leap into these new terminologies without checking to see how they are being applied – especially just as the government is announcing all its new 'creative innovation' strategies.

I gave a paper (which came out of 'Smart Works' really) at a meeting in Melbourne; it talks about some of the issues to do with creative industries and innovation as they might affect makers. (Check articles in 'Craft culture 2008' on the Craft Victoria website.)

*And you have your aesthetic judgement.*

Yes, and one of the nice things about getting older is that you have experience to draw on. Everyone takes their own experience – and understandings and judgements – to whatever exhibition or studio they might visit. A curator often has a broad context of relationships that might cross other fields: education, organisations, whole parallel worlds in other fields such as ceramics and woodwork, or textiles and jewellery where you might be able to see relationships with what's going on in glass. Responses to work change only in that, let's say, I chose a work for a collection in 1990 that was the most significant example of something or somebody at a particular time. Looking at it now, nineteen years later, you don't measure it only against today, you measure it still as being a really important piece of its time. It may still be a classic, but you read it both from now, and from then.

*If you are looking at a piece from the 1960s, you bring the 1960s with it?*

If you look at one of those pieces Stephen Skillitzi made in 1972 in Woolloomooloo, it's really significant for what it is. You can't possibly compare it directly with a piece from now, because the circumstances were different.

*Because it brings it's historical context with it, but if it just appeared on this table now without that history?*

Then you might say: "God, that looks like a piece of seventies glass", [laughs] and then you look for what is written underneath or find out more about it. You find it is valid; it has its place in time.

*Looking at the final question on presenting a work?*

It has to be presented in a way that does it justice. It may be what it is sitting on. It may be the way the light comes into it, or behind it. It may be the height. It may be whether it's crowded or whether it is isolated. So the physical presentation definitely affects it. If it is high up on a shelf and you can't see it, or it's too low. The physical presentation is a primary consideration.

Then there is information. That might be a changing screen with images of the workshop and certainly information. Also, the artist talking about it – it is interesting to hear what artists say about their work. Sometimes you look at a catalogue and they never mention how they made it, physically. You spent a long time telling me about the importance of relationship between the conceptual idea and the process of working. Often all of what is written is poetic and there is no idea of what is being done.

Again I think this is about art being seen to do with intellect and not technique, but of course it can be both. I remember standing in front of a Tom Roberts painting in the Art Gallery of NSW and the people around me were saying, but how did he do it? People love knowing about the process – and skill, as well as imagination. I like people to talk about the interaction of their ideas with the material.

*But you are not there being stopped by the sheer cleverness of the technique?*

Exactly, but I would say all of these people [2007 Ranamok catalogue] have a relationship with the material. That's why they work with it.

The crafts have been criticised by visual artists as being only to do with skill and not being to do with ideas and imagination. I would dispute that for a start. Glass in particular is often called seductive, that the material itself is seductive. I think that is a positive thing, but it has been used in a critical way as meaning being able to get by because it is seductive without actually being 'good' art.

*Its 'prettiness' can be a trap.*

Yes and perhaps that's why we have many people in here [Ranamok catalogue] only talking about their ideas, proving that they are making intellectual statements. I think a painter can equally say something about material. Arthur Boyd talks about the pleasure of putting the paint on. He acknowledges that. As well, there are clearly conceptual things going on in the work.

Makers still talk about their craft. Novelists still talk about their craft. Scriptwriters talk about their craft and it is about knowing how to do something really well. It doesn't mean craftspeople don't have ideas and imagination.

*Why then is it a term of condescension?*

Which century was it that the intellect got separated from the physical process? The Western world separated them and never got over it. Status. I'm fascinated with the slow food movement. How people just love to make food. They will spend forever just making pasta or dishes that take considerable preparation and slow cooking. People are making their own clothes again. These are acknowledgements of people wanting to know how to do something really well, and that have meaning for them.

I was sitting on a plane the other day and a young Japanese woman came in, very smart, very exotic, and out of her bag she pulled knitting needles. She spent two hours working stitch by stitch. I have a friend who works at a museum and he is an electronics expert. He knows all there is to know about electronics and he runs all the electronics in the exhibitions and other projects. He is Scot and his granny taught him to knit by hand. What he is truly fascinated by are 1970s, 1980s knitting machines. He spends all his time understanding the technology, interpreting the patterns and developing his own. He will do samples; samples of this tension and that tension, this yarn and that, this rib and that rib. I love the contrast of somebody who is an expert in both electronics and with a knitting machine.

*He is playing the technology like a harp.*

Absolutely.