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“I wasn’t crying about mothers,” he said rather indignantly. “I was crying because I couldn’t get my shadow to stick on. Besides, I wasn’t crying.”

Peter Pan
ABSTRACT

Heritage as Process: Constructing the Historical Child’s Voice Through Art Practice

David Harvey describes heritage as a ‘process’ that is not inert and takes place in the present (2010). In heritage practices there are opposing discourses and positions. Artists add another voice to the discourses of heritage and have been described as ‘critical figure[s] in the heritage process’ (Howard, 1998) because they present institutional critique, craft new heritage, and open up ‘Authorised Heritage Discourse’ (Smith, 2006). The role of the artist in this process is explored through practice and the critique of works by artists, including: Corin Sworn, Andrea Fraser, and Danh Vo. This study challenges how art and artists are used in heritage practices, and proposes that artworks that have not been commissioned by heritage institutions can still be used to critique the processes of heritage.

The study focuses on historical biographies at the Foundling Museum in London: a ‘museum of childhood’ (Harris, 2013). In current heritage practice, children are regarded as passive and their role is ‘obscured’ (Smith, 2013). In the Foundling Museum there is a tension of ownership that stems from the lack of separation between the histories of children and the history of childhood. Often, the adult voice is represented rather than that of the child. Children are often voice-less in the preservation of their history, as this process is generally undertaken by adults on behalf of the children or ‘perhaps for their childhood selves’ (Smith and Pascoe, 2013). Many scholars still fail to differentiate histories of children, which concern actual practices of young people, from histories of childhood that are ideological concepts adults hold of children.

This study explores how the voice of the child might be ‘found’ or reconstructed, using art practice as a form of interrogation. The facilitation of workshops with contemporary children provided material to construct the historical child’s voice. The workshops explored the children’s empathetic engagement to the foundlings through role-play and art making; alongside examining the boundaries of freedom and control. Field notes were employed as a method of documentation and critical analysis when photography of children was not permitted due to ethical considerations. Finally, curation of situated artworks were employed as a method to test the communication of the historical voice in the museum.
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INTRODUCTION

I face a collection of small objects that are exhibited behind glass, tilting upwards, floating. I read captions that tell me that they are the ‘foundling tokens’. They range from engraved coins, swatches of fabric, items of jewellery, handwritten poems, to small everyday items, such as a thimble and a hazelnut.

These small hand-sized objects are exhibited in the Foundling Museum in London and form part of the Foundling Hospital History. From 1741, upon entry of their child to the hospital, a mother (or, in rare cases, a father) was asked to ‘affix on each child some particular writing, or other distinguishing mark or token, so that the children may be known thereafter if necessary’. The tokens were part of the admissions process to the hospital and used as an identifier if a family member returned to reclaim their child.

When looking at the tokens in the Foundling Museum, I am drawn to the spaces in-between the tokens, the gap between the object and its shadow (an illusion created by plastic supports and spotlights) and the distance between myself, the glass, and the object. I recall J. M. Barrie’s Peter Pan, how Peter lost his shadow, but once found, Wendy stitched the shadow back onto Peter’s feet. While housed in this display, the tokens remain detached from their shadows and their individual owner; displayed in a grid format, like a collection of butterflies that have been

pinned down, they become one rather than many. Butterfly collecting was popular in the Victorian age, and it was at this time that the foundling tokens were first exhibited. But unlike the butterflies, the tokens are unified by their original purpose rather than similarity in material quality.

Beside the display of the tokens is a small LCD screen that presents a selection of digital captions. By swiping sideways, you can view the tokens (enlarged, with detail) while reading their accompanying narratives. I hesitated over the image of a ring with a red heart-shaped stone that was inscribed with the words ‘qui me neglige me perd’, the words would have been pressed against the skin, ‘he who neglects me loses me’. It was miniature, worn on a child’s finger perhaps. According to the caption, this token belonged to Harriet Littleton, who was renamed Harriott Woodhall on admission, and recorded as ‘discharged’. The museum text suggests that the child might have been claimed, or more likely, she had a disability and could not find an apprenticeship. ‘Harriet’s fate is yet to be discovered’. Harriet remains unreachable. Could I repair what had been broken, like Wendy mending Pan’s shadow?

The Foundling Museum is a ‘museum of childhood’, but there is a tension of ownership that stems from the lack of separation between the histories of children and the history of childhood. Often the biographies of adults are represented in the museum rather than that of the child. Previous exhibitions at the Foundling Museum maintained giving privilege to the narratives of Thomas Coram, the mothers, the major art donors, hospital governors, or foundlings as adults; the foundlings are ‘framed’ as childhood rather than as children.

The French historian Philippe Ariès argues that childhood is a social construction created by modern society, and that in medieval society, ‘childhood did not exist’. People were ‘differentiated only by their place in the division of labour’. Of all social groups which formed societies of the past, ‘children, seldom seen and rarely heard in the document, remain for

2 In 1858, when the children who were associated with the tokens were no longer living, the Governors took the decision to open the billets so that a number of the tokens could be put on display. This effectively separated the links between token and child. No records were kept and the majority of the tokens became ‘orphans’.
historians the most elusive, the most obscure’. 7 Carolyn Steedman expands on this, building on the search for an absent historical child as a search for an internalised self:

The search is not the historian’s alone. The search is for the self and the past that is lost and gone; and some of the ways in which, since the end of the eighteenth century, the lost object has come to assume the shape and form of the child. 8

Children are rarely vocal in the preservation of their heritage: rather, this process is generally undertaken by adults, on behalf of the children, ‘but perhaps for their childhood selves’. 9 The ‘voice’ of the historical child – the foundling children from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries – is not vocalised in the museum.

‘Voice’ can be physiological, philosophical, and political. In historical research, the physical voice of historical people is absent. One cannot speak to or hear the people from the past but through letters, diaries and writing from the time; one may imagine their voices. Often historians aim to ‘give a voice’ to historical figures who have been mis- or under represented. It is a term used in creative writing to refer to the voice of the author, character, and the narrator; each of these are layered in the creation of a unified narrative.

I seek to explore if art might ‘give a voice’ to historical figures, with particular interest in the under-represented ‘voice’ of the child. Museum captions may include ‘statements by artists or critics, but their voice is the single, disembodied voice of the museum’, 10 this unified ‘voice’ is what Laurajane Smith terms ‘Authorised Heritage Discourse’. 11 I am trying to find the historical voice of the 18th century foundling children, their voice has been obscured by historical documentation 12 and remains silent in heritage discourse – as Smith observes, heritage ‘alienates a range of other cultural and social experiences’ whose identities ‘are often obscured or devalued’. 13

12 This is explored in the chapter ‘Single and Multiple Voice’ where I draw on the writing of historian Michel de Certeau. He writes how administrative powers in the documentation of situations ‘tidy up’ speech, and this leads to a ‘ghosting’ — or erasure.
Heritage is not only a social and cultural process, it is also political where a range of struggles are faced; such as the decision of who and what historical narrative is represented in a museum, when there are often restrictions such as funding, space, and artefacts. Analysing who is included in an exhibition can help to illuminate motives in the museum and nationally. An example of the interplay of politics and curating was seen in the Indigenous Australia exhibition at the British Museum in 2015. The Museum was criticised for downplaying the brutal treatment of the people, and the acquisition of particular objects and figures from the Aborigine resistance, such as Jandamarra. This decision to ‘hide’ particular narratives is problematic when matters of repatriation in the museum are ongoing debates.

In museums, historical people can be presented as ‘characters’ that can be used to engage visitors at a historical site. Characters can be a tool for empathy, but can contribute to a ‘spotlight effect’ that leads you to focus on one individual rather than a number of people. It also refers to a person in a novel, play, or film; a part played by an actor. During this thesis, I will use terms and references from theatre and performance, since the performer is linked to character and authenticity; the material reality of the performer, and the immaterial emotional response.

This is a practice-based study – to which art practice is central – and this is explored through making, exhibiting, and testing. Artists work in museums, but often their engagement is framed and limited when they are required to deliver the needs of the institution. I will question the role of artistic practice in heritage, both in and outside of the museum.

14 This exhibition is discussed further in the chapter ‘Single and Multiple Voice’.
16 The term ‘character’ was used during the panel discussion at the annual Heritage Consortium Conference at the Heritage Quay in May 2015. Lisa O’Neill was advising the Collection Manager at Hardwick Hall to use Lady Arbella Stuart as a ‘character’ to increase visitor numbers.
This research is led by the following aims:

I. To explore how art practice might communicate the historical person’s ‘voice’ and examine the value of multiple ‘voices’ in the museum.  

II. To analyse the representation of the historical child in the museum and to explore how art practice and workshops with children might capture the voice of the child instead of the institutionalised history of childhood.  

III. To understand and analyse the representation of the individual or ‘character’ in contemporary museum practices.

A contextual review follows this introduction, which outlines the heritage field and describes examples of representation in museums, leading to a discussion on how art practice contributes to heritage – both in and outside of the museum – and how can this be built upon. The following chapters present results from stages of art practice and research that address the research aims: ‘Single and Multiple Voice’, ‘Freedom and Control’, ‘Empathy and Over-Identification’, before concluding with a discussion on the complexity of care and contributions made to knowledge.

From this point onwards I use various fonts to draw attention to other voices that arise in the text. My own voice is typeset in the serif typeface ‘Perpetua’ and the child’s voice is in ‘Joanna’, shaded a rusty brown both for visibility and to remind the reader of the foundling children’s uniforms. The voice of the museum or heritage practitioner (a museum curator, for example) is typeset in ‘gill sans light’.

---

18 I refer to the voices of the historical person, the artist, and the museum, for example.
CHAPTER ONE

HERITAGE AND CHILDHOOD

1.1. Heritage

Heritage is a word derived from the Old French eritage, ‘that which may be inherited’, and from the Latin word for ‘heir’, 19 heres, a person entitled to property or rank on the predecessor’s death. The term is synonymous with manifestations of the past.20 It refers to the inheritance of intangible memories, such as rituals and folklore, and the tangible culture of artefacts and landscapes. Heritage as a field of study arose during the 1980s, and academic enquiry has increased since the establishment of the Association of Critical Heritage Studies manifesto in 2012.21 Though heritage is a comparatively new academic discipline, it is not a new phenomenon. In ‘Heritage Pasts and Heritage Presents’, David Harvey writes that it is a human condition to preserve the past.22 Drawing on David Lowenthal’s comparison of this act of preservation to concepts of nostalgia,23 Harvey writes that heritage is a ‘selective portrayal contingent on present-day requirements, thereby reflecting a sense of nostalgia towards the heritage heroes of yesteryear’.24

Svetlana Boym writes that in the mid-nineteenth century ‘nostalgia’ became institutionalised in foundations and museums.25 In her essay ‘Nostalgia and its Discontents’, Boym discusses how the industrialisation of the mid-nineteenth century fuelled the need for institutions – such as national and provincial museums – as if ‘the ritual of commemoration could help to patch up the irreversibility of time’.26 Boym discusses the intertwined nature between heritage and nostalgia –is there heritage without nostalgia? – she suggests that nostalgia can be used to

19 A person entitled to property or rank on the predecessor’s death.
24 Harvey, Heritage Pasts and Heritage Presents, p. 337.
26 Ibid.
critique heritage and illuminate its mechanisms. Nostalgia can be perceived as a subjective past. Film theorist Rachel Moore views nostalgia as a space of ‘in betweeness’ where the past and present are brought together. Heritage practice also seeks to bring the two together by making the past accessible in the present, but there are differences between the two: Moore regards the process in nostalgia as ‘inflammatory’, but this does not necessarily exist in heritage discourse.

Poet and academic, Susan Stewart defines nostalgia as:

A sadness without an object […] It remains behind and before that experience. Nostalgia, like any form of narrative, is always ideological: the past it seeks has never existed except as narrative, and hence, always absent that past continually threatens to reproduce itself as a felt lack […] longing for an impossibly pure context of lived experience at a place of origin.

Stewart’s writing on nostalgia could be compared to the motivations behind this study. I began with the feeling of ‘lack’, that there was a sadness without the ‘object’. Perhaps nostalgia could be likened to the search for the historical child.

Harvey describes heritage as a ‘process’ that is not inert. It takes place in the present, ‘people engage with it, re-work it, appropriate it and contest it (…) it is part of the way identities are created.’ Heritage academic and principal investigator for Heritage Futures at UCL, Rodney Harrison states that heritage is a ‘creative engagement with the past in the present (that) focuses our attention on our ability to take an active and informed role in the production of our own future’. It is this process that separates heritage from history.

Lowenthal writes:

Heritage should not be confused with history. History seeks to convince by truth, and succumbs to falsehood. Heritage exaggerates and omits […] Heritage uses historical traces and tells historical tales […] Historians aim to reduce bias; heritage sanctions and strengthens it.

30 Harvey, Heritage Pasts and Heritage Presents, p. 320.
Heritage is a cultural process that identifies things and places that are deemed to have ‘value’. Harrison describes it as part of a ‘regime of care’, drawing on the words to curate and assemble. He divides the different fields of practice in heritage-making as follows:

- Categorising (identifying, documenting, nominating, listing, recovering, enumerating);
- Curating (collecting, selecting, attributing value);
- Conserving (caring, preserving, storing, archiving, managing);
- Communicating (using, interpreting, exhibiting).

But what about the ‘process’ of making heritage that the visitor produces? What about acts of remembering, engaging, performing, experiencing? Harrison does not include visitors as part of the heritage-making process. The fields he lists are industry-focussed with trained persons undertaking the action. How then do we see the role of people and non-experts as part of the heritage process?

In the present day, the past is labelled as ‘heritage’ when it is selected to become part of the conservation and management of the heritage industries. This curation of material treasures reflects contemporary cultural values, social debates, and aspirations, rather than those of the past. In the museum, these artefacts are the subject of museological interpretation, and heritage practitioners form a dialogue with an artefact to aid the communication of history. This entails teaching museum visitors a version of history that has been constructed with fragments of the past.

In museum and heritage communication, historical people are sometimes presented as ‘characters’. Individual biography is employed, using the singular to represent the multiple, with the hope of aiding universal communication, but running the danger of creating stereotypes. A contemporary example, the Family At Wartime exhibition at the Imperial War Museum.

---

35 Smith, The Uses of Heritage, p. 11.
38 Items in museum, gallery, and archive collections.
39 Harvey, Heritage Pasts and Heritage Presents, p. 320.
40 The term ‘character’ used during the panel discussion at the annual Heritage Consortium Conference at the Heritage Quay in May 2015. Lisa O’Neill was advising the Collection Manager at Hardwick Hall to use Lady Arbella Stuart as a ‘character’ to increase visitor numbers.
Museum, opens with an accurate miniature model of the Allpress family home, thus positioning the family as characters in a doll’s house. Audio recordings of the Allpress family reminiscing about their childhood are displayed alongside contemporaneous household items though these objects are not the family’s possessions, a fact that is not made apparent in the display. The decision to display these artefacts alongside the Allpress oral histories presents one particular family as a representation to understand the experience of many London-based families during the Blitz. This was the intention of the museum, which describes the exhibition as allowing visitors to ‘discover how ordinary Londoners faced challenges of life at home during the Second World War through the story of the Allpress family’. Although there is a charm to using one family to ‘humanise’ the display, the presentation could be perceived as reductive and problematic because it uses a singular experience to represent the multiple. The portrayal could create a distorted version of the past that leads to a misinterpretation of history, which I will explore in the chapter ‘Single and Multiple Voice’.

1.1.1. Heritage Discourse

The current representation of historical people as ‘characters’ is an example of what could be perceived as a mechanism of ‘Authorised Heritage Discourse’ (referred to simply as AHD in heritage literature). Laurajane Smith identified this discourse in *The Uses of Heritage* published in 2006 – a book that I will return to throughout this thesis – and since then it has been prevalent in heritage research. Authorised Heritage Discourse may be used to establish a national identity and alienate a range of other social experiences, such as erasing women, ethnic communities, indigenous communities, and working class and labour histories. The

---

42 Smith, *The Uses of Heritage*, p. 44.
43 Laurajane Smith is a co-author of the ACHS manifesto, the editor of the *International Journal of Heritage Studies* and is part of the ACHS executive committee. Until 2015, Smith was the President of the ACHS. In 2016, Tim Winter took over this role.
discourse is tied to the idea that heritage is ‘bounded’\textsuperscript{48} and contained in objects or sites. It draws attention to particular narratives, objects, and sites. In so doing, it gives ‘voice’ to selected historical narratives that are deemed important but silences others – by not allowing them ‘space’ in the museum, for example.

Smith argues that Authorised Heritage Discourse legitimises, without question, the authority of spokespersons and expertise. A contemporary example is English Heritage,\textsuperscript{49} which focusses on caring for the past so that it can be passed on to ‘future generations for their “education”’.\textsuperscript{50} Tourist studies researcher Keith Hollinshead observes that Authorised Heritage Discourse is a form of ‘social control’\textsuperscript{51} that constructs visitors to heritage sites and museums as passive. It is a model that presents heritage as complete and unchanging, and as a consequence it obscures the power relations that support a particular view.

In comparison, the Association of Critical Heritage Studies manifesto challenges Authorised Heritage Discourse\textsuperscript{52} and champions heritage as a ‘cultural’ discourse.\textsuperscript{53} One of the co-authors of the manifesto, Smith writes that the cultural discourse of heritage enables sites as a tool to engage with acts of remembering to better understand the present. The sites and artefacts are merely an aide-mémoire – they are not ‘heritage’. The Association of Critical Heritage Studies manifesto seeks to ‘invite the active participation of people and communities who to date have been marginalised in the creation and management of “heritage”’.\textsuperscript{54} Heritage is a way of seeing the past – a ‘gaze’\textsuperscript{55} – and when marginalised communities are included, those that we have gazed upon, gaze back and interact with the process.

Authorised Heritage Discourse is an industry-based practice that involves the public being spoken to. In contrast, the Association of Critical Heritage Studies manifesto aims to give a

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{48} Smith, The Uses of Heritage, p. 31.
\textsuperscript{49} Emma Waterton, Politics, Policy and the Discourses of Heritage in Britain, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
\textsuperscript{50} Smith, The Uses of Heritage, p. 29.
\textsuperscript{52} Smith and Campbell, Association of Critical Heritage Studies Manifesto.
\textsuperscript{53} Waterton, Politics, Policy and the Discourses of Heritage in Britain.
\textsuperscript{54} Smith and Campbell, Association of Critical Heritage Studies Manifesto.
\end{flushleft}
voice to communities and speak with – or, it might be argued, for – the public. The manifesto has been criticised by heritage practitioners working in the industry as presenting a stance that ‘ignores the practitioner and over-emphasises theory’; 56 Some view the manifesto as a document written by academics outside the industry, as a document positioned against the heritage practitioner.

I consider both positions – Authorised Heritage Discourse and the Association of Critical Heritage Studies manifesto – to be inadequate and propose that seeking ways to bring them together might open up new interpretations and relations in the heritage industry. Current heritage practice is a site of struggle for authority and representation of individuals, 57 and in bringing both voices together, I will explore the space between these dialogues to look for new methods of interpretation.

However, the manifesto can still be used as a tool to analyse current museum practice. English Heritage, a non-departmental body of the British Government, is a current example of Authorised Heritage Discourse. English Heritage’s core Vision and Values are listed on their website 58 and open with the subheading ‘authenticity’, an aim to ‘separate fact from fiction’. 59 The task of separating fact from fiction appears to be binary, there is a space between the two; an example being oral history, when a memory or statement might not be ‘accurate’. The subheading ‘authenticity’ is positioned alongside a photograph of a man taking part in historical re-enactment. Based on current research on heritage tourism this is a useful goal because visitors expect to have an ‘authentic’ experience during their visit. 60 Yet, on first appearances, English Heritage appears to be blurring these boundaries of fact and fiction by replaying history with actors. Rather than separating fact and fiction, one hangs in front of the other – like a ‘scrim drop’ in front of the cyclorama on stage, its appearance shifting from opaque to translucent based on theatre lights – the two are overlaid.

57 An example is the controversy surrounding the British Museum’s 2015 Indigenous Australia exhibition that resulted in protests and boycotts due to the acquisition and interpretation of the artefacts.
59 Ibid.
Authenticity is a term that needs addressing. It does not play a lead role in my research, but it often casts shadows over it, and it should be acknowledged. It is associated with the truthfulness of origins, deriving from the Greek *authentikos*, meaning ‘genuine’. The Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary describes the meaning of ‘authenticity’ as ‘the quality of being genuine or true’. But these words can contradict each other; an object that is authentic can be ‘genuine or true’, however, if it is ‘true’ it does not have to be the genuine item. Authenticity – or, to be ‘genuine’ – is not something that I am searching for in my art practice, as I recognise its unattainability, but it may be used to question heritage and its aims.

Authenticity can refer to an intangible response to an object, not just the tangible object itself. In tourism studies, Tom Selwyn defined the different strands in authenticity as ‘hot’ (fabulous) and ‘cool’ (factual), and uses these as frameworks for analysis. 61 Hot authenticity describes the intangible, such as emotional responses. Cool authenticity refers to the tangible, such as artefacts and sites. In this research, I will be exploring what Selwyn terms ‘hot’ and ‘cool’; how a child engaged with the narratives of the foundling children, whether the response be empathetic or apathetic. Selwyn’s terms have been applied to theatre when examining authenticity in performance. Daniel Schulze explores Selwyn’s terms as a definition of authenticity in his book *Authenticity in Contemporary Theatre*. He writes on authenticity; ‘it is certain that the reality of the performance, be it stylised or realist, has always moved audiences and has been perceived as authentic’. 62 Theatre entails both a material reality – ‘cool’ – in the presence of the performer and a degree of artifice in the mimetic presentation; the interplay between these two aspects of the form is capable of generating emotional experiences that are ‘authentic’ and that organically arise rather than artificially imposed, and subjective.

Jenny Kidd uses Selwyn’s terms of ‘hot’ and ‘cool’ as a framework for analysis when discussing performances at heritage sites, she writes, ‘engaging audiences in dialogue through performance can engender a healthy questioning of cultural authority, an understanding of the knottiness of the past, and result in less superficial analysis of the “authentic”’. 63 But, Erik Cohen and Scott Cohen write that these two modes of authenticity – hot and cool – ‘are interlinked, as the dynamics of one intersects with that of the other, contributing to a fluid, and sometimes

---

politically rife and unstable, relationship’. 64 Both forms of authenticity ‘exist in tension with each other’. 65

Authenticity appears to be a paradox. An inauthentic – ‘constructed’ – act might trigger an authentic – ‘organic’ – experience, such as when an actor portrays an imagined character. Rather than questioning what was authentic, I became fascinated with visitors’ responses to the foundling tokens and their engagement during the museum’s art workshops. Were participants responding with empathy or apathy? These questions are developed in the fourth chapter, ‘Empathy and Over-identification’, and the discussion places the contemporary children’s portraits (produced in art workshops led by myself) at the forefront. These images are used to explore the contemporary children and the spectator’s relationship to the historical foundling child, raising the problematic nature of over-identification with the past.

The heritage site and the artefacts – Sewlyn’s cool authenticity – are the key to the authentic experience described by English Heritage: ‘seek[ing] to be true to the story of the places and artefacts that we look after and present’. 66 In their statement, there is no mention of person, either present or absent. The use of actors in re-enactment or a fictional representation of a historical person does not detract from English Heritage’s aim to ‘separate fact from fiction’, 67 as it is the use of materiality that maintains their statement’s view of an authentic experience. We might start to imagine this situation with the metaphor of the stage, with the historical building forming the cyclorama, and the artefacts as the props.

In comparison, the Association of Critical Heritage Studies manifesto makes no mention of truth or authenticity; it is absent from the bullet-pointed aims. Smith (who co-authored the manifesto) argues that the authenticity of heritage lies in the intangible meanings people construct from the material objects, and stresses the value of ‘emotional and experiential’ authenticity – Sewlyn’s hot authenticity. The manifesto places importance on the intangible (but makes no mention directly of authenticity) whereas English Heritage has an opposing view, placing importance on the tangible (sites and objects) as being key.
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67 English Heritage, *Our Vision and Values*.
At the 3rd Association of Critical Heritage Studies conference in Montréal in 2016, divisions between heritage positions were apparent. Debates were raised over how heritage should be critiqued. In the paper ‘Beyond “Natural” and “Cultural” Heritage: Toward an Ontological Politics of Heritage in the Age of Anthropocene’, Rodney Harrison proposes a new framework that supports UCL’s research program, *Assembling Alternative Futures for Heritage* (2015–19), a research project that aims to bring heritage practices (categorising, curating, conserving, communicating) into ‘closer dialogue’ in the critique of heritage.69 This framework is a contrasting viewpoint to the ACHS manifesto, which is criticised for its oppositional stance against its own industry.70 Harrison writes:

> I suggest that rather than taking a social constructivist approach to heritage, as some (e.g., Smith 2006; but see Solli et al. 2011) have done in turning away from the idea of heritage value as universal and inherent, we might instead see heritage as collaborative, dialogical and interactive, a material-discursive process in which past and future arise out of dialogue and encounter between multiple embodied subjects in (and with) the present.71

Harrison places ‘material’ as important in the heritage process. He argues that Smith’s ‘cultural’ discourse cannot be disentangled from the ‘material’ discourse of heritage – the landscape, for example. He challenges Smith’s view (and that of the Association of Critical Heritage Studies manifesto) that ‘heritage meaning is made only by humans’72 and proposes that sites, museums and objects are also ‘heritage’ even if they in themselves do not make meaning. Harrison’s viewpoint is trying to capture the full interaction between the material and immaterial. The relationship between the material and immaterial is also comparable to performance. The material reality of the performer or spectators body and bodily response is a basis for ‘authenticity’, tied into discussions on subjectivity and emotion: ‘cool’ and material, ‘hot’ and immaterial. The nearness of ‘hot’ and ‘cold’, identification and distance, is encapsulated in the paradox of the performer.
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In the essay ‘Keeping Critical Heritage Studies Critical: Why “Post-Humanism” and the “New Materialism” Are Not So Critical’, Smith challenges Harrison. Smith, with Campbell, writes that the perspective of Post-Humanism and New Materialism displaces humanity and privileges non-human actors. Harrison’s viewpoint risk-downplaying the human importance in heritage. Smith and Campbell write:

What is also problematic is the increasingly popular attribution of agency to non-human actors and the material world. We believe that this is theoretically untenable, and an implausible vitalist importation in to heritage and museum studies that trivialises and side-lines the social, as well as human and personal agency […] this attribution, rather, than downplaying the human, is actually anthropomorphic, as it mistakenly projects a form of human agency on to the material world.

Even in the Association of Critical Heritage Studies, debates continue over what is heritage and what/who is privileged in the process. At the conference in Montréal, practitioners raised concerns about the manifesto’s ‘language’ – described by Smith as ‘self-consciously provocative’ – and it was taken offline in 2017.

1.1.2. Artists and Heritage

Alongside the dialogues of the Association of Critical Heritage Studies and English Heritage, artists might add a third ‘voice’ to the conversations in heritage.

The museum has been the location for notable artistic interventions that critique heritage, and the artist has been described as an ‘authentic voice’ in the museum. While I acknowledge that the artist does not necessarily seek to be an authentic voice, Peter Howard describes the artist as a ‘critical figure in the heritage process’, as they present institutional critique, craft new heritage, and can present an alternative dialogue to Authorised Heritage Discourse. This area is

recently gaining ground and attention in the field. In 2009 Arts&Heritage was launched by Judith King and Timandra Nichols to commission contemporary art projects at museums and heritage sites; their website includes a ‘toolkit’ for museums working with artists and a document outlining the ‘principles of engagement’. The Arts&Heritage programme Meeting Point was added to Arts Council England’s National Portfolio in 2018 and awarded £940,000. In 2017 Newcastle University was granted Arts and Humanities Research Council funding to undertake the project Mapping Contemporary Art in the Heritage Experience (2017-2019), the project aims to question: Creation (the artists’ engagement at the heritage site), Consumption (audience experience), and Exchange (criteria for evaluating contemporary art at heritage sites).  

Both Arts&Heritage (their online toolkits, training sessions, and so on) and Mapping Contemporary Art in the Heritage Experience appear to be focussed on exploring the impact of art commissions at heritage sites – how art can be a new opportunity for ‘public engagement’ and ‘challenge audiences expectations and preconceptions’. Both appear not to question where the artist sits alongside the processes of heritage; and from discussions, there is a preconceived idea amongst staff and researchers involved with both programmes that the artist is outside the heritage process. I will use my practice to explore if this is the case, questioning if the artist is positioned inside, outside, or on the borders of the heritage process. This entails an examination of heritage and the artists’ role in these processes, which I will explore through a series of practical experimentation as part of this project.

This research explores how a contemporary art process might examine a particular heritage context, so it is important to understand how it has developed from, and contributes to a context of art practice in heritage. Therefore, bound into the following pages is a fold out map – titled a Map of the Field – that highlights key art works that engage with issues at stake in this research. Contemporary art practice is constantly developing, therefore the map is visually arranged chronologically and positions this research within a particular moment of time as the field continues to expand. The map is divided into two sections: work undertaken inside and outside of the museum.

79 Newcastle University, Aims and Objectives [website] www.research.ncl.ac.uk/mcahe/about/aimsandobjectives/ [accessed 20 February 2018].
80 Newcastle University, About [website] www.research.ncl.ac.uk/mcahe/about/ [accessed 20 February 2018].
82 A conversation with Nick Cass, a member of the research team on Mapping Contemporary Art in the Heritage Experience and Co-Director of the Centre for Critical Studies in Museums.
**Key Artworks; In Museums**

**Museum Highlights: A Gallery Talk**
(Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1989)
Andrea Fraser

**McMellon Fell**
the Museum of Modern Art, 1970
Hans Haacke

**Missing the Museum**
Maryland Historical Society, 1992-3
Fred Wilson

**MoMA Poll**
The Freud Museum, 1994
Susan Hiller

**The Brooks**
Los Angeles Contemporary Museum of Art, 2000
Juan Capistrán

**Childhood Rituals**
The Freud Museum, 2011
Alice Anderson

**In Course of Arrangement**
British Museum, 1997
Fred Wilson
Curated by James Putnam

**An Elite Experience for Everyone**
(Philadelphia Museum of Art, 2005)
Claire Robbins

**FallingVoices**
The Foundling Museum, 2016
Steve Lewison

**Capital**
The British Museum, 1995
Terry Smith
Curated by James Putnam

**Freud Dreams of Rome**
The Freud Museum, 2007-8
Sharon Kivland

**Sandwick**
The British Museum, 1994
Andy Goldsworthy

**Appointment**
The Freud Museum, 1999
Sophie Calle
Curated by James Putnam

**Winning Heights - A Manuscript**
The Brontë Parsonage Museum, 2017-18
Clare Twomey

**Silent Sticks**
The Whitechapel Gallery, 2015
Corin Sworn

**Scala Nota**
Tanya Bonakdar Galleria, 1994
Mark Dion

**Folk Archive**
The Barbican, 2005
Jeremy Deller

**History Lesson**
The Bluecoat, 1999
Janet Hodgson

**A Local History**
University of Cambridge, 2012
Edmund de Waal

**Lost and Found**
Pérez Art Museum Miami, 2016
Susan Hiller

**Monument**
Leeds Art Gallery, 1980-1
Susan Hiller

**Quantum Ghost**
Gasworks, 2019
Libita Clayton

**ARTS&HERITAGE**
Meeting Point, 2016-17
Artist Commissions

**MCAHE**
Newcastle University, 2018
Artist Commissions, including:
Susan Philipsz
Matt Stokes
Andrew Burton & Fiona Curran
Mark Fairhurst

**MoMA Poll**
The Freud Museum, 1994
Susan Hiller
Although I am titling the diagram as a *Map of the Field*, it is a field that I have constructed to aid in the contextualisation of my practice. Rather than focussing purely on artworks made for museums, it includes practices that deal with the ‘principles of heritage’ that may occur in alternative spaces, such as conventional gallery practices. In this instance, ‘heritage’ needs to be understood as artworks that explore a critical relationship between the past and present, not purely artworks exhibited in museums.

The following discussion on the *Map of the Field* leads onto a detailed comparison of three artworks – Andrea Fraser’s *Museum Highlights*, Corin Sworn’s *Silent Sticks*, and Dahn Vo’s *Slip of the Tongue* – that allow for an exploration into the various roles artists take in the heritage process and how they position themselves in their work.

On the far left of the *Map of the Field* is Hans Haacke’s *MoMA Poll* (1970), chronologically at the start of the diagram. *MoMA Poll* was controversial when it was first exhibited because it challenged MoMA trustee and New York governor Nelson Rockefeller by asking the public the question ‘would the fact that Governor Rockefeller has not denounced President Nixon’s Indochina policy be a reason for you not to vote for him in November?’ and in so doing, it raised awareness of Rockefeller’s political affinity. This work is considered to be an early example of ‘institutional critique’.

Institutional Critique is a systematic enquiry into the workings of institutions – galleries, museums, libraries, hospitals – through art practice. It is a material form of commentary on an institution that makes historically and socially constructed boundaries visible. The term was coined in the late 1960s when artists began to make work in response to the institutions that exhibited their work. Gerald Raunig discussed Intuitional Critique in *Institutional Practices*, noting that there were two phases of this practice in the 1970s and the 1990s. Raunig writes that ‘the “first generation” of Institutional Critique sought a distance from the institution, the “second” addressed the inevitable involvement in the institution’, although he recognises that both phases can be blurred, but champions practices that ‘do not fancy themselves in an imagined distance to institutions’. Raunig also notes that there is a contemporary (or third) phase, which he describes as ‘transformations as ways of escaping from the arts of governing,

---

84 Ibid.
lines of flight, which are not at all to be taken as harmless or individualistic or escapist and esoteric, even if they no longer allow dreaming of an entirely different exteriority’.  

Haacke describes his projects as “double-agents” that enter into the institution of art to show that much of what it presents as natural is historical and socially constructed’. By ‘natural’, what Haacke implies that these museum objects are often perceived to be presented as they were ‘found’ – in a natural and enduring state – not framed by the social construction of power exercised in the museum. Travis English analyses Haacke’s work, explaining that museums ‘strategically mystify their relations in order to (…) maintain power. Haacke’s work is tactical in that it demystifies their power’. Haacke achieves this by revealing aspects that might go unnoticed, such as the relation between museums and their corporate sponsors, as he did in MoMA Poll. Although I do not aim to ‘reveal’, but aim to explore those who have not been given a place in the museum (the foundling/s) and use art practice to reconstruct absent voices.

A seminal work that employs processes of institutional critique in the museum through curatorial methods is Fred Wilson’s Mining the Museum (1992-3), shown at Maryland Historical Society. Mining the Museum questions hidden and marginalised histories through a redisplay of the museum collection, bringing to light the history of Americans and American Indians by drawing attention to their absence. For example, Wilson displayed a trio of busts of three prominent white men (Napoleon, Henry Clay, and Andrew Jackson) alongside three empty pedestals, labelled with the names of important Black historical figures from Maryland’s history (Harriet Tubman, Frederick Douglass, and Benjamin Banneker). This act was an exploration of on the museum’s choice in acquisition; an example of who they deemed important and worthy of preservation alongside whom was forgotten. Wilson noted, ‘what they put on view says a lot about a museum, but what’s in storage tells you even more’. This work sits in relation to this research as it focuses on the voices that are ‘missing’ – the foundling children – and questions why their voices have not been given a ‘place’ in the museum and archives. Both practices question the politics of erasure and how this can alter the retelling of history.
Alongside *Mining the Museum*, other artworks included in the *Map of the Field* employ curatorial techniques, one being Sophie Calle’s *The Appointment* (1999) at the Freud Museum. Calle uses pink captions and personal items to construct narratives that blend fact with fiction in the museum. The artist’s voice is visible in the museum and replaces the ‘space’ – curator-written captions, and so on – that is usually expected to contain authoritative explanation, a forms of Authorised Heritage Discourse.

Joanne Morra writes about *Appointment* in her book *Inside the Freud Museums*, describing how the work engages with the viewer by constructing an environment that allows them to ‘perform the role of the non-sympathetic and non-judgemental psychoanalyst’. It is a ‘site-responsive’ artwork that ‘[interrupts the] normative reading’ of the museum; Morra uses the term ‘site-responsive’ as a means of understanding the ‘generative and reciprocal nature of this form of art intervention that is temporarily housed in a space that is not primarily meant for contemporary art’. My practice-based research can also be defined as site-responsive, as it is tied to the Foundling Museum. Site-specificity allows for a ‘site of struggle, where the competing positions concerning the nature of the site, as well as the “proper” relationship of art and artists to it, are being contested’.

Both the Freud Museum and the Foundling Museum are not primarily used to house contemporary art, but both have an ongoing relationship with commissioning artists to engage with their collections. Calle’s *Appointment* and my practice-based research temporarily “insert” and “juxtapose” themselves within the Museum’s collection.

Alongside Calle’s use of captions, another method that allows for the ‘artist’s voice’ to be inserted the museum is the gallery tour. Notably Andrea Fraser pioneered this in her practice, her first tour being *Damaged Goods Gallery Talk Starts Here* (1986) and this was followed by *Museum Highlights: A Gallery Tour* (1989) – a work which I discuss in detail later on in this chapter.
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Fraser’s strategies for artist interventions in museums have been followed and built upon by other artists who work in this field. Claire Robins’ performance *An Elite Experience for Everyone* (2005) – a tour in the William Morris Gallery – is similar, not only in structure but in method. For example, both artists used quotations from published texts in the writing of their script, which they performed as a ‘character’ rather than as themselves. Robins describes *An Elite Experience for Everyone* as a ‘sort of Andrea Fraser meets Mrs Merton’ although she approaches the performance in her writing from an educational perspective in *Curious Lessons in the Museum*. In this text, Robins examines the ‘pedagogical implication’ and how artworks may ‘encourage new experiences for audiences so as to re-conceive and reconfigure museums’. Although there is an element of educational structure in my practice-based research, unlike Robins, I do not approach my art practice from a pedagogical perspective. The art workshops undertaken as part of this research are a form of art practice that I intend to use to enable an exploration of constraints of care.

In *Curious Lessons in the Museum*, Robins also presents an overview of the ‘field’ that my research is situated, discussing how artists engage with museums and the implications. Alongside the work of Hans Haacke, Fred Wilson, Sophie Calle, and Andrea Fraser, she also considers the work of other practitioners that engage with museums, such as: Hubert Duprat, Mark Dion, Michael Craig-Martin, Willem de Rooij, Andy Goldsworthy, Joseph Kosuth, Juan Capistran, and so on. Robins writes that since the 1990s, the ‘growth of artists’ interventions have been influenced by the ‘shift in the way that visitors experience and learn from collections’ as they are in ‘close relation to the museums’ incentives to change and update their social and pedagogic roles’. I debate that considering the artist intervention as ‘a pedagogic tool’ is tied to how the work is commissioned: is it invited or uninvited? Has the artist instigated the relationship or has the museum? For example, there has been a different expectation placed on me – as an artist – that is dependent on the artwork as part of a museum commission or if I approached the museum independently with a proposal.
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98 By museum, Robins includes: museums of artefacts, natural history museums, local history museums, and art museums.
99 Ibid.
Alongside the exploration of the artists’ voice in the museum, there are notable works that allow for a discussion on other aspects of ‘voice’ in heritage practices. This includes Elizabeth Price’s *A RESTORATION* (2016), Susan Hiller’s *Lost and Found* (2016), and Libita Clayton’s *Quantum Ghost* (2019), to name but a few.

Price’s *A RESTORATION* was commissioned for the Ashmolean Museum. I saw it redisplayed at Site Gallery as part of their *RE-COLLECTIONS* (2019), an exhibition that aimed to ‘bringing together many perspectives and voices that orate, narrate and envision its histories’. A *RESTORATION* features artefacts from the Ashmolean Museum and the Pitt Rives Museum collections, with a particular focus on the Sir Arthur Evans archive – Evans was the former keeper of the Ashmolean, who controversially sought to ‘restore’ the archaeological site of Knossos in Crete. The audio track allows for an imagined “sound” of objects to be constructed through percussion and music, synced with the CGI visuals. Overlaying these sounds, is a ‘synthetic, collective voice, a chorus of self-proclaimed “museum administrators”’. The voice(s) describe themselves as an anonymous ‘we’, hinting at the anonymity of the ‘museum voice’ – museum captions are authorless, but address us with authority.

Another work included in the *Map of the Field* that explores ‘voice’ is Susan Hiller’s *Lost and Found* (2016). It is situated outside of the museum, but it is still a key work that explores heritage. *Lost and Found* is a composition of the voices of people who speak extinct and endangered languages; some voices sing, recite vocabulary lists, and others narrate stories. The title of the work hints at a ‘loss’ of heritage, but it also suggests that ‘voice/s’ have been ‘found’ or preserved. As one of the speakers explains that they have come here (to take part in the recording) to ‘protect’ their language.

The voices are accompanied by a film: a simple vibrating oscilloscopic line, which could be perceived to re-establish the physicality of the voices (the speakers’ faces cannot be seen, they are only heard). Hiller chooses to remove the identity of the speakers, in so doing, explores the
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power of the acousmatique voice.\textsuperscript{106}

Lost and Found has been described as a work that communicates ‘a powerful sense of grief, directly or indirectly referring to the histories of colonialism that led to the precarious state of their mother tongues’.\textsuperscript{107} Hiller described the work as:

> Sound waves actually touch our ears, so when we listen to a person talking we are literally touched by them… I wanted to facilitate direct contact, empathy, person-to-person feeling. In any case, there is always an unacknowledged uncanny aspect to sound recordings, which don’t distinguish between dead and living voices. Perhaps this reminds us that we will also become ghosts someday.\textsuperscript{108}

In Hyperallergic, Monica Uszervowics describes the work as containing a sense of ‘paranormal magic’\textsuperscript{109} – one of the voices belongs to the last speaker of the language Wichita, Doris McIemore, who died less than two months before the work was screened. Technology has allowed for the voices to return and be heard.

Hiller termed her work ‘paraconceptual’,\textsuperscript{110} due to her interest with the supernatural, and her practice could be considered in regard to Jacques Derrida’s Spectres of Marx. In this book, Derrida coins the term ‘hauntology’;\textsuperscript{111} seeking to contrast ‘ontology’ – a self-identical presence – with the figure of the spectre that is never fully-present. Mark Fisher applies Derrida’s spectre (one that alters perceptions of space and time\textsuperscript{112}) to technology and film that appears ‘ghostly’. Fischer writes that in these works, there is not only a haunting of the past, but a haunting of a ‘lost future’.\textsuperscript{113} Voices return and repeat in Lost and Found, no longer attached to their speakers, hinting at a heritage that is lost to future generations.

\textsuperscript{106} A term that I explore in relation to my own practice and discuss in the chapter ‘A Single and Multiple Voice’.
\textsuperscript{107} Exhibition Caption, RE-COLLECTIONS, Sheffield: Site Gallery, 2019.
\textsuperscript{109} Monica Uszerowicz, The Spectral Sounds of Endangered and Extinct Languages.
\textsuperscript{112} Mark Fisher, ‘What Is Hauntology?’, Film Quarterly, 66, 1, Fall 2012, pp. 16-24.
\textsuperscript{113} Op. Cit., p. 16.
1.1.3. The Artists’ Position in the Retelling of History

To further explore the position of artists within heritage, I will examine three works in depth – Fraser’s *Museum Highlights*, Corin Sworn’s *Silent Sticks*, and Danh Vo’s *Slip of the Tongue* – each artist provides a different position in the retelling of history and I will draw comparisons between each one. I have chosen to focus on one work that takes place both inside (Fraser’s intervention) and outside the museum (Sworn and Vo’s work occur in the gallery space). This is a decision I made when considering the artists’ role in the ‘retelling’ of history, as it occurs in both spaces.

Andrea Fraser’s work *Museum Highlights* is of particular relevance to this study because of its use of voice and character. It is a destabilisation of the traditional museum tour and it allows for the same critique of the heritage industry sought by the Association of Critical Heritage Studies manifesto. In *Museum Highlights*, Fraser is exposing an alternative viewpoint of the institution, using performance art to challenge established traditions and expose elite cultural narratives within Authorised Heritage Discourse.

In *Museum Highlights* Fraser performs the fictional persona of Jane Castleton, a docent in the museum. Castleton represents the non-expert, middle class employee, although Fraser has pointed out that Castleton is not a character or an individual, ‘she is an object’. This identification of person as object is a theme that Fraser explores throughout her practice. ‘I’m not a person today. I’m an object within an artwork’, she writes. This statement opens discussions of performer as art object; Fraser gives ‘her body in the absence of art objects’. In *Museum Highlights* she has been described as both ‘Fraser-Jane and Fraser-Museum and Jane-Museum’ in the performance.

Drawing on the work of theatre practitioner Bertolt Brecht, Shannon Jackson analyses *Museum Highlights* by describing the stylised performance as a form of acting that “shows” rather than
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“becomes” its character — a technique known as Gestus — and in the museum ‘de-familiarisation’ occurs in an attempt to allow ‘the hidden truth the reveal itself’. Fraser achieves this by stripping herself of identity to present institutional critique through her physical actions. Fraser’s Jane Castleton is a ‘stylised portrayal’ of an individual and the vehicle for the artist’s critical voice. Jackson describes Fraser as a ‘narrator for the character’ of Castleton, rather than embodying the character. A method used to produce this effect is the script, which is synthesised from an array of sources on institutions. The intended result, according to Fraser, is to create a ‘cacophony of competing voices that expose the absurdities and true interests of the museum’, her voice is not one of an ‘individual’ but multiple voices speaking through one mouth. Although Jane Castleton appears knowledgeable, she refuses to convey to the public the knowledge they ‘desire’ as she continues her performance as a monologue and answers no questions. Fraser treats her surroundings and audience with the same ‘detachment as the historian adopts with those of the past’ — what Brecht describes as ‘historicization’ — and it creates a ‘critical’ distance between her and the onlookers.

Interpretations of history have taken place outside the museum and in the gallery. Corin Sworn’s Silent Sticks (2015) was commissioned as part of the MaxMara Prize for women. The work was inspired by the stock characters from the Commedia dell’Arte and notions of mistaken identity. Although it is situated in the Whitechapel Gallery (rather than a ‘heritage site’), the installation offers an alternative model of heritage, its a particular retelling of history in the present day and an interpretation of archival material. Silent Sticks slips ‘between fact, fiction and fantasy’. During an interview I conducted with Sworn, she describes the intention and process behind Silent Sticks:

119 Ibid.
121 Jackson, Social Works, p. 121.
122 Ibid.
I went to Ikea and wandered around the present day to configure what objects could be used as indicators to a completely different time. I didn’t want them to not be ‘today’. I don’t believe you can get back to 1550. I’m interested in the game of pretending 1550.\textsuperscript{130}

In \textit{Silent Sticks}, Sworn does not aim to recreate the past, but explores the way that she – and the viewer – read and interpret the past.\textsuperscript{131} By responding to a historical narrative, she reinterprets it to reveal notions of the present day, which she achieves through the integration of the past and the present through her choices of objects.

As part of her research in to Commedia dell’Arte, Sworn worked with a sixteenth-century prop list, legacies, and drawings. Frustrated by the lack of information she could find about the Commedia dell’Arte, she began to research a real-life case of mistaken identity, the story of sixteenth-century French peasant Martin Guerre.\textsuperscript{132} Rather than focusing on the archetypal characters of the theatre, as was her initial intention, she retells the story of an individual who
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\textit{Silent Sticks}

Corin Sworn, 2015

The Whitechapel Gallery

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}
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\textsuperscript{132} There have been various interpretations of the narrative of Martin Guerre, including a novel, a film, and a historical account.
\end{flushleft}
did exist. Silent Sticks is a useful case study because it demonstrates how a historical person is being used in a contemporary art work. In this case, Sworn has positioned herself as the director of Guerre’s narrative, rather than as a character in his story.

To retell Guerre’s narrative, Sworn combines film projection, sound, mirrors, costume, and objects in her display. Reviews describe the film as the key to linking these disparate elements. However, the significance of the spoken voice cannot be ignored because without the sound, the installation would lack Sworn’s narrative. The story is recounted by a narrator, whose voice emits from speakers placed around the installation. The audio has been described as ‘ghosts’, but I felt, on viewing, it was as if the objects were speaking. The curator Daniel Herrmann at the Whitechapel Gallery explains that the installation presents ‘the objects as actor’. This implies that the narrative voice emanates from the props, which then appear to speak as an ensemble. The objects become the archetypal characters in the story and appear to be the physical form from which the narrator’s voice originates. Sworn regards the objects as ‘dead figures, where the being had died but the figure has remained; an abstract’.

Sworn says that in the work she aims to use ‘guise and costume to address social anxieties around status and recognition’, and in turn question authority. In the work, it is unclear if Sworn is referring to historical or contemporary authority. Her installation is not a form of contemporary Authorised Heritage Discourse, and (although it was not Sworn’s aim to explore this territory) some might describe the work as positioned outside this discourse, as it presents an artist’s narrative rather than that of the expert heritage practitioner. Unlike the museum, which portrays “evidence” in the form of “authentic” objects, Sworn produces new art objects that have a ‘malleability’ to become vehicles for her retelling of history.

134 Ibid.
135 Whitechapel Gallery, "Curator’s Tour: MaxMara Art Prize for Women: Corin Sworn", YouTube [website] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x000CT0F24 [accessed 1 June 2015].
Visitors to *Silent Sticks* describe the installation as strange, and brimming with hidden intrigue. Even though it achieves a sense of drama, some reviewers feel it 'never [rises] to be really special'. Critics note that there is disappointment on viewing *Silent Sticks* because it feels unfinished, as if there was 'something missing'; could this be attributed to the absence of any authentic objects from the Commedia dell’Arte, an absence of Sewlyn’s cool authenticity? Or, as the narrator’s voice was dead-pan and appeared to lack in emotion, could this be creating a ‘distancing’ effect? It could be argued that Sworn intended her work to ‘lack’, as it allows for the audience to adopt a critical distance to question historical certainty. This could also be likened to Brechtian theatre, which adopts a critical approach that deliberately produces critical engagement. Brecht sought to create a sense of distancing in his performances, which he terms *Verfremdungs effekt*, so that audiences would not sympathise or empathise with the characters on stage to the extent that they lost critical engagement.

In an interview, Sworn explains that she put the viewer ‘in a space that is half-built’ to play with the viewers’ imaginations, allowing them to ‘fill in the gaps’. When I first saw *Silent Sticks*, I was also struck by the sense of ‘lack’, but at the time, I did not ‘fill in the gaps’ as she intended. It was only in hindsight, and after speaking with Sworn, that I began to consider the work as the artist intended. I did not feel invited to ‘fill in the gaps’ at the time, and I question what could have been in place that would guide me to? Was it simply that I could not forget that the work was positioned in a gallery space? How would I have approached the work if it had been shown in a theatre? But, other visitors may have ‘filled the gaps’ as Sworn intended. In this study, I began with the quest to ‘fill the gaps’ where the foundlings’ voices were missing using art practice. As the discussion develops, I will question how this aim evolves through making and testing.

At the heart of both *Museum Highlights* and *Silent Sticks*, there is a questioning of the social; Sworn addresses ‘social anxieties’ regarding status and Fraser critiques the ‘hidden social
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reality in the museum through the representation of Castleton. Both artists' portrayals can be considered akin to *Verfremdungseffekt*, since the audience is detached from the work (the 'lack' in *Silent Sticks*, for example). Brecht intended for the audience to understand the character’s dilemmas rather than over-identifying with them, which would impede their analysis of the situation.

In comparison with Sworn’s representation of history, Danh Vo approaches history through his personal experiences. His works in the Venice Biennale 2015, *Slip of the Tongue* and *Mothertongue*, enable his own biographical connections to unify objects; this is achieved by writing elaborate captions laden with personal meaning and backstory. Although the very subjectivity of this presentation of historical biography is at odds with the idea of the task of history; Vo ‘labours to keep meaning withheld from the viewer’, so that you ‘feel rather than understand’. Claire Bishop suggests that this is caused by the work being ‘grounded in biography and sensibility, two authority-granting aspects of the author-function that have long been criticised as regressive’. Perhaps, through Vo’s biography being embedded in the work, there appears to be little critical distance for the viewer. In comparison to *Museum Highlights* and *Silent Sticks*, Fraser is an actor performing the role of Castleton, removing her identity, and portraying another. Sworn positions herself off-stage as the director. Vo is the subject of his installation and it is his voice that links the objects in *Slip of the Tongue* and *Mothertongue*.

When I saw *Slip of the Tongue*, I was charmed by the aesthetics of the work but I misunderstood the objects through the decisions in the display. For example, I believed that a letter written by Saint Jean-Théophane Vénard to his father on the eve of his execution was an original document, but it was a handwritten copy made by the artist’s own father. Vo and his father did not translate or understand the French contained in the original letter. To him, the copied letter symbolises his personal relationship with his father, their escape from Vietnam, and their conversion to Catholicism. When I viewed the letter in *Slip of the Tongue*, I believed it was an authentic letter, and it created a false sense of hot authenticity. Vo has essentially overwritten the history of Vénard, and layered his voice with a new meaning that does not attempt to
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convey anything true.

In her essay ‘History Depletes Itself’ Claire Bishop critiques Vo’s work, writing that his success makes her ‘uneasy’ as the biographical is privileged so that the ‘poetics of the past (are) prone to devolving into information as ornament’. Bishop feels that Vo’s individual taste is at the forefront of his curated exhibition. Vo’s work privileges narratives and withholds meaning; he hides the origins of the objects, and combines them with his own narrative. Vénard’s history is removed but a copy of the letter remains in tribute to Vo’s father. Bishop draws on Mark Godfrey’s term ‘artist as historian’ – a term used to describe when artists with a research-based practice recuperate marginal historical figures (such as Vénard) – to describe Vo’s practice. This could also be applied to Sworn’s practice and her representation of Guerre in *Silent Sticks*.
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If the artist is taking on the role of the historian, what does that suggest about Vo’s position in the discourses of heritage? A historian is regarded as a person of expertise, a voice of authority; could we suggest that Vo is on the borders of Authorised Heritage Discourse? Or rather, could his work be thought of as an author who entwines auto-biographical narrative with that of historical objects? Might it be comparable with Edmund du Waal’s *Hare with the Amber Eyes*, in which du Waal narrates the history of his family while uncovering the history of a collection of Japanese miniatures? Waal describes the book as a ‘biography of a collection and the biography of my family’.  

The *Hare with the Amber Eyes*’s dual biography – a biography of family and objects – could be likened to Vo’s practice. It could also be argued that internal narratives and personal experience have the potential to tell an emotive historical story. As the novelist Ursula Le Guin observes, ‘the only way to the truly collective, to the image that is alive and meaningful in all of us, seems to be through the truly personal’. This is a question I examine through practice in the chapter ‘Empathy and Over-identification’.

From the analysis of Fraser, Sworn, and Vo, I envisioned how my practice could be contextualised. As discussed previously, the number of artists working with heritage is vast – and Claire Robbins provides an overview of this in her book *Curious Lessons in the Museum*. It is an expanding field, including the works of Catherine Bertola, Steve Lewinson, *Arts&Heritage*, and so on; these practitioners do not necessarily engage with critical heritage, instead some of their works could be perceived as an illustrative interpretation of the past. But, alongside their works, there is an overlap of artists who are engaged with processes of institutional critique (such as Fraser) and those who have a traditional gallery practice (Sworn and Vo). All of which can be used to examine ‘heritage’ where these practices intersect (see Figure 1.3). My practice sits between these practices – where there is a ‘fusion’ of disciplines – in an area that I have shaded grey in the following diagram. I am concerned with the unsettlement and critical construction of heritage (and this does not have to be tied to a museum or conventional heritage institution) and the exploration of how the past is established in the eyes of the present.
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1.2. Children and Childhood

1.2.1. History of Children and Childhood

The contemporary notion that we have of ‘childhood’ began to emerge in the eighteenth-century with Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s Émile, or On Education, published in 1762. Rousseau writes that a system of education can lead to the creation of his idealised ‘natural man’. He insists that children should begin their education through experiencing nature and be freed from swaddling clothes, before being taught a manual trade (such as carpentry), then a formal education working with a private tutor, and so on. Émile inspired a new national system of
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In *Childhood*, Chris Jenks outlines the different representations of children throughout history. Jenks writes that we regard children as ‘pure, bestial, innocent, corrupt, charged with potential, tabula rasa, or even as we view our adult selves’. He designs two images of the child: the Dionysian and the Apollonian.

Dionysus was the ancient Greek God for wine and revelry, and like the God, the Dionysian child harbours potential for evil and should not fall into bad company. Philippe Ariès noted that the sixteenth century view of the child – this Dionysian child – was physically and mentally weak, which was accompanied by the practice of ‘swaddling’ to restrict the child’s movements (a practice that went against Rousseau’s view of childhood). Innocence in this child is not inherent, it is achieved (or forced) through training, punishment, labour, or religion – Christianity contributed to this view of the Dionysian child with the idea of ‘original sin’.

During the Age of Enlightenment another view of the child emerged: the Apollonian. The Apollonian child is the ‘heir to sunshine and light […] the modern, Western, but only “public”, way of regarding the child’. Apollo was the ancient Greek God of poetry, art, sun, light, and knowledge; yet, he can also bring a deadly plague and ill-health. Jenks notes that the construction of the Apollonian child occurs with Rousseau, as ‘he is the author of their manifesto, *Émile*’. This child is born inherently good and requires adult care, encouragement, and education to unlock their inner potential.

Both the Dionysian and the Apollonian child are merely ‘two images’ rather than ‘literal descriptions’ but help to unpick the ‘different discourses we have about children’. Both coexist, like ‘two sides to the same coin’. Although the Apollonian child dominates and informs contemporary models of child care in Western society. Jenks draws from Michel Foucault’s *Discipline and Punish* to illuminate how both of these images of children are controlled. The Dionysian, evil child must be beaten, aligning to the older forms of punishment, such as the scaffold. The Apollonian child is controlled by modern forms of
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power; observation and surveillance monitor this child ‘in mind and body’. 161 Jenks writes that this Apollonian child ‘is truly visible; it is most certainly seen and not heard’. 162

In contemporary Western society, childhood is a transient stage. Article 1 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child defines a child as all those under the age of eighteen-years old. 163 While there are different names for various stages of childhood, our contemporary notion of the ‘child’ is usually regarded as being between five and twelve-years old. 164 The concept of childhood is constantly shifting. Cunningham writes, ‘the construction of childhood is of course a continuing process: “childhood” is never fixed and constant’. 165 This is not dissimilar to the process of heritage, the construction of childhood reflects shifting social and moral values. 166

The UK government aspires for children to be ‘safe’, ‘secure’, and ‘healthy’; terms located on the agendas Every Child Matters (Department for Children and Families, 2003) and The Statutory Framework for the Early Years Foundation Stage (DFCF, 2007). In their article ‘Limitless Provocations of the “safe”, “secure” and “healthy” child’, Rachel Holmes and Liz Jones question how the child is conceptualised in UK education policy. Holmes and Jones describe a moment when an external examiner’s comments on the choice of image that an undergraduate student included in their assessments calling the staff to be ‘more mindful of the paedophilic menace that always threatens and exposes the vulnerability of the young child’. The image referred to was Nan Goldin’s 1998 photograph Klara and Edda Belly Dancing. Could it be that the external examiner expected images that were aligned to Jenks’ conceptualisation of the Apollonian child, which is a public representation of innocence, and this image did not fit within this mould? In response, Holmes and Jones ask ‘why were our habitual encounters with images of children generally regarded as quite safe?’ 167 To critique this they created a film that included contemporary representations of children, such as Richard Prince’s photograph Spiritual America.

161 P. 68.
162 Chris Jenks, Childhood, p. 69.
166 Harvey, Heritage Pasts and Heritage Presents, p. 320.
and Susan Andrew’s photographic series *The Lois Project*, to elicit responses from professionals who work with children. The film ‘enacted an ontological shudder’ from the audience. UK policy mandates a construction of ‘bounded versions of children’ that ‘reiterate those “safe”, almost voice-less visual documents’, such as the public image of a formal school photograph. These images have become too familiar, so when we see images such as *Klara and Edda Belly Dancing*, it shocks us – although it is normal, it is a private family moment that is not frequently photographed. Holmes and Jones suggest that the ‘unbounded image’ of the naked child ‘can never be looked at “innocently” as there is no such thing as an innocent gaze’ as we see them for the adults they will become and understand the repercussions of the image.

1.2.2 Children in the Heritage Industry

In the Association of Critical Heritage Studies Manifesto, a specified aim is to give a voice to the ‘marginalised and excluded’, and children are included in this category. Many scholars still fail to differentiate histories of ‘children’, concerning actual practices of young people, from histories of ‘childhood’, which are ideological concepts of children held by adults. To be a child is a temporary period of time, different lived experiences, a progression into adulthood. In *Children, Childhood, and Cultural Heritage*, Kate Darian Smith and Carla Pascoe write that part of the nature of this conflation in heritage sites, is due to the ‘enormously problematic nature of uncovering source material authored by children themselves’ and historians are forced to refer to texts where adults refer to children or remember their own experiences. This is also evidenced in museums; for example, in *A Family at Wartime*, the adult Allpress family reminisce about their childhood – this is a history of ‘childhood’, not a history of ‘children’. If one were to ask a child about an experience, it might not be as measured or guarded as an adult, or, it might not be verbalised in a way that an adult wants to hear. In comparison, if one were to ask an adult to recall a memory from childhood, it could be nostalgic or – drawing on Holmes and Jones’ analysis of children’s photographs – a representation ‘bounded’ by adult morals. When I recall my childhood, I often think of moments of innocent play but would not always recount the moments that are not deemed ‘publicly’ appropriate.
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Until recently there has been ‘scholarly neglect’\(^{175}\) of children, notably in ‘discussions of museology, heritage sites and material culture’\(^{176}\) among historians and heritage researchers. Although educational benefit of historical sites for children is regarded as an important part of heritage engagement, children are regarded as passive in this process and their very role as ‘heritage makers is […] obscured by Authorised Heritage Discourse’\(^{177}\). In current heritage practice, both in academia and the museum, the voice of the child is often absent. The V & A’s Museum of Childhood, for example, mainly exhibits objects made for children, rather than those made by children. This tension is present in museum’s name: it is a museum of childhood rather than a museum for children. In the collections, the adult voice is represented rather than that of the child; this tension also occurs in art practice, as with the Whitechapel’s Children’s Commission 2015.\(^{178}\)

Recently museums and heritage sites have begun to include children in their discourse. In May 2015 English Heritage advertised for their first Child Executive Officer;\(^{179}\) in February 2016, a group of sixty-nine children aged between six and fourteen curated the exhibition *Anything Goes* at the National Museum in Poland; and in 2016 the Young People’s Programme at Tate launched its project *Stories Uncovered*, which aimed to look at ‘London’s heritage through the eyes of young people’.\(^{180}\) Although how active or passive the children’s roles were in these projects is questionable; their input is shaped and programmed by the adults who control the projects. This control is unsaid and, often, invisible. For example, English Heritage’s Child Executive Officer produced a ‘wish list’ that was ‘curated’ by members of staff. It is not clear how much the list was ‘shaped’ by adults before it was published as a list written by a child. It might be the case that the adults involved in the ‘editing’ the wish list made changes based on what they liked, or, what they assumed children might like. The position ‘Child Executive Officer’ can be used as a marketing tool, as the title was used as the buzz word in the event promotion. By evoking the idea of the child, there is an expectation that this might increase

\(^{175}\) Ibid.


\(^{178}\) For the commission, Neuenschwander remade children’s drawings into costumes. She reframed their voices in her own practice.


accessibility and audience numbers – perhaps for adults, it might cater for the nostalgia for their own childhood?

1.2.3. Representations of Children in Museums

There are historical representations of children in museums, recent examples being: On Their Own: Britain’s Child Migrants a temporary exhibition at the V & A’s Museum of Childhood and the Ragged School Museum’s Ragged Children: Mended Lives, a permanent exhibition produced in collaboration with Queen Mary University. Both exhibitions opened in October 2015.

On Their Own focussed on British children who were sent to Australia and Canada in the early 1900s. Ellie Moffat, Curator of Maritime Collections at Merseyside Maritime Museum, describes the exhibition as one that ‘tells the story of a significant chapter in our history (…) we wanted to ensure that the difficult experiences these young children faced are shared with as wide an audience as possible’.181 The exhibition toured Australia and England: the Australian Maritime Museum, National Museums Liverpool and the V & A Museum of Childhood.

Although the exhibition was presented in a ‘museum of childhood’, it was undoubtedly aimed at an adult audience due to the subject matter, text-heavy content, and language used in the captions. For example, one read:

Children’s lives were shaped by these national differences, as well as the cultures of the organisations that sent and received them. Their vulnerability meant that the kindness, indifference or cruelty of the people they met often had a profound effect on their lives.

The language is not accessible to children and throughout the exhibition there appeared to be confusion in the display over for whom it was intended. Based on this introduction, the exhibition appeared to align itself with the image of the Apollonian child, one who is ‘vulnerable’ – a ‘public’ view of regarding the child – although their treatment was akin to the image of Dionysian child. They had been physically punished, arguably, behind closed doors.

Included in the exhibition were five letters written by children. The letters were presented as original documents, retyped on iPad screens for legibility, and as audio files. The children’s physical letters were presented for adults to read, framed and hung at adult height, rather than at the eyeline of a child. However, the audio recordings allowed for a different kind of accessibility. Indeed, when I was at the exhibition, a couple of children huddled around a headset, listening, before rushing off to find their mother. The voices were ‘dramatic’, which contrasted strongly with the dialogue in the rest of the exhibition. On first impression, the audio recordings were clichéd. The over-acted voice jarred with the letter and, in its attempts to be authentic, the voices were inappropriate and unbelievable. Another factor was that the voices were clearly adults who were mimicking younger voices; they were not children, they were not even teenagers. It was an adult speaking in the place of a child. This irritated me, and I began to question my response. There was an attempt to elide the distance between the performer and the performed, and when the attempt fails, the artifice seems artless, naïve, or manipulative. I have had similar reactions to performances where I have witnessed adults acting the roles of very young children. Is it the lack of ‘authenticity’ that makes the acted voices unappealing? A child’s voice is distinctly recognisable, and this is not it? Although this is my reaction, and cannot be attributed to every listener, the ‘falseness’ irritated me as the performances could not capture what they were pretending to be.

There are representations of children included in the Ragged School Museum’s Ragged Children: Mended Lives. The exhibition is housed in buildings that once formed the largest ragged free school in London, established by Dr Thomas Barnardo. 182 The ragged schools were organisations dedicated to the free education of destitute children. The emergence of these institutions coincided with the construction of the image of the Apollonian child, the publication of Rosseau’s Émile, and with it, the idea that a child should receive a formal education to become a good citizen.

The Ragged School Museum is clearly a place for children, as it hosts educational events that allow the children to take part in a Victorian lesson led by an actor playing the role of Miss Perkins. But the exhibition Mended Lives is aimed at both adults and children. The exhibition contains a few objects that are accompanied by text-heavy panels – but these objects do not
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182 Barnard’s Copperfield Road Free Road School opened its doors to children in 1877 and closed in 1908 when the government opened schools to serve families in the local area.
relate to the biographies mentioned, a curatorial decision also used in the Imperial War Museum’s *A Family At Wartime* when there is a lack of material remains.

One caption board is titled *Rights of the Child, Case Studies: “Saved From the Abyss”* in a bright-blue font. Below, the ‘stories’ of Rosina Florence Males, Rosa Bundey, William Flynn, Thomas Stevens, and James Fitzgerald are written. One extract reads:

Rosa Bundley
8 years old, from West London

When Rosa Bundley was 3, her father and five of her siblings died of scarlet fever. Her mother became an alcoholic and may have turned to sex work to make a living. She and Rosa lived in boarding houses, and at one point in Paddington Workhouse. Rosa came to Barnardo’s with her older sister Marion, who had work as a servant. Marion’s employer suggested that Rosa should be cared for by Barnardo’s. Later, Rosa was sent to Canada.
When Rosa came to Barnardo’s she was in poor health, with swollen glands and headlice. She was sent to the Barkingside Village for Girls, where this note records she was “Placed in Beehive Cottage. A good little child – Prepared for Canada”.

The text is accompanied by a black and white photograph of a child, and a scanned extract of handwriting from a ragged school report, dated 1883. There are no words or statements from Rosa, and it may be assumed that none were ever recorded. No objects accompany this display; it is merely a large caption mounted on a red stand. The exhibition reveals how little information remains on Rosa and the challenges faced by curators to tell her ‘story’.

1.2.4. Artists and Children

The ethical representation of individuals is complicated, especially in relation to children. Children are regarded as ‘vulnerable’ and this makes them potentially susceptible to exploitation – a viewpoint aligned with the public image of the Apollonian child. Artists have frequently worked with children to create their work, such as the Whitechapel’s Children’s Commission. Artists often use their own children in their work, such as Mary Kelly’s Post Partum Document (1976), Sally Mann’s Immediate Family (1992), Imogen Stidworthy’s A Whisper Heard (2003), and Sharon Kivland’s Mon Fils (2011). Mann’s work, in particular, highlights the ethical issues with using children, as she was accused of sexualising them in her photographs.183

In order to discuss representations of children, I will focus on two different works: Imogen Stidworthy’s A Whisper Heard (2003), which includes her son in the exploration of the acquisition and loss of language; and Simon and Tom Bloor’s work for the Whitechapel Gallery’s Children’s Commission (2013), in which they collaborated with children from Hermitage Primary School. These works are chosen as case studies as they address different areas: parent and child, and artist(s) and a school.

Imogen Stidworthy’s A Whisper Heard was first exhibited in 2003 at Matt’s Gallery. I saw it at the Wellcome Collection in February 2016.184 In the installation at the Wellcome Collection, Stidworthy’s notes from Journey To The Centre Of The Earth were attached to the wall. Journey To
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184 The installation was included as part of the exhibition States of Mind: Tracing the Edges of Consciousness at the Wellcome Collection in 2016.
The Centre Of The Earth is a story that explores disorientation and the notes included focus on a segment in the narrative when a man wakes up in a maze. A curtain was used as a screen to dampen sound but also to add barriers in the space, and it spiralled towards voices in the centre. Walking through the installation, winding inwards (metaphorically entering the space of the mind), I felt as disorientated as the narrator in Journey To The Centre Of The Earth. Inside the centre of the installation, I watched a man – Tony, who had suffered from a stroke – struggle to find words. Then I heard a child’s voice. At first I felt frustrated that another artist’s work was encroaching; it felt separate. I weaved my way out of the maze and found the little boy’s voice emanating from a small, white 1990s computer speaker screwed onto the wall. To my surprise, this voice was part of A Whisper Heard. Severin’s voice can be described in the frame of ‘ventriloquism’, as it is not the ‘child’s voice’ we hear, but the child reciting the ‘adult’s voice’. Unlike the voices in the exhibition On Their Own, the gap between the adult and child’s voice is apparent. The child is not performing a role and is following his mother’s instructions, but the words he has been asked to repeat are those of Jules Verne. The relationship between Severin and his mother, Stidworthy, plays into this action; I assume he would be relaxed in her company and able to ‘perform’.

Figure 1.5
Loose Parts
Simon and Tom Bloor
The Whitechapel Gallery, 2013
In comparison with Stidworthy’s representation of the child in *A Whisper Heard*, Simon and Tom Bloor’s *Loose Parts* involves the participation of school children, who have no personal relationship with the artists. *Loose Parts* was the outcome of the Whitechapel Gallery’s Children Commission in 2013. In the work, children destroyed clay sculptures that the artists had made to ‘encourage a sense of rebellion within the school’ [185]. This is comparable with Severin’s role in *A Whisper Heard*, as the children’s behaviour was directed by the artists. What if, in this instance, a child did not want to ‘destroy’ a clay sculpture? What if they wanted to keep it and take it home? What if, rather than simply ‘squashing’ the clay, the children wanted to shape something else from it? There was no room for this. The photographs taken of the children’s hands squashing the Bloor brothers’ sculptures are against a grey backdrop, posed, paused, controlled, directed. I question the children’s role in this project as there appears to be no room for their own expression and, if there had been, it was not included in the exhibition. This would not necessarily be a criticism if the work did not intend to ‘encourage rebellion’, as the children in *Loose Parts* are being obedient to the artists’ instructions. Their behaviour does not ‘rebel’ against the artists’ instructions. This opens up questions of the artists’ role and how ‘control’ shapes the children’s actions. What kind of authorship takes place in this instance, where the participants are given some agency, but the artists’ directing and editing process are selective? How much of the ‘child’ is left in the artwork?

In Childhood Studies there has been a similar debate on the role of the researcher and how their presence alters and influences children’s responses. The researcher who ‘listens’ to the child is at risk of marking the dialogues with their ‘motives’ [186] and could become a ‘subtle instrument of social control’. [187] In his article ‘Early Childhood Studies as Vocal Studies: Examining the social practices of “giving voice to children’s voices” in a crèche’ Oliver Schnoor writes:

‘Voices’ which seem to be only ‘elicited’ are, in fact, constructed in these practices. The treating of children, for example, as individuals with competencies to choose and make decisions on their daily life is itself a social practice and not divisible from the children’s dealing with this treatment and the resulting mutual influencing and adopting of ‘voices’. [188]

Although a different discipline, these questions could be applied to the artist who works with children in their practice. How much freedom or control should the artist allow? How does the artist represent the child in their work? How does artwork communicate the child’s voice? How can art practice and workshops with children capture the voice of the child instead of the institutionalised history of childhood?
CHAPTER TWO

METHOD OF PRACTICE

Art practice is the 'praxis'\(^{189}\) of this study; its *modus operandi*, and the central method of this research. Robin Nelson uses the term ‘praxis’ to describe the integration of practice and theory as a form of research. Nelson writes that it is an ‘iterative process of “doing-reflecting-reading-articulating-doing”’, \(^{190}\) we do not just think knowledge, ‘we “do” knowledge’. \(^{191}\) In this study, I work across a variety of media – drawing, performance, painting, sculpture, sound, filming, photography, digital process, participatory workshops – approaching the project from different angles determined by the research aims and subject matter. Knowing what medium I would explore at different stages of the practice was a decision based on planning and ‘intuitive’\(^{192}\) action.

This chapter addresses each stage of the practice chronologically, to form a story of the process. I outline the guiding principles that lie behind decisions but the findings are discussed in and expanded on in the chapters that follow. To illustrate the discussion, stitched into the binding of the following pages is a fold out map of the practice that can be used as a guide when working through the text. The practice is grouped by three themes – voice, control, empathy\(^{193}\) – that shape the resulting chapters – ‘Single and Multiple Voice’, ‘Freedom and Control’, ‘Empathy and Over-identification’.
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\(^{190}\) Op. Cit., p. 32.

\(^{191}\) Op. Cit., p. 66.


\(^{193}\) The works are bounded by theme: ‘voice’ in red, ‘control’ in grey, and ‘empathy’ in white.
Initial Experiments

I. Automatic Writing
II. Audio recording of automatic speech
III. Filming
IV. Photography
V. Dressed in Costume
VI. Being under hypnosis
VII. Performing a séance
VIII. Listening
IX. Sleeping
X. Rewriting and/or redisplaying museum captions

Initial Experiments:
The Horniman Museum
April 2015
Sleeping with the Artefact (film)
Writing the Artefact (text)
Looking at the Artefact (film)
Researching the Artefact (four screen film)
Speaking the Artefact (audio)

Initial Experiments:
The Museum of Witchcraft
August–September 2015
Cecil’s Captions (photography)
The Bodmin Witch (book)

Foundling Museum
Artist Residency
January–October 2016

Foundling Names (performance)
March 2016
Repeat After Me (film and voice)
Repeat After Me: A Second Time (film and voice)
Repeat After Me: Try Again (film and voice)
February 2016

Thomas’ Testimony (film)
Visitor Responses... (sound)
February 2016

Foundling Voices (film)

Listening in the Museum (film)
Sleeping in the Museum (film)

Foundling Flâneur (sound)
March 2016

HoneyWright (sound)
April 2016

Listening in the Museum (film)

Foundling Flâneur (sound)

Listening in the Museum (film)

Control

Foundling Museum Workshops

Observing
January–March 2016

Triumphant Lamentation (sound)

Foundling Voices
I. Two Foundling Voices
II. Three Foundling Voices
III Twenty-four Foundling Voices

28 January
10 February
4 February
25 February

15–29 April
Performance Workshops (in a theatre)

1 April–7 July
Character Workshops
(in a school and a home)

Becoming I (animation)

Becoming II (animation)

Generalised Empathy (digital)

Faded Memories (digital)

Foundling Museum Workshops

Leading
April–July 2016

28 January
Triumphant Lamentation (sound)

Foundling Voices
I. Two Foundling Voices
II. Three Foundling Voices
III Twenty-four Foundling Voices

10 February
Foundling Feelings (video)

4 February
EnsembleVoices (sound)

16–23 June
Art Workshops
(in the museum)

15–29 April
Performance Workshops (in a theatre)

1 April–7 July
Character Workshops
(in a school and a home)

Becoming I (animation)

Becoming II (animation)

Generalised Empathy (digital)

Faded Memories (digital)

Foundling Museum Workshops

Leading
April–July 2016

28 January
Triumphant Lamentation (sound)

Foundling Voices
I. Two Foundling Voices
II. Three Foundling Voices
III Twenty-four Foundling Voices

10 February
Foundling Feelings (video)

4 February
EnsembleVoices (sound)

16–23 June
Art Workshops
(in the museum)

15–29 April
Performance Workshops (in a theatre)

1 April–7 July
Character Workshops
(in a school and a home)

Becoming I (animation)

Becoming II (animation)

Generalised Empathy (digital)

Faded Memories (digital)
Initial Experiments

In 2015 I undertook a series of practical tests that allowed me to explore what methods might be used during an artist residency. This was a diagnostic period that allowed me to test how I might search for ‘voice’. Experiments took place at the Horniman Museum, the Museum of Witchcraft & Magic, Bishops’ House Museum, and the Foundling Museum. In these museums, I worked with objects associated with trauma and illness, such as charms, amulets, and tokens. These small, hand-size items belonged to 'Working'- and 'Under Class' people of eighteenth-century Britain; the owners of some objects are documented, but for others there are no records.

I explored my response to museum objects through physical touch, combined with:

I. Automatic writing.
II. Audio recording of automatic speech.
III. Filming.
IV. Photography.
V. Dressed in costume.
VI. Being under hypnosis.
VII. Performing a séance.
VIII. Listening.
IX. Sleeping.
X. Rewriting and/or redisplaying the museum captions.

The aim behind these experiments was to test my responses to these historical objects and how I might construct ‘voice’ through art practice. The motivation behind exploring the objects through touch was an attempt to test an interaction with the items outside the museum environment, such as the display cases, cabinets, and so on. However, I still had to wear purple latex gloves to protect the artefacts from any oil or residue on my skin. I had hoped that handling the object would close the distance between myself and the object, but the gloves

194 These practical experiments took place before the Ph.D. confirmation stage, which was scheduled one year into the project. These tests were included in my Ph.D. confirmation presentation to suggest where the practice might lead during the research once I began the artist residency at the Foundling Museum.
195 I used a digital Canon 5D Mark II camera and a handmade chestnut-wood 10” x 8” pinhole camera.
196 I underwent a hypnotic induction while handling charms and amulets at the Horniman Museum, as did forty participants who I invited to take part in the project, as I wanted to observe how different people responded to the same selection of museum objects.
became a new device of separation. In addition to the gloves, I was never permitted to be alone with the artefacts and there was always a member of the museum staff present, even when I was sleeping with the object. During these sessions, I felt uncomfortable and self-aware, but afterwards my self-awareness dissolved into humour; I had unintentionally disrupted the museum by challenging its role of ‘guardian’.

I view these initial experiments as a phase that occurred before the key stages of practice-based research. I have included this stage on the timeline of practice, but with a visual ‘break’ to signify a separation between the two. I do not discuss the findings from these sessions in the later chapters, but the processes needed addressing here, as it was a necessary process that helped develop the methods used in the project.

During these explorations, I discovered that these approaches produced results that were self-orientated, for example, automatic writing drew on my own memories and then applied them to the museum object; but this interpretation was potentially meaningless to another person. Due to the application of my personal taste, I produced stereotypes, such as a series of pin-hole photographs that appeared Victorian and ‘ghostly’. I was replacing the origins of the objects with my own narrative, but to what purpose? This realisation led me to work with others when searching for the child’s ‘voice’.

Phase I: Artist Residency

Part A: In the Museum
I secured an artist residency at the Foundling Museum in an attempt to understand the processes occurring in the institution, including what visitors could not see: the day-to-day, social dynamics, internal politics, and power play. To analyse these complicated social processes, I had to understand them intimately. The museum agreed to host me for one day a week during the six-month residency. During that time, I could enter the museum without a fee, speak to staff and visitors, and handle museum objects on request. The time restriction was in place to accommodate the staff at the museum to ensure other duties would run smoothly.
I chose to undertake an ‘artist residency’ as a means of accessing the collection, placing myself in the museum, rather than responding to their collection without their knowledge. If I had entered the museum ‘under cover’ – which I chose not to – I would have added restrictions to my research that would not help me to explore my research questions, including the prevention of access to objects that are held in the stores. Ultimately, I would be at risk of undertaking ‘covert research’; I would not be able to speak to museum staff and include it in my thesis. By undertaking a ‘residency’, I positioned myself in the museum rather than outside, anticipating that a level of trust and friendship would develop between me and the staff that would affect the critique of the institution.

Before the residency began I planned what I wanted to undertake. On the days that I was in the museum, I would speak to volunteers and invigilators, gathering stories and scraps of information on the museum’s history and working environment. I would speak to visitors in the museum about their response to the collection, specifically the foundling tokens, as these are objects that are intrinsically linked to the foundling’s biographies. I organised meetings with the Foundling Forum and visits to sites tied to the history of the museum, such as Charterhouse, a branch of the hospital in the 1700s.

I set a target to make a ‘sketch-work’ each week as an experiment to test ‘voice’. These experiments would not be exhibited, but were exploratory. I planned to work predominately in digital for speed and once each sketch-work was completed, it would be documented on a website197 that would allow me to view the work linearly so that I could spot developments as they occurred. The sketch-works are often made in response to workshop sessions and are not medium-specific, consisting of: readings, performances, films, text, objects, photography, and so on. The findings from this process are discussed in the chapters ‘Single and Multiple Voice’ and ‘Freedom and Control’.

Part II: in the Archive

Alongside time spent in the museum, I set aside dates to undertake research in the London Metropolitan Archive, which holds a number of the documents relating to the Foundling Hospital’s history, such as the petitions and billet books. I planned to read letters, to search for

197 Refer to: www.findingfoundlings.co.uk
any clues or traces of children, asking myself if this letter was written by a child, with the aim of piecing together a chronological biography. There are certain rules, or research methods, to follow when working in the archive: using a pencil when note-taking to prevent any damage to the documents, request items and Reading Room etiquette, how to open the books without damaging the spine by resting them on foam protectors, and using the microfilm machines. There are guides specifically for researching the Foundling Hospital that outline what items are available and the reference number.198 These requirements are in place so that the archive can care for the documents.

The archive is essentially a collection of documents. In ‘Archives, Documents, Traces’, Paul Ricoeur describes them as form of institutional activity in which ‘discrimination is unavoidable – what should be conserved, what thrown away?’199 A question that sounds familiar to the discussions raised in the previous chapter, and allows parallels to be drawn between archives and Authorised Heritage Discourse. Archives are an ‘authorised deposit’200 that allow us to view the aims of the institution. Jacques Derrida writes that ‘there is no political power without the control of the archive’,201 and that a country’s democratisation can be measured by the accessibility and interpretation of an archive.

Archives are a context of enquiry and source for many artists, including Susan Hiller, the Blunt Research Group, Sharon Kivland, Gerhard Richter, Christian Boltanski, the Atlas Group, Ilya Kabakov, and Corin Sworn. There has been a notable amount written on the archive, including Jacques Derrida’s Archive Fever, Simone Osthoff’s Performing the Archive, and the Whitechapel Gallery’s Documents of Contemporary Art’s The Archive. In ‘The Archival Impulse’ Hal Foster defines archival art as one that:

Make(s) historical information often lost or displayed, physically present. To this end [archival artists] elaborate on the found image, object, and favour the installation format.202

200 Ibid.
This statement might apply to Susan Hiller’s installation *After the Freud Museum*, which was a display of collected objects in boxes and presented in a vitrine at the Freud Museum. The work includes objects presented in an installation format; the work could be viewed as a form of Foster’s ‘archival impulse’. Hiller describes each box as an ‘installation within an installation’, and each box tells a story that is narrated by the artist.

The Blunt Research Group offer a reconstruction of archival texts in a series of poems, titled *The Lost Privilege Company*, printed anonymously in the *Chicago Review*, *The Recluse*, and *Gulf Coast* in 2015. The works are composed entirely from phrases from case files of the early youth prisons in California from 1910 to 1925. The writers employ italics when using the direct speech of the teen ‘wards’, aged between 13 and 17, whereas text without italics indicates the speech of fieldworkers interviewing the youths. Each poem is about an individual ward, and titled with their real name: Edward, Dimas, Pete, and so on. The work re-orders archival documents to construct narratives. I draw on the work of the Blunt Research Group when writing this thesis through the use of the three typefaces ‘Perpetua’, ‘Joanna’, and ‘gill sans light’. This design decision reminds the reader that there is a layering of voices in the text and this is an attempt to tease them apart, or to acknowledge where one might blur into another. Rather than drawing attention to each individual voice, I have chosen to highlight these three as I deem them important due to the nature of the research: attempting to take apart heritage discourse, exploring the role of the artist in this process, and the reconstruction of the child’s voice. This choice might also be at ‘danger of “othering”’ these voices; it might distance these separate the voices by making them stand out from my own. But I play with this separation and ‘othering’ – as if part of my art practice and the problems of representation spill onto the text.

The artist can ‘activate’ the archive, allowing for a re-representation of history and presenting narratives that are neglected. But there are ethical implications to working with archival material; the documents should be treated with care, both physically (not damaging the document) and morally (how/if one mis-represents and why).

Phase II: Social Art Practice

In my initial experiments, I used my body as a medium for the work – as a performer – but problems occurring during these tests led me towards working with children as a ‘collective body’. I aimed to use children’s art workshops as a testing ground to explore, make, and observe, in the hope that I would find material to incorporate into the constructed child’s ‘voice’. Art and performance workshops are often viewed in the frame of pedagogy, but in this study they are part of my art practice and structured to deliberately recreate an educational model to enable me to test the constraints of care that are built around children.

Claire Bishop calls the practice of artists using a ‘nonprofessional’ to perform a role in their artwork as ‘delegated performance’, which entails a displacement of the artist’s body/identity, and in so doing the artist is ‘guaranteed authenticity through [the ‘nonprofessional’ performer’s] proximity to the everyday’. The nonprofessional/child may bring a degree of authenticity in their material presence, as Bishop suggests, but their improvisations in the workshops are no less constructed and (potentially) clichéd than an adults. There are problems with representation in this practice, which will be discussed in relation to the practice as we move through the chapters.

However, in any exhibitions of practice, I will not be able to have the children present due to ethical restrictions in place and the need to hide their individual identities. Even so, I still consider them as performers who played a part in the creation of the work. In comparison, artists do not always have to conceal children’s identities in their work depending on the guidelines – of either the funding or the venue – to which they are adhering. Such as the artist Janet Hodgson, who employed children as performers in the work _History Lesson_, which was exhibited at the Bluecoat in Liverpool. For _History Lesson_, eight films that were projected throughout the building and local children performed as ‘characters’, appearing ‘like ghosts’. Hodgson hired local children for her work, and this was not prevented by any guidelines or restrictions in place at the venue. In comparison, my project has been undertaken for research and I am required to meet different ethical requirements put in place by the University. The children are not just actors, but part of the research, and must be aware of their position.

207 Op. Cit., p. 110
Alongside viewing the workshops as ‘delegated performance’, the sessions could also be encompassed by the wider term ‘social art practice’ that ‘involves people and communities in debate, collaboration or social interaction’.

My methods may be described in this frame. The children’s role in the workshops would be in flux, between the role of a performer, a collaborator, and a subject of research.

This form of social – or ‘participatory’ – art practice has been criticised as promoting cultural events, with short-term effects, and not always illuminating the power problems in play. Artist Fiona Whelan critiques the nature of socially-engaged art practice and the distinction between the ‘artist/non-artist’ in this dialogue and how this creates tension and separation in the work. There is also a discussion to be had for the single (the artist and/or participants as individuals) and the collective authorship in the practice, and how the boundaries are in flux during the process.

In *Artificial Hells*, Clare Bishop writes that ‘instead of supplying the market with commodities, participatory art is perceived to channel art’s symbolic capital towards constructive social change’. Bishops warns that the ethical criteria and evaluation of such projects emphasise the ‘process *as* product’ as an inversion of capitalism’s predilection to justify and evaluate the work, rather than what the project achieves in terms of ‘artistic mastery and individualism’. However, it is crucial to evaluate this field ‘*as art*, since this is the institutional field in which it is endorsed and disseminated’.

A number of artists employ social engagement in their art practice, including Assemble, Becky Shaw, Rivane Neuenschwander, Lucy Orta, Superflex, Jeanne van Heeswijk, Temporary Services, Simon and Tom Bloor (as discussed earlier), and many others.

---


Becky Shaw’s project *Hiding In Plain Sight*216 was developed during working with healthcare practitioners moving into research careers at King’s College London, and in response to historic images of nurses at the Florence Nightingale Museum. The project, including a film with Rose Butler, explored how ‘observing, witnessing and experiencing affects and informs practice and research’217 through a collaboration with health-care research students at King’s College London. Shaw writes that her ‘process of making work usually involves letting people or a situation generate a direction’,218 but that ‘escaping representation in social art practice seems almost impossible’.219

There are numerous books written on social art practice, key texts including Bishop’s *Artificial Hells* (as mentioned), Shannon Jackson’s *Social Works*, Nato Thompson’s *Living As Form*, and Pablo Helguera’s *Education for Socially Engaged Art*. I draw on Jackson’s book, as she uses theory from performance – such as writing from Brecht – to unpick the mechanisms of social art practice.

**Part A: Observing the Museum’s Art Workshops**

Before I was permitted to lead workshops, the museum requested that I observe their current sessions. I began by observing nursery workshops, then assisting with teenagers, a group of home-schooled children, and family workshops. Each session was led by an artist and lasted between one and two hours. I noted how the artists addressed the children and how the activities were structured.220 This enabled me to view the problems in the current system – such as the pressures from funding bodies, group numbers, time restrictions, and expectation of a final product – and it strengthened my understanding of the social processes at play. I drew on the process of observation to plan my own sessions.

**Part B: Leading Art Workshops with Children**

The sessions I led were structured for children aged between five to fourteen-years old, the age of the children living in in the Foundling Hospital. At five-years old, the foundlings were taken

216 On this project, *Hiding In Plain Sight*, Becky Shaw was working in collaboration with artist Rose Butler and curator Frances Williams.
220 This information is included in the later chapter ‘Freedom and Control’.
from their wet nurses and returned to the hospital. At fourteen years, the foundlings were regarded as adults and they started their apprenticeships. Between these ages the children were in the care of the hospital before reaching adulthood, called ‘foundlings’. This cusp of adulthood is of interest to me during the search for the historical child’s voice, and it is the motivation behind working with this age group.

As the workshops formed part of the art practice, I aimed to generate work *with* the children, rather than to treat them as an audience. I intended to explore how contemporary children engage with the narratives of the historical child in the museum, questioning if they responded with empathy or indifference. It also allowed me to build on Bishop’s observations of ‘guaranteed authenticity’ in delegated performance and Selwyn’s notion of hot authenticity when representing the historical child with the outcome becoming *fuel* for my art practice and the ‘authentic heat’.

The museum could only host a certain number of workshops, so I arranged further sessions independently outside the institution to accommodate this. I could then explore the effect of different locations: the museum, a school, a theatre and a home. I worked with larger groups of thirty students to smaller, more intimate, groups of four children. The locations opened up new questions as it altered the way that the children responded in the session; for example, the children were more at ease in the family home. I expand on the findings in the chapter ‘Freedom and Control’.

At the start of each workshop session, I introduced the group to the Foundling Hospital’s history and the admissions process to the Hospital. This presentation and discussion was based on the structure in place at the museum and on the sessions I had observed. I began by illustrating the quality of life at the time of the Foundling Hospital with Hogarth’s *Gin Lane*. If I ran my workshop at the museum, I took the group on a tour of the museum’s *Introductory Gallery*, and if not, it was a presentation with images and questions.

**Part C: The Workshop Structure**

I addressed the group as Dorothy Heathcote recommends in *The Mantle of The Expert* as experts rather than passive attendees, which is not the mainstream model of teacher/pupil
relationship. Artist Fiona Whelan used a similar structure for *What’s the Story? Collective*, based on Jacques Rancière’s *The Ignorant Schoolmaster*. ‘Equality became a starting point,’ she says, and subject identities were not removed but ‘symbolically laid flat, highlighting our differences in knowledge’. This ‘equality’ can be hard to achieve, and it is not necessarily the same experience for every child involved. I kept the title ‘artist’ rather than ‘teacher’ when working with the children to keep my position as one who works outside the school or the museum, using the sessions as a form of art practice.

After the introductions and opening discussions, I facilitated warm-up exercises based on methods from theatre practitioner Konstantin Stanislavski’s *System*, such as ‘Given Circumstances’. In theatre, the technique of ‘Given Circumstances’ refers to details given or implied in a play-script, but rather than this form, I sourced this information from historical records and retold it to the children so that they could interpret it into their performances; for example, the children imagined themselves as foundlings, inventing a foundling character. The children were given situations based on the Foundling Hospital – I would discuss facts such as names, dates, tokens, or the food the children ate, and so on – and that influenced their invented character’s development and movement.

Following on from the warm-up games, the workshops progressed to either drama or art-based activities. Exploring the history of the museum and the lives of foundlings through *action*, including: improvised performances, storytelling, token-making, portrait painting, and drawing. Throughout the sessions, the children constructed an imagined ‘character’ foundling. As discussed in the ‘Introduction’, character is a term that needs to be treated with caution in relation to history as it can lead to a misidentification, in that the children mistake the Foundling Hospital as a wholly fictional situation. However, in the sessions I found that it was useful when working with children aged between five and fourteen-years old, as it was a word with which they were familiar from literature and role-play that helped them understand the task that was set: to imagine what it was like to be a foundling.

223 Whelan and Ryan, *Beating the Bounds of Socially Engaged Art?*
224 These activities are outlined and explored in the later chapter ‘Freedom and Control’.
Characterisation and the presentation of historical people is a blurred territory in the project. The children were asked to blend fact and fiction to imagine the spaces in-between: the foundlings, the gaps in history, the ‘little blanks’. The children’s imagined ‘characters’ were used to highlight these blanks and these fictional representations are viewed in relation to the foundlings’ lives. When I planned the sessions, I assumed that the children’s imagined characters would function differently to the other use of adult actors, such as that of actors playing stock or stereotypical characters in museum settings. I wanted to explore how children imagine the past, but more particularly, how a child imagines another historical child and what this could bring to the representation. My intention was not only to engage the children with the narrative of the foundlings, but also to help myself understand – as an adult – how a child might respond. I intended this to avoid the pitfalls entailed with imagining how I thought a child would respond, and the practice becoming a conventional representation of childhood.

Part D: Drawing and Field Notes as Documentation
When working with children, research ethics underpin every method that is integrated into the project, both in what was practically explored and in the subject being explored. The most notable impact on the research was the consideration of how the workshops could be documented as photography and filming was prevented. Instead, I adopted field notes and drawing as a method of observation; it was quick to record the sessions while they were taking place without breaking any ethical rules and keep the group at ease, as a pencil did not seem as intrusive as a camera: it was small and discreet, the only lens my eye.

The anthropologist Michael Taussig discusses drawings in field notebooks as ‘fragments suggestive of a world beyond’. However, they are frequently omitted from the final publication, and thought of as ‘mere aids’ that are part of a process rather than a final product. This is how I anticipated that they would work in my study, not as a final artwork, but as a method to reflect and understand what I was observing. Taussig questions if he drew what he truly observed, writing ‘after that I made the drawing, as if I still couldn’t believe what I had

225 Charles Dickens, ‘Received a Blank Child’, *Household Words*, London: Bradbury & Evans, March 1853.
seen’. 228 He describes this doubt as ‘witnessing’ rather than ‘seeing’. This difference between these two types of observation will be used to analyse my role as a witness to the workshop sessions in the following chapters.

For each session, I worked on A1 paper to examine each workshop. I segmented the page to separate my reflections and act as a prompt to ensure I revisited my observations. Each sheet followed the same format:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentation</th>
<th>Reflections</th>
<th>Drawings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Return</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The left panel contains the documentation of the workshop, which I aimed to complete during or immediately after the session.

- The right panel contained drawings, which I aimed to complete during or on the day of the workshop. These consisted of images of the children, the actions, or the workshop outputs.

- The upper-centre panel contains reflections, written a few days after the session. This writing builds on the initial writings and analyses my observations.

- The lower-centre panel contains return. This section adds any thoughts, completed a week after the workshop.

The field notes are used to illustrate the text in the chapter ‘Freedom and Control’.

Phase III: Art Practice as Curation

After the art workshops and the residency, I was left with ‘parts’—remains from the session—but nothing whole. I had from June to October to construct works from these ‘parts’, which would then be exhibited at the museum for an ‘artist residency closing event’ on 14 October 2016. During this process, I integrated curatorial methods into my art practice. I worked with the remnants from the workshops—the children’s artworks, voice-recordings, art equipment—as if they were artefacts. I aimed to consider the museum as the site, and place objects in dialogue with the collection.

While artists often work with found objects and materials, this does not make always it ‘curation’. The artist as curator can construct an ‘intervention’ in a collection, museum, or archive by proposing alternative display methods to the ‘historical (and, often, imperial) lineage of institutional cultures of curating’.229 In *The Culture of Curating and the Curating of Culture(s)*, Paul O’Neill discusses curating as a form of art practice, writing:

> There has been a clear shift away from an artist-centred cultural hierarchy toward a post-productive discourse, in which the function of curating has become another recognised part of the expanded field of art making.230

The etymology of curating comes from the Latin for ‘care’, *curare*. Traditionally a curator was a keeper of cultural heritage at an institution, such as a museum or gallery. The curator is responsible for cataloguing, managing, assembling, and displaying collections. The role also includes planning for exhibitions, researching the collection, and making decisions on how objects should be interpreted. This may include writing captions and the representation of historical people. In Scotland, the term ‘curator’ also means the guardian of a child. It is a legal term: a curator *ad litem*. In this instance, the curator acts independently in the child’s best interest. This is not dissimilar to the ethical restrictions on my art practice: the child’s identity is hidden, there are no photographs, video footage, or names attached to the research. In my practice, I will continue to question if it is possible for the children to maintain their visibility when these guidelines are adhered to.

---

This chapter and those that follow adhere to a similar format: beginning by unpicking key terms, followed by weaving the practice-based research into a discussion that addresses one of the research aims. In this chapter, I explore ‘how art practice might communicate the historical persons “voice” and examine the value of multiple “voices” in the museum’. What can happen if you use artwork to ‘speak’ for another? Before I begin to discuss the practice, I set the foundations for the discussion through a speculation of ‘voice’.

Voice is linked to its ‘carrier’ and their breath. Historically, time, sound, air, and soul were often fused as one.\textsuperscript{231} Aristotle linked the Greek word for breath, \textit{pneuma}, to the ‘soul’ in the phrase \textit{pneuma symphyton}, breath as vehicle for the soul.\textsuperscript{232} In \textit{The Order of Sounds}, François Bonnet writes that breath and voice are ‘immediately and intimately bound to those endowed with them, and directly linked to Origin myths’.\textsuperscript{233} The gods used breath to create life and every being was given a name. We take breath into our bodies and expel it. The air passes through our vocal cords, which vibrate to cause phonation. The voice travels up from within us, passes through our mouths (which performs around it\textsuperscript{234}) and breaks away from our body as sound waves that compress and refract, travelling across space and through a medium (such as air), and into the ear of the listener. The voice is placed between the listener and the speaker – the subject and the Other – at an intersection. To allow oneself to hear another voice, there needs to be a degree of silence. Then, we can feel the sound of the voice ‘\textit{in our body}’.\textsuperscript{235}

A voice can be conceptualised as external; as a laugh, a call, a babble, a cry, and so on. In learning to speak as a child, we incorporate the voice of the Other (by mimicking sounds and words from our parents, for example). The voice is an operator between the exterior and interior of our body, but belongs to neither, ‘placed in a zone of overlapping’\textsuperscript{236} between ourselves and the Other. The foundling children were taught their first words while in the care

\textsuperscript{233} Bonnet, \textit{The Order of Sounds}, p. 13.
\textsuperscript{235} Op. Cit., p. 4.
of their wet nurses; later they were educated in the Foundling Hospital, and from the 1800s, they were taught to read and write. One of the methods was ‘rote-learning’, one of repetition, where the child would mimic the adult.

A voice can also be internal; hearing voices in psychosis and the voice of the superego, for example. The best-known of all internal voices is the Socratic voice, the ‘daemon’ that accompanied Socrates throughout his life. The internal voice – Socrates’ daemon – was externalised in Philip Pullman’s *His Dark Materials* trilogy as a voice with which one interacted outside of the body. The ‘daemon’ took on an animal form and could be seen by oneself and by others and it could not be hidden inside the mind. How do we establish a divide between our own internal voice and that of the Other? Where is the origin of these voices? This is ‘the first ontological break’\(^\text{237}\) when we begin to differentiate between the exterior and interior world.

To ‘give voice’ is to be able to express an emotion or opinion, but it also has issues of authenticity. Issues arise when the singular ‘voice’ is referred to as multiple ‘voices’. Article 12 of the UNCRC speaks of the best interests of ‘the child’ when referring to all children; the sociologist Allison James questions the use of the singular term ‘child’ to refer to all ‘children’; she writes, ‘far from giving children greater audibility and visibility as social actors […] children are simply further disempowered’.\(^\text{238}\) James suggests that the idea of the child’s ‘voice’ in research is problematic as it assumes that they are participants in the project, but, James proposes that they are ‘objects of adult research’,\(^\text{239}\) which could lead to ‘ethnographic ventriloquism’.\(^\text{240}\) Might being part of the research project influence the children’s responses, and if so, how could this effect be measured? How could the child’s voice be teased apart from that of the researcher?

Voice can also be considered as a silence and to take away another’s voice is to assert power.\(^\text{241}\) In *The Body in Pain*, Elaine Scarry describes the absent voice as being a goal of the torturer and the removal of another’s voice is a display of control.\(^\text{242}\) In *This is a Voice*, Steven Connor writes

\(^{239}\) James, *Giving Voice to Children’s Voices*, p. 262.
\(^{241}\) Steven Connor, *This is a Voice*, London: Wellcome Trust, 2016, p. 10.
that an infant’s voice is ‘all they have to command and control the world’,\textsuperscript{243} as they are born physically powerless. I set out to find a voice that I believed was missing – or ‘lost’.

When considering the loss of voice, I recall Disney’s \textit{The Little Mermaid}, based on Hans Christian Anderson’s fairy tale. The mermaid Ariel makes a deal with a sea witch and agrees to exchange her voice for human legs. In the animation, when the spell is cast to grant the wish, Ariel sings and her throat begins to glow. As she continues to sing, her voice sounds as if it is dividing in two, but when her mouth is still, another voice (an echo of the original) keeps on singing. The evil sea witch’s hands then reach into the mermaid’s throat and pull out a glowing yellow ball that continues to sing with Ariel’s ‘other’ voice – this object represents the ‘voice’. The witch houses the voice in a sea shell. Ariel has ‘lost’ her voice and is mute. Could this narrative be a metaphor to imagine the ‘lost’ voice? Whether or not it has been lost, stolen, or displaced?

Before I began my residency at the Foundling Museum in February 2016, I searched for the foundling children’s testimonies in the London Metropolitan Archive. Although I found scraps – character references and letters from the foundlings as adults – I questioned if this missing ‘voice’ was ‘lost’. Had it existed? Could it be found? Why had it not been recorded?

There are different kinds of ‘lost’ in this instance. We know that the children did keep school books where they would write during their lessons (perhaps they wrote notes and messages in these pages) so a record of these children’s voices might have existed as a record, but was perhaps not regarded as historically significant so was not kept. Although the London Metropolitan Archive only has two school books in its collection – Abraham Taylor’s handwriting book is one of these – there must have been many more. Between the recited words and controlled penmanship in the handwriting books, the only trace of the child is in the little inky fingerprints that occasionally mark the page. Given the historical time of the Foundling Hospital, and how the concept of childhood has changed since then, perhaps the child’s voice did not exist then as it does today and was not regarded as having any value.

There is also the matter of technology, as writing was the only means to record voice and technology was not available as it is today; audio recording was impossible and there were no phone calls or radio transmissions. Audio recording has only been possible since the invention

\textsuperscript{243} Connor, \textit{This is a Voice}, p. 10.
of the phonograph in 1877. Although recently, archivist David Giovanni and historian Patrick Feaster have been using modern processes to uncover ‘unheard’ voices; they have been able to recover voices from the past ‘traced in soot’,244 notably the voice of Édouard-Léon Scott singing ‘Au Clair de la Lune’ on a phonautogram245 in 1860.

The ‘lost object’ has been discussed extensively in psychoanalysis. Sigmund Freud’s *Three Essays on Sexuality* includes the essay ‘The Finding of an Object’, which concerns the transformations during adolescence. Discussing the primal object, the mother’s breast, he writes that the investment in a sexual partner after puberty is a rediscovery of this object. He writes, ‘the finding of an object is in fact a re-finding of it’.246 But what if this ‘lost object’ is never found and is essentially phantasmatic? Jacques Lacan further developed the idea of a ‘lost object’ as an object that never was. It was only considered as lost after the fact, when the subject cannot find ‘it’ in fantasy or dreams. It is a symbol of ‘lack’ and the helpless quest for fulfilment. Lacan calls the unattainable object of desire the *objet petit a*. The *a* signifies *autre* (other) and the *object* derives from the Freudian ‘object’ meaning ‘otherness’.

244 Caption at the British Library, *Listen: 140 Years of Recorded Sound* exhibition
245 A ‘phonautogram’ is the visual study of acoustic sound, tracing vibrations using a pig bristle stylus onto lampblack-coated paper.
In psychoanalysis, voice is ‘part-object’ – the invocatory object, or ‘sound object’⁴⁷ – that serves as a vehicle for expression. It is only part of the body, not the whole (such as the mother’s breast). It is not a particular sound of a voice that the ‘object’ refers to, but the fundamental relationship of the outside (the other) to the inside (the self), which the subject will define as a ‘lack’.⁴⁸ In Lacanian theory, the function of the part-objects is it to ‘extinguish the material to which they owe their existence’⁴⁹ (such as the speaker from whom the voice originates) and thus ‘they leave a vacant space’,⁵⁰ which is the origin of desire. Lacan identified voice as objet petit a, and with this identification, we can think of voice as a sound that we hear and also an empty space. A subject defined by lack that cannot be fulfilled, which is a ‘curiously soundless notion of voice’.⁵¹

Commenting on Lacan’s theory as voice as objet petit a, Mladen Dolar writes that to conceive voice as a part-object, we must not think of it as a voice that can be heard, it is not a thing that exists, but it is ‘evoked only by bits of materiality, attached to them as an invisible, inaudible appendage yet not amalgamated with them: it is both evoked and covered, enveloped by and conceals the voice’.⁵² Dolar comments on the nature of voice as one that never ‘fully synchronizes’⁵³ with the one who speaks.

In The Little Mermaid, Ariel’s ‘lost’ voice is separated from her body and trapped in a shell. Later on in the story, a sea witch pretends to be Ariel by speaking with her voice by wearing the shell as a necklace. She fools the prince by singing, while Ariel – now a human girl – remains mute. Could Ariel’s voice be compared to objet petit a? her voice as ‘object’? Part of the body; a part-object that has been lost, or, separated? A ‘lack’, as she cannot claim her identity without her voice.

In the following sections, I consider the relationship between voice and object, ventriloquism, the synchronisation of voice, the representation of voice, and the collective voice.

---

⁴⁹ Ibid.
⁵⁰ Ibid.
⁵³ LaBelle, The Lexicon of the Mouth, p. 5.
3.1. Found Voices

3.1.1. In the Archive

Michel de Certeau writes that there is a ‘ghosting of speech’ in the rearrangement of texts by administrative powers in the documentation of situations. This might include the choice to acquire and catalogue particular texts, such as the inclusion of the Foundling Hospital committee minutes in the London Metropolitan Archive. However, it is not only the preservation of the document but what was chosen to be written down in the document itself that is an act of preservation. There are other examples of a 'ghosting of speech' in the Foundling Hospital records, such as the crosses that take the place of foundling mother’s names on the hospital petitions, which are also a sign of illiteracy; the inability to document one’s own name due to lack of education. The foundling children’s verbal testimonies have been silenced, deleted from history. There are no crosses or marks. They are, as Charles Dickens writes, ‘little blanks’; they have no name. De Certeau compares these historical absences with the narrative of Robinson Crusoe, when the protagonist was ‘haunted, by an absent other that returned to the shores of the island, by “the print of a man’s naked foot on the shore”’. Crusoe is haunted by a mark of the body, a smudge. It is not a voice, but ‘a mark of an “apparition” (that) disturbs the order that a capitalising and methodical labour has constructed’. The footprint is feared as something material that has arrived and might destroy or challenge his order. Is that the same for the historical child? I can only assume that the children’s voices were not included in the archive – not because they were feared – but because it was not considered necessary.

Contemporary art practice may be used to draw attention to absent voices and under-represented people, by giving them a ‘place’ in archives and museums, which in turn disrupts and challenges order; like the footprint. An example of such an attempt in the Foundling Museum is the exhibition The Fallen Woman, July 2015. It was promoted as aiming to ‘give a

---
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voice' to the mothers in the museum’s history, and as part of the exhibition, a sound installation *Fallen Voices* by Steve Lewinson was commissioned. It met with mixed reviews.

*Fallen Voices* feature the voices of actors in an attempt to ‘[bring] to the fore the voices which have previously been hidden’. Lewinson remarks that in the hospital’s two hundred-year history, the women’s stories are unheard, and that most of the petitions were written by men, due to female illiteracy. *Fallen Voices* layers the women’s speech (it hisses), drawing on stereotypical associations of ‘magic’ and spell-casting. Lewinson describes the sound as ambiguous, using distortions to ‘reflect the mythologised idea of the “fallen” woman’. The curator speaks about how *Fallen Voices* allows the visitor to feel as if the spaces are ‘haunted’ by the women and ‘that the words […] make the walls come alive’. The work borders on cliché in the representation of the dead as ghosts.

The layering of voices unifies the women, and the individual accounts become one representation. The actors whisper passages from selected petitions held in the London Metropolitan Archive; the words are undecipherable. The listener can hear a scratching of the man’s pen, as if writing the petition, and this sound overpowers the women’s words. The work does not ‘bring voices of the women to the fore’, but perhaps, rather than ‘overwriting’ of the women, the aim was instead to show how she/they were elided. Their narratives are merged and multiple voices become combined as one in the work.

De Certeau warns that the quest for the historical voice, which he refers to as the ‘voice of the people’, is useless. This statement – the ‘voice of the people’ – implies a collective body, as portrayed in *Fallen Voices*. In comparison, the contemporary ‘voice’ is recorded countlessly; normalised and mediated on the television and radio. But the unrecorded voice of the past has been ‘simultaneously colonized and mythified by a recent Western history’.

---
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past can be found interpreted in fiction, historical books, and films, all of which are a fantasy that fulfil society’s expectations. This ‘fantasy’ can be compared to Authorised Heritage Discourse, which – although it relies on truth and certainty – also re-establishes an elite viewpoint or national identity through the representation of the past. The voice of the past can be found outside of fiction, as testimony, in archives, and so on. But in these forms, it could have been ‘tidied up’ by those in a position of power (such the testimonies written down in the Foundling Hospital’s committee minutes). De Certeau writes that the historical voice is determined by a system, such as social or familial. There is no ‘pure’ voice to be uncovered. In this discussion, he uses the singular noun ‘voice’ to refer to the multiple ‘voices’ of the past and in so doing, he highlights the failures that arise in the search, such as multiple lives combined as a singular experience.

3.1.2. In Literature

Foundling voices may be found in different literary forms, from Charles Dickens’ fictional character Tattycoram in Little Dorrit to Hannah Brown’s 1919 autobiography The Child She Bare, by a foundling. However, these texts do not contain the child’s voice. They are the voice/s of childhood. Dickens observed children and he frequently visited the Foundling Hospital, but the speech in his novels cannot be mistaken for direct quotation from children. The voices have been reframed and edited by an adult for a fictional narrative. They are present to perform a role in the narrative. The Child She Bare is a novel written by a foundling, but when Hannah Brown was an adult. The text is no longer the voice of the child, but one of childhood reminiscence.

At the 3rd conference for the National Centre for Research in Children’s Literature, the speakers and attendees (predominantly novelists) could not see issues with writing the child’s voice and constructing it in fiction. This method has a place in literature when the ‘voice’ is presented as a narrative device. However, when the ‘voice’ is situated in a museum and linked to a person who lived it has a different requirement and historical weight. In the context of this study, if I were to speak for the child it could become Authorised Heritage Discourse, as I would be an expert (researcher, artist, adult) speaking in the place of another. The representation may be perceived as truthful in the museum, whereas in fiction it is not.
In Henry Mayhew’s *London Labour and the London Poor*, accounts of the lives of the poor (such as the foundlings and their mothers) were documented. In Karl Marx’s *Capital*, children’s testimonies have been documented. Marx quotes testimonies from Mr Scriven’s Report of 1841 to the Children’s Employment Commissioners printed in the first report of the *Commission on the Employment of Children* (1863). The children included in the report are in a comparable situation with the foundlings – they are apprenticed in industry, such as in pottery or the mills, common work placements for foundlings in the 1800s. The children’s voices are documented as follows:

Fifteen hours of labour for a child of 7! J. Murray, 12 years of age, says: ‘I turn jogger and run moulds. I come at 6. Sometimes I come at 4. I worked all last night, till 6 o’clock this morning. I have not been to bed since the night before last. There were eight or nine other boys working last night. All but one have come in this morning. I get 3 shillings and sixpence. I do not get any more for working at night. I worked two nights last week.’

Marx quotes the children, and interrupts with thoughts (‘Fifteen hours of labour for a child of 7!’) that are a form of de Certeau’s ‘ghosting of speech’. How much of the child’s voice has been edited by the adult writing the testimony? No doubt the regional accents – like Joseph’s Yorkshire accent in Emily Brontë’s *Wuthering Heights* – were not recorded in the children’s speech, omitted for accessibility. Although it might not be an accurate voice, the testimony could construct a hot authenticity for the reader that then allows for a sense of the child to develop in the reader’s imagination.

3.1.3. The Spectators’ Voice

When undertaking the residency at the museum, I considered the foundling tokens as an ‘abstract’ for the children (as Sworn described her objects in *Silent Sticks* – an object where ‘the being had died but the figure has remained’). Might gathering verbal responses to these ‘abstracts’ begin to fill (or draw attention to) the space of the child’s absent voice?
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I spoke to visitors about their responses to the foundling tokens. I asked how these objects made them feel, which one caught their eye, what the object made them think, what memories it triggered. A number of visitors refused to speak to me, but there were a few visitors who felt comfortable in engaging in conversation, which was recorded with their consent. Afterwards, I listened through the recordings, and edited the dialogue to remove any trace of my own voice as I was not interested in my questions, but fascinated with the visitor’s responses. I wanted the listener to focus on their answers, the motivation behind the erasure. The voices were edited to become the sound piece, Visitor Responses at the Foundling Museum (9m 58s). It is conversational and there are no audio effects; speakers describe their responses one after another.

The following are extracts from the recording:

I think it’s great because each one you think of the story that is behind the token […] I think it’s just really beautiful, showing that rich people and even poor people had to give up their children (Girl, 12).

It’s very unusual, like, why would you bring a coin (Boy, 11).
I guess people didn’t have anything else to identify their children with (Mother).
They had one thing? Ale.
Ale is not their name.
Take it off a bottle of beer –
They had that. They had that. That’s all they had.

Speakers related the foundling tokens to their own lives and memories, rather than empathising with the foundlings, such as:

Rouge make-up, I know what rouge was. […] ’Cause she had macular degeneration she couldn’t see what she was doing, so she always had these bright red cheeks! (Woman).

Even in my lifetime in the 50s, children were sent off to Australia. It was dreadful. (Woman).

Objects may ‘evoke flash-images and trigger memories’ in the viewer, revealing more about the individual than the foundlings. This was also the case in my earlier works that I made

during the diagnostic period, which I discussed earlier in the chapter ‘Method of Practice’. My responses to museum objects revealed more about me, my contemporary ideas and tastes than they did about the history of the object.

Even though the audio editing was minimal, the work still went through the editing process. I chose to remove and include certain conversations, constructing a narrative and changing the order of speakers. In so doing, the contemporary voices have been ‘rearranged and tidied up’. As the artist of the work, I have power over the presentation and I question how much of the work is my voice. Although I am not heard (I removed my speech entirely in the editing process) I am still present. The artist can never be fully removed from the work, no matter how hard I tried to play a neutral role. I have not directed or changed the order of words in the speech. Perhaps, this work could be described as the artist being a ‘prism’ for another’s voice. The spectators’ voices have been refracted. The idea of refraction will be drawn throughout this chapter as I question my (the artist’s) effect on the voices of others and how I have reframed them in my artwork.

The museum visitors’ accents are noticeable; there are speakers with Received Pronunciation, Scottish, Essex, or American accents. Their speech is unconsciously judged by the listener based on their preconceptions, and this alters the response to the work and the speaker. A preconception might be that a speaker with Received Pronunciation would come from an upper-class, southern family rather than a working-class, northern family. In particular, the boy who says, They had that. They had that, cannot comprehend that the mother would only have a beer bottle, voices his contempt in a stereotypical upper-class accent. His accent changes the way that the listener receives his statement.

When I hear the clinking of metal bracelets (which I remember were gold when I was recording the conversation), I compare both the present and the past visitors to the Foundling Hospital/Museum. In the nineteenth century, when mothers came to the Foundling Hospital to ask for their baby to be accepted into care, the upper class would come and watch for entertainment, not dissimilar to observing public executions, patients in madhouses, or

---

269 I held objects in the Horniman Museum and the Foundling Museum and responded to them through automatic writing. The handling sessions were recorded and were edited, becoming a moving image piece played across four screens, which was screened at Sheffield Hallam University’s METHOD conference in May 2015.
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criminals in prisons. Michel Foucault writes how observation in these spaces is a form of control, in that spaces were ‘no longer built simply to be seen […] or to observe the external space […] but to permit an internal, articulated and detail to control – to render visible those who are inside it’.\textsuperscript{272} He describes a school, the École Militaire, that appeared to be built for the this purpose. ‘The pupils were confined to their cells throughout the night’, he writes, with ‘a window placed on the corridor wall of each room from chest-level’ as an apparatus of observation.\textsuperscript{273} The motivation behind this act could be to ensure the children remain pure and don’t get up to any mischief, like the Dionysian child the adults must ensure that the potential for evil is removed. It could also be to keep the child safe, or to quickly observe if any have been taken sick. The control of children is discussed in detail in the following chapter, \textit{Freedom and Control}.


3.2. The Constructed Voice

3.2.1. The Artist’s Voice

In London Metropolitan Archive, I found a bundle of letters. They were character references addressed to the Foundling Hospital, written by the foundling’s masters (adults). In the references, the masters used the same descriptions and qualities for their apprentices. Characteristics of ‘honesty’ and ‘sobriety’ were highly valued. The boys were apparently better behaved than the girls, especially if the girls were apprenticed as servants in pairs.
I photographed and edited scans of the letters in Adobe Photoshop so they were easier to read. The phrases that related to the foundlings were ‘highlighted’, rather than the discussions regarding the adults and their businesses. Highlighting became a process of erasure. I created new gaps. Craig Dworkin writes about works that are blank, erased, or silent in his book *No Medium*, suggesting that these works can only become legible in social contexts.²⁷⁴

The edited letters became the work *Founding Characters*, exhibited at the Peltz Gallery as part of *Research In Practice (R.I.P.)* in January 2016. I printed out ten digitally altered letters, keeping the same dimensions as the originals. The scale meant that the difficulty in legibility remained because the cursive handwriting was very small (see Figure 3.3).

I had not seen the exhibition space until the event. I decided to place the letters in a vitrine as it is visually similar to the display methods currently in place at the museum, which allowed me to test the work in this format. Alongside exhibiting the documents at R.I.P., I read the work aloud. During the performance, I paused when there was blank space in the text to allow moments of silence and disjointed sentences. Listeners commented that the silence was ‘haunting’ because they began to imagine what was in the gaps and often what is imagined is more upsetting than the reality.

The performance was unrehearsed and so mistakes were made, partly due to the unfamiliar language and size of the text. I stumbled on words and, on listening to the recording, it sounded as if my body was rejecting the text. These words were not mine, they were the words of the foundlings’ masters (a historical adult’s voice). In the mistakes, there was an ‘honesty’ – perhaps, even a ‘hot’ authenticity – and a vulnerability. The performance was a reading. I had not practiced or memorised the words, so I had to face the vitrine with my back to the audience. In the performance, my body created a barrier between the text and the spectators. In hindsight, the work led me to consider the hierarchy produced by the artist in the presentation of history. Metaphorically, I could be described as positioned ‘inside’ the heritage process; as an artist, I stood between the audience and the artefacts, delivering information. Was my positioning in *Foundling Characters* that dissimilar to Authorised Heritage Discourse and

the hierarchy of the museum? What if, like myself, Authorised Heritage Discourse has its back to the audience, blocking the spectator’s view of the past. Like Walter Benjamin’s description of Klee’s painting *Angelus Novus* as the angel of history, I had my ‘back turned towards the past’; I would like to ‘awaken the dead, and make whole what has been smashed’ but I remain in the future to which my ‘back is turned’. The interpretation of *Angelus Novus* is a pessimistic one, as the angel moves forwards but is fixated on the past, as it repeats itself (the ‘pile of debris’). Was the having my back towards the audience metaphorically the ‘wrong’ way to face?

---
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My relation to the texts in *Foundling Characters* is comparable with that of a museum curator or a collections manager. I decided what information was revealed and what should be held back. Although my voice was unsteady, I was in a position of power. The foundlings remain absent in the work. Although the words refer to them, they are written by adults and I – another adult – read them. Those in power still speak for them. Instead, the work becomes articulate through the communication of power, revealing the foundlings’ situation by acknowledging their lack of power as I speak for them. By not allowing the children to have a ‘voice’, the work acknowledges this lack of voice.

After the performance at the Peltz Gallery, I met with members of the *Foundling Forum* and spoke to the group about my research. They had never found any detailed records of the child’s voice and I began to realise how fruitless the task of finding foundlings’ voices might be. However, they had one thing, one scrap: the testimony of a foundling child in the Foundling Hospital Committee Minutes. The boy was called Thomas. His words were written down by Mrs West in 1764. The child was fourteen-years old and had run away from his apprenticeship master. He had returned to the hospital to inform them about his extremely poor treatment and beatings. The testimony documented what Thomas said, but it was not a literal word-for-word account as it was written from Mrs West’s perspective. One had to imagine what the child had said through her words – a ghosting of speech.

I filmed myself reciting what Thomas’ words might have been. I spoke as if I were Thomas – changing the words ‘he’ to ‘I’ for example – and after filming, I took the sound away and cropped the footage so that my identity was obscured. Then, I took Thomas’s/my voice away and added Mrs West’s words below the footage as a subtitle. The work containing a layering of multiple voices, is entitled *Thomas’ Testimony* (Figure 3.5).
In *Thomas’ Testimony* it is clearly an adult’s mouth voicing the words rather than a child’s, and it is my teeth that give it away. In the work, the voice never ‘fully synchronizes’\(^{279}\) with the one who speaks and I am reminded of the sea witch in *The Little Mermaid*; I speaking with a voice that did not belong to me. The work does not attempt to elide the distance between child and adult’s ‘voices’, as the exhibition *On Their Own* attempted.\(^{280}\) It is an adult speaking in a child’s words in an undisguised way.

![Figure 3.5](image-url)

*Figure 3.5*

*Thomas’ Testimony* (Film Still)

Rachel Emily Taylor, February 2016

After completing this sketch, I decided I needed to take a step back from the practice and not use myself as a performer in future works (even if I was silent). If I wanted to construct the historical child’s voice, I needed to work with child actors so that the constructed voice could speak *through them*.

\(^{279}\) LaBelle, *The Lexicon of the Mouth*, p. 5.

\(^{280}\) The presentation of adult performers as children was included in the exhibition *On Their Own* at the V & A’s Museum of Childhood, discussed in chapter one ‘Heritage and Childhood’.
3.2.2. The Contemporary Child’s Voice

In February 2016 I worked with a child actor to record the work *Repeat After Me*. I composed a script from the proverbs in the foundling children’s handwriting books. I intended to test the historical child’s school work in a contemporary setting, exploring how a contemporary child would respond to a similar activity.

The following is a short extract of the script:

A man’s manners commonly shape his fortune (x 14)
Sedentary employments require recreation (x 14)
Pleasure arising from virtue is most sincere (x 14)
Xenophon had much esteem for his learning (x 14)
Keep company with virtuous characters (x 14)
Humility is the foundation of preferment (x 14)
Youth cannot improve without application (x 14)
Temperance in prosperity indicates wisdom (x 14)
Lamentation and weeping attend vicious acts (x 1)
Misery is the consequence of wicked actions (x 14)
Fame stimulates ambitious dispositions (x 14)
Sedentary employments require recreation (x 14)
Omit not present opportunities of learning (x 14)
Wicked practices are accompanied with shame (x 14)

I filmed a child actor reading the script. The footage used a similar visual style as in Thomas’ Testimony, a close crop of the child’s mouth. I made this decision because I wanted the viewer to be able to imagine any child in relation the video; it also protected her identity. Even though her mother had signed a model release form, I was aware of the sensitive ethical considerations and this had filtered into my practice.

Comparable to Severin’s role in A Whisper Heard,281 the child was not performing a role, but was reading an adult’s voice as themselves. In hindsight, there was no conscious attempt to elide the distance between the performer and performed, but this created a gap between the two that established an aesthetic distance comparable to Brechtian theatre. When reading the script, the child struggled with the words, probably because they were old-fashioned and unfamiliar. So – this was not planned or expected – I read the lines first so that she could repeat them after me. This took away the stress from the child who had been nervous that she would make a mistake. In the 1800s children at the Foundling Hospital were taught to read and write. They were instructed through rote-learning, and repetition, comparable to the method I used for Repeat After Me. As my inclusion was unintentional, I wanted to hide my presence. I removed my voice and the learning process in the editing. At this stage in the practice, I did not want the artist’s voice to be present.

In a second edit of Repeat After Me II, I played with ‘taking away’ the child’s voice so that it was out-of-sync with the video. I moved the voice in the software so that it was ahead of the video creating an image-delay. The work began to test notions of ventriloquism. The child was not reading a foundling’s words, but the action was a mirror to the past; the child undertook the same exercise that the foundlings were instructed to. The contemporary child became a vessel

281 Imogen Stidworthy’s installation A Whisper Heard was discussed in chapter one ‘Heritage and Childhood’.
for a historical voice to speak through. The contemporary child was what Connor describes as a ‘vocalic body’, a ‘surrogate or secondary body, [...] formed and sustained out of the autonomous operations of the voice’.282

The third edit, Repeat After Me III, was another attempt at working with the same footage. I pulled the voice further apart from the footage to make even more distance between the historical voice and the contemporary child. In these experiments, I felt as if I was on a knife’s edge. It felt possible to go ‘too far’ with the edit, by removing the voice so it was no longer relatable to the footage. I was still unsure of what I was searching for, feeling as if I was close, yet I had not reached it. During the making process, I felt that if I pushed/pulled the historical and contemporary child’s experiences together/apart, through repetition and action, something would form in the space between the two: in the moment of delay where the mouth didn’t quite match the sound. The child’s voice has been removed from their body, using the

' razor’ tool in Adobe Audition, I cut through the sound. In this instance, the voice is a part-object, removed from the body so that the mouth appears behind as an empty space; a lack.

In *Repeat After Me*, it was not the historical child’s voice that we were reading. It was a historical adult’s. In the handwriting books, the foundlings had copied the proverbs while under instruction from a schoolmaster. The child actor repeated words given to her while under my instruction; the present mirrored the past. Although it was not the child’s voice with which we worked, we were repeating the *action* of the past and the process of learning that the children undertook in the Foundling Hospital.

As with performance at the Peltz Gallery, I was drawn to the mistakes. These stumbles were ‘authentic’, the only moments that revealed the contemporary child’s voice. At 00:22 in *Repeat After Me*, the child mouths, *I can’t say it!* Her silent ‘voice’ visible only through lip-reading.

### 3.5. Ensemble Voices

In March 2016, after speaking to a Sound Designer, I became interested in the difference between the frequency of children’s and adult’s voices. It appears that an adult’s voice can ‘drown out’ a child’s due to the lower frequencies of their vocal register. An adult’s voice can travel spatially further than a child’s. For example, an adult’s voice can be heard through walls whereas a child’s voice is not as clear. The higher frequencies of children’s voices refract from the wall and bounce back towards the origin of the sound.

In response, I made a series of sketches, entitled *Ensemble Voices*, to test how multiple voices ‘travel’. I recorded child actors\(^{283}\) speaking alongside an adult, setting up the audio equipment in another room. Although this did not produce the noticeable difference I had imagined. I wanted to continue to test how the quality of the child’s voice changed under the varying circumstances. I then directed the children to speak in unison as a pair,\(^{284}\) as a trio,\(^{285}\) and

---

\(^{283}\) I worked with a drama class at a school in County Durham. Even though the children were performers, I am still required to conceal their individual names due to the ethical restrictions on the research.


finally, a group of twenty-four. The words were not important to the study, but I asked them to repeat words such as ‘listen, speech, voice, found, finding, foundling,’ and so on.

Listening to the recordings, when there were twenty-four voices it began to sound like a classroom – the institutionalised ‘voice of childhood’ – while the other two recordings were familial. For what I was intending, the trio of voices was the most successful because identities started to blur but it did not sound as institutionalised (it did not sound like the sing-song chant, like a classroom of school children reciting their times tables). There was a merging in the speech where I could begin to imagine the foundling child between the voices. In the slight overlaps, I could almost hear another voice; it was unexplainable. I recall Konstantins Raudive, listening for the voices of the dead in sound recordings (Electronic Voice Phenomena). But I was not listening to radio static; I was perceiving multiple voices as another voice, a new voice. Connor questions the power of the choral voice, writing ‘how is one to speak of the strange and powerful plural-singular that is the choral voice?’ He notes that there is a rich literature on music theory and choral singing, but little study on ‘collective voicing’. Connor proposes the term chorality to describe acts of joint vocalisation. These acts include prayer, children’s games, formalised learning processes, and chants of protest. Chorality is a form of ventriloquism where the source is not hidden from view, but rather it ‘gives rise to the fantasy of a collective voice-body’. The illusion of a new voice being perceived within the trio of voices is what Connor describes as a form of chorality where a ‘collective voice-body’ is perceived.

Ensemble Voices hides the source of the collective voice-body in two ways: one, by recording the children in another room and behind a wall, and two, by concealing them in sound rather than video footage. The motivation behind merely recording the children’s voices rather than filming them speak was a decision guided by the University’s ethics committee to protect the children. This takes Connor’s chorality further, combining it with Michel Chion’s acousmatique voice, that of a speaker off-screen in cinema (for example, a narrator or voice-over): a voice without origin, when the speaker is invisible to the eye, empathises the power of utterance; ‘the power of a voice without a visible source is the power of a less-than-presence which is also

288 Steven Connor, Choralities, Duke University, 27 March 2015.
The word acousmatique originates from the Greek word akousmatikoi, which refers to the pupils of the philosopher Pythagoras, who had to sit in absolute silence while he delivered lectures from behind a veil. The aim behind this was to reduce one’s perception – the speaker or physical object could not be seen – so that the student relies on listening alone, requiring increased concentration.

I question if hiding the children’s bodies adds power to the child’s voice/children’s voices. Like the acousmatique voice of God, which one hears but cannot see the source. Or Dorothy addressing the Wizard of Oz; while he remains off camera he maintains his control, once she sees he is just a man standing behind a screen, his power is disrupted. Perhaps hiding the children changes the order of power and their voices become ‘timeless’, no longer bound to the identity of the speakers themselves. It removes any aesthetic or visual that would pin the voice down to a particular moment in history. However, we are aware that when we listen to a recorded voice, we are always hearing the past, as ‘sound recording and its associated process of playback, which is nothing other than a re-representation of a sound held in memory’. The recorded voice suggests the original source, but through the medium, it remains inaccessible.

3.5.1. The Anthem

Building on the explorations of Ensemble Voices, I recorded a children’s choir singing Handel’s Anthem for the Foundling Hospital. Handel often staged concerts in the Foundling Hospital chapel. There is a room dedicated to him in the Foundling Museum containing the Gerald Coke Handel Collection.

The lyrics and melody of Anthem for the Foundling Hospital are not ‘child-friendly’ by modern standards: it is a strange anthem to have written for children but in the eighteenth century, childhood was conceived differently. The lyrics address the rich, rather than the poor, and it opens with text adapted from Psalm 41: ‘blessed are they who considereth the poor’. So perhaps, rather than it being written for the children of the Foundling Hospital, the piece was written to congratulate and thank the major donors and the founding Governors and

289 Connor, Dumbstruck, p. 25.
290 Bonnet, The Order of Sounds, p. 7.
Guardians. Due to their Christian donations to the hospital, they had secured their place in Heaven; this anthem re-established that message and the ‘goodness’ of their character.

When I arrived to record the choir, the conductor had not spent any time with the group rehearsing the song, so I had the opportunity to observe them learning the music through rhythmic and rote-learning methods, which I included in the recording. The conductor used clapping to indicate rhythm and he sang/spoke the lines so that the children could repeat him.

291 The list of founding Governors and Guardians includes: seventeen Dukes, twenty-nine Earls, six Viscounts, twenty Barons, twenty Baronet, Seven Privy Councillors, the Lord Major and eight Aldermen of the City of London, and many more.
The final recording of the choir, *The Anthem*, is a loop of 05:12 of sound that repeats endlessly without a break. A woman assisting the conductor sang with the children while they learnt the piece. I repeatedly asked her to stop singing, explaining the project to her again (I wanted the children’s voices only), but she did not accede to this request and she kept on trying to sing over the children. Her voice can be heard at certain moments in the recording (most noticeably during the high-pitched notes) if listening closely, as it could not be removed in post-production.

In October *The Anthem* was exhibited in the Foundling Museum in Handel’s room on the top floor. The children’s voices were situated in this space to provide a critical voice alongside Handel’s objects, such as his Last Will and Testimony – by ‘critical’, I suggested that it disrupts the order of power in the museum display. Sound cannot be held in one place; it permeates and moves through the museum. The speakers were placed high up in the room and the source of the sound could not be seen, building on my explorations of a ‘collective voice-body’ in the earlier work *Ensemble Voices*. When entering the museum, one could hear the singing coming from the top floor; it echoed down the stairwell, alluding to the angels and ‘innocent’ child that was at the heart of the Victorian imagery of Foundling Hospital. Like enclosures built in churches, where nuns would sing hidden behind screens, it could be thought of as the voices of angels. *The Anthem* teases the listener to walk up the stairs in the museum, searching for where the sound originates.

*The Anthem* was the first sound work since *Foundling Characters* for which I did not remove the adult’s voice. The conductor’s voice intentionally remained in the work. Unlike *Repeat After Me*, from which I removed my voice so that the child appeared to be speaking without the adult’s lead, *The Anthem* did not hide the process. By revealing it, the work became a form of critique when placed alongside the Gerald Coke Handel Collection. As in forms of institutional critique (Hans Haacke, for example) the work seeks to ‘demystify their power’ by revealing the rehearsal process that would not be shown in a traditional performance of *Anthem for the Foundling Hospital* in the hospital chapel. The manner in which the contemporary music arises is
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demystified, and although I cannot be certain how the foundlings were taught, the action could be comparable: *The Anthem* reveals how the children’s ‘voice’ is constructed.

The children incorporate the voice of the Other, projecting Handel’s words and music from their bodies, but by mimicking their conductor; a form of ventriloquism. They become vessels for another (both past and present) to speak through. In the work, there is an analogy to be made between physical voice and ‘voice’. We hear the conductor and the children’s ‘physical’ voices, but there is the action that surrounds it; an ‘inaudible appendage’ that is ‘voice’.

3.5.2. An Interruption

During the residency at the Foundling Museum, the collection of long-case clocks became a central part of the experience of being in the museum. They are wound every day and the chimes ring throughout the building. I was told that the clocks were gradually breaking and wearing away. As they chimed, they gradually broke, but the museum had not yet stopped this routine. The clocks were a constant reminder of time when in the building, and when I undertook any recording in the building, the clock chimes were always present.

The chiming reminded me of classroom registers and school timetables. In my workshops, the contemporary children called out their names and were noted as ‘present’. They named their foundling characters and were given new names (more of the workshops are discussed in the next chapters). The foundlings did not know the name given to them by their mother at birth. I made an audio work in response. The sound was formed from recordings made on completion of the workshops, listing of the names of the invented foundling characters. This naming was then edited in post-production to echo the clock chimes in the museum.

The work was tested in SIA Gallery in August 2016 as part of the exhibition *Testing Testing*. This initial display posed problems, as the work did not carry the same weight when viewed out of the context of the museum. Without the long-case clocks, meaning was lost, even when an individual speaker was displayed on a plinth to mirror the format of a clock. However,

296 I had requested a speaker embedded in a plinth at the height of a long-case clock, but this curatorial requirement was not followed in the installation of the exhibition. Instead, the speaker was exhibited on a standard size plinth.
Testing Testing drew my attention to interesting aspects of the work that I would not have noticed if it had not been shown in this environment.

The exhibition included a symposium, during which the audio still played. The children’s voices interrupted the presentations. At first I felt uncomfortable with the intrusion and I offered to turn off the work, but, an organiser encouraged me to allow it to remain on. It was if the children were interrupting the adult conversation, as if to say, ‘I’m still here, listen to me!’

After Testing Testing, I realised that the strength of the work was in this intrusion. In October 2016, An Interruption was exhibited in the foyer of the Foundling Museum (Figure 3.9). During the event, attendees collected their glasses of wine from the foyer and lingered here; occasionally the children would interrupt their conversation – a play on the idea that children should be ‘seen and not heard’, as their interruption was uncomfortable. As I had full autonomy

over the display of the work, *An Interruption* was played on a speaker embedded in a walnut plinth, built to the same dimensions as the museum’s long-case clocks. It appeared to be part of the room, blending into the background among the donation boxes and fire-extinguishers.

3.6 Discussions
On reflection, my art practice enacted the *search* for the absent voice. Like the search for the lost city of Atlantis — searching for a lost land that is no longer attainable — the act of looking can give the absent object ‘shape’. The *search* surrounds the space where the voice should be, or suggests a shape that it could be, drawing attention to its absence.

When attempting to reconstruct the voice of the historical foundling child, I began by using the voices of others. But through making, I realised that this process would only put the words of others in the foundlings’ mouths; Charles Dickens, Hannah Brown, oral histories from *Foundling Voices*… none of these words could take the form of the ‘voice’ for which I was searching. There are ethical considerations to contemplate when giving voice to another. These questions have fuelled recent debates in relation to art practice, such as Dana Schutz’s painting *Open Casket* at the 2016 Whitney Biennale, which depicts an image of Emmett Till, a black American teenager murdered by White racists in 1955.

In an open letter, the artist Hannah Black called for *Open Casket* to be destroyed because it is ‘a painting of a dead African-American boy by a white artist’ 298 who has used ‘Black pain as raw material’. 299 The reaction to the work demonstrates the problematic nature of representation. Andrew Moisey writes in support of Black’s open letter, that ‘a prohibition on white artists trying to show what black pain is like does make sense’. 300 Although Black’s letter was later recognised as a rhetorical artwork, 301 in response, Dana Schutz acknowledges that she does not ‘know what it is like to be black in America but I do know what it is like to be a mother’ but

299 Ibid.
her engagement with the image was through ‘empathy with his mother’. This statement raises interesting questions on empathy and appropriation, which are explored in the later chapter ‘Empathy and Over-identification’.

In April 2017, after protests, the painting *Open Casket* was temporarily removed from the biennale. Coco Fusco responded that the censorship of Schutz’s work should also be challenged. In her article for *Hyperallergic*, Fusco draws attention to 23 March, when Schutz’s email was hacked and an apologia was sent to online publication. ‘None of Schutz’s detractors, Fusco writes, ‘have addressed whether they think it’s fine to punish the artist by putting words in her mouth.’ The problems that surround *Open Casket*, although not the same as those I faced in my research, can be used as a comparison for critique. For example, I undertook the task of attempting to represent another (Schutz’s representing Till) in my artwork and was I ‘putting words in another’s mouth’ (Schutz’s hacked email apologia).

Fusco argues that the policing of art production leads to censorship and ‘silence’. Although she notes that there are issues with the visual language that Schutz used in her depiction, the image blew ‘the lid off a biennial’ and has encouraged debate that is ‘not such a bad thing, given the ghastly state of American political culture at the moment’. Her comments sit alongside that of the biennale’s co-curator, Mia Locks, who said that the painting ‘comes at such a polarised time in America. Groups are getting caught up in their own bubbles, speaking only to each other.’ The fear of representation and/or speaking for another can be considered as a product of the current political climate. The ‘policing’ of representation has changed in the last few years, from misrepresentation in colonial anthropology to the current hyper-sensitivity.
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In 2016, the artist Vanessa Place used Twitter as a platform to draw attention to the racism in the 1939 novel *Gone With The Wind*, but the project was accused of being racist and Place was removed from her teaching appointment at the University of Colorado. Poet Kenneth Goldsmith read Michael Brown’s autopsy report as a poem (for which he had rearranged the order of the text for artistic effect and changed medical terms to accessible language understandable by a lay audience) at Brown University in 2015. Frank Furedi has written for spiked-online criticising this recent attitude and comparing it to religious moralists, writing, ‘declarations about cultural appropriation constitute a claim to moral authority (...) today, the rhetoric of cultural appropriation provides people with a script for the public performance of sanctimony’ and he argues that this behaviour ‘encourages the deepening of divisions between cultures’. 309

What is the limit of moralistic erasure? Should a ‘voice’ be removed, erased, or silenced? It is not only representation that calls artwork into question, but also the conduct of the creator. In 2018, a John William Waterhouse 1896 painting *Hylas and the Nymphs* was removed from Manchester Art Gallery to prompt debate on the representation of women, 310 but is the removal of an artwork the best method to prompt this debate? Also, can we judge the representations of the past by our contemporary values? In the same year, 2018, Chuck Close’s upcoming exhibition *In the Tower: Chuck Close* due to open at the National Gallery of Art in Washington was cancelled and his painting was removed from Seattle University due to accusations of sexual misconduct. Svetlana Mintcheva questions this, and voices her concerns that it will lead to the removal of other artists’ works from public display: Caravaggio (murderer), Schiele (sexual assault), and so on. Mintcheva writes, ‘to remove art because it is tainted by the sins of its maker sets an impossible standard for institutions’. 311

In contemporary society, we are sensitive to issues of cultural appropriation – such as wearing African braids or a Native American headdress – and it is linked to ideas of:

310 This was an artistic act by Sonya Boyce, which featured in a solo show that would open later in the year at Manchester Art Gallery.
1) the *representation* of experiences by cultural ‘outsiders’ (sometimes called ‘voice appropriation’); 2) the *use* of artistic styles distinctive of cultural groups by non-members; and, 3) the procurement or continued *possession* of cultural objects by non-members or culturally distant institutions.

Appropriation occurs when people represent the experiences of others as their own. Schutz’s *Open Casket* falls under this category, as it was criticised as a representation by a ‘cultural “outsider”’. What happens when the original experience becomes erased and overwritten? In museums, representations of historical people are particularly fraught because they are displayed as facts, when often they are distortions that have been curated by staff at the museum. Perhaps there is no ‘truth’ from which they derive, but only a series of representations. Museums have been described as sites for ‘the play of identity, [with displays] involved in defining the identities of communities – or denying them an identity’. A representation might not be questioned by a museum visitor and it leads to historical and cultural stereotypes.

The *Indigenous Australia* exhibition at the British Museum in 2015 can be used to support this concern. Although it was curated by an aboriginal Australian curator Gaye Sculthorpe, critics picked up on the fact that the museum had chosen to represent particular histories promoting a stereotypical outlook on aboriginal culture, such as ‘the Dreaming’. But the brutal treatment of the people, the acquisition of particular objects and figures from the aborigine resistance, such as Jandamarra, were played down. This decision to hide particular narratives supports the museum’s presentation of its own past in the current climate, where matters of repatriation are ongoing debates.

Kimberley Moulton, an Australian curator of Aboriginal heritage, discussed the issue of cultural representation, stating that ‘museums and galleries still present our cultural artefacts in a dated
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ethnographic way, and homogenise us as one people”. What strikes me about this is the description of a whole culture condensed into a melting pot and simplified for consumerism – the singular representing the multiple. This statement can be used to critique the British Museum’s decision to exhibit a selection of chosen artefacts that promote a certain cultural perspective. It could also be argued that the limited space of the gallery would have also impacted on these decision, as would sales, as ultimately the museum wants to sell exhibition tickets; they will have chosen to curate an exhibition (and a presentation of history) that they considered would be popular and increase income.

The museum did consult with indigenous Aboriginals and islanders from the Torres Strait and every object was approved for display by descendants of the original owners. Although the provenance of some of the artefacts was unclear in the display – an aspect that critics panned – Sculthorpe explains that the reasoning behind this was that the provenance of some of the items is unclear. Perhaps the controversy regarding the exhibition can be compared with Open Casket; a White artist representing the corpse of a Black teenager. Although the museum worked with communities (in line with the Association of Critical Heritage Studies manifesto’s ‘cultural discourse’), the exhibition is situated in an institution that is historically at odds with the objects themselves. Visitors, without this awareness of the curatorial process regarded the exhibition critically, as an elite speaking for another (Authorised Heritage Discourse).

In her article First Nations on View, Susan Ashley writes how the Canadian museums represent cultures, and how even the museum itself retains ‘two basic competencies’ from colonial times – ‘they collect and they exhibit’. The redisplay of these objects in the British Museum is always going to be tied to an embodied colonialism. Ashley describes how Canadian museums have tackled the representation of First Nations in a similar vein to Indigenous Australia, by involving the First Nations in the curation and including their public declarations. But there are inherent problems with trying to define diverse peoples who have been ‘altered through
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colonial encounters [...] disrupted by European cultures’, processes that have resulted in a ‘new voice, the hybrid voice’.318

It has been debated that the policing and sensitivity of representation is being ‘taken too far’,319 and it becomes an exclusionary practice that prohibits cultural exchange. One might avoid discussing topics of cultural exchange to avoid offence, which in turn will result in a different form of silencing. Peter Yu, a member of the Yawuru people, stated that the *Indigenous Australia* exhibition ‘allows for a reflection’,320 and Sculthorpe notes that ‘contemporary Britons have little knowledge of Australian history’.321 Without exhibitions such as *Indigenous Australia*, one could hypothesise that (without media attention that comes hand in hand with exhibitions), these issues would not be raised, discussions would not take place, and repatriations would not be made.

The First People’s Hall exhibition in the Canadian Museum of Civilization in Ottawa is a collaboration between First Nations and non-First Nations, which includes stories and representations from two points of view (displayed separately in the same space), has been described as ‘multi-vocal’322 where ‘two social language within the limits of an utterance’.323 Perhaps this is a method that can be used to create a juxtaposition between the First Nation and non-First Nation voices. Yet, the separation between the two might produce an ‘othering’ where all must keep within their own ‘voice’.

When I began this study, I did not see the problems of representation in my research. In my initial proposal, I described representations of historical people in the museum as characters. However, as outlined in *Heritage and Childhood*, the very term ‘character’ is problematic. I questioned representations of biographies in the museum and if ethically, and morally, historical people should be regarded as ‘characters’. In the context of *Open Casket* and *Indigenous*...
Australia, it would be very challenging (and offensive) to present Emmett Till and Jandamarra as ‘characters’. A character is often associated with fiction, which further distances us from the historical person, making them appear to be less ‘real’. I began to question why the museum and the University did not impose any ethical restrictions on how I interpreted the foundlings – and the foundlings, now dead, cannot object to their representation in my artwork – but I began to impose my own moral restrictions.

There is an overlying consideration of ‘care’, from the curator’s care for the collections to the systems of care for contemporary children in the museum. It raises questions of how care has changed over time and its impact. ‘Care’ is a word that derives from the Old English caru, ‘concern, anxiety, sorrow, grief, trouble’, from the Proto-Germanic karo, ‘sorrow, cry’ and from the Proto-Indo-European gehr-, meaning to ‘shout or call’. I cannot help but be fascinated by how the definition implies that the care-giver is active and vocal, whereas the care-receiver of concern is silent. The power of ‘care’ remains situated in the one who is concerned of the other. The museum is viewed as speaking for the historical people it represents and through captions, it gives ‘voice’ to the accompanying life relics.

Andrea Phillips writes about ‘care’ and the welfare state in relation to the arts in her anthology Caring Culture. Phillips writes that the concept of care was ‘governmentalised by the welfare state (that “the people” need to be looked after as they cannot manage themselves)’ and in this system, power is retained by the artist. Since the dissolution of the welfare state, a new system has begun, one that encourages participation, self-authorship, and individuality; care is individualised.

Care can be kind, but it can also be a straight-jacket that restricts and prevents discussion and interpretation. The discussion in this chapter has raised issues about and with care; who can speak for whom, and when? Care can lead to hesitation. It can lead to silence, which is evident in this project, where both the historical child and the contemporary child are absent. I am not permitted to include any contemporary children’s names, identifiers, or photographs in the research. Not even when the children ask me to credit their name beside their work. In the search to uncover the missing voice of the historical child, it has led to ethical requirements that have concealed the other.

CHAPTER FOUR
FREEDOM AND CONTROL

This chapter explores how art practice and workshops with children might capture the voice of the child instead of the institutionalised history of childhood. I critique the freedom and control permitted in the art practice, museum, and the workshops, which allows for a discussion on public and private spaces. The practice is situated as social art — drawing on Social Works by Shannon Jackson and Delegated Performance by Claire Bishop — and the educational model is used to examine the constraints built around children in the museum, as discussed in ‘Method of Practice’.

In the eighteenth century, when the Foundling Hospital was established, efforts were made to ‘capture the street child and win him into a life of moral certainty’.\(^{325}\) This anticipated the foundation of other similar institutions, such as the first Ragged Schools. It could be perceived that adults attempted to control the spaces children inhabited to ensure their safety, and this act is part of the institutionalisation of childhood. Chris Jenks writes that childhood space is a ‘central issue in relation to […] control’.\(^{326}\) The grounds of the Foundling Hospital were bounded to ensure spatial control of the children. In the hospital’s Committee Minutes, I came across the following statements:

The boys playing ground be further secured to keep them within bounds.\(^{327}\)

Ordered that the proper Workmen be apply’d to deliver in an estimate of the charge of removing them to the end of the Long Wall on the West side of the girls playing ground with ye fence proper to confine the children.\(^{328}\)

In Discipline and Punish, Foucault notes that discipline often ‘requires enclosure’;\(^ {329}\) like a school building, monastery, or walled town, and a guardian only opens its gates to permitted individuals. The organisation of the classroom made it possible to supersede the traditional

\(^{325}\) Jenks, Childhood, p. 87.

\(^{326}\) Op. Cit., p. 75.

\(^{327}\) Foundling Hospital, Committee Minutes, 18 June 1761. A/FH/A/04, London Metropolitan Archive, London, United Kingdom.

\(^{328}\) Foundling Hospital, Committee Minutes, 3 September 1761. A/FH/A/04, London Metropolitan Archive, London, United Kingdom.

\(^{329}\) Foucault, Discipline and Punishment, p. 141.
system (of one pupil working with a master) by assigning each child a place and a desk. It made ‘the educational space function like a learning machine, but also as a machine for supervising, hierarchizing, rewarding’.330

Organising time (through a classroom timetable) was a technique used by monastic communities, 331 described by Foucault in relation to schools as a method of control that can ensure better productivity. He writes of Écoles Mutuelles, describing their system (from the early nineteenth century, when the Foundling Hospital operated):

‘Mutual improvement schools’: 8.45 entrance of the monitor, 8:52 the monitor’s summons, 8:56 entrance of the children and prayer, 9:00 the children go to their benches, 9:04 first slate, 9:08 end of dictation, 9:12 second slate, etc. 332

These timetables and movements were organised through orders, whistles, bells, clapping of hands, or a look from the teacher. The school became in charge of the development of individuals through ‘spatial distribution (cellular)’, ‘coding of activities (organic)’, ‘accumulation of time (genetic)’, and the ‘combination’ of bodies en masse (combinatory). 333 Rather than children behaving as individuals, they could be perceived as behaving collectively; behaving, moving, acting at the same time, and controlled by a gaze. Foucault’s analysis of the mechanisms of ‘discipline’ is threaded through this chapter as I discuss and analyse the freedom and control – the containment of bodies – in the workshop sessions.

The foundling children undertook their classes in the Foundling Hospital. Contemporary children undertake learning in primary and secondary schools, which can have similar spatial distribution (desks in rows, facing a teacher) and control of time (classes changing on the hour, for example). The workshops I led took place at different locations: the family home, the school theatre, the school classroom, and the museum. There is another relevance between the spaces, not just between the school and the Foundling Hospital as mentioned, but also the family home. The Foundling Hospital offered a type of home, a space to replace home. I unravel the effect of these spaces – the control in public/private spaces – as the discussion develops in the chapter in relation to the workshops.

331 Op. Cit., p. 149
Since the Foundling Hospital opened its doors, children are spending more time in ‘places for children’ constructed by adults, and according to Play England and National Children’s Bureau, are spending less time in ‘children’s places of their own making’. However, it could be argued that children have always spent their time in spaces constructed by adults, which were then disrupted through their play. Even the ‘street child’ of the nineteenth century spent time in areas built by adults, but found new ways to behave in adult-constructed spaces. Since the construction of the Apollonian child, children are often prevented from spending time in public spaces unless supervised by adults and placed in ‘caretaking’ spaces of the home or institution, such as the Clore Studio in the Foundling Museum. This can decrease children’s self-directed time and lead to adult control of children’s behaviour. In 2001 sociologist Frank Furedi wrote Paranoid Parenting, which discussed policy-making in childhood and how this has impacted on society’s view of children as vulnerable and in need of protection. Furedi writes that ‘when youngsters are protected from risks, they miss out on important opportunities to learn sound judgments and build their confidence and resilience’. He proposes that the safeguarding stems from adults interpreting children’s behaviour through adult motives.

Holmes and Jones question, ‘are we to assume that the school, UK policy mandates and discourses aimed at “protecting” young people are intended to advocate the romantic innocence, vulnerability and asexuality of the child because this public institution is somehow outside of the public sphere and can therefore purify and deliver young children from the sexualised worldliness and realities of private spaces? They propose that ‘the child being buckled into the straight-jacketed logic of UK policy and of spaces’ needs to be critiqued, and there needs to be an analysis of the distinction of spaces as being binary: public/private. These spaces call ‘into question the notion of “bounded” in the relationship with “safe” texts and “safe”

335 Jenks, Childhood, p. 64.
336 Lester and Russell, Play for a Change, p. 33.
337 The Clore Studio is a room where art workshops and learning sessions take place, but it is hidden from museum visitors on the lower ground floor.
340 Ibid.
341 Holmes and Jones, ‘Limitless Provocations of the “safe”, “secure” and “healthy” child’, p. 80-1.
images of the child’. I draw on their ideas to critique the spaces in which I worked with the children, calling into question the separation between the family home, the school theatre, the school classroom, and the museum.

Art workshops are used to encourage engagement in museums, archives, and galleries. Tate Britain led the project Seeing Through in 2009–11 and South London Gallery hosted Making Play in 2008–11. Seeing Through worked with young people and care teams with the aim to ‘demystify Tate Britain’, whereas Making Play explored ‘the concepts of “play” and “art” in terms of practitioners/facilitators’. Art workshops can be used as a method of education; at the Foundling Museum, students can take part in an artist-led workshop or their school can request specific workshops, such as ‘Victorian England’ or ‘Citizenship’. When families with children visit the museum, they are invited to take part in the Hetty Feather Trail that guides them around the museum with a booklet containing questions and art-based activities; it is heavily structured with a specified route.

I will discuss observations from three workshops, which were led by three artists, each session will be illustrated by field notes, and conclude with an analysis and a description of a sketch-work made in response. After this section, I describe workshops I led as part of my art practice.

4.1. Observed Art Workshops

Before I was permitted to work with children in the museum, I was required to observe a series of current workshop sessions; this was part of the museum’s process to ensure quality control and child protection. I used this opportunity to analyse the structure and activities to inform my workshop facilitation plans. However, unlike an audience member to a performance separated by the stage and the stalls, I was integrated in the session. I assisted the facilitators, worked with the children, and helped control the space – when in the Clore studio, I was asked

342 Op. Cit., p. 82.
346 I observed seven sessions in total, including: family workshops, nursery workshops, and school workshops.
to make sure the door was locked at all times so that children could not leave and other visitors could not enter.

As an outsider (I was not employed by the museum), I was surprised by the creative constraints, control, and structure established in the sessions and the lack of freedom this allowed. Due to my position (a researcher), I reviewed the sessions with different aims from those of the museum and the artists they employ. I was looking for different outcomes, reactions, for example. I was looking to see how the children engaged with the narratives of the Foundling Hospital and viewing the workshops as a form of social art practice.

Figure 4.1
Field Notes (detail)
Rachel Emily Taylor, January 2016

On 28 January 2016, the museum hosted a workshop led by artist Isobel Manning and supported by the museum’s Artists’ Projects Curator Emma Middleton. The session lasted two hours and it was attended by twelve children from a local nursery.347 The children were accompanied by teachers and a group of parents. I was warned the parents often completed the artwork for the children, to look out for this and encourage them not to do so. The workshop focussed on the children’s bedtime at the Foundling Hospital. The artist planned that the children would be making night-lights – reminiscent of lanterns from the 1800s – and printing

347 The children participating in the workshop were three years old.
drawings onto a pre-made bed cover. The aim was that the resulting artwork would be exhibited in the museum’s Artist Projects space.

When the children arrived, I was told there were more than expected and they were younger; it was only afterwards that I realised how much this impacted on the session. The children sat in a circle and the museum curator asked if they had been to the museum before – the children did not reply. The curator stated that the foundling children used to live ‘here’, in the museum building. 348 ‘They were different to you because they had no mummies and daddies,’ she said. ‘Who puts you to bed at night?’ she asked. The children replied, mummy, granddad, daddy, my cat, mummy, until we reached a little boy, who I will call A– (for the sake of ethics). He did not answer. Then a nursery assistant shook her head and there was an understanding between the adults, and the curator continued around the circle.

348 This is not the case; the Foundling Hospital building stood on the land that is now known as Coram’s Fields. A play area that only children (or adults accompanied by children) can enter. I assumed that this explanation was given so that the introduction was simple due to the age of the children.

Figure 4.2
Field Notes (detail)
Rachel Emily Taylor, January 2016
After the opening discussion, the artist guided the children on a tour around the museum’s Introductory Gallery. They walked two by two, holding adults’ hands, making sure they didn’t run, and walking neatly in a line. The children sat on the bed in the gallery space that was a replica of one contained in the foundlings’ dormitory. The children erupted into giggles and laughter, and the artist informed the group that the foundling children had ‘one big sleepover’. After the tour, the children walked holding hands, two-by-two, back to the Clore Studio (with one child pretending to fall over on the way) where the art-making activities would begin.

The children were asked to draw an image of ‘who put them to bed at night’ on poly-tiles, which would then be used to print onto a bed sheet. The task was challenging for their age, because the material was difficult to draw on and it required a lot of pressure to mark the polystyrene with any accuracy. There were tears and screams. If an image was drawn onto a poly-tile, the children would then take it to the museum curator, who printed it for them on the bed-sheet. After printing, the children returned to the activity tables. Child A—remained silent throughout and tore his poly-tile into tiny pieces. He did not participate, and was eventually taken away from the museum and back to Coram’s Fields Community nursery by a teaching assistant.

Figure 4.3
Field Notes (detail)
Rachel Emily Taylor, January 2016
Reflections

In the workshop session, rather than focussing on the children’s experience, the museum’s goal appeared to be the creation of artwork and if it could be included in an exhibition in the Artist’s Projects Space. Before the workshop began, I had heard an off-hand comment that the ‘funding had been cut’, which had then impacted on the materials the museum could purchase. There would be restrictions in place to which I, as an outsider, would not be privy. It appeared that the workshop was shaped by political and institutional pressures based on the conflicting values of the funding bodies. There will be limitations on time; the children will only be able to spend a certain amount of their class time at the museum and the museum will only have the Clore Studio available for an allocated time, and this will impact on the time that the artist can lead the session.

The activity was structured, but due to the children’s lack of engagement and resistance, it felt out of control. Even if the adults tried to shape the children’s responses, the children gained ‘power’ through their decision not to engage. By deciding not to participate, a number of children were taken back to the nursery early and were permitted to leave the museum with an adult to supervise their return.

Orly Orbach’s 2009 Making Play residency at the South London Gallery can be compared to this workshop. It was a project that ‘failed’ because the children did not want to follow the artist’s plan. The word ‘fail’ was used in a discussion between me and Frances Williams, the Head of Education at the South London Gallery, when discussing this particular residency. To ‘fail’ would be that the intended plan was not met or completed, but even so, something still ‘happened’. Orbach had intended to wallpaper columns with drawings and images, and these columns would be used for further storytelling activities. However, the children did not take to the activity or participate in wallpapering the columns. Tim Gill examines the unplanned tension between structure and chaos during Orbach’s residency in his essay ‘Control and Chaos’. Gill describes the different roles of the adult in children’s play: the role of the professional in a staffed-adventure project is to ‘support the children’s self-directed play impulses’, whereas in an art workshop environment the role of the artist is to ‘guide children through a more-or-less well-defined creative process, towards a more or less well-defined

creative goal’. The Making Play residency programme aimed to explore the space between these two roles, supporting play and guiding children. At the Foundling Museum, the goal was aligned to the art workshop environment – the children were guided to a defined creative output – and ‘play’ was not an apparent consideration.

The behaviour of the children in Orbach’s workshop could be compared to the children in the Foundling Museum, who ‘didn’t want to follow (the) plan’. When both workshops appeared to ‘fail’, the artist questioned her role and the purpose of the session. The children regained control through the “rule of two feet” – if it is not engaging me, I will go. The children resisted attempts of the adults to guide them through the sessions. Freud first used the term ‘resistance’ in psychoanalysis to describe the unwillingness to recall past memories but it later came to signify all obstacles that arise in treatment, and it shows that treatment has started. Melanie Klein frequently uses the term ‘resistance’ in her analysis of children but does not define it, although she thinks of it as an expression of anxiety or negative transference. Rachel Holmes writes how ‘silence both blocks and produces analysis’ but ‘such silences carry traces of voices that have the power to affect us, precisely because they exceed the limits of the spoken word’.

Sketch Artwork

In response to this session, I made the sketch-work Triumphant Lamentation. It developed in two stages. First, I attempted to understand A–’s actions through repeating them, ripping up a photocopied page of a foundling child’s handwriting book, symbolising the historical children’s ‘work’. Secondly, I recorded myself reading ‘triumphant lamentation’, words that were written in the handwriting book. I then worked with the audio track in Adobe Audition, ‘ripping up’ audio files with the razor tool. Through making, I began to consider both my role and my effect on another’s voice – the audio work Triumphant Lamentation masks and distorts the

voice of the child. I also began to consider that the child’s ‘voice’ could be expressed through action rather than words, which fed into the previous chapter, ‘Single and Multiple Voice’. This was an early audio test that led to the creation of the later sound works: Repeat After Me, Ensemble Voices, The Anthem, and An Interruption.

4.1.2. Nursery Workshop, February 2016

I observed a two-hour workshop attended by children from a local nursery. In this session, the artist structured activities in response to the museum’s paintings, which depicted ships and battles on the sea; the children would be making boats. The workshop had the same introductory format as the previous one – supported by the curator Emma Middleton – and because the children were a little older, they were more confident in speaking and replying to questions.

The curator began by asking the group, ‘What makes the foundling children different to you?’

A little girl responded with, ‘they come from the other side.’

‘No, not quite –’, the curator interrupted.

358 The children were three and a half years old. The six-month age difference between these children and the first group made a notable difference in their behaviour and comprehension.

359 This child described the foundling children in terms of space rather than time.
They had no mummies and daddies, a little boy piped up.

The group entered the Picture Gallery, holding hands, two-by-two. Here the children sat in front of the paintings and when prompted, they chimed in unison, **Pirates! Sharks! Boats! Flags!** Before returning to the Clore Studio, where they were directed to sit around paper laid out on the floor in a ‘U’ shape, which they decorated with stamps to look like the ocean. As a group, whilst working they called out the name of each stamp, **Dolphin, Shark, Starfish, Whale!**

‘Don’t walk on the paper’, the curator reminded.
After this section of the workshop the children sat around tables. They were given a ready-made boat, on to which they were instructed to stick ‘portholes’ and a cut-out paper people that would be their ship’s captains and they were asked to stick eyes on the face using printed stickers. Once the boats had been decorated the children took them to the paper-sea, and they pushed the boats across the paper. There were squeals of enjoyment and (to the artist’s shouts of protest) they ran around so fast that the paper ripped and the boats were thrown into the air.

Reflections

As an observer, the workshops appear to be more ‘controlled’ when there is a pressure for the children to make something to take away, such as the boats, as these were ready-made so all that remained was to decorate them with stickers; there was no freedom to be messy, destructive, playful, or out of control.

I observed how the museum staff evaluated the activity. It appeared to me that importance was placed on photographs of the session and the resulting artwork as this material would act as documentation for sponsors and funding bodies. I (an outsider and researcher) am in a different position to the museum employees and in some ways, I have more flexibility in what I can do in

---

360 The children were working with coloured, circle-shaped papers that I had been instructed to prepare for the start of the workshop.
workshops – for example, there is not as much pressure for the children to create a ‘quality product’ but I have different restrictions due to my role as a researcher (ethics, for example).

Sketch Artwork

After observing this session what stuck in my mind was the children’s voices when they chimed in unison: Dolphin, Shark, Starfish, Whale. I made a sketch-artwork in response to this, titled Ensemble Voices, which I discussed in the previous chapter ‘Single and Multiple Voice’, exploring the child’s voice individually and as a chorus.

4.1.3. School Workshop, February 2016

The following school workshop was organised by a different department in the museum. It was led by an artist following plans set by the museum’s Schools Officer, Elisabeth Lee. It was directed more towards ‘learning’, with less importance placed on ‘making’. The session was

Figure 4.7

Gin Lane

William Hogarth, 1751.
programmed for home-schooled children, arranged through a parent support group. The morning session was aimed at children aged four to eleven whereas the afternoon was for children aged nine to sixteen. These sessions were hosted in the Picture Gallery rather than the Clore Studio. This space was visible in the museum and less ‘contained’: the doors weren’t closed or locked, museum visitors could come and go, and the parents were in charge of the children’s attendance and remained present.

The morning session began with the artist giving the children a ‘light’ introduction to the museum; using Hogarth’s *Gin Lane* (Figure 4.7), the artist explained that life for the poor was difficult since the water made people sick, so they had to drink alcohol at Gin Palaces instead (which is not exactly true). The hospital’s entry system was explained using raffle tickets to demonstrate how likely it was for a child to be accepted. 361 Finally, the children placed their

361 In the 1700s when applications became numerous, a system of balloting with red, black and white balls was introduced. If the mother pulled out a white ball from the bag, it meant that her child was ‘accepted’; a black ball
hands in bags with their eyes closed and pulled out a badge with a name on that would be their new foundling name for the duration of the session.

Returning upstairs to the Picture Gallery, the children undertook a number of learning activities. After discussing William Hogarth’s painting of Thomas Coram,362 they drew a self-portrait surrounded by objects important to them (Figure 4.8). On completion, they were given a sheet of black paper with a piece of chalk, along with a copy of a page in Abraham Taylor’s handwriting book, which they had to copy. After this activity, the children and parents dispersed, breaking up into small groups before heading to lunch.

362 The artist used William Hogarth’s painting of Thomas Coram to discuss how paintings included objects that were symbolic of the sitter’s life. For example, in the image Hogarth included signifiers for Coram’s character: the Royal Charter, a Captain’s coat, a globe and ships on the horizon. The artist described why these objects were important to Coram, and that now the children would draw their own self-portrait surrounded by objects that are significant to them.
The afternoon workshop followed the same format as the morning session, and contained the same exercises. Although this session involved more narration from the artist and the teenagers engaged in the discussion. After looking at *Gin Lane* and Nathanial Parr’s etching *Admission to the Foundling Hospital by Ballot*, the artist explained the hospital raffle system and he asked the group, “What would it have felt like to have your baby accepted in the raffle?"\(^{363}\)

A nine-year old girl nervously replied, happy, but sad to give up the baby.

An older boy said, sad, yeah, losing the baby.

The children and teenagers moved towards the cabinet containing the foundling tokens and peered inside. A tall sixteen-year-old turned towards the artist and asked, why did they need them, if the child looked like a parent, wouldn’t it be obvious?

The group returned upstairs and were given their new names, to a hubbub of appreciation and contempt; Abraham… I don’t mind that, it means I’ll have lots of kids. One boy swaggered up to the artist and guffawed, I know what your new name should be — DICK!

Afterwards they undertook the portrait drawing exercise and practised handwriting with chalk on black paper. Once this was completed, the artist began to wrap up the workshop and initiated a closing discussion, asking the group, “What have you learnt about the foundlings?"

Don’t get angry about sharing my bedroom because foundlings didn’t have one.

Even though your siblings are horrible to you, be glad you got them.

Horrible, because porridge wasn’t nice.

‘No that was when we spoke about the workhouse –’

If I had been living one-hundred years ago, I would’ve been a gong farmer –

‘What’s that – I haven’t heard of that!’

---

363 The artist’s voice is typeset in gill sans light – the voice of the heritage practitioner – because he was following a script written by the museum’s School Officer, Elisabeth Lee.
The discussion pattered out and I followed the group as they meandered through the museum towards the exit. When they were making their way through the Introductory Gallery, I asked one boy, ‘What do you think it would be like to be a foundling?’ and I was met with silence.

‘What token would you leave?’ I asked another.

He shrugged, *Dunno.*

**Reflections**

In comparison with the nursery workshops, these sessions were predominantly based on learning and listening rather than art-making. The exercises allowed the children to re-enact events from the past (such as that of choosing a raffle ticket) so that they could understand the hospital entry system. After this session, I became fascinated by the children’s apparent lack of empathy and indifference to the hospital narrative and it became something that I structured my own sessions around – could I facilitate a session that would encourage the children to *feel* and to empathise with the foundlings? I expand on this question in the later chapter ‘Empathy and Over-identification’.

**Sketch Artwork**

I observed that the children were not outwardly displaying empathy towards the foundlings’ situation, and I evaluated this through their dialogue. Based on their responses, I synthesised them into a script that formed the sketch-artwork *Foundling Voices*. I used timing and pauses to allow the contemporary children’s voices to be ‘heard’, and as the audience read the text in their mind, the missing voice could be imagined. Their children’s words became a play-script that was lacking in the physical presence of performers.

**4.2. Artist-led Workshops**

I led art workshop sessions at different locations and the sessions were structured for different group sizes, and I worked with groups of four to forty children. The youngest child I worked
with was five and the oldest was fourteen. This age band was selected simply because it was between these ages that the children resided at the foundling hospital.  

After observing the sessions in the museum, I resolved to allow more ‘freedom’ in my workshops, which I would explore through play, performance, and art making. I wanted to investigate if the children responded with greater or lesser empathy in sessions using these methods rather than those of the sessions I observed, where the adults controlled the children’s creativity.

4.2.1. The School Theatre

I worked with a group of thirty children aged between thirteen and fourteen years across two sessions; each was two and a half hours in length. I began the session by introducing myself to the group, narrating the history of the Foundling Hospital, explaining why I wanted to work with them: they were the same age as the foundlings, and I needed their advice on how to retell the stories from their perspective. I made the decision to address the group as Dorothy Heathcote recommends in The Mantle of the Expert by framing the children as ‘experts’ rather than passive attendees. I achieved this through my use of language. I spoke to them as if they were equals and the project was more than a classroom exercise: the resulting improvised performances were important and would be used in research.

We began by doing warm-up exercises outlined in Augusto Boal’s Games for Actor’s and Non-Actors,  before attempting to draw on exercises from Konstantin Stanislavski, such Given Circumstances and Magic If. During the exercises the teenagers dispersed, moving around the space. At first I was dubious about the freedom that I had allowed, as the group was boisterous and excitable. I observed that they were self-conscious, which then filtered into their play. A student in the group said she had a similar experience and that she ‘loved’ being lost, to an outburst of appreciative laughter. At this point, I realised that if I wanted to get the children to feel any empathy for the foundlings, I had to encourage them to forget their social dynamics and

---

364 Children were accepted by the Foundling Hospital at twelve-months old or younger, and then placed in the care of a wet nurse. At four years the child was removed from the wet nurse and returned to the hospital, where they remained until they were apprenticed. Apprenticeship commonly took place when the child was fourteen, but there are cases in the 1700s when children as young as three were apprenticed.

365 The exercises were based on the walk series in ‘Feeling What We Touch’ and the mirror sequence in ‘Seeing What We Look At’ described in Augusto Boal, Games for Actors and Non-Actors, trans. by Adrain Jackson, London: Routledge, 1992.
thoroughly engage them in the session, which often meant that I had to ask questions to keep their focus on the task in hand.

As the workshop progressed, the teenagers broke into groups, working on their improvisations based on the Foundling Hospital. Through movement and role-play the children asked questions that had not arisen in previous sessions that I had observed. A teenager asked me whether boys and girls should be walking in the same space together – a valid point as they were kept separate in the Foundling Hospital. The realisation of how boys and girls did not mix affected how they divided themselves into groups and this filtered through into their role-play.

Initially a number of the students did not appear to find it easy to separate the present from the past. For example, a girl who played the role of a nurse in the Foundling Hospital spoke to her boss on a mobile phone and did not construct a backstory for her character.

The four groups improvised the following performances:

1. A group of five boys.

   The boys said the Lord’s Prayer before eating their supper at the Foundling Hospital. One of the boys played the role of the school master. The improvisation focussed on Christianity and the religious priority of the Foundling Hospital, but it was presented to an audience comically. For example, one of the teenagers said, your mum is like a door-handle, everyone has had a go!
2. A group of five girls.

The improvisation was a story in two parts. It began with a girl leaving the Foundling Hospital to start her apprenticeship as a servant in a rich household. The second half of the improvisation involved a narrated flashback, during which the girl transformed into a baby falling to her knees under the spotlight.

3. A group of eight girls.

The girls fought over a letter written by one of the foundlings to her absent mother. A ‘bully’ read the letter out loud making fun of the other child’s wish to be reunited with her family. The improvisation introduced themes of bullying to the Foundling Hospital narrative.

4. A group of three boys

One boy played the role of the narrator, addressing the audience directly and introducing the story; another played the part of a foundling; and the final boy played the role of mother and the Foundling Hospital security guard, both losing and taking the child. The performance began with a ‘birth scene’. The mother wrote a letter to her son before abandoning him. The child was taken by the ‘security guard’ to the Foundling Hospital and dragged off stage behind a curtain while screaming.

These performances are a form of art practice. In *Social Works*, referencing Riminini Protokoll’s *Airport Kids*, Jackson writes that the positioning of child performers as ‘experts’ in artworks pushes the presentation of ‘real world narrative in opposing directions at once’: producing a ‘naturalized authenticity that makes audiences feel that they are in the midst of the real’ and the child’s ability to ‘overcome the chaos of childhood’. They are what Bishop would describe as delegated performance, as I was using a ‘nonprofessional’ (the children) to perform a role to produce ‘guaranteed authenticity’. This method allowed me to be displaced and remove myself from the stage, which was my intention. I wanted to mask my role and influence, and focus on the children’s responses. However, in delegated performance, there is an underlying concern that the artist is ‘exploiting other subjects’ and delegated performance often leads to a

366 Class-system was demonstrated through accent. The students were from County Durham, so rather than maintaining their Northern accents, they adopted a RP (received pronunciation) accent as is stereotypically ‘posh’ in contemporary British society.
368 Ibid.
369 Bishop, *Delegated Performance*, p. 91
‘heated debate about the ethics of representation’. Bishop writes, ‘the risk of superficiality that occasionally accompanies the reductive branding or packaging of social identities in a work of art (“the unemployed,” “the blind,” “children,” “brass band players,” etc.) should always be set against the dominant modes of media representation in opposition to which these works so frequently intend to do battle’. My work might be at ‘risk’ because I am working with ‘children’, a packaging of many under one title. Through this method, I explored representations of children and the construction of childhood with the potential to subvert or draw attention to a representation of childhood to ‘trouble our relationship’ with it.

In the performances, a ‘representation’ of contemporary and historical people was portrayed. Representation is entwined with notions of ‘showing’ and ‘portraying’. It is not a presence but a re-presence that is never truly objective. In representation, there are issues between ‘speaking for’ and ‘portraying’ for another, problems that were discussed in ‘Single and Multiple Voice’

372 Ibid.
in relation to Schutz’s painting Open Casket, the contemporary children ‘speaking for’ the historical children. Or, the contemporary child could be described as an ‘understudy’ in a performance, their presence highlighting the absence of the other child. Although the contemporary child’s actions on stage are their own (even though I attempted to displace my body from the performance) I have still influenced their portrayal of their ‘character’, as if I am the director who has ‘blocked’ the scene – the director, a role that Sworn identified with in the making of Silent Sticks, a role that involves leading a team of actors and staff (stagehands, lighting designers, set designers, and so on) towards realising an interpretation of a script on stage. I speculate if this is comparable with the role of the artist in the heritage process, that there is an interpretation of a history (rather than play-script) through the collaboration with a team of museum curators, collection managers, museum visitors, and so on.

After the final performances, as a group the teenagers told me that they aimed to make the audience feel sympathy for the foundlings, but most of the performances and storylines seemed comical, for example, there were ‘your mum’ jokes, boys giving birth, and drunk schoolmasters questioning their faith – and it is worth acknowledging that the comedy might have been a defensive response to any empathy they may have been feeling. Humour is also regarded as a ‘resistance – to self-reflection’ and ‘an effective way of silencing’. However, among these scenes other scenarios developed that were not humorous, such as a foundling girl falling to her knees in despair, transforming into a baby under a spotlight.

At the time, I analysed the performances alongside the conversations I had with the children. Did the audience feel sympathy – and did I feel sympathetic? Did I feel empathetic? Did they portray a character that had a back-story? Did their interpretation show a lack of engagement or an understanding of the Foundling Hospital? In hindsight, I began to wonder if the children actually want the audience to feel sympathy if their performances were so diverse? Did they merely say that because they guessed that was what I was looking for – empathy? Or, did they think that through comedy, they could make the audience feel sympathy, even though that is not what I would expect?

373 My position in relation to the children’s work will be discussed in more detail in the chapter ‘Single and Multiple Voice’.
374 ‘Blocking’ is a term used in theatre to describe a practice in the rehearsal process when the director determines where the actors should move on stage to ensure the sightlines for the audience and that the actor is always lit, according to the lighting design of the scene.
375 Holmes et al, Silence as Resistance to Analysis, p. 497.
376 Norman Denzin, ‘The Reflexive Interview and a Performative Social Science’, Qualitative Research, 1, 2001, 23–46, p. 34.
I spoke to the group about what they had thought they had gained from the session, and they said that they had learnt a lot and through drama they had definitely found out more about the Foundling Hospital. After their performances, when I talked to them individually about how they imagined the foundlings would have felt, I had responses such as:

Really lonely, and like, really depressed.

It would have been all they ever knew, so maybe they didn’t know any better. It was normal for them. It must have been really important where they were apprenticed.

It’s sort of like being taken, but you’re still with friends and you’re with people that have been through the same thing as you, so just have fun about it, and like, they would have made it fun. It would’ve been like a big family.

From these responses, the teenagers appeared to demonstrate an understanding for the foundlings. It appeared that through action the children were developing an empathetic response to the foundlings.377 Not only might this have been down to learning through doing – which is described in pedagogy as ‘reflection-in-action’378 – but also that the children had more

377 Empathy will be reflected on and discussed critically in the following chapter, ‘Empathy and Over-identification’.
time (four hours in total) and freedom (I left them for an hour to their own devices to construct narratives and characters explored through role-play).

After this session, I started to consider how I might measure, or even confirm, that the children were experiencing any form of empathy towards the foundlings. How could I judge engagement through discourse if the child does not have the vocabulary to express the emotions they were experiencing?

4.2.3. The Family Home
I undertook an art workshop at a family home, working with a small group of six children aged between seven and eleven. The three-hour session was initially an art-based activity test, but it ended up being a springboard for further sessions. The artwork is explored in depth in the later chapter ‘Empathy and Over-identification’ and included a story-telling exercise, making tokens, drawing, and portrait painting.

In the session, I explored how much freedom could be allowed without the group losing sight of the foundlings and their history. I stepped back, aiming to merely ‘support’ the children, but when attention waned, I added structure to the exercises. When drawing the portraits, I suggested that they drew each element step by step starting with drawing the outline of the face as an oval shape. I then demonstrated how they could measure their features, and they marked these lines on the drawings. The structure of taking one feature at a time helped to maintain their focus without them becoming overwhelmed with the task or becoming upset if the image did not look as they wished. To my surprise, the children liked a level of control in the activities as it alleviated pressure. Once the children had drawn their characters, they were painted with acrylic. Each child was given a limited colour palette, and I demonstrated how to mix black, before they had the freedom to mix their own colours based on the Foundling Hospital uniform.

379 Gill, Control and Chaos, p. 148.
380 Each child’s paint palette had titanium white, cadmium red, cadmium yellow, and ultramarine blue acrylic paint.
381 The children looked at Victorian paintings of foundlings by Emma Brownlow and Sophie Anderson.
The activity was not geared around ‘play’, like the *Making Play* residencies at the South London Gallery, as it was focussed on art-making. There was a tendency for me to ‘teach’ the children as I have a background in teaching observational art painting. I never disciplined the children, even when they misbehaved or became distracted. I was always present to assist (and watch) the children and to ensure the children finished their paintings. If I had stepped back and allowed them complete freedom in the activity without direction, they would not have made anything in the session, and would have been unsatisfied afterwards. I suggest that in this session there was a certain expectation for the children: they wanted to make good work of which they, and their parents, would be proud. This may have also been influenced by the awareness that they would be taking part in a research project with an ‘artist’, which involved signing consent forms for ethical procedures, framing the situation before the session began.

As a mediator, if I had stepped back from the session, this would not have necessarily created a better environment to enable the children to achieve what they wanted in the time. During

---

382 Before undertaking my Ph.D. research, I taught observational drawing and painting at Chelsea Fine Arts in London. I worked with children aged seven to sixteen-years old.
the session, one foot fell into the role of ‘art educator’ but the other foot remained as an ‘artist researcher’. This was a ‘problem’ throughout all of the workshops, where – because I was working with groups of children – it was assumed that the session was for ‘teaching’ rather than a form of art practice.

4.2.2. The Museum
As part of my artist residency at the Foundling Museum, I led a workshop session for forty children from a primary school in Camden, aged between seven and eight-years old. I structured two days of activities that ran from 10:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m., hosted a week apart. As this series was organised by the School’s Officer rather than Artist’s Project’s Curator, I was under pressure from the museum to keep the introduction and structure similar to the format currently in place in the museum. 383 There were further restraints on this session; as it was hosted at the museum, I would be observed by the staff as it would impact on the museum’s reputation. I worked through my plans with the School’s Officer. There was pressure on what language I used to address the children and how I narrated the history of the Foundling Hospital. 384

I was limited with space in the museum and I had to use the Clore Studio. Before the session began, tables and chairs were set up by the School’s Officer and the children were seated in groups of ten. We had to keep the doors and windows locked so that the children did not leave the room until their lunch break when they were supervised by the schoolteachers; this was due to safety policies put in place by the museum, both to protect the children and the museum staff in the event that a child went missing.

383 This was due to the fact that I wanted to work with children older than nursery age, and preferably with children from Year 2 or 3 (aged six to eight-years old).
384 I was essentially asked to ‘soften’ the history and gloss over certain details to prevent upset. This seemed at odds with the methods used by the museum’s Artist Project’s Curator, who addressed the issue directly telling the children that the foundlings had ‘no mummies and daddies’.
At the start of the workshop I introduced myself as the artist-in-residence, and I led the children around the museum. The tour I gave was similar to the sessions that I had observed, and the museum’s Learning Officer accompanied me to make sure that the session ran smoothly. The group were boisterous and loud, especially when they all got to take turns sitting on the foundling’s bed in the museum’s Introductory Gallery. At the end of the tour, I gave the children their new foundling name from a bag of nametags used by the museum, before returning to the Clore Studio. When in their seats, we continued discussions and questions, and I felt that with a large group of forty I had to work hard to keep their attention; it was not as relaxed as the smaller group session. The children then imagined a foundling character and started to design a token for them, first drawing and then pressing their design into self-hardening clay circle shapes that would later be painted gold. We then began to work on an exercise based on Given Circumstances and influenced by the previous session in that it was written rather than spoken, before drawing their character surrounded by objects and scenery related to the child’s apprenticeship, and coloured their image in with pencils.
When the children returned the following week for the second session, I was surprised by how much they had remembered. Initially, I was concerned over how much they had understood, but it was apparent in their answers and artwork that the narratives had impacted more than I had expected. Figure 4.14 is a drawing of a foundling being accepted into the hospital; this image demonstrates the child’s awareness of the foundling baby being accepted into care.

![Figure 4.14: Child's Drawing](image)

In the following session, we explored the theme of ‘home’. As the children drew their responses, I allowed freedom by not informing them what the outcome would be, encouraging them to use their imagination. The only limitations were the use of A4 paper, and there was limited colouring crayons, pencils and coloured paper. It is worth considering that the children had seen images of the Foundling Hospital in the Introductory Gallery, so this will have impacted on their drawing. For example, a number of the drawings included both a ‘girls’ and ‘boys’ wing, not dissimilar to the original structure.
The drawings resulted in interesting imagery. In Figure 4.15 the windows transform into a
dinosaur, as if the gigantic lizard is guarding the sleeping children below. He watches over
them, but is he keeping them safe or keeping them a prisoner? In Figure 4.16, the children have
sad u-shaped mouths and are drawn within rectangular shapes, appearing to be trapped in small
rooms, beds, or coffins. The children are not in the building – it is drawn on the left-hand side
of the page and coloured with brown – but red windows are drawn repeatedly on the bottom
right-hand corner of the page. I wonder if the windows are markers for an outside/inside space
that is separated by invisible walls and boundaries. The windows are a way to see through the
boundaries without crossing them and there is an awareness of this division. A window can be a
method for escape. A window can be used to view others, like a panopticon, where the
foundlings are observed; the panopticon is described by Foucault as the ideal form of the

---

385 A panopticon is a type of institutional building designed by Jeremy Bentham in the late eighteenth century, and discussed by Foucault in *Discipline and Punishment* in relation to power and surveillance.
modern disciplinary institution because of the unequal ‘gaze’ where ‘one is totally seen, without ever seeing’. 386

After they drew their image, they built three-dimensional homes with boxes. Initially I wanted the group to work together to make a gigantic structure, but the museum was uncertain about this, so it was scaled down. Each child had a small box each to decorate. This was unfortunate, as the larger scale structure would have allowed more room for play and collaboration, but was prohibited due to health and safety.

4.2.4. The School Classroom

After the painting session at the family home, I organised a series of further workshops at a school, working with eighty teenagers in separate two-hour sessions. They were aged between twelve and fourteen-years old, divided by school year groups; they knew their peers and were in a familiar setting. I arranged these sessions outside the museum as there was less pressure on me to meet the museum’s School’s Officer’s standards. I would also be able to use acrylic in the school’s art-room, as I was told that this material is too ‘messy’ for the museum.

I found this series at the school challenging. In comparison, the session at the family home was easier, but it may have been due to age or group size. In the classroom, the older year group still focussed on the activity, but with details like lipstick and eyelashes. My initial reaction was that the images lacked the naivety and charm of the younger children’s artwork. 387 At first I was not sure what this ‘charm’ was; perhaps to do with age and maturity. I found myself associating the paintings by the younger children with my own childhood memories, using my own experiences as a form of empathy, but in hindsight this is problematic and it reveals my expected ‘childhood innocence’. I made the assumption that the paintings made by teenagers in this session were essentially too ‘grown-up’ and lacked the voice of the child. At the time, they could be called the ‘voice of the teenager’ (Figure 4.17). Although this in itself reveals how I myself am ‘framing’ their voice and my own embedded preconceived ideas of what childhood is that is influenced by my own memories, tinged with nostalgia.

387 The children were aged between seven and eleven-years old.
In contemporary society there is a paranoia about child protection, fuelled by ideas of childhood innocence and the image of the Apollonian Child. 388 There is a fetishisation of childhood and we are in a ‘state of conflict of what we consider childhood to be for and about’389 that stems from Rousseau’s conceptualisation of childhood in Émile, or On Education. Frank Furedi discusses this conflict and how it stems from ‘adulthood being recycled through childhood’; 390 with this statement he alludes to the attribution of our adult motives to children’s actions.

4.3. Discussion

4.3.1. Ethical Restrictions

The ethics of working with children are particularly challenging, but this process began to reveal the mechanisms behind societies aim to ‘protect’ children. As part of this study, I submitted a number of research forms to the University ethics committee. The most notable restriction was that I was not able to take photographs during the sessions or document the

---

388 Jenks, Childhood, p. 64.
children’s artwork without signed permission from the child and a guardian. The child had to be aware that they were participating in research and remain unidentifiable.

The museum’s child protection requirements differ from those of the University. I had to have a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check to ensure the children’s protection and safety. Before facilitating any workshop sessions, I was required to observe current workshops in the museum. Unlike the University, the museum had no problem with photography, filming, or audio recording; indeed, the staff was surprised I could not document the sessions. They also viewed the consent forms and emails to schools as a hindrance, another factor that led me to organise independent workshops outside the museum and at the family home.

The requirements put in place by both the University and the museum influenced my practice, impacting on documentation methods, selected locations, and workshop delivery. The most noticeable impact was the use of field notes as a means of documentation, as the children’s identities could be concealed in drawings. As a researcher, I found that I disagreed with the measures to not credit or photograph the children. If one had the parent and child’s permission, should it not be allowed? What if the child wanted to be visible in the project? The children frequently asked me if their name would be included by their drawing, but the University did not approve of this attribution. I suggest that the protection of identity stems from a fear of paedophilia – what if the child could be traced from their name? Who will look at their image? – and it is this fear that is behind the ethical regulations. This is valid, but the protection regulations are nonetheless restrictive.

Drawing is often used as a method when photography is not allowed. In I Swear I Saw This, the anthropologist Michael Taussig questions, ‘why is the drawing OK but not a photograph?’, noting that ‘it is impossible to say with confidence why these displacements of photography by drawing are allowed or encouraged’. Perhaps it is due to the level of privacy that is required. An example being in the courtroom, where there is a level of protection for the prosecution and witnesses. A drawing is a ‘squint-eyed’ view of the reality, which renders it a different kind of documentation; an approximation. Archaeologist Helen Wickstead writes that ‘drawing might provide a way to think about relations between presence and absence, past and

391 Micheal Taussig, I Swear I Saw This, p. 11.
present’. Contemporary drawing intersects with archaeological practices as it ‘can involve re-enacting the gestures of its making’, and as it is both a ‘verb and a noun, action and the traces of action, presence and absence’.

Like courtroom drawings, drawings in ethnographic fieldwork notebooks ‘butt against realism’, and in their incompletion, they ‘capture something invisible and auratic’. I found that this was the case in my work. They proved a valuable method, enabling me to analyse what I was observing. They gave emphasis to important moments and in some cases, added visual exaggeration in their stylisation, as with the drawing of the large mouth of a wailing child (Figure 4.18).

My initial responses to the workshop sessions were emotional. How could I not draw the children when they were such an integral part of the experience? To work around the ethical restrictions, I drew in a stylised format that represented the action, but the child, s/he is unrecognisable, and the drawing could be described as a characterisation or an interpretation. It is not an image of the real child. As the workshops progressed, rather than struggling with what I could and could not draw, I began to document the children’s art work as this felt ethically ‘safer’ in that I would not be breaking any rules that would lead to accusations of misconduct. However, the process of simply copying another’s drawing did not spark the same revelations as those in drawing the children and their actions did. Rather than using drawing to ‘encompass’ events that I had witnessed, I was merely documenting drawings that I saw the children make and the act did not have the same process of looking. The contemporary children, like the foundlings, were beginning to disappear in my own research due to the limitations on documentation. I began to consider how different our rules of protection are from the past. Even if it is based on varying motivations, the outcome (the disappearing child) is similar.

394 Wickstead, Between the Lines: Drawing Archaeology, p. 551.
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397 Taussig, I Swear I Saw This, p. 72.
4.3.2. Controlled Space

An important aspect of the workshops was space. In response to the restrictions and opportunities presented, I ended up hosting the sessions across four different locations and with alternative group sizes. I found that a smaller group, combined with the familiarity of space, such as the family home, proved the most fruitful as the children appeared to be more relaxed.

In each space, there were a number of unspoken rules (the children had to stay in the theatre for the allocated time, for example). Controlling space can be a way of safeguarding and observing children. In psychoanalysis, spaces are created during work with children that can be drawn on as a comparison to the workshop sessions, such as the Maison Verte. The psychoanalyst Françoise Dolto created the first Maison Verte in 1979 as a place that introduces children to a safe social environment. It is an open space, but it has precise rules. It aims to be an ‘environment where they can explore with others the rules and excitement of joining in with
society’. 398 In each Maison Verte there is a red line that separates the two rooms, and the children’s pedal-cars and tricycles are not allowed to cross over it: ‘this is one of the two rules that cannot be infringed. It introduces the sense of limits, boundaries, and transgression. It is the notion that there are laws in every day society.’ 399 Interplay between adult and child takes place in response to the red line. The boundaries made visible by the Maison Verte are present spaces of young children’s play, such as the fences and gates around playgrounds. The inclusion of the red tape was a practical decision. The children are young and must be supervised. They cannot be allowed to leave the space independently otherwise the Maison Verte might be reprimanded for lack of care.

In the workshop sessions I led there were also boundaries in place. These ensured that the children were observed by an adult at all times during the allocated time. In both instances, this is for safety (and to avoid complaints from others, such as the Maison Verte’s nearby shops). Furedi is critical of our over-supervision of children, 400 but the case of the Maison Verte or the Foundling Museum, it is not the parents who are responsible for the wellbeing of the child, and in a society where there can be legal implications if anything ‘goes wrong’, this is a requirement that is necessary to prevent criminalisation. What if one of the children in the pedal cars was run over if they strayed onto the road? What if they had been abducted by a passer-by? What if they discouraged customers from visiting the nearby shops?

As well as controlling the boundaries of space, there are certain times that children can be at the Maison Verte, partly based on the organisation of staffing and volunteers. In the school, ‘time’ is another method for adults to control childhood; through timetables, term dates, and so on. It is a method that Foucault’s attributes to the mechanisms of discipline. In Play for a Change, Lester and Russell write that ‘everyday time for children is busy, and children’s own use of time is threatened by the many plans and commitments made on their behalf by others’. 401 Both time and space are conditions that are relevant to the social construction and control of childhood. 402 This may be considered in relation to the Maison Verte and the museum workshops as to how children are controlled outside the family home. However, for the Maison

398 Maison Verte, About Us [website], www.maisonverte.org.uk/AboutUs/ [accessed 27 February 2017].
401 Lester and Russell, Play for a Change, p. 33.
402 Jenks, Childhood, p. 80.
Verte, allocating time is a practical decision, just as the timing was for the workshop sessions at the museum (was the Clore Studio available and so on). Unlike a playground area in a park that is open at all times of the day (although depending on the local council, it might be closed at night) the Maison Verte and the museum workshops do not function the same way. They consist of controlled play/art-making that has been put in place to serve a function. The sessions involve interaction with children and adults who are not the child’s parents or relatives, it is not the same as play at home.

There is a discussion to be had in response to the various spaces the workshops took place in: the public spaces of the museum, school classroom, and school theatre in comparison to the private space of the family home. Although the Foundling Hospital was a space to replace home, it also included the same mechanisms as the classroom. The hospital has lessons, meal-times, play-times, matrons, school masters, with all areas observed. The foundlings slept in large dormitories in rows of beds, a space that is both public and private. The contemporary family home functions differently from the Foundling Hospital. It is a place where lessons do not normally take place, but the children are familiar with the space. It is a place for play, where the children have (or share) their own bedrooms – they do not share dormitories – and they can close their bedroom doors and avoid observance (although this is perhaps describing a rather small societal group). At the home, there is a garden, but it is fenced (a sign of the boundaries of ownership and to prevent trespassing).

In comparison, museums use space, time, and directions to control visitors. Museum visitors are positioned as passive receivers of information and guided on a specific route through displays of captions and signage. This is not necessarily a negative experience, as visitors can choose whether to follow the museum’s suggestions. The use of language – be it captions, displays, tours or instructions – can be considered as a ‘voice’ that is part of a method of control in the museum.

---
403 I have chosen to use the term ‘voice’ in this instance to keep the discussion linked to the/an individual that writes or speaks.
I did not realise how controlled my workshop sessions had been until I revisited my instructions. Until then, I had attempted to hide the artist’s—my—’voice’. As I remembered the workshops, I attempted to recall the instructions I gave while the children were painting. I recited the instructions aloud and recorded them on a zoom H5, and without the children’s discussion, I was surprised at how controlling I had been. These recorded instructions became part of the installation *Kept Within the Bounds*, exhibited in the Foundling Museum in October 2016. I made the decision to include my vocal instructions as sound so that the work exposed the controlled nature of the museum workshops, contemporary education, and the Foundling Hospital.

Are the children aware that they are controlled? Viewing the drawings, it would seem so. In Figure 4.19 three guards march across the bridge of the Foundling Hospital, dressed in red and brandishing swords like historical knights or the Guard at Buckingham Palace. The knight’s role is both to keep the children inside to prevent escape and to protect the children from outside
danger. This may be likened to the teachers and artist-facilitators in the workshop who keep the children in the Clore Studio, keeping windows and doors shut so they cannot escape or get abducted.

4.3.3. The Children’s Role

What was the role of the children in the workshops? Was I as controlling as I perceive the Bloor brother’s to be during their project *Loose Parts*? Were the children in this study ‘puppets’? I set up boundaries and allowed them room inside these parameters to explore the themes.

There is an underlying concern that the artist is ‘exploiting other subjects’ and delegated performance often leads to a ‘heated debate about the ethics of representation’. 404 To my discomfort, I questioned if I was appropriating their voice and experience. During the early stages of my research, I was asked ‘who is the historical child?’ I knew that the expected answer was ‘me’ – the trope of the ‘inner child’. I ignored this thought, and answered with a clarification between historical and contemporary children. Yet this question stayed with me and played on my mind as I attempted to tease myself apart from the voices I was trying to construct.

The orphan – or foundling – is a reoccurring motif, both a ‘character out of place’ 405 and the ‘eternal Other’. 406 The orphan in literature and folklore often has to undertake a quest as part of a ‘coming of age tale’. The foundling might be regarded as a symbol of ‘the pain of isolation’ 407 that exist in all of us, which is why they continue to exist in children’s literature. As noted by Lemn Sissay in his work *Superman was a Foundling* that lists fictional characters who are orphans:

Frodo Baggins was adopted, Gideon Smeed was a foundling, Ham Peggotty was adopted, Han Solo was orphaned, Harriet Beadle was a foundling, Harry Potter was fostered, Hashio Mizouchi was a foundling, Heathcliff was a foundling, Heidi was fostered, Helena Landless was orphaned, Hercules

404 Bishop, *Delegated Performance*, p. 95.
was adopted, Hetty Feather was a foundling, Hortense was an orphan, Hotaru Tomoe was adopted, Huckleberry Finn was fostered, Jack Dawkins was orphaned.\textsuperscript{408}

Perhaps the orphan – or ‘foundling’ – is a symbol with which we may identify as a prevalent protagonist in literature.

\textsuperscript{408} Lemn Sissay cited the Foundling Museum, \textit{Superman was a Foundling} [website]
www.foundlingmuseum.org.uk/events/superman-was-a-foundling/ [accessed 10 August 2017]
I continued my search for the historical child, but after observing and facilitating workshops, I realised that another fragment I was hoping to find was empathy. I was looking for an empathetic engagement with the foundling children. Perhaps this was due to my own tendency to ‘feel too much’ and to over-identify with the past. Yet it also had its roots in my initial observations of the workshop sessions when the children appeared to be unengaged and restricted in their creative responses.409

‘Empathy’ started to gain significance when I instinctively jotted it down as a method in my field notes and since then, it has been central to the analyses of the children’s workshops. The history of empathy as a term is complicated. It was introduced into the English language in the twentieth century, translated from the German Einfühlung. This in turn is a translation from the Ancient Greek word for ‘passion’, empátheia, and it derives from en ‘in’ and pathos ‘feeling’. Einfühlung was used to describe an aesthetic experience such as contemplating works of art, the viewer’s emotional reaction to a painting. The term was later expanded to include the aesthetic experience and our modern understanding of empathy is now defined as the ability to understand someone else’s perspective, of another person or a fictional character.

The literary scholars Aledia Assmann and Ines Detmers open Empathy and its Limits with the bold statement ‘empathy is a new topic’,410 and while this might be the case for certain disciplines, it is not for all – empathy has been debated in philosophy, psychotherapy, and education.411 In Critical Heritage Studies, affect and emotion are gaining new ground in academic research. Divya Tolia-Kelly, Emma Waterton, and Steve Watson are currently exploring this area; their 2017 book Heritage, Affect and Emotion412 presents an ‘embodied’ rather than textual approach to heritage research. In Heritage, Affect and Emotion, Steven Cooke and Donna-Lee Frieze’s chapter critiques the affect of testimony in Holocaust museums, and they

409 I have discussed these observations in the previous chapter ‘Freedom and Control’, pp. 88-106.
411 Research in this area has been undertaken by philosopher Edmund Husserl, historian Keith Jenkins, psychoanalyst Heinz Kohut, and considered in Jean-Pol Martin’s learning by teaching (LdL) method, for example.
draw on Jennifer Hansen-Glucklich analysis that by viewing material remains (such as victims’ shoes) exhibited alongside survivors’ testimony, it can aid an ‘affective connective based on empathy and identification’ and ‘transform passive spectators into involved and concerned Holocaust witnesses’.413

In 2009 Smith and Campbell write that there was a lack of recognition of empathy in heritage and museum studies, noting that ‘empathy is questioned as something that substitutes shallow identification for appropriately rigorous historical understanding’,414 a statement that included in Smith’s essay ‘The Elephant in the Room’, the title suggesting that empathy is unspoken, wild, and uncontained in the heritage industry. It could be argued that empathy is part of the ‘cultural discourse’415 of heritage championed in Smith’s The Uses of Heritage, since the ability to empathise with the past is not restricted to museum directors, scholars, or leading authorities. Empathy has been described by Magdalena Nowak as in the ‘domain of the common people’416 as it is accessible across cultures, education, and class – but it can also be a fantasy.

Historians have been cautious of the use of empathy in the field, noting that the moral sentiments of the present should not be employed in the study of the past,417 and in heritage practice, emotion has been described as ‘dangerous’,418 as it has the potential to create an unstable rather than balanced understanding of history. Essentially, it is viewed as unreliable. This stance is comparable to Brecht’s Verfremdungseffekt technique in theatre that creates ‘distance’ to prevent the audience losing themselves in the narrative and enabling critical understanding of the situation.

In Against Empathy: The Case for Rational Compassion Paul Bloom notes different forms of empathy: cognitive empathy and emotional empathy. Bloom describes cognitive empathy as a form of social intelligence, where you can understand that the other is in pain without feeling it

415 Laurajane Smith’s book The Uses of Heritage presents heritage as a ‘cultural discourse’.
(a form of empathy that Bloom does not oppose) and emotional empathy is ‘the act of coming to experience the world as you think someone else does’. Bloom is morally against this form of emotional empathy, and describes the negatives effects as being ‘biased’, ‘short-sighted’, ‘innumerate’, ‘corrosive’, suggesting it can ‘spark violence’. These critical viewpoints will be used to unpick problems that might occur when empathy leads to over-identification – in particular, how empathy can lead to bias and favours one over many (a spotlight effect).

Sympathy, empathy, apathy, and indifference; should we feel a sense of empathy with the foundlings? In Regarding the Pain of Others, Susan Sontag writes that ‘people want to weep. Pathos, in the form of a narrative, does not wear out’. We could consider that feeling sympathy for those that we now regard as unfortunate (in the context of today) might simply highlight our own privileges and take on a form of catharsis. Sontag is critical of the assumption that one can understand the pain of another person:

‘We’ – this ‘we’ is everyone who has never experienced anything like what they went through – don’t understand. We don’t get it. We can’t truly imagine what it was like. We can’t imagine how dreadful, how terrifying […] is; and how normal it becomes.

I argue that when empathy is combined with critical distance – cognitive empathy – it may aid the spectator to reach a ‘critical state’ of emotional understanding. In Tales of Love Julia Kristeva used the term to claim empathy as a feeling of oneness. Analysing the term from the position of Freud, she draws parallels between Einfühlung and narcissism, noting that empathy plays a positive role as long as the subject is self-aware of their narcissism. Positive empathy deals with contrast and difference, rather than following Lipp’s description of empathy as one of imitation and passive immersion. In the mimetic process, one must actively reformulate what one is seeing to understand one’s feelings about it. As Magdalena Nowak explains, empathy ‘transforms “history as a reconstruction of the past” into “history as a critical rewriting and understanding of the past”’. She writes:

There is no possibility of reproducing what happened, the only thing one can do is to cautiously empathise and always remain in a state of unsettlement about the past, which contributes more to the real knowledge than a strict classification of facts.\footnote{Ibid.}

Throughout the chapter, I consider my role as one that creates a ‘state of unsettlement’. I examine empathy and over-identification in the child and the spectator. The art practice leads the inquiry chronologically: I discuss the outcome of the art workshops before concluding with the installation \textit{Kept Within The Bounds}, exhibited at the Foundling Museum in October 2016.

5.1. The Empathetic Child

5.1.1. Painting at Home

In April 2016, I worked with a group of eight to eleven-year olds to explore the histories of the foundling children through art-making. The three-hour session took place in a family home and I worked alongside a group of six children. The session was initially discussed in the previous chapter ‘Freedom and Control’, but rather than analysing the structure of the activities, in this chapter I will be focussing on emotional engagement through the discussion of artworks made.

I began the session by introducing the children to the history of the Foundling Hospital,\footnote{The introduction was the same format as in the opening presentations in the performance-based workshops that I described in chapter 4, ‘Freedom and Control’, pp. 90-99.} and although some of the children had watched Jacqueline Wilson’s \textit{Hetty Feather}\footnote{Hetty Feather is the main protagonist in Jacqueline Wilson’s children’s books of the same name, published in 2009. The story was later adapted for a children’s television series that aired in May 2015. In the story, Hetty is abandoned at the Foundling Hospital in 1876, but when she is older, she runs away to the circus to find her mother, although the story is not historically accurate. For example, the CBBC trailer shows Hetty holding her token; the child would not have their token and tokens were no longer used in the hospital after the 1760s.} on CBBC and were familiar with the Foundling Museum (unlike the previous groups\footnote{I refer to the performance-based workshop sessions that I undertook with a group of thirty thirteen to fourteen-year olds in a school theatre. These sessions are discussed in the chapter ‘Freedom and Control’.}), I re-introduced them to the narratives. Each child imagined what it was like to be a foundling. I instigated this act, achieving it through exercises based on Stanislavski’s techniques \textit{Magic If} and \textit{Given Circumstances}, as described in the earlier chapter ‘Method of Practice’.\footnote{Konstantin Stanislavski, \textit{An Actor’s Work}, trans. by Jean Benedetti, London: Routledge, 2008. [Работа Актора Над Собой. Russia: Азбука-Классика, 1936]} The children were invited to construct their own imaginary foundling ‘character’ and make tokens in response. They were each given a piece of self-hardening clay cut into a circle, visually similar to the tokens in the
museum collection. The children inscribed the clay with their own design and to my surprise and without my direction, the children pressed in their own birthdates. For a few moments, they had forgotten their character and the nature of the task, before correcting their mistake. This behaviour also occurred during the following workshops, on which I will expand later.

As discussed in ‘Freedom and Control’, structure was put in place to guide the children towards empathy. There was order to achieve the passing on of knowledge. Bioethicist Jackie Leach Scully says that empathy is not possible without ‘knowledge of the other’, as this is needed to imagine another person’s situation. As the artist/facilitator, I am responsible for this in the workshops. In hindsight, my own opinion influenced how I passed on this knowledge. Although this was something that I attempted to avoid, there is a tendency to judge their historical situation with my contemporary values; in history, this is termed ‘presentism’.

I gave each child a 10” x 8” canvas and asked them to draw their character’s portrait. I also showed them examples of paintings of foundlings in the museum, such as the work of Emma Brownlow and Sophie Anderson; these images were intended to assist the children in drawing the uniforms.

---

430 Jackie Leach Scully, Keynote, Empathies, University of Basel, June 2017.
I suggested that the children started their image by drawing the outline of the face – a simple oval shape – before adding their features. I gave a mirror to the children who struggled so that their features could help to guide them with their proportions. Their reflections could be used to measure and understand what features needed to be included. The mirror also enabled them to crop their images ‘in frame’. In hindsight, by handing each child a canvas that had borders and a mirror – I directed them towards tools that cropped their image. The drawings became faces that were bounded inside frames and without bodies. By removing the body, I unintentionally de-sexualised the children. It was my intention to encourage them to focus on the face and eliminate the challenge of drawing the body, the hands, scenery, and so on. But what did this suggest about my bias towards how a child should be represented? Or how I wanted the children to portray and empathise with their characters? Did it align with the

Figure 5.2
*Foundling Girls in the Chapel*
Sophie Anderson, 1877
representation of the Apollonian child as one of innocence? The portraits could be described as ‘bounded’ by adult morals and presenting a particular representation of childhood; this is further comparable to Smith’s proposition that heritage is also ‘bounded’ within objects or sites by Authorised Heritage Discourse.

Some children panicked when there was freedom in the task of drawing a portrait, so I sat beside them and demonstrated how to measure their features with their finger and a pencil. As I continued, I found myself talking about facial symmetry, which the children enjoyed and they drew a line of symmetry to guide their drawings. During the session, I decided to use guidelines to help focus their attention so that they could complete each stage of their portrait step-by-step and the children became absorbed in the exercise. A child asked me to draw on their canvas when they were ‘stuck’ but I refused to do so.

The children had an hour to compose their drawings and rework their character’s expression. In one drawing a child focussed on the mouth and out of frustration at the external image not appearing similar to the imagined, they replaced the straight mouth with a crescent moon smile. Although this shape is not how the mouth anatomically appears, it is a standardised shape that the child associated with the mouth. In this instance, the child was aiming to draw a ‘neutral’ expression but after becoming frustrated with the image, they chose to draw a recognised expression of happiness. On speaking to the child, happiness was not the emotion after becoming frustrated with the image, they chose to draw a recognised expression of happiness. On speaking to the child, happiness was not the emotion

431 Holmes and Jones, Limitless Provocations of the “safe”, “secure” and “healthy” child, p. 79.
432 Smith, The Uses of Heritage, p. 31.
they intended to communicate. The child reverted to familiar symbols when faced with the inability to draw what they imagined. If, however, their foundling ‘character’ was in fact happy, this might seem an unexpected emotion based on the common reaction from visitors at the Foundling Museum, but it is still a valid interpretation made by the child.

Figure 5.4

E’s Foundling Character Portrait

Rachel Emily Taylor’s workshops, April 2016

---

433 I make reference the sketch-artwork Visitor Responses To The Foundling Tokens (April 2016) discussed in the chapter ‘Single and Multiple Voice’.
Gender and race were altered without my direction, but the children rarely deviated from their own appearance. On one occasion an eight-year old girl, whom I will call E–, drew a boy. E– identifies as a boy and asks for her peers to call her by a male name. This image led me to consider the drawings in relation to the work of Françoise Dolto, who used drawing and model-making as clinical methods when working with children. She considered many of these works to be ‘self-portraits’ but she did not mean this in the traditional sense, calling them an ‘unconscious image of the body’ – a representation of the id, the ego or the super-ego. It was only through conversation and viewing the drawings that Dolto made her analysis of the children. Rather than an image of a foundling, E–’s drawing could be a ‘self-portrait’ of how the child views herself (Figure 5.4).

In all of the drawings, the eyes are large in proportion and appear to be doubled; the eyes have two irises and, in some cases, two pupils. This ‘double portrait’ could have been caused by looking in the mirror and the gaze moving while drawing. However, it gave the impression of being looked at by two people, perhaps the historical and the contemporary child, or perhaps an image of the child and their alter ego.

The ‘doubling’ is also a product of my instructions: I asked the children to draw a portrait of the historical child, but there were mirrors on the table. I had constructed an environment that could influence the children in relating the image to their reflection. Based on this awareness, in following workshops that I discuss later on in this chapter, I made the decision to remove the mirrors. Even so, a blending of self and other still occurred – and this could be described as an example of Lacan’s mirror stage. Lacan returned to the mirror stage throughout his work and developed its complexity. Initially viewed as a stage in the child’s development (when one begins to recognise oneself in the mirror) but later developed it as a fundamental aspect of subjectivity. The subject – very much like the children in the workshops – is ‘permanently caught and captivated by his own image’.

---

5.1.2. At the Museum

In July 2016 I led a series of workshops at the Foundling Museum. I worked with a larger group of thirty-five children aged between six to seven years old from a primary school in Camden, over a period of two full days. I structured the session in a similar manner as before but included a tour of the museum and the foundling tokens. Each of the children was given a new foundling name, which they wore on a badge for the entire session. As outlined in ‘Method’, after a series of warm-up exercises based on activities in Boal’s *Games for Actors and Non-Actors*, they were asked to imagine what it was like to be a foundling. The group then worked on their character’s attributes, based on *Given Circumstances*; this activity was written rather than spoken.

The children were asked to design a token for their imagined foundling and before working with clay, they drew their design on paper. At the end of the activity, I collected the sheets

---

436 The tour focused on the Introductory Gallery at the museum and it took a similar format to the sessions that I had observed. For example, we started at the print of Hogarth’s *Gin Lane* and used paintings to tell the children stories of what London was like during the 1700s when the Foundling Hospital was first opened.

437 This activity of naming the children by giving them badges with ‘foundling names’ is an activity already in place in the workshops at the museum.

438 The exercises were based on the walk series in ‘Feeling What We Touch’ and the mirror sequence in ‘Seeing What We Look At’ described in Boal’s *Games for Actors and Non-Actors*.

439 This is a reference to a method used in Konstantin Stanislavski’s *System*. 

Figure 5.5

*A child’s drawing of eyes* (detail)

Rachel Emily Taylor’s workshops, April 2016
with the designs on, which helped me to unpick the final three-dimensional objects as aided legibility.

Here follow a few examples of what the children wrote:

October 23th 2008
1700
Archibald
Mohamad

I love you
Ayugyst 15th 17 2019

I love you
13.12.08 13.12.1700

I have included what the children erased and it is these mistakes that interest me. They are examples of when children had written their own name or date of birth, and then, remembering that they were making tokens for their foundling character, they crossed out their ‘mistake’ and reworked their design. This work led me to consider the problematic of empathy and how it may not be possible to separate oneself from an imagined other. On first impression, I thought that the work suggested a lack of separation from the contemporary and historical child. However, it might also be a product of the exercises, since the structure never addressed this or teased the two apart. The blurring of the two is suggested by their character

440 This name was one of the foundling names given to the child to wear on a badge as part of an earlier activity.
plan when the children described the attributes of their imagined character and, similarly, the child added their own name or age and before crossing it out:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Foundling: Mario James</th>
<th>Boy/Girl:</th>
<th>Age: 27</th>
<th>Hair Colour: White</th>
<th>Eye Colour: Blue</th>
<th>What job do they do when they group up: Army</th>
<th>Token: golden neckles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Foundling: Jimmy Isaiah</th>
<th>Boy/Girl:</th>
<th>Age: 7 4</th>
<th>Hair Colour: black yellow</th>
<th>Eye Colour: brown blue</th>
<th>What job do they do when they group up: servant</th>
<th>Token: Acorn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Foundling: Danny Beatrice</th>
<th>Boy/Girl:</th>
<th>Age: 10 7 1/2</th>
<th>Hair Colour: blonde black</th>
<th>Eye Colour: green brown</th>
<th>What job do they do when they group up: Doctor</th>
<th>Token: coin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The foundling’s apprenticeship was linked to the child’s own ambitions and desires. These are not always past or present, but look towards the future. On one of the coins the date is listed as 2019 and the age of the foundling is twenty-seven. Viewed in relation to nostalgia, the activity might be viewed as a ‘longing’ for another time – a ‘time’ that Stewart would describe as
‘ideological’. 441 Boym writes that nostalgia is not always ‘directed towards the past, but rather sideways’. 442 It can be forward facing, an off-modern. In this instance, the child could be longing to be – or know – themselves when they are a ‘grown up’.

When the children were working on their characters, they edited information and changed their ideas, remembering that the foundling had to be either a servant or in the army:

- **Name of Foundling:** Mildred
  - **Boy/Girl:** Girl
  - **Age:** 7
  - **Hair Colour:** blue and purple
  - **Eye Colour:** pink
  - **What job do they do when they group up:** servant
  - **Token:** Fish

At times they did not alter their desires at all, and the foundling’s ambitions remained their own.

- **Name of Foundling:** Helena
  - **Boy/Girl:** girl
  - **Age:** 15
  - **Hair Colour:** brownet
  - **Eye Colour:** blue
  - **What job do they do when they group up:** Eexplora
  - **Token:** Cainee

I made the decision to include the above texts as a transcription in print rather than the children’s handwriting not only for legibility, but also to conceal the children’s identities in the research. Handwriting strikes me as personal, and by removing their marks, I can hide them further for the sake of the University’s ethical requirements. The frames act as a barrier to

---

separate each work, acting as a marker for when their writing is removed, but also framing their words. The transformation of the children’s work into an ‘official language’ of type makes the ‘crossing out’ appear charged and draws attention to the mistakes in the text.

After both workshops, I considered if the children were blurring boundaries of self and other. I questioned if the past was a plastic medium with which the children worked, or if, the children occupied an imaginative space where all times existed at once, in an ‘in-between space’\(^{443}\) where there is a fusion between the child’s self and the imagined past. It might be considered as a ‘multi-time space’ where the present/past is not linear, but occurring simultaneously. I recall the child who said that the foundlings [come] from the other side. It appeared that some of the children think of the past in terms of ‘space’. These spatial and temporal dimensions are in Freud’s model of the unconscious, which he depicted as a ‘large entrance hall’ that is adjacent to a ‘kind of drawing-room – in which the consciousness too resides’.\(^{444}\) Stanislavski also interprets the subconscious as a house in which an actor searches for a tiny bead of memory,\(^{445}\) and in these rooms, ‘time is out of joint’.\(^{446}\)

Jacques Derrida writes in *Spectres of Marx* that to be ‘just’ we must live beyond our living-present in ‘a spectral moment, a moment that no longer belongs to time, if one understands by this word the linking of modalized presents (past present, actual present: “now,” future present)’,\(^{447}\) to have an understanding beyond time, that looks in all directions. A child’s concept of time might be a layered palimpsest of histories and futures; this might be seen in the drawings by the children from the Camden primary school. During this session, unlike the previous one, the children did not have access to a mirror and could not see their reflection during the process.

The following drawing (Figure 5.6) could be used to analyse a contemporary child’s interpretation of the past. The marks are aggressive. The pencil has been pressed down hard, with long, fast strokes that caused the paper to crumple under the pressure. In the session we had focussed on the Foundling Hospital in the early nineteenth century, and although the image

---

\(^{443}\) Moore, *Hollis Frampton [nostalgia]*, p.10.


\(^{446}\) William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, Act 1, Scene 4, 186–90; this quotation is also a reference to Jacques Derrida’s *Specters of Marx*, which references Hamlet in the discussion of ‘hauntology’.

\(^{447}\) Jacques Derrida, *Specters of Marx*. 
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is not an historically accurate representation of the era, the symbols chosen still demonstrate an emotional understanding. For example, the child made the decision that their foundling would have joined the army, and drew guns (a contemporary representation of warfare) to depict this. Without an in-depth historical education or knowledge of visual references, the child could not represent this narrative accurately in their drawing, so they based the image on their own understanding and contemporary viewpoint.

Figure 5.6
A Foundling
Rachel Emily Taylor’s workshops, July 2016

448 Being apprenticed into the army was the most common route for foundling boys, particularly in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.
The mouth is a long downward curve (Figure 5.7), creating a recognised image of sadness. Through drawing, emotions have been attributed to the character. This image could be considered as a means to analyse how the child responded to the narratives of the Foundling Hospital in relation to ‘empathy’. Klein described empathy as the ability to ‘put oneself in another’s shoes’, being able to see from another’s point of view. It requires imaginative reconstruction. The shoes may not fit, the surface might feel rough and unfamiliar. A shoe is also an object that is subject to fashion and current trends. The metaphor suggests that one can never lose oneself in the act, one is simply wearing another’s shoes, and one’s own life experiences will influence one’s response. The outcomes from the workshop sessions support this, as they revealed that the children’s interpretation of the past was not neutral, nor without contemporary social or individual influence.

However, during this discussion, we must not lose sight that the children were asked to imagine another person. This person (although based on historical fact) was a work of fiction. The task could be compared to an actor rehearsing to perform a role on stage. Stanislavski’s Emotion Memory encouraged an actor to apply his/her own memories to their character’s experiences. The actor would import these feelings onto their character. Philip Auslander writes that in Stanislavski’s System, the ‘the actor’s self’ is always ‘privileged’ and present during a

performance, but both character and actor should ‘fuse completely’. Not dissimilar to the
characters invented by the children, where there was a blurring of self and other – and the
foundling character was an invention that never existed.

The philosopher Sarah Richmond has considered the basis of empathy in ‘Projective
Identification’, when aspects of the self are attributed to an external object. Klein writes that
projective identification occurs when an infant expels the ‘bad parts of the self’, and
attributes them to their mother, but Richmond notes that this is not a straightforward
substitution, as the infant feels as if a part of itself has now entered the mother. It is essentially a
narcissistic act in which there is blurring between self and other; in comparison empathy
‘requires a distinction between self and other’.

There are dangers of projective identification, in that there are people who lose themselves
entirely in others and are incapable of objective judgement – a concern raised by Bloom in
Against Empathy. Therefore projective identification could be attributed to the problems
perceived in empathy, such as the over-absorption in another. These concerns are raised by
Jackie Leach Scully, who voices her concern that there are epistemic obstacles to imagine
another’s life and inhabit their embodied experience: ‘I’m highly sceptical if this is possible, and
I think we are kidding ourselves if we think we can do it.’ We are erasing the other by
imagining ourselves in their position, and in so doing, are appropriating their experience, which
leads to a misunderstanding of their experience. Jesse Prinz expanded on this at the 2017
conference Empathies, stating that ‘empathy is a double-edged sword, by erasing the other and
making the other’s pain your own’. The use of ‘erase’ can also be considered as a
‘replacement’. One stands in their shoes but one does not stand in their skin.

451 Philip Auslander, 'Just Be Yourself: Logocentrism and Difference in Performance Theory' in Acting
2002, p. 54.
452 Melanie Klein, ‘Notes on Some Schizoid Mechanisms’ (1946), ‘Envy and Gratitude’ and Other Works 1946–63,
p. 8.
453 The blurring of self and other in this instance could be considered in relation to Freud’s primary and
secondary narcissism. You are born with primary narcissism, an example being when children believe themselves
to be invincible, but at some point primary narcissism is directed on to an external object rather than oneself. This
is when secondary narcissism develops, and causes an individual to seek self-preservation and there is a distinction
between self and other.
454 Sarah Richmond, ‘Being in Others: Empathy from a Psychoanalytical Perspective’, European Journal of
455 Jackie Leach Scully, Keynote, Empathies, University of Basel, June 2017.
456 Jesse Prinz, Keynote, Empathies, University of Basel, June 2017.
5.2 The Empathetic Spectator

5.2.1. The Artist as Spectator

When I looked at the children’s paintings, they provoked a reaction in me. I felt as if I was being stared at, and I felt a pang of guilt and sympathy, which I wonder might be empathy for the historical children. The reaction to empathise (or sympathise) with the foundlings based on these images may not appear logical, since the images have no physical connection to the past or the foundlings. But they are made in response to these narratives, and when one is aware of the context, they might trigger a reaction.

Peter Shaughnessy notes Freud used the word empathy – *Einfühlung* – in his writing. Focussing on his 1913 paper *On Beginning the Treatment*, the word was used when Freud discussed the relationship between the patient and analyst. Shaughnessy argued that *Einfühlung* has been mistranslated in the English version as a ‘sympathetic understanding’. Shaughnessy argues that English speakers would miss the nuance of the term *Einfühlung*, which in modern German translated to ‘empathy’ but also *feeling into*. There has been discussion on the central role of the use of empathy in psychoanalytical practice. Through empathy, the patient feels as if they are understood by the analyst. Paul Ornstein notes that this ‘constitutes essential aspects of the curative process: empathy-based understanding evokes a feeling of being known, affirmed, recognised, and validated – in Kohut’s encompassing phrase: “mirrored”’.  

---

459 Heinz Kohut, ‘introspection, Empathy and Psychoanalysis: An Examination of the Relationship Between Mode of Observation and Theory’, presented at the 25th Anniversary Meeting of the Chicago Institute for
On viewing the paintings at the end of the workshop, I remember the children laying them out on the floor in a row. They began comparing their work and playing a guessing game, with cries of ‘whose drawing is mine, Daddy? Guess!’ Ostensibly the children did not seem to empathise with the foundlings, but there appeared to be a connection in their paintings. The foundling children stared out of the images with wide-eyes and closed mouths, as if ‘voice-less’. In these images, each child has captured the face of a foundling from their imagination. These lost and forgotten children reappear, as if they had been photographed. Each painting is a portrait of two people: the child-artist and the foundling child they seek to recreate. The paint had covered the pencil marks – the doubling of the eyes, the guidelines, and the mistakes – and through the application of colour, the two people in the image were merged into one.

Something struck me. I felt as if I had found something in the work. I could not articulate why at the time. It might have been the significance of similarity or the value of multiplicity. Or the representation of a ‘face’. One’s relationship with another’s face is also important in the work of the philosopher Emmanuel Lévinas, whose ‘face-to-face’ encounter forms the basis for his philosophy of ethics. In *Totality and Infinity*, he argues that only a face-to-face meeting establishes a responsibility for the Other in the Self. Could it be that one could empathise with

---


461 A similarity in both composition and colour palette.
the other through an encounter with the face? What was it about these images in particular? After reflecting on my reaction, it was the eyes.

In each painting, the eyes are extremely large. They stare at me. My projection onto the images is one of sadness, nervousness, and accusation; feelings that I equate with the foundlings, reflecting back at me. I recall the English saying that ‘children should be seen and not heard’. Perhaps, I thought, the silence in these images is also a ‘voice’. In *Mirroring and Attunement*, Kenneth Wright writes that metaphorical language – such as drawn symbolic forms – is a way in which we can communicate our feelings; the images are a method to ‘speak’.462 It may be thought of as a form of ‘affective identification’, a mode of ‘communication’ that ‘does not take place between subjects, but directly between affects’.463 Wright describes the artist’s involvement in the objects he produces – as I inadvertently did in the direction of the children’s paintings – as a ‘dialogue in which [the artist] struggles with [his/her] medium until it gives back to him the resonating forms for which he is searching’.464

![Figure 5.10](image)

*Foundling Character Portrait (detail)*
Rachel Emily Taylor’s workshops, July 2016

The gaze in the paintings is an important part of my interpretation. Lacan separated the concept of the gaze from that of ‘look’, which is concerned with the organ of sight and the subject, and

describes ‘the gaze’ as anxiety when one becomes aware that one is viewed.\textsuperscript{465} In the \textit{Practices of Looking}, Marita Sturken and Lisa Cartwright note that the gaze is ‘integral to systems of power’.\textsuperscript{466} Power is closely entwined with an adult’s relationship with a child. Holmes and Jones write that the teacher asks children to ‘look at me’ and listen to the lesson as a ‘mechanism of subjection’, but children are also told ‘not to stare’ because it is rude;\textsuperscript{467} a look from a child can cause ‘confrontation’.\textsuperscript{468}

The term ‘pupil’ is the centre of the eye, but also thought of as ‘student’ and ‘ward’, an orphan child. Pupil originates from the Latin \textit{pupilla}, meaning ‘little girl’, but also the tiny image one sees of oneself reflected in the eye of another. In these paintings, the adult is not reflected back in the eye of the children, yet could the gaze in these images assert the power that the foundlings lack? They watch the viewer but the pupil remains dark and unreflective – there is no adult or teacher reflected in the gaze. Recalling Foucault’s \textit{Discipline and Punish}, observation is part of a modern system of control – do these children assert power from their unblinking look? \textit{Kept Within The Bounds} turns the panopticon inside out, the eyes look outward rather than inward, and the children contained stare out at us from all sides.

In her work \textit{Self Contained},\textsuperscript{469} the artist Rebecca Fortnum explores concepts of the child’s gaze. Fortnum produced a series of drawings of children, but in her images their eyes are closed (another method to take power from the viewer’s gaze). Fortnum views the closed eyes in her drawings as a ‘shield’ that protects ‘the space of imagination from the intrusive (adult) gaze’.\textsuperscript{470} She, as an adult, drew the children, focussing on their ‘faces as an external sign, a portal to the understandings of a child’s inner workings’.\textsuperscript{471} Comparatively, in my workshop sessions, rather than an adult looking at the children from the outside, the paintings from my workshop were made by children, but still arguably directed by myself. Although I did not guide the children if their character’s eyes should be open or closed, the children chose to depict their portrait with open eyes, staring back at themselves and the viewer. Fortnum’s \textit{Self Contained} explores the governess/Fortnum’s relationship with the children, as one that cannot look into the child. I


\textsuperscript{467} Holmes and Jones, \textit{Limitless Provocations of the “safe”, “secure” and “healthy” child}, p. 90.

\textsuperscript{468} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{469} \textit{Self Contained} was exhibited at the Freud Museum, London in 2013.

\textsuperscript{470} Op. Cit., p. 86

\textsuperscript{471} Ibid.
attempted to look in, but found the subject was looking back at me. Like Lacan’s *objet petit a*, the unattainable other that I am searching for, the paintings are a mirror in which my own interpretation of the lost historical child was reflected back at me.

---

**Figure 5.11**
Testing Testing
Rachel Emily Taylor, August 2016
SIA Gallery

5.2.2. Testing Testing
On completion of the workshops, there were a hundred paintings made by children. The portraits were then tested through various methods of display before the residency’s closing event at the Foundling Museum. One of these processes involved taking part in the exhibition *Testing Testing* at Sheffield Institute of the Arts (SIA) Gallery in August 2016. The process of *Testing Testing* was challenging, enabling the recognition of aspects previously unseen, and enabling curation to work as an important method of re-framing.

---

472 After the initial painting workshop described at the start of this chapter, I re-ran the workshop following the same format with children at Polam Hall School. I undertook workshop sessions in the school’s art rooms so that I had more material to work with.
I was not in control of the display or placement of the work, as this was decided by a separate curating team. In hindsight, I did not realise this was such an important element of my practice. SIA gallery was not the correct site – it was not the Foundling Museum – and it would be viewed out of context; this had a greater impact on the work than I anticipated. When the work is not viewed in the museum, it lacks the historical connotations that the museum would bestow. This could be thought comparatively with Sworn’s Silent Sticks and her installation’s ‘lack’ of cool authenticity; without the museum there are no material objects that historically ‘place’ the work in time. With this display, there is no comment to be made regarding the work’s place in the social structures in the museum. However these problems help to understand the work and it forms part of the research methods.473

The curating team suggested a method of display that would be suitable for a group exhibition. The works would be displayed in a rectangular format using the scale and height of the SIA Gallery walls. On viewing the displayed work in the gallery space I realised that using height was problematic. It gave the impression that the children were looking down on the viewer from an elevated position. The act of looking ‘up’ at the children imposed a different physicality in viewing than I intended; the upward gaze was awkward. It reminded me of performance methods that I had been taught at the Michael Chekhov studio in London, one of which included the importance of the direction of the actor’s gaze. The task was to walk around the space looking up and then repeat the exercise looking down. The exercise was to help the group begin to understand Chekhov’s acting tool Psychological Gesture.474 I recall that looking up made me feel psychically exposed whereas looking down closed me off from the group and I felt safe. The act of looking up at the portrait’s gaze in Testing Testing made me uncomfortable, but not in the way that I intended. The children’s gaze directed downwards from a great height seemed to communicate the problematic Victorian image of children as angelic cherubs and this was not dissimilar from the eighteenth-century paintings of foundlings. This made me reconsider my work for the artist’s residency closing event at the museum and led me to the decision that the paintings needed to be displayed at child height.

473 Refer to page 49 for discussion on curation in the chapter ‘Method of Practice’.
*Testing Testing* exposes problems in the work, one of which was highlighted when a visitor assumed that I had made the paintings. It did not dawn on them that these were works by children. This misunderstanding revealed that without means of contextualising, visitors could assume that the work was by an adult imitating children’s paintings. By removing myself and the workshop process from the installation, I had hidden the work and it appeared to be something it was not. Lack of information hid the contemporary children. Hiding the process of the workshops in the presentation of the paintings is problematic and can be considered as a form of Authorised Heritage Discourse; the discourse that I was trying to subvert.

5.2.3. Kept Within The Bounds

Working through the problems encountered in *Testing Testing* led me to consider that I needed to ‘unpack’ the paintings in the final installation. The completed work was exhibited as the
piece, *Kept Within The Bounds* displayed in the Picture Gallery at the Foundling Museum at the residency closing event in October 2016.

*Kept Within The Bounds* made the workshop process clear, including items— or ‘artefacts’— from the workshops: aprons, paint brushes, mirror, a paint palette, etc. A visitor commented on the objects, remarking that these everyday objects reminded her of her children and ‘pulled on the heartstrings’. Perhaps the mundanity and familiarity allowed visitors to draw on their own memories of contemporary children, even their own, in relation to the historical foundlings. Wright describes the spectator’s affective identification with artwork as one that has no effect on the art’s form, but the work ‘remains a responsive object’ in which there is a ‘dialogue between its forms and the viewer’s emotional being’.

![Figure 5.13](image_url)

*Figure 5.13
Ground Plan of the Foundling Hospital
Paul Fourdrinier, 1742

The children’s paintings were included in the work as though they were found objects, displayed on white MDF structures. In hindsight, it is comparable to Sworn’s aim for *Silent Sticks* – it is ‘a space that is half-built’\(^{476}\) – but the reason behind this was not for the audience to ‘fill the gaps’, as she intended. Instead, it was due to the fact that I did not want the structures to masquerade as historical artefacts, they were contemporary, rather like items from Ikea. They were assembled in the same format as the floor plan for Foundling Hospital building, a structure that no longer exists; it stood on Coram’s Fields. The installation recreates a space that is missing, where the foundlings once lived. The paintings of the boys represent the boy’s wing, the paintings of the girls represent the girl’s wing, with an entrance gate and chapel. The paintings were secured to the ‘walls’ of the building; the children were placed on the edge of the boundaries of containment, *enclosed*,\(^{477}\) looking out. By rebuilding the spaces that the foundlings once inhabited in an attempt to ‘find’ them, the reconstruction becomes the container for the children – or *agalma*.\(^{478}\)

During the process of putting the separate elements of the work together in the installation, I struggled with one element. The workshop process was still not clear and I had to add my own voice (reading the instructions) to the work to avoid the problems of concealment that arose in *Testing Testing*, as addressed in the chapter ‘Single and Multiple Voice’; my voice revealed the boundaries and restrictions in place during the sessions. Rather than ‘filling in the gaps’, the work shone a spotlight on where the child’s voice should be. Metaphorically, I had built ‘bounds’ to contain negative space, drawing attention to what was ‘lacking’.

*Kept Within The Bounds* explores the under-representation of historical children, focussing on their lack of place in the museum. It achieves this by situating the work in the museum’s Picture Gallery; a room filled with paintings of important male figures in the hospital history, such as the founder Thomas Coram. By positioning the children’s paintings below these works, at child height, the forgotten children appear to be of a lower status, both in terms of historical position and importance in relation to the museum’s collection. The men are remembered, not the children; their portraits have been chosen as important, treasured in the museum collection.

---

\(^{476}\) Corin Sworn. Unpublished Research Interview, Glasgow, United Kingdom, January 2017.

\(^{477}\) Foucault, *Discipline and Punishment*, p. 141.

\(^{478}\) ‘Agalma’ is a reference to Lacan’s 1960-1 seminar when he articulates the *objet petit a* with the term *agalma*, which refers to the Greek term that means an ornament that is hidden inside a worthless box. Lacan used the term to describe an object hidden in Socrates body that sparked Alcibiades’ fascination with him; *agalma* is an object of desire.
The children’s paintings below reveal both the class system of the time and how these historical figures have maintained their position of power. They are those the Foundling Hospital wants us to remember, the ones who they deemed important. In so doing, *Kept Within The Bounds* disrupts notions of Authorised Heritage Discourse in the museum by attempting to challenge this presentation of history by adding a new discourse in relation to the collection. I began to consider how the artist is on the borders of the heritage process. The artist is not outside, nor inside – but between and looking inwards – like Klee’s painting *Angelus Novus*.

![Figure 5.14](image)

*Kept Within the Bounds* (detail)
Rachel Emily Taylor, October 2016
The Picture Gallery, The Foundling Museum

5.3. Discussion

At the 2017 *Empathies* conference, keynote speaker Scully discussed empathy in relation to disability, noting that empathy can lead to a marginalised experience being distorted and ‘shaped by perceptions of another that are elite’. ⁴⁷⁹ During my research, I have come to notice the different approaches and understandings of empathy, as one that can allow the perceiver to

---

⁴⁷⁹ Scully, *Empathies*. 
(metaphorically) feel into or feel onto another. By using empathy to feel onto another, one erases them, replacing their experience with one’s own. Schutz’s painting Open Casket (discussed in ‘Single and Multiple Voice’) is an example with which to explore empathy as an act that feels onto another.

Schutz’s paint replaces the original photograph image of Emmett Till. Her choice of abstraction as an aesthetic dialogue has been associated with ‘erasure’. However, Theodor Adorno asserts that the realist representations of the Holocaust simply offer ‘voyeuristic pleasure’ and abstraction offers ‘a more profound grasp of the horrors of history’.480 Does Open Casket offer a profound grasp of the horrors of history? Schutz has chosen to paint a photograph that is publically available – Till’s mother told the funeral director, ‘Let the people see what I have seen’.481 In Open Casket, we see an abstraction of the photograph that Till’s mother chose to release – does it differ from the ‘voyeuristic pleasure’ of the photographic image? The term ‘abstract’ could be considered in relation to Sworn’s Silent Sticks, as she described the objects in the installation as ‘abstracts’482 for the dead. Could the term ‘abstract’ be used to consider the relationship between the historical children and the tokens? Or even, the paintings by the children? An abstraction that “shows” rather than “becomes” its character:483 a Gestus.

Presenting an interpretation of history through artwork raises discussions that go beyond the original image. I found that this was the case in my own practice, as visitors could grasp the history of the foundlings through the work. I recall when a woman heard the children’s voices chime in An Interruption, she turned to me and said ‘that sent shivers down my spine’, as tears welled up in her eyes. Although her emotional response was not triggered by an authentic voice/object, it provoked an emotional reaction that the visitor believed was an understanding of the Foundling Hospital.

Can the viewer’s empathy be measured? At the Association of Critical Heritage Studies conference in Montreal in June 2016, Laurajane Smith presented an as yet unpublished paper ‘Empathy as a Register of Engagement in Heritage Making’, discussing how to analyse the level of empathy in dialogue from the deeply imaginative to the indifferent. According to Smith, a

483 Shannon Jackson, Social Works, p. 121.
low emotional or cognitive engagement to a heritage site\textsuperscript{484} is as follows: ‘Sad, especially when you consider I think the last person hung was actually innocent. (OMG017: female, 35-44, lab assistant, Indigenous Australian)’\textsuperscript{485}

In comparison, here is a visitor who Smith analysed as being deeply engaged with the same heritage site:

Emotional in a bit of a way to have a look and see where we’ve come from, you know, what it could have been like to be back then. I mean the size of the cells alone and the prisoners, yes it’s logical [the interpretation of the site], but you don’t, you pick up the emotional side of history more when you come and visit somewhere. (OMG059: Female, 35-44, customer service, Australian)\textsuperscript{486}

Based on the paper and the concluding discussion at the conference, deductions were made that proposed that educated women visitors felt more empathy than men or those of working-class based on word choice, length of dialogue, sentence structure, and willingness to discuss their emotions. I disagreed with this assumption that eloquent word choices suggested that a visitor felt more empathy than another. A visitor with a particular level of education might feel more at ease discussing their emotions with an academic researcher. The same can be said for the children who might not have the vocabulary to express their feelings or be comfortable in the conversation. Children are often shy and reserved in revealing their feelings in front of their peers, and from what I observed this applied to both boys and girls. In this instance, how can we analyse the degree of empathy purely through speech? When emotions are left unspoken, where does that leave the child’s ‘voice’?

5.3.1. The Institutionalised Child

During the exhibition \textit{Testing Testing}, I was speaking to a tutor in a secondary school who told me that the children’s paintings were ‘familiar’ and that they were quite an ‘expected’ outcome. By this she meant that she recognised the images in both style and composition from

\textsuperscript{484} The Old Melbourne Goal in Australia.
\textsuperscript{486} Ibid., p. 6.
her experience as a tutor. Her response led me to consider that the images revealed both the nature of our current education system and the images’ contemporary aesthetic.

One of my research aims was to explore how art practice might communicate the historical person’s ‘voice’. Yet, it does not seem possible to capture a voice without some influence of an institution – the museum, education or culture – as it is so ingrained in our society. In the paintings, the influence of contemporary education is apparent in their visual projections. My aim, to explore how art practice might capture the voice of the child instead of the institutionalised history of childhood, is only achievable to a certain degree. The work reveals the institution of childhood, its control and influence on the children, but it also places the child at the centre of the work. It is essentially paintings by children rather than a representation of childhood and by adults remembering their childhood.

The paintings may be viewed as a representation of the contemporary child’s institution and psyche. The paintings in *Kept Within the Bounds* are not the same images that a historical foundling child would have made in the same environment. However, the presentation of the paintings in the context of the museum and the Foundling Hospital’s history allows the audience or viewer to project our contemporary understanding of the context onto the images.
5.3.2. Heritage, Empathy, and Indifference

The paintings illuminate the underpinnings of heritage. There are layers of the present and the past in the artwork, and the historical and contemporary children overlap one another. The paintings have been made in the present as a response to the past; we cannot escape from the now in the image. The artwork reveals that we cannot truthfully access the past without the influence of today, but we can interpret the past and this process reveals the influence of our current values, the institution, and national identity. We must recognise the power and influence that this act contains.

The paintings are not an example of Authorised Heritage Discourse or Critical Heritage Studies’ cultural discourse; they sit outside these two discourses. The work borders on the edge of Authorised Heritage Discourse, as it is exhibited at a ‘site’ and includes ‘objects’. But, the paintings are not the creation of a spokesperson or authority of expertise (they have been made by children) and unlike Authorised Heritage Discourse, which stresses the importance ‘on not being emotional, on maintaining professional objectivity’, the work explores empathy.

According to Julie Koss in her paper ‘On the Limits of Empathy’, Bertolt Brecht ‘compromised’ empathy in theatre. Brecht believed that the emotional identification of Einfühlungstheatre – ‘empathy theatre’ – encouraged spectators to become passive, losing their identity and critical reflection. In response, Brecht developed his theory of estrangement, known as Verfremdungseffekt. The concern with audience passivity has also been raised in Critical Heritage Studies; researchers have noted that Authorised Heritage Discourse constructs ‘heritage that is engaged with passively – […] that gaze is a passive one in which the audience will uncritically consume the message of heritage constructed by heritage experts’.

Despite the public dismissal of Einfühlung, Brecht noted that it would be beneficial as a rehearsal technique and that ideally it could be used alongside Verfremdungseffekt. John Rouse describes the tripartite rehearsal process: ‘after an initial period of acquainting herself with her character

487 Op. Cit., p. 8
490 Smith, Uses of Heritage, p. 31.
and its motivations the actor goes on to a “Stanislavskian” phase of empathetic character work from the “inside”. Finally, the actor takes a step back from the character and “examines it once again ‘from the outside’”.\textsuperscript{492}

This process is comparable to that of \textit{Kept Within the Bounds}. In the art workshops (or ‘rehearsal’ process) I aimed to construct empathetic emotions through character construction and role play with the children (understudies) that resulted in the paintings (actors). Although in the final installation (or, one might say, ‘performance’) the work is presented in a display comparable with Brecht’s \textit{Gestus}. It ‘shows the medium’ by the inclusion of the workshop instructions (as if the audience can hear the director calling out the stage directions), which demystifies the process. Instead of emphasising the emotion of the characters, \textit{Kept Within the Bounds} allows the actors (the children’s paintings) to demonstrate the social attitudes and construct a momentary tableau (a collection of motionless figures, or paintings, representing a scene from history). The installation is an ‘interruption’\textsuperscript{493} that creates a ‘state of unsettlement’\textsuperscript{494} in the museum.

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{493} ‘Interruption’ is a technique in Brechtian \textit{Epic Theatre} where the actors collaborate to form a ‘freeze frame’.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{494} John Rouse, \textit{Brecht and the Contradictory Actor}, p. 240.
\end{flushright}
CHAPTER SIX
CONCLUSION

The process of searching for the absent voice can be considered in relation to Roland Barthes’ *Preparation of a Novel.* Barthes describes the method of writing the novel as a ‘path’; he writes, ‘what matters is the path, following the path, not what you find at the end. The Quest for the Fantasy is already a Narrative “Begin, even without hope; proceed, even without success.” ’  

Barthes suggests that the novel can be ‘exhausted and accomplished by – its Preparation’. This description can be considered relevant to this research, as what was important was the journey and exploration of process, rather than finding the historical child’s voice. The missing voice could not be found because it does not exist as I had anticipated. The ‘child’s voice’ did not exist then (when the foundlings were alive) as it does today, since what we regard as childhood and how a ‘voice’ can be documented has changed over time.

I began this thesis by discussing the foundling tokens and how these small objects were connected/detached from their owner’s lives. The contextual review ‘Heritage and Childhood’ followed, and I present heritage as a ‘process’ that is rooted in the present and directed towards the future. It is a social and cultural process, which is political; deciding who and what is represented to establish a national identity but this can lead to certain narratives being hidden or lost. There are different discourses and positions in heritage, such as Authorised Heritage Discourse and the Association of Heritage Studies manifesto (which champions heritage as a ‘cultural’ discourse). The artist adds another ‘voice’ to the discourses of heritage. In my research, I question if the artist was positioned inside or outside of the heritage process. As I conclude this study, I view the artist as a voice that is unfixed, and moves between the borders and on the inside of the heritage process – they are never on the outside looking inwards. They are part of the discourse of heritage and are not separate from it.

Even if the artist is making work that is not situated in a museum and/or does not respond directly to heritage, they can use their practice to critically frame the past and present, and these

496 Barthes, *The Preparation of a Novel,* p. 20
works can contribute to the heritage field. Their practice can do more than fit within the criteria used for evaluating contemporary art at heritage sites – creation, consumption, and exchange\textsuperscript{498} – as the contribution they make cannot be so clinically defined and separated. The works discussed in the contextual review (Fraser’s \textit{Museum Highlights}, Sworn’s \textit{Silent Sticks}, and Vo’s \textit{Slip of the Tongue}) are not commissioned by heritage institutions, but works such as these can be used to critique the discourses in heritage (such as Authorised Heritage Discourse). This forms one of the contributions to knowledge made in this thesis.

There might be resistance or hesitation to commissions such as Sworn’s \textit{Silent Sticks} being regarded as part of the heritage discourse. The work was commissioned by the Max Mara Prize for Women and exhibited in the Whitechapel Gallery; it was not funded by heritage professionals, it was not exhibited in a historical setting (such as a museum or archive). The work was not in a designated space that artworks are expected to belong if regarded as part of ‘heritage practice’ and it was not made with the intention to critique heritage. However works such as these can be used to question how the artist interprets the past (from the position of an actor, director, subject, and so on) and how the viewer perceives it, and this can reveal our perceptions of the present day.

Heritage practitioners might want to keep art in its pre-designated role and space, and in so doing, it is arguably controlled by Authorised Heritage Discourse. The artworks can conform to what is ‘expected’ from the institution – to help ‘increase visitor numbers’\textsuperscript{499} and to be ‘received and consumed’.\textsuperscript{500} The artwork is then at risk of becoming ornamental and/or about a heritage story (Lewinson’s \textit{Fallen Voices}) instead of being an active, challenging, and constructive voice in the heritage process that breaks through the ‘bounds’ rather than being controlled; comparable to the children that are confined in this study in spaces such as the Clore Studio.

Also, projects are frequently awarded to established, award-winning artists\textsuperscript{501} – artists that are arguably perceived as ‘safe’ choices. An example being the decision to commission Fiona

\textsuperscript{498} Newcastle University, \textit{Aims and Objectives} [website] www.research.ncl.ac.uk/mcahe/about/aimsandobjectives/ [accessed 20 February 2018].


\textsuperscript{500} ibid.

Curran, Mark Fairnington, and Matt Stokes\textsuperscript{502} for Mapping Contemporary Art in the Heritage. In comparison, artists who could be perceived as ‘risky’ are not as frequently commissioned, especially for large-scale projects. How do these decisions impact on how and what is perceived as the artist’s ‘voice’? Will it effect how the artworks are ‘received and consumed by heritage property visitors’?\textsuperscript{503} These questions should be considered in future critiques of the role of the artist in the heritage process, and this leads us on to discuss the findings from the research aims, beginning with:

1. To explore how art practice might communicate the historical person’s ‘voice’ and examine the value of multiple ‘voices’ in the museum.

I intended to use art practice to reconstruct a voice that was ‘lost’, but there were different kinds of lost in this instance: philosophical and technological. To ‘give voice’ to another creates issues of authenticity, representation, and assertions of power. A number of works were discussed in the research that included an actor performing another’s voice.\textsuperscript{504} In the exhibition On Their Own, there was an attempt to elide the distance between two voices – an adult performing the role of a child – and this can seem artless, naïve, and manipulative. In the works Foundling Characters and Repeat After Me there was a conscious gap between the performer and the performed, and this created a critical distance that can be effective. This relationship between the performer and the ‘voice’ (or script) led to questions on authenticity – empathetic identification and aesthetical distance – that were underlined by a theatrical approach (Brecht, Stanislavski, Auslander, Heathcote, and so on), which enabled a particular lens to look through and discuss the practice.

There was no ‘pure’, singular voice to be found. A ‘voice’ cannot be presented without the influence of the artist, an institution, the listener, or the contemporary social environment. The work The Anthem engaged a choir of children – as multiple voices – to sing in unison while learning Handel’s Anthem for the Foundling Hospital through repetition, which revealed the

\textsuperscript{502} Fiona Curran is a Senior Tutor at the Royal College of Art; Mark Fairnington is a Reader in Painting at Wimbledon College of Arts; and Matt Stokes has been exhibited at the BALTIC Centre for Contemporary Art, Matt’s Gallery, Centro Andaluz de Arte Contemporáneo, Kunsthalle Fridericianum, and so on.

\textsuperscript{503} Newcastle University, Mapping Contemporary Art [website] https://research.ncl.ac.uk/heritagenewcastle/heritagenewcastleprojects/mappingcontemporaryart/ [accessed 20 September 2018].

\textsuperscript{504} A child speaking an adult’s words, an adult speaking a child’s words, and so on.
process of constructing ‘voice’. We hear the physical voices of the singers, but it is in the action that the ‘inaudible appendage’\textsuperscript{505} that is ‘voice’ arises.

In the chapter ‘Single and Multiple Voice’, I discussed the ‘soundless voice’ as one that leaves a vacant space. This supported the proposal that the child’s ‘voice’ may be regarded as a non-verbal form, such as a drawing. Therefore the practice undertaken as part of this study (such as the foundling character paintings) contributes to ideas of ‘voice’. The artworks act as ‘bounds’ to surround the negative space and draw attention to what is ‘lacking’: the absent voice.

II. To analyse the representation of the historical child in the museum and to explore how art practice and workshops with children might capture the voice of the child instead of the institutionalised history of childhood.

This study sought to construct the historical child’s voice, but childhood itself is a social construction and is comparable to heritage; both are a construction that reveals our contemporary ideology and hope for the future, neither is fixed and stable. In the heritage industry, children are viewed as passive and visit the sites to ‘learn’. Representations of children are lacking because there are few historical documents authored by children themselves. Therefore through workshops with children, artists and heritage practitioners might be able to generate material to represent the child rather than childhood in the museum.

The study questions the boundaries that the museum constructs around contemporary children, such as the Foundling Museum’s Clore Studio and Artists’ Project Space, these spaces are often hidden from visitors or separated from the rest of the collection. The Clore Studio maintains the children’s safety during a workshop (they can be easily observed and cannot leave the space without an adult’s permission) and prevents museum visitors from being overly disturbed. These discussions take place in the chapter ‘Freedom and Control’ and contribute to literature on participatory art practice in the museum and how an artist might consider the location of where their workshop takes place: in public and private spaces, both in and outside of the museum. There might be resistance in the museum to blurring the boundaries that are currently in place, but this could be explored through further practice and negotiations with a museum during a future artist residency.

\textsuperscript{505} Dolar, A Voice and Nothing More, p. 73.
In this study, there is a complexity in shielding and protecting of the contemporary children as part of a ‘regime of care’. The University’s ethical regulations placed on this study are to ensure the safe-guarding of the child participants, but is this too strict? The children had to remain anonymous, even when their artwork was included in the study, but why can’t a child have their work credited if they request it to be so? What is the danger of including their first name in print alongside their drawing? How could a child be traced or put at risk by the publication of their first name (no surname, no address, no photographic image) alongside their artwork? In some instances, the child was upset that they could not be credited for their work. The ethical regulations form a metaphorical straight-jacket. This level of institutional care can lead to a concealment of identity. It is a fine line to tread, and one that has to be regarded with caution and questioned. The contemporary children, like the foundlings, will ‘disappear’ in academic research if policies such as these remain in place.

There are current practices that do not adhere to such strict ethical regulations as I was required to follow, and argue that ethics should be negotiated with the participants, and this is how researchers at Manchester Metropolitan University are proceeding with the research project ODD: Feeling Different in the World of Education. I view this project as contributing to this viewpoint. In future research, I would argue that negotiating ethics with the participants is vital, particularly in concerns of representation and ‘voice’. Perhaps I could have fought harder to instigate this type of negotiated ethical practice in this study, however the combined ethical processes of museum and University are part of the contemporary mechanisms of control and protection, so following them gave me an increased insight into how the contemporary child is constructed.

III. To understand and analyse the representation of the individual or ‘character’ in contemporary museum practices.

In the representation of individuals in museum practice, a number of questions need to be asked: who is included, vocalised, and given space. Heritage practitioners may choose to represent particular individuals that support an established national identity and this is a political process that should be negotiated with care.

506 Harrison, Beyond “Natural” and “Cultural” Heritage, p. 35.
In the chapter ‘Empathy and Over-identification’, I analyse the outcome of workshops with contemporary children, in which they were guided in a workshop to construct a ‘character’ based on the foundling hospital narrative. The sessions lead me to question empathy and how it might lead to an over-identification with the past. Empathy is at risk of allowing the empathiser to claim ownership of another person’s life story. I argue that when empathy is combined with critical distance (what Bloom describes as ‘cognitive empathy’) it may aid a critical state of understanding; not dissimilar from Brechtian theatre and Verfremdungseffekt.508

In the workshops, the children drew an image of their imagined foundling character and I describe these as ‘double portraits’ – the contemporary and the historical child overlaid in one image – where the boundaries of self and other are blurred. These paintings are ‘abstracts’ for the imagined historical children, as they ‘show’ rather than ‘become’ character: 509 they are a Gestus.

The workshop process was based on Stanislavskian methods of empathetic character work. The contemporary children were encouraged to imaginatively put themselves in ‘another’s shoes’, 510 using techniques such as Given Circumstances. On completion of the workshops, I used the outcomes (paintings, drawings, and so on) as material to be included in further art works (such as Kept Within The Bounds) which were exhibited at the Foundling Museum in October 2016. The combination of Stanislavski and Brecht techniques during the making (or ‘rehearsal’ process) is a contribution to method, and I consider the final artworks as ‘interruptions’ 511 that aim to create a ‘state of unsettlement’512 in the museum.

---

508 Koss, On the Limits of Empathy, p. 152.
509 Shannon Jackson, Social Works, p. 121.
511 ‘Interruption’ is a technique in Brechtian Epic Theatre where the actors collaborate to form a ‘freeze frame’.
512 Ibid.
Future Directions

These are questions from this study that I intend to take forward in future research. I intend to examine space and environment in heritage practice, exploring how artwork can be ‘un-contained’ outside of the museum.

I have been awarded funding from Arts Council England to work with the Brontë Parsonage Museum in Haworth on a project titled *The Outsider*, which aims to explore notions of a ‘contemporary Heathcliff’ through art workshops with children from Keighley. I will build upon research methods from this study, integrating art and performance practice to explore the children’s relationship to the landscape and Heathcliff, who also was a foundling. These workshops will take place both in and outside of the museum, and predominantly on Penistone Hill, to allow further exploration into freedom and control in workshops with children. I will work with the museum and the school to negotiate ethics with the participants, which might allow for the children to be more ‘visible’ in future artwork.
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