

ARTICLE

The hopes of memorial remaking: Product, process, and the temporal rhythms of making

Clare Holdsworth 

School of Geography, Geology and the Environment, Keele University, Keele, UK

Correspondence

Clare Holdsworth, School of Geography, Geology and the Environment, Keele University, Keele, UK.

Email: c.m.holdsworth@keele.ac.uk

Funding information

Leverhulme Trust, Grant/Award Number: MRF-2017-044

Abstract

The individual and social therapeutic benefits of spending time making have received both popular and academic endorsement. These testimonials often promote the sentiment that the benefits of making are experienced in the doing rather than what is made. In particular, making is recognised for providing alternative temporal experiences to the incessant pace of global capitalism. In this paper I unpick this bias towards the processes over the products of making in an autoethnographic study of memorial remaking. This practice involved making items for family members from my father's clothing in 2020/21 following his death at the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. Inspired by William Morris's writing on the hopes of work, I reflect on the assumed value of process over product and reassess this binary with reference to time. In Morris's original formulation time is expressed through the hope of rest, which I suggest can be reworked into rhythm. Through re-engaging with the hopes of making in my own practice of memorial remaking, I reflect how changing the temporal dimension from rest to rhythm is more in tune with a relational approach to creativity rather than confining making to responsibilities that are bounded by time and space. Memorial remaking provides a way of fabricating how memories, intimacies, emotions and responsibilities are interwoven into the experiences of grief, through making items that resonate with individuals in time and space. Thus, this paper also unpicks how experiences of grief consolidate normative codes of moving on and individual endeavour to craft one's journey through this process.

KEYWORDS

autoethnography, emotion, grief, making, memory, rhythm

1 | INTRODUCTION

In April 2020, 3 weeks into the first English COVID-19 lockdown, my father died after a short illness. One of the first things my mother did after he died was to throw out his Harris¹ tweed jacket. My father had bought the jacket on holiday in Scotland over a decade previously and in recent years had worn it around the house as it became too scruffy for outside

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

The information, practices and views in this article are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the Royal Geographical Society (with IBG).

© 2022 The Author. *The Geographical Journal* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of Royal Geographical Society (with the Institute of British Geographers).

wear. I understood why my mother wanted to discard the jacket quickly. Its shabby state symbolised the recent decline in my father's health rather than the man he had been. For myself, discarding a well-worn and loved item did not seem appropriate in those immediate days of grief. I asked my mother to rescue it from the bin so I could think about how to remake it. It took me 4 months to fulfil this intention. In August 2020, I used the fabric from the jacket to make a hat and bag for my sister. Once I had completed these first items and started to sort through the rest of my father's clothes the possibility of remaking other items reconciled the intensity of loss. In the winter of 2020/21 I continued my practice of remaking my father's clothes to make a stuffed cat for my daughter from a shirt, waistcoat and tie; two fabric pictures of North Staffordshire potbanks² for my mother and aunt from ties and shirts; and reused fabric from a sheepskin coat for a coat collar for myself (see Figure 1). I also offered my enthusiasm for the comfort of memorial remaking to friends.³

My practice of memorial remaking was not simply an act of kindness or having something to do. Memorial remaking during the COVID-19 lockdowns of 2020/21 provided a sense of purpose in the absence of being able to spend time with family and friends. This case study engages with differing constellations of absence-presence that are bound together



FIGURE 1 Remade items, clockwise from top left: Hat and bag, cat, Potbanks picture and coat with sheepskin collar. Image: Author

through the collective and individual loss of living through the first year of COVID-19 (Maddrell, 2020). Memorial remaking became a way of spending time with other people in their absence rather than simply inhabiting time. This practice captures the relationality of busyness; doing things for other people that are equally therapeutic for the self (Holdsworth, 2021). This relational interpretation of the social life of time reworks the duality of absence-presence, as the self-practice of making rematerialises intimate relationships. Materialising my father's memory was also a reaction to institutional silences in response to bereavement and the challenges of sustaining professional practice through a time of grief.

The practice also initiated a reassessment of how I interpreted the value of making (Price & Hawkins, 2018). Prior to April 2020, I had been inclined to follow the dominant interpretation in both popular and academic accounts that makers 'gain pleasure from what they have done, but it is the *doing it* that really counts' (Gauntlett, 2018, p. 81, emphasis in original). Developing a practice of memorial remaking made me question this binary between product and process as it became impossible to distinguish between the two. The relationality of memorial remaking threads together materials, materiality, relationships, identities and responsibilities and is difficult to unpick these into what is done and what it made. Moving on from this binary is not just a riddle to solve in relation to making practices, it applies equally to fundamental questions about the value of work and the tensions around productivity, performance and well-being.

These are not new questions and in weaving together the products and processes of making I turn to classic nineteenth century texts on the ethics of work. In particular, I take inspiration from William Morris's (1888/2008) three hopes of useful work: rest, product and pleasure in the work itself. Reworking this trinity into a rhythmical account of making threads together the processes of starting, accomplishing, repeating and finishing, and enables me to stitch together how these rhythms of practice are orientated towards making *something*. Following Lefebvre (2004), developing a sense for the rhythm of making opens up the time of making beyond the practice of doing in the present towards a relational conceptualisation of temporality that flows between the focus of doing and the intention of moving towards an intended outcome (Holdsworth & Hall, 2022). This synthesis between present and future is captured through the expression of hope (Alacovska, 2019) to open a eurhythmic flow between practice and product.

In this paper, I stitch together my experiences of memorial remaking through refabricating Morris's trinity of hopes of work. The temporal analysis developed in this paper advances geographical scholarship that already resists a polarised reading between product and process by paying close attention to the embodied practices of making and the qualities of making spaces (Carr & Gibson, 2016; Paton, 2013; Price & Hawkins, 2018; Smith, 2019). With this paper I seek to open up geographical research to interrogate the temporal rhythms of making through unpicking how time spent making both organises the social and is of the social (Bastian et al., 2020). Evoking a relational interpretation of time and making considers how a geographical lens is apposite for unpicking normative interpretations of what making should be or do. The nexus of geographies defined by Hayden Lorimer that knit together 'memories, emotion, intimacy, responsibility and creativity' (Lorimer, 2019, p. 331) can frame how making is experienced without being defined to a predetermined outcome, such as makers' well-being or material products. This perspective can retain the commitment to opening up what happens *within* the practices of making, which scholarship on art therapy (Leone, 2021) and craft activism (Bratich & Brush, 2011) have promoted; while simultaneously threading the identities and relationships that are made within to those that are carried forward in time and place. This focus on the nexus of creativity, memory and intimacy is also developed through an important subtheme of this paper that reworks normative interpretations of the 'work' of grief (Hedtke & Winslade, 2017). The work of grief materialised in remaking is not a passive journey through disembodied stages but rather a relational and visceral practice that oscillates between doing and inaction which is expressed in hesitation, uncertainty and procrastination of completion (Maddrell, 2021). This paper starts with the detail of my own practice and autoethnographic approach as this is the starting point for my own curiosity in the hopes and temporality of making. I then review recent geographical scholarship on making as a precursor to introducing a reworking of Morris's three hopes of work. In interpreting my own practice, I explore how the rhythms of making tie together the tension between process and product that I craft through my own journey of grieving my father's death.

2 | AUTOETHNOGRAPHY OF MEMORIAL REMAKING

This commitment to studying creativity within a nexus of memory, emotion, intimacy and responsibility is developed through my autoethnographic account of memorial remaking. One of the challenges of using this method is that it does not comply with the conventions of empirical scholarship (Chang, 2008; Ellis, 2004). In particular, this method is criticised for its perceived lack of rigour (Ellis et al., 2011; Le Roux, 2017). In developing the authenticity of autoethnography,

proponents of this method emphasise how it is not an introspective study of the self, but a method that combines biography with ethnography so that authors are subjects not just reflective observers (Butz & Besio, 2009; Chang, 2008; Ellis, 2004; Moss, 2000). I use an autoethnographic lens to study my own making practice by not just detailing how I make but through paying close attention to how making is inherently relational. I explicitly follow a feminist reading of the self to prioritise how subjectivities are produced through interdependencies.

This study was not my first experience of crafting autoethnography, in the previous year I wrote about the symbolism of crocheting blankets during a period of caring for family members with cancer. This initial experience established a practice of weaving professional and personal life that was supportive for me and beneficial for others. Returning to autoethnography after my father's death developed this previous study through a change of medium (sewing) and greater attention to the diversity of making. Turning my professional gaze explicitly to personal grief was also a reaction to institutional silence and inaction in response to grief. I was entitled to five days' bereavement leave and though I wanted to keep myself busy with work, continuing working was not simply a question of carrying on with existing projects, which had also been disrupted by COVID-19 lockdowns.

Researching one's own practice opens up significant ethical questions that require careful negotiation. I am not just writing about my own experiences; my relational interpretation of making also makes public my family's private grief. I discussed my intentions for memorial making with my family and shared my reflections on how I experienced the process and their engagement with what I made. I applied and received a favourable ethical opinion from Keele University's ethics committee which related to the use of the gifted artefacts in my research. However, the ethical process of institutional committees is not well suited to autoethnography; a consent form is of little value if others are wary about the intention of studying the self. Throughout the practices of making and writing I shared my experiences and reflections with my family to co-create this autoethnographic study.

This autoethnographic study took place over a seven-month period beginning in August 2020 and ending in March 2021. All of the items were made in my domestic workspace. This is space that I have created over a number of years and having this space is not incidental, though it does mean that I do not have to negotiate *where* I sew. In this paper I focus on the temporal aspects rather than the spatial dynamics of rhythm as this is more explicit in my practice of memorial remaking. I am an experienced sewer, and this study captures a small part of my making practice. However, while sewing is not new to me, using these skills in an autoethnographic context is a novel experience and has refreshed my sewing practice.

3 | GEOGRAPHIES OF MAKING

Making things, as the anthropologist Tim Ingold (2013) writes, is intrinsic to human existence. The primacy of making has inspired geographers to engage with the processes of making and the diversity of products that are made that are not just restricted to material things. Identities, communities, skills and well-being can, in different ways, be made (Bratich & Brush, 2011; Gauntlett, 2018). The direction of this geographical scholarship on making has developed through discovering the embodied practices of becoming and being skilled and the spaces of making that are produced through these practices (Hawkins, 2019; Price & Hawkins, 2018). This scholarship is mostly aligned towards ontologies of materiality that foreground an ecological perspective (Ingold, 2000, 2007) or the interconnectivities of 'new' materialism (Barad, 2003). What these positions share in common is the insistency on the primacy of materials over materiality; that is, making is studied through processes and materials rather than the thingness of making. In Ingold's (2007) conceptualism of ecological materialism, material relations are prioritised in order to interpret the world made up from the flows and entanglements of materials. Karen Barad's (2003) new materialism originates from a relational interpretation of materials. This interpretation considers how matter has the capacity to affect through relational assemblages of human and non-human parts. These material orientations open up the possibility of scholarship on making beyond what is done or made to embrace identities, communities and spaces that are produced through making. Relational interpretations of materials foreground the significance of the diverse elements in assemblages of making, which geographers have examined (see, for example, Patchett, 2016; Paton, 2013; Smith, 2019; Straughan, 2018).

Methodologically, geographical research has been enlivened through participatory methods that transcend distinctions between researcher and maker (Carr & Gibson, 2017; Hawkins, 2015). These participatory methods include self-studies of making that are orientated towards the embodied practices of becoming skilled (Latham & Wagner, 2020; Paton, 2013; Straughan, 2018). The intuition of learning how to do, rather than studying what is done, foregrounds the processes through which the hands that do suppresses the mind that plans (Sudnow, 2001). Embodied feelings for

body-material-tool interactions are developed through dynamic rather than linear processes that can equally be frustrating as well as confirming (O'Connor, 2007). Thus, exploring how bodies learn to make is more than examining the acquisition of skills, it is about appreciating the subtle practices of calibration within the unevenness of doing (Lea, 2009; Lorimer & Lund, 2003).

The vibrancy of recent geographical studies of making has established the authenticity and rigour of research in this field. It is though timely to consider the direction of this scholarship and how it contributes to interdisciplinary discussions about making. The popularity of making, which has intensified during the COVID-19 lockdowns (Kurutz, 2021), and the societal and individual benefits associated with it, has widened disciplinary interest and the inclusion of making in empirical studies of well-being is well established (Collier, 2012; Leone, 2021; Riley et al., 2013). Emerging discourses about therapeutic making are often directed through endorsements of slow crafting to emphasise the enjoyment of simply doing (see for example Wellesley-Smith, 2015). Yet experiences of experimenting with different ways of spending time during COVID-19 lockdowns also shed light on the limitations of individualistic therapeutic making practices that overlook making with and for others (Holdsworth, 2021). The scope for geographical research to contribute to popular and academic debates can be realised through unpicking these assumed benefits and addressing how these can be enfranchised. In particular, geographical perspectives on the assemblage of bodies and materials that are produced in making underscores its non-linear qualities and unsettles the certainty that is ascribed to the agency of making. This recalibration of making away from the assumed linear outcomes (for example, improving well-being, developing community relationships and social identities) can be assessed by considering how making sits within a wider nexus of relational geographies that embraces not just doing but the subjectivities that are created and sustained through this doing. Evoking a relational interpretation of making widens out its parameters beyond the immediate bodies and spaces where making happens and threads making together with reference to memory, emotion, intimacy and responsibility. These threads of the wider connections that are made through making are very much present in geographical research. For example, studies of becoming skilled considers the *longue durée* of intergenerational transference of skill (Patchett, 2016); autoethnographic accounts capture the diversity of emotional experiences weaving together the intensity of frustration and joy (Hawkins, 2015; Ocejo, 2014) and the responsibility of making is addressed through environmental responsiveness (Burke, 2018). With this paper I seek to consolidate geographical interest in the diversity of making through detailing how these different threads of individual/collective practice in time and space are interwoven through temporal rhythms.

4 | THE HOPES OF MAKING

In introducing time as a way of tying together the nexus of threads that are implicit in making, I turn to Morris's writing about the hope of work. Morris's influence on making practices spans more than his celebrated aesthetics to include the ethics of working practices and how craft work should be organised for human well-being and development (Adamson, 2013). Reading about the history of craft to inform my own practice, Morris's writings spoke to my experiences of memorial remaking and equally my practice enabled a reengagement with his work. In his celebrated essay, 'Useful work v. Useless toil', Morris expands on one of his favourite themes of how to free human society from the 'compulsion to labour needlessly' (1888/2008, p. 13). His solution is worked through a commitment to the three hopes of work: the hope of rest, the hope of product and the hope of pleasure in the work itself (1888/2008, p. 2). The latter two clearly map onto the duality between process and product that is considered in 20-first century scholarship on making. David Gauntlett (2018), for example, discusses Morris's essay before concluding that it is the hope of doing that is most important. Returning to the original text, Morris explicitly places rest first as it is the 'simplest and most natural part of hope' (1888/2008, p. 2). His endorsement is very much of its time and captures nineteenth century western cultural endorsements of salvation through hard work, most famously expressed in Weber's (1905/1930) characterisation of the diligence of Protestant work ethics. While the value of rest is endorsed in modern-day accounts of time pressure (Pang, 2016; Rosa, 2017), these endorsements share the nineteenth century assumption that responsibilities are demarcated. My reengagement with the hopes of making through the practice of memorial remaking foregrounds how reworking the premise of discrete responsibilities through a relational approach is facilitated by changing the temporal dimension from rest to rhythm.

A reinterpretation of rest into rhythm develops feminist writings about time to consider how responsibilities are continually reworked rather than foreclosed. For example, Lisa Baraitser (2017) interprets time through the lens of care to foreground how acts of non-production are never completed, but are extended, delayed or repeated. Rather than following Baraitser's distinction between (non)events I suggest that the temporal fixation with the hope of rest can be useful

reworked through a more vitalist conceptualisation of rhythm. Moving from rest to rhythm opens up the hopes (and fears) of starting, moving towards completion through doing and the inevitable reversals that are implicit in making and the challenges of bringing making to an end, rather than emphasising the satisfaction of rest. These temporal rhythms of making thread together the hopes of product and the pleasure taken in work itself. Framing rhythms of making through hope re-orientates the temporality of making away from attention to making in the 'now' towards a synthesis between past, present and future.

Replacing rest with rhythm is particularly appropriate for geographical studies of making as rhythm is not simply a contour of time, but as Lefebvre (2004/1992) writes rhythm is inevitable where there are interactions between place, time and energy. Thus, while rest assumes a static and bounded temporality,⁴ rhythm is active and experienced through the dynamics of space and time. Rhythms of making are not just about when making is done but where and the places that are produced through these practices. A focus on rhythm can also facilitate how investment in the time of making reveals the social life of time and the meanings that are ascribed to this; for example, the possibility of a more authentic temporal experience that pays attention to embodied making practices in time and space. Moreover, rhythm is, following Lefebvre, a tool of analysis rather than an object of study. Opening up the examination of making through rhythm analysis requires an embodied approach to develop a feel for how rhythms are made.

In the following section I present my autoethnographic account of establishing a practice of remaking that moves rhythmically between process and product.

5 | MEMORIAL REMAKING

5.1 | Hat and bag for my sister

After rescuing my father's jacket, it lay crumpled in the corner of my craft room. I was not motivated to remake it in the months immediately after his death which coincided with the first English COVID-19 lockdown. During this time, I deliberately pursued a change in my orientation to crafting. Rather than taking on bigger projects to be completed over a number of weeks, I kept myself busy with new, smaller projects that could be finished quickly. It mattered that I was getting things done, bringing projects to an end quickly rather than taking time to enjoy the more protracted rhythm of longer projects. This shift towards the hope of product away from process against the backdrop of the uncertainty of COVID-19 lockdowns and coming to terms with the brevity of a life that has passed captures how rhythms of making are contoured by relational temporalities. The strains and uncertainty of intimacy and responsibility at this time shifted my orientation to completion rather than doing.

This experience reveals how the certainty that is ascribed to the enjoyment of simply doing, which is popularised in therapeutic slow making, is not given. It is conditional on who is doing the making and the social forces that determine who makes, where making is done and the value of its remuneration (Hollenbach, 2019; McRobbie, 2016). This conditionality is recognised in accounts of discrimination and disadvantage that are reproduced through making. For example, Zoe Collins (2018) details how women's sewing in the global South both celebrates and neglects women's agency. Adamson (2013) describes a similar duality for female Irish lace makers in the nineteenth century; the dexterity of these female makers was admired, though their craft did not ameliorate their destitution. I am not comparing my experience with the poverty that employed female sewers endure. My observation is simply that being able to take pleasure in making, in either product or process, is structural rather than intrinsic. Even for white, middle-class, middle-aged women the hopes of making are constituted by responsibilities and the social and intimate identities that are made through making.

I was also hesitant about how my intention to remake would be received by others. Memorial remaking could be read as mawkish and inappropriate, as the work of grief is to move on rather than to linger in the traces of loved ones' material presence. Remaking goes against the normative rules that follow Elizabeth Kubler-Ross's (1969) model of defined stages of grief: denial, anger, bargaining, depression and ultimately acceptance. These stages are orientated to the expectation of letting go (Parkes, 2002). The normalising of moving on in mainstream psychological interpretations of grief is such that any desire to stay connected to those who have died is interpreted by psychiatrists as 'pathologically refusing to accept reality' (Hedtke & Winslade, 2017, p. 41). This distinction is gendered as women are more likely to express the need to stay connected, thus women's mourning is pathologised by the rules of grief.

Instead of following the rules that define the work of grief, I sought to craft my own grief. In their thought-provoking and moving account of grieving, counsellors Hedtke and Winslade (2017) present the possibility of crafting grief to reveal the beauty that it leaves behind. They draw on Judith Butler's use of self-crafting in developing an account of the self that

'always takes place in relation to an imposed set of norms' (Butler, 2005, p. 19). Crafting grief, therefore, moves 'between what is crafted onto us and our own efforts to craft our own project' (Hedtke & Winslade, 2017, p. 18). It occurred to me that remaking my father's jacket was a literal interpretation of crafting my own grief to reinterpret normative endorsements of moving on. I also talked about remaking with my family, seeking their approval that my own crafting of grief was not divergent from their own. The relationality of grief is more than segueing between internalisation and externalisation; it is equally crafted through intimate relations.

Four months after my father died, I was ready to start remaking the jacket into a hat and bag. The initial first cut of the jacket was difficult; to break the unity of the cloth was saying goodbye to my father again. But once I started the hope of process took over. Cutting up the jacket revealed the initial craft of its making through the intricate assemblage of tweed, hair canvas, fused interfacing and lining. I adapted the original crafting in remaking and used interlined pieces of tweed for more structural parts of the hat. My uneasiness about cutting up the jacket quickly dissolved into the delight of appreciating the skill of its construction and the connection back to Harris where the cloth was woven and the jacket was made. It was uplifting, not melancholic, to breathe new life into a treasured and well-worn item. I combined the tweed with orange curtain material from my fabric stash to bring out the subtle shading of the tweed. I finished off the hat and bag with handsewn Dorset buttons.⁵

The final stage of making was gifting the hat and bag to my sister on her birthday. The delight that she and other family members took in the remade items diminished any uncertainty I might have had about the appropriateness of remaking. The rhythm of making from initial hesitancy and uncertainty, through the joy of rediscovering hidden craft, ended with the shared realised hope of product.

5.2 | Cats for daughters

The success of the hat and bag encouraged further development of my practice of memorial remaking. My next project was not in memory of my father. A friend had lost her partner 3 days before my father died. His sudden and unexpected passing was a terrible shock; though due to COVID-19 restrictions I was not able to comfort her in person and tentatively offered to make something for her young daughter in his memory. We agreed that a stuffed cat toy was most suitable, and I made this from two of his shirts. The make was straightforward and quick. I used a purchased pattern and completed the cat over a weekend. The simplicity of making the cat contrasted with the emotional complexity of its finished form. For my friend it brought both comfort and symbolised the intensity of her loss. Her daughter was temporarily distracted by making up stories for the new cat toy.

Making the cat subtly changed my orientation to memorial remaking, from being inspired from the clothes my father left behind to actively looking for items to remake. After making the cat for my friend I decided to make a similar one for my daughter. Going through my father's clothes I selected a yellow waistcoat, check shirt and his Liberal Democrat political party tie. This yellow cat captures my father's love of colour and honours his political values in a playful way. The Liberal Democrat tie was perfect for making the cat ears. The cat resonates with memories of the different ways in which my father remained true to himself and his values.

In making both cats, the hope of making was that these simple cats could bring comfort in the immediate time of grief and enable both daughters to carry the memory of loved ones forward with them. The cats reconcile with Ingold's (2010) insistence of doing making forwards through synthesising past, present and future. The cats are not haunted by the past or resist the future. Moreover, the temporal horizon of making these cats is realised through intimate intergenerational relations. The cats bring into focus how material and social relations are weaved together through remaking.

5.3 | Making pictorial memories

Sorting through my father's belongings was an active process about deciding what to keep. Rather than relying on a binary between keeping and discarding (Woodward, 2021), the affective materiality of clothing inspired a third option of what I could remake anew. My father's ties were particularly suited to renewal as they were uniquely personal items. I decided to use these to make pictures of North Staffordshire potbanks from my parents' adopted home. The choice of an industrial landscape changed the parameters of remaking again through interweaving memories of place and identity to capture in material form how identities in place are unmade and remade through synthesis of past, present and future (Jones & Garde-Hansen, 2012). Using the industrial landscape of North Staffordshire is not independent of collective

memories and their broader political, social and economic significance. This industrial landscape remains in a handful of potbanks that have been preserved in North Staffordshire against the economic decline of the pottery industry.⁶ The appeal of potbanks in the absence of industry is more than a haunting of the landscape; their unique and whimsical form shapes collective identities. Working the image of potbanks into memorial remaking interweaves these collective and personal memories.

Once I had decided on the themes of potbanks, the design of the picture required a little more thought. There was less urgency to complete the potbank picture compared with previous items as I was more comfortable with a slower orientation towards making. For a few weeks I was obsessed with thinking about how the picture could come together and sought advice about my ideas from family members. The significance of this shared endorsement of creativity is often overlooked in conventional interpretations of creativity that define this process in relation to individual inspiration and design (Csikszentmihalyi, 2013). My experiences of memorial remaking illustrate how this focus on the creative individual may overlook how creativity is equally developed through interpersonal relationships.

As soon as I started to make the picture, the intensity of making took over and my attention was on realising the design. I cut out potbank shapes from the ties and used a few of my father's red, pink and yellow shirts for factory buildings and dawn/dusk sky. Grey buttons from his shirts created smoke from the kilns. I made two tie pictures, the first for my aunt (my father's sister) and the second for my mother. The pictures are not identical; I redefined the design in making the second picture, including more definition in the sky. Taking time to work through and redefine design was facilitated by a reassertion of the hope of process, I could enjoy making both pictures and took more satisfaction in making. The hope of product was realised through gifting these to my mother and aunt and the pleasure they took in a memory of my father that was simultaneously unique and collective.

5.4 | Reconnecting with the rhythm of making

The final item that I made from my father's clothes was for myself. A favourite item that I rediscovered when going through my father's clothes was his old sheepskin coat. Finding this coat immediately brought back the hazy memories of childhood that reside 'in the continuity of psychic materials from childhood through into adult life' (Philo, 2003, p. 15). I have a memory of my father wearing the coat but not where or when and I could not find any photographs of him wearing it. The coat was stuffed at the back of a wardrobe and showed its age: the fabric was badly scuffed and stained; seams were coming undone; and the buttons (not all of which were the original ones) were hanging on threads.

I decided to use the sheepskin for a collar on a coat. I had purchased an orange boiled wool fabric at a craft fair in January 2020 with the idea of making a new coat as my sewing ambition for that year. This project was put on hold during the remainder of 2020. During the first lockdowns, the solitude of mourning and spending time with my mother meant I had no need for a new coat.

Acquiring my father's sheepskin coat was the motivation to return to this intention to make a coat for myself and fall into the rhythm of making a longer-term project. This rhythm is more than starting and finishing. Both these stages take time in themselves and making in between falls into a pattern of progression and suspended completion. I was familiar with this rhythm and how it contours the progression of making. My rhythm of making always starts with cutting out the pattern. This is never straightforward as it requires familiarisation with the construction of the pattern, the detail of the fabric and how these will be combined. Cutting out captures how the refinement of skill is developed, in a Deleuzian fashion, through repetition within difference (Bissell, 2013; Patchett, 2016).

Step two was hand-making buttonholes. Rather than sewing machine buttonholes at the end, I decided to start with handmade ones that captured my intention to take time in carefully producing a well-made coat. The next stages defined the shape of the coat: seams, sleeves and then collar and the first two stages were repeated for the lining. Moving though making the form of the coat was straightforward, other than some unpicking of the collar seams I make no mistakes and the fit of the coat was perfect. My enthusiasm for making started to wane as I moved towards finishing. I sewed the hem and then stopped. The coat was not complete, it was missing buttons, and the hem required a final press. Rather than bringing this project to an end I left the coat on the mannequin in my craft room and turned my attention to other projects. The coat was abandoned, almost but not quite finished.

Finishing making something is not the end of the process; this is achieved through acceding to the thingness of what is made. The other items that I made were finished by gifting these to family and friends. Sharing the hope of product with others facilitated drawing the hope of process to an end. These items became something through shared appreciation. It is much harder to move from the hope of process to product for something that I make for myself. I procrastinated about

letting go of making the coat and endorsing its thingness as something I could wear. It took me 3 months to finally get around to finishing the coat so that it was ready to wear. Or maybe not; wearing clothes that are self-made is not always a given, you have to be ready to give in to the hope of product and move on from the obsession with the detail of making.

6 | CONCLUSION

Memorial remaking captured my need to do and make something in a time of both personal and global uncertainty and sorrow. It was a departure from how I had used sewing in the past and as such it may be interpreted as specific to this unique time. However, my examination of this practice has followed the principles of autoethnography in using the epiphany of the exceptional and difficult events of 2020 to draw attention to normative readings of making and unpick these through a nexus of geographies of memory, emotion, intimacy and responsibility. This reinterpretation of making does not seek to make claims for a definite practice of making that define how making *should* be done and how it is valued. My intentions and realisation of memorial remaking interweaves within this nexus in divergent ways to segue rhythmically between the hopes of process and product. This rhythm is not just expressed in the time spent making, it is also produced through anticipating starting a new project and commitment to finish what has begun. Developing an intuition for rhythm; anticipating, starting, pausing, repeating, finishing is not incidental to creativity, it is a method for how creativity can be sustained. In acknowledging the rhythm of making this case study of memorial remaking recasts the duality between inaction and doing that is captured in other studies of grief (Maddrell, 2021). While I was motivated to do *something* in response to grief, realising this intention not only took time, it also came about through my family's endorsement.

This autoethnographic study speaks to public and academic interest in the potential of craft and making to develop alternative temporalities to the intensive speed of global capitalism (Holdsworth, 2021). This collective desire to spend time better has intensified during the COVID-19 pandemic, which has focused public attention to ask fundamental questions about everyday temporalities and the production and use of space–time. However, experiences of the pandemic were varied. The retreat into domestic spaces and the opening up of time was not experienced by everyone; many workers continued to go out to work to keep key services open. The divergent spatial and temporal experiences of COVID-19 illustrate the futility of normative codes about how to spend time. Solutions to feeling overwhelmed by multiple and divergent responsibilities cannot be universal. Instead these have to be crafted between normative codes and individual interpretation. My use of sewing to work through difficult times is personal; it is not even a consistent practice for myself. I segued between quick tasks and taking time to develop a more rhythmical making practice. Fundamental to the ongoing crafting of making is being open to the hopes of both product and process and not assuming that one takes precedence over the other.

A geographical lens is apposite for developing this more intuitive and dynamic interpretation of crafting time. While geographers' instinctive focus is towards questions of space, these necessarily also ask questions about time through examining the dynamic, multiple and uneven contours of space–time (Massey, 2005). In this account I held questions about space in the background to foreground a relational interpretation of temporality to unpick the assumption that space is inherently social while time is about change and progression. A relational interpretation of temporality foregrounds the synthesis of past, present and future, though the direction of this synthesis (from past through to future or vice versa) is not given (Hoy, 2012). Connecting this synthesis together enables us, as Heidegger (1962) proposes, to have time rather than being distracted by the busyness of time. My practice of memorial remaking materialises the synthesis of temporality through rhythmically weaving together past, present and future in both the hopes of process and product. Extrapolating from this autoethnographic study illustrates how crafting rhythms of making allows for a more authentic temporality rather than a unilateral commitment to slowing down or prioritising process over product.

Developing this rhythm between product and process is not a solo project. My urgency in the beginning to get things done, by focusing on the hope of product over rhythm or process, was stimulated by wanting to make things for other people, rather than take the time to enjoy doing something for myself. As I developed my practice of memorial remaking and settled into a rhythm that stitched together the hopes of product and process, this practice opened up to incorporate more diverse memories, emotions and intimacies. Making is not simply about taking time out and withdrawing from other people. These temporal and spatial parameters are experienced through, not despite of, interdependencies.

My use of memorial remaking was also therapeutic in opening up an alternative journey through grief that subtly rejected the requirement to let go through endorsing how material and intimate properties are not discrete. It also allowed me to take time against institutional norms that restrict grief within a bounded timeframe. The potential of

fabric to be remade is not just about the quality and characteristics of the cloth, it also captures who has worn these and memories of previous use. In rejecting the work of grief that progresses to the ultimate goal of letting go, memories are present, not as hauntings of the past, but in intersections with identities and emotions that can be carried forward into the future.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My time to practice and reflect on memorial remaking was supported by a Leverhulme Trust Major Research Fellowship (*The Social Life of Busyness in an Age of Deacceleration* grant number MRF-2017-044) whose support is gratefully acknowledged. I would like to thank the editor and anonymous reviewers for their time in engaging with the paper and their insightful comments. Finally, I wish to acknowledge the support of my family in my endeavour to remake our shared grief for my father.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analyzed in this study.

ORCID

Clare Holdsworth  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9064-3493>

ENDNOTES

- ¹ By law, Harris tweed can only be made in the islands of the Outer Hebrides of the western coast of Scotland in the homes of weavers. See <https://www.harristweed.org/>
- ² Potbanks are the colloquial term for bottle ovens or kilns used for firing ware in the pottery industry in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.
- ³ Further details on the items made are available at: <https://www.threadingtime.co.uk/memorial-crafts>
- ⁴ I acknowledge the imagined spatial dimensions of rest, for example idyllic holiday destinations.
- ⁵ Dorset buttons are made by sewing round a closed ring; in the 20-first century these are usually made with brass rings. Dorset buttons were made in southwest England in the seventeenth, eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries before the mechanisation of button making made this craft obsolete. It continues as a leisure craft for making decorative buttons.
- ⁶ Employment in the pottery industry in North Staffordshire reached a peak of 67,000 in the 1930s and declined to 6000 (4% of the workforce) by the first decade of the 20-first century; this decline was particularly precipitous in the 1980s and 1990s (Leach, 2018, page 36).

REFERENCES

- Adamson, G. (2013) *The invention of craft*. London, UK: Bloomsbury.
- Alacovska, A. (2019) 'Keep hoping, keep going': Towards a hopeful sociology of creative work. *The Sociological Review*, 67, 51118–51136. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038026118779014>
- Barad, K. (2003) Posthumanist performativity: Toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter. *Signs*, 28, 801–831. Available from. Available from: <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/345321>
- Baraitser, L. (2017) *Enduring time*. London, UK: Bloomsbury.
- Bastian, M., Baraitser, L., Flexer, M. J., Hom, A. R. & Salisbury, L. (2020) Introduction: The social life of time. *Time & Society*, 29(2), 289–296. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0961463x20921674>
- Bissell, D. (2013) Habit displaced: The disruption of skilful performance. *Geographical Research*, 51(2), 120–129. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-5871.2012.00765.x>
- Bratich, J. & Brush, H.M. (2011) Fabricating activism: Craft-work, popular culture, gender. *Utopian Studies*, 22(2), 233–260. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.5325/utopianstudies.22.2.0233>
- Burke, M. (2018) Knitting the atmosphere: Creative entanglements with climate change. In: Price, L. & Hawkins, H. (Eds.) *Geographies of making, craft and creativity*. London, UK: Routledge, pp. 158–173.
- Butler, J. (2005) *Giving an account of oneself*. New York, NY: Fordham UP.
- Butz, D. & Besio, K. (2009) Autoethnography. *Geography Compass*, 3(5), 1660–1674. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-8198.2009.00279.x>
- Carr, C. & Gibson, C. (2016) Geographies of making. *Progress in Human Geography*, 40(3), 297–315. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132515578775>
- Carr, C. & Gibson, C. (2017) Animating geographies of making: Embodied slow scholarship for participant-researchers of maker cultures and material work. *Geography Compass*, 11(6), e12317-1–e12317-10.
- Chang, H. (2008) *Autoethnography as method*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

- Collier, A.F. (2012) *Using textile arts and handcrafts in therapy with women*. London, UK: Jessica King.
- Collins, Z. (2018) Unpicking the material politics of sewing for development: Sex, religion and women's rights. In: Price, L. & Hawkins, H. (Eds.) *Geographies of making, craft and creativity*. London, UK: Routledge, pp. 78–93.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2013) *Creativity: The psychology of discovery and invention*. London, UK: HarperPerennial.
- Ellis, C. (2004) *The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography*. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.
- Ellis, C., Adams, T.E. & Bochner, A.P. (2011) Autoethnography: An overview. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 12(1), Art.10. Available from: <https://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1589/3095>
- Gauntlett, D. (2018) *Making is connecting: The social power of creativity, from craft and knitting to digital everything*, 2nd edition. London, UK: Policy Press.
- Hawkins, H. (2015) Creative geographic methods: Knowing, representing, intervening. On composing place and page. *Cultural Geographies*, 22(2), 247–268. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474015569995>
- Hawkins, H. (2019) Geography's creative (re)turn: Toward a critical framework. *Progress in Human Geography*, 43(6), 963–984. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132518804341>
- Hedtke, L. & Winslade, J. (2017) *The crafting of grief: Constructing aesthetic responses to loss*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Heidegger, M. (1962) *Being and time*. Translated by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Holdsworth, C. (2021) *The social life of busyness*. London, UK: Emerald.
- Holdsworth, C. & Hall, S.M. (2022) A grammar for non-teleological geographies: Differentiating the divergence of intention and outcomes in the everyday. *Progress in Human Geography*. Advance online publication. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/03091325221093639>
- Hollenbach, J. (2019) Moving beyond a modern craft: Thoughts on white entitlement and cultural appropriation in professional craft in Canada. *Studio Magazine*. Available from: <https://www.studiomagazine.ca/articles/2019/moving-beyond-a-modern-craft> [Accessed: 4 August 2021].
- Hoy, D.C. (2012) *The time of our lives: A critical history of temporality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ingold, T. (2000) *The perception of the environment: Essays on livelihood, dwelling and skill*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Ingold, T. (2007) Materials against materiality. *Archaeological Dialogues*, 14(1), 1–16.
- Ingold, T. (2010) The textility of making. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 34(1), 91–102. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/cje/bep042>
- Ingold, T. (2013) *Making: Anthropology, archaeology, art and architecture*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Jones, O. & Garde-Hansen, J. (2012) *Geography and memory: Explorations in identity, place and becoming*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.
- Kubler-Ross, E. (1969) *On death and dying*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Kurutz, S. (2021) What we learned from a year of crafting. *New York Times*, 13th May. Available from: <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/05/13/style/craft-boom.html>.
- Latham, A. & Wagner, L.B. (2020) Experiments in becoming: Corporeality, attunement and doing research. *Cultural Geographies*, 28(1), 91–108. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474020949550>
- Le Roux, C.S. (2017) Exploring rigour in autoethnographic research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 20(2), 195–207. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2016.1140965>
- Lea, J. (2009) Becoming skilled: The cultural and corporeal geographies of teaching and learning Thai yoga massage. *Geoforum*, 40(3), 465–474. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2009.03.005>
- Leach, H. (2018) *Sociophonetic variation in Stoke-on-Trent's pottery industry*. PhD thesis, University of Sheffield. Available from: <https://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/21547/> [Accessed: 27 July 2021].
- Lefebvre, H. (2004) *Rhythmanalysis: Space, time and everyday life*. Translated by Stuart Elden and Gerald Moore. London, UK: Continuum.
- Leone, L. (Eds.). (2021) *Craft in art therapy: Diverse approaches to the transformative power of craft materials and methods*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Lorimer, H. & Lund, K. (2003) Performing facts: Finding a way over Scotland's mountains. *The Sociological Review*, 51(2_suppl), 130–144. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2004.00455.x>
- Lorimer, H. (2019) Dear departed: Writing the lifeworlds of place. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 44(2), 331–345. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12278>
- Maddrell, A. (2020) Bereavement, grief and consolation: emotional-affective geographies of loss during COVID-19. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 10(2), 110–117. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/2043820620934947>
- Maddrell, A. (2021) The politics of volunteering in loss and at a loss: autobiographical reflections on grief, vulnerability, and (in)action. In: Bissell, D., Rose, M. & Harrison, P. (Eds.) *Negative geographies: Exploring the politics of limits*. Nebraska: Nebraska UP, pp. 119–138.
- Massey, D. (2005) *For space*. London, UK: SAGE.
- McRobbie, A. (2016) *Be creative: Making a living in the new culture industries*. Cambridge, MA: Polity.
- Morris, W. (1888/2008) *Useful work versus useless toil*. London, UK: Penguin Books.
- Moss, P. (2000) *Placing autobiography in geography*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse UP.
- Ocejo, R.E. (2014) Show the animal: Constructing and communicating new elite food tastes at upscale butcher shops. *Poetics*, 47, 106–121. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2014.10.006>
- O'Connor, E. (2007) Embodied knowledge in glassblowing: The experience of meaning and the struggle towards proficiency. *Sociological Review*, 55(SUPPL. 1), 126–141. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2007.00697.x>
- Pang, A.S.-K. (2016) *Rest: Why you get more done when you work less*. London, UK: Penguin.

- Parkes, C.M. (2002) Grief: Lessons from the past, visions for the future. *Death Studies*, 26(5), 367–385. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.5334/pb-50-1-2-7>
- Patchett, M. (2016) The taxidermist's apprentice: Stitching together the past and present of a craft practice. *Cultural Geographies*, 23(3), 401–419. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474015612730>
- Paton, D.A. (2013) The quarry as sculpture: The place of making. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 45(5), 1070–1086. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1068/a45568>
- Philo, C. (2003) To go back up the side hill: Memories, imaginations and reveries of childhood. *Children's Geographies*, 1(1), 7–24. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14733280302188>
- Price, L. & Hawkins, H. (2018) Towards the geographies of making: An introduction. In: Price, L. & Hawkins, H. (Eds.) *Geographies of making, craft and creativity*. London, UK: Routledge, pp. 1–30.
- Riley, J., Corkhill, B. & Morris, C. (2013) The benefits of knitting for personal and social well-being in adulthood: Findings from an international survey. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 76(2), 50–57. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.4276/030802213X13603244419077>
- Rosa, H. (2017) De-synchronisation, dynamic stabilisation, dispositional squeeze: The problem of temporal mismatch. In: Wajcman, J. & Dodd, N. (Eds.) *The sociology of speed: Digital, organizational, and social temporalities*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, pp. 25–41.
- Smith, T.S.J. (2019) Therapeutic taskscapes and craft geography: Cultivating well-being and atmospheres of recovery in the workshop. *Social and Cultural Geography*, 22, 151–169. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2018.1562088>
- Straughan, E. (2018) Entangled corporeality in the making of taxidermy. In: Price, L. & Hawkins, H. (Eds.) *Geographies of making, craft and creativity*. London, UK: Routledge, pp. 144–157.
- Sudnow, D. (2001) *Ways of the hand: A rewritten account*, 2nd Revised edition. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Weber, M. (1905/1930) *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. Translated by Talcott parsons. London, UK: Routledge.
- Wellesley-Smith, C. (2015) *Slow stitch: Mindful and contemplative textile art*. London, UK: Batsford.
- Woodward, S. (2021) Clutter in domestic spaces: Material vibrancy, and competing moralities. *Sociological Review*, 69, 1214–1228. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038026121998218>

How to cite this article: Holdsworth, C. (2022) The hopes of memorial remaking: Product, process, and the temporal rhythms of making. *The Geographical Journal*, 188, 559–570. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12467>