

## National Cultural Policy Submission

1470319

Public

Individual

Harriet Schwarzrock

Short submission (text box 500 words or less)

Submission to the National Cultural Policy Review Harriet Schwarzrock, artist and doctoral candidate,

I am a practising artist who makes for a living. Not metaphorically, but materially: I blow glass, fabricate neon, and work scientific glass in a home studio in [REDACTED]. Making is both my livelihood and the engine of my research as a doctoral candidate at the [REDACTED]. My practice sits at the intersection of craft, science, and contemporary art, and it is sustained, daily, physical, and financially precarious.

Revive is an ambitious and necessary framework. But its breadth is also a risk. Without deliberate attention, the craft and design sector will remain peripheral to its implementation, absorbed into broader categories that do not adequately reflect the realities of our work. I write to advocate for clear, structural recognition of craft and design within the policy, and to name specifically where our needs align with the five pillars.

Pillar 4: Strong Cultural Infrastructure is where this alignment is most critical. For artists like me, cultural infrastructure is not only exhibition space or funding bodies. It is the workshop, the kiln, the torch, the specialist supplier. It is the transmission of technical knowledge from practitioner to practitioner, often informally, across generations. It is the shared studio, the residency, the fellowship, the glassworks. These are the conditions that make a practice possible, and they are chronically under-resourced.

I have been fortunate with residency opportunities: the Corning Museum of Glass, the inaugural Canberra Glassworks Art Group Fellowship, and the AsiaLink residency in Japan have each been formative. But these opportunities are rare, competitive, and fragile. The material knowledge required for glass, neon, and other craft-based practices cannot be acquired quickly or cheaply. It is embodied, cumulative, and dependent on access to specialised equipment and skilled mentors. When studios close, when fellowships are defunded, when the chain of transmission is broken, that knowledge does not simply pause. It disappears.

Revive should explicitly name craft and design infrastructure as a cultural priority and allocate funding accordingly. This means supporting not only major institutions but also the smaller nodes of the ecology: independent studios, regional practice hubs, material research fellowships, and mentorship structures that sustain specialist knowledge across generations.

I would also ask that the policy acknowledge the dual role many craft practitioners hold as both cultural producers and researchers. Practice-led research, conducted through making, contributes original knowledge to both the cultural and academic sectors. My own doctoral research into plasma illumination encased within blown glass operates precisely in this space. The policy should support pathways that allow artists to sustain this kind of rigorous, material-based inquiry without having to choose between financial survival and intellectual contribution.

The craft and design sector is smaller than some. But it is foundational. The objects we make, and the knowledge we carry, matter. Revive is an opportunity to say so clearly.