The task was to ensure an economic and social context in which positive opportunities were present rather than merely an absence of constraints. 'Freedom is opportunity' might have been the watchword of the Ministry ... there was a recognition from the outset that the economic system could, even with full employment, satisfy only part of human needs and that the 'real business of life' is in its human relationships and that the quality of these will depend in part on the physical and social environment in which they are conducted. A concern for that environment was therefore an integral part of the Ministry's role.

Herbert 'Nugget' Coombs was appointed Director General of Post-War Reconstruction early in 1943. His biographical reflections on the reconstruction period emphasise the languages which were characteristic of policy debate at this time: the declaration 'freedom is opportunity' became the cornerstone of Australia's view of itself as an allied nation in the postwar 'west'. The prewar belief that insecurity, unregulated competition and a minimal state role in welfare, could be an effective stimulus to endeavour was replaced by an expectation that government was responsible for the provision of economic and social security. One of the ways in which this expectation was translated was in the postwar expectation of full employment. However, as Coombs identifies, it was not enough for government to provide economic security in the form of employment or welfare. Government also had a role in 'the real business of life'. The 'real business of life' for the postwar planners was a concern with a variety of aspects of life: the provision of spaces (both social and geographical) for 'community'; the provision of activities for the population's increased leisure time; an education in consumption; and, above all, an education in citizenship.
It was in this context of the management of 'freedom' that art was mobilised as part of a program of education for citizenship. After World War 2 the provision of funding for the arts was articulated as an 'expectation' of government or (what in the 1980s was called) a 'right' of citizenship. Elsewhere I have investigated the historical relations between culture and government in Australia from the mid-nineteenth century to the present day. This archaeology of the discursive frameworks of Australian cultural programs investigates the ways in which art programs have been used to construct particular forms of identity. I am interested in those programs which sought to provide access to culture for members of the public who were understood as having no or limited access, and were thought capable of benefiting from such access. The relations between art, citizenship and government are historically particular. For instance, in the mid-to-late-nineteenth century the establishment of Mechanics' Institutes and State art galleries was primarily based on a civilising rationale for the uses of art. In contrast, during and after the World War 2, art programs, supported (albeit minimally) by government, and advocates of increased government support of culture articulated their uses of culture as concerned with shaping participatory citizens.

This account of the history of cultural policy argues that the relations between government and art are best defined by the ways in which different strategies for the management of populations have been organised and deployed. My approach to the history of Australian art programs is informed by a body of work which, developing from Michel Foucault's 'Governmentality', applies a distinctive perspective to the history of the relations between government and culture. Foucault argues that government is not limited to organisations or mechanisms attached to the State, rather, government refers to the activities of all institutions concerned with the regulation and management of populations. My adoption of this approach allows me analysis key discourses which form relations of influence between State and non-State sponsored art programs. Tony Bennett and Nikolas Rose have developed Foucault's theorisation of government and the relations between knowledge and power in ways that are directly useful to my investigation of government and culture relations in postwar Australia. Bennett has applied a reading of Foucault to the history of the museum and has understood relations between government and culture as being defined above all by the ways in which government strategically uses culture to act on the social. In this way Bennett draws on Foucault's understanding of government as essentially involved with the moulding of public and private behaviour, or, to put it another way, government is concerned with the 'conduct of conduct'. Nikolas Rose has also developed Foucault's conception of governmentality as a way of exploring the connections between self-formation and the government of populations.

What Bennett and Rose's approaches have in common is their argument that populations are managed not only through the provision of State services but also and more importantly through governmental techniques aimed at the formation of personalities which have desirable
attributes and characteristics. However, for Bennett and Rose this relation is not understandable through the concept of coercion; rather, liberal techniques of government are productive in the sense that they provide, via the construction of new social norms, new ways of being and knowing. As Rose puts it, the 'importance of liberalism is not that it first recognised, defined or defended freedom as a right of all citizens. Rather, its significance is that for the first time the arts of government were systematically linked to the practice of freedom'. From this perspective postwar art programs were part of a complex of knowledges and institutions which sought to manage populations by equipping individuals with the capacity to be self-regulating.

What were some of the conditions of emergence of postwar Australian cultural policy? It is not my aim here to provide an exhaustive account of institutional funding of the arts but to describe the dominant discourses which framed the conjunction of art, citizenship and government in the years immediately following the World War 2. I argue first that these conditions resulted in a distinct set of objectives for government in relation to art and citizenship which were that cultural programs could provide training for participatory citizenship, and responsible leisure and consumption. Second, I argue, these objectives can be understood as the result of a framing of the relationship between art and citizenship as one of mutual responsibility which recast the citizen as amenable to management through a rationalised system of 'planning'. Integral to this rationale of mutual responsibility was the construction of a citizenry as a resource to be enlisted in its own self-management.

It will be helpful to begin with an overview of the reconstruction debates in Australia. This overview will seek to describe the ways in which particular kinds of civic conduct were articulated in relation to postwar governance more generally. In social programs developed during the late 1930s and increasingly during reconstruction, the discursive relations between government and citizenship were refigured around the figure of the participatory citizen responsible to both the 'community' and the nation. It was via the logic of mutual responsibility that the three primary postwar concerns of full employment, welfare, and consumption 'problems' would be best governed. This participatory citizen was to be trained in the techniques of participation, in part, through the provision of broader access to cultural programs and their contents. In section two, on culture and reconstruction, I will discuss some of the frames of reference within which government funding of the arts was advocated. The roles envisaged for art programs were many but primarily they were understood as useful in training the participatory citizen in the useful expenditure of leisure and informed consumption. These constructions of the relations between art and citizenship are evident in the postwar organisation of the Australian Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts (CEMA), the National Gallery of Victoria, and the Art Gallery of New South Wales. In the 1940s in Australia there was a shift in political expectation which meant that management of the arts came to be seen
as a state responsibility. The discursive coordinates against which this shift can be understood are central to understanding the dynamics of contemporary Australian cultural policy.

RECONSTRUCTION

The immediate postwar period was characterised by a loose consensus on proposals for the reconstruction of Australia; that social and economic planning would result in an Australia able 'to achieve the aspirations of Everyman by enlightened extensions of state action'.9 As Tim Rowse argues, notions of social, political and economic reconstruction, while ascendant towards the end of the 1930s, became effectual in the context of war and reconstruction in providing the opportunity for experimentation with centralised planning. World War 2 was not the only factor which provided the opportunity for a shift in the favoured forms of planning; other factors were, the Depression, Roosevelt's 'New Deal', the influence of Keynesian economics, and the necessity, at least initially, for government to 'sell' the war to the Australian people with the promise of a new reconstructed postwar World.10

During World War 2 in Australia, as in Britain, there was a political shift to the left. Labor's success during the war was mirrored by the collapse of the non-Labour parties, in particular the collapse of the coalition between the United Australia Party and the Country Party. Ben Chifley led the Labour Party in the postwar years and his 1946 victory, based on the promise of extensive reconstruction, gave Labour, for the first time since 1913, control of both houses.11 However, the goal of extensive reconstruction was limited by the defeat of the Powers Referendum in 1944. In this referendum the government sought to refer certain state powers to the Commonwealth for a period of five years after the end of the war. As David Lee argues, the defeat of this motion ensured 'that reform would be piecemeal and protracted and that, with some loss of the reforming momentum, opponents to change would have the chance to mobilise more effectively'.12 Yet, it would be false to understand politics and government during the 1940s in terms of two camps, with the 'true believers' on the left, committed to the reconstruction of an egalitarian Australian society, versus the forces of conservatism committed to the status quo.13

Nicholas Brown provides a revisionist account of government in Australia during the postwar period.14 According to Brown, customary analyses of postwar Australian government trace a shift from the supposed 'integrity' of the postwar period of reform 'shaped [by] an impressive disciplinary orthodoxy in ... economics centering on state intervention and social welfare commitments'.15 This was 'lost' with the shift to 'neo-liberalism' traceable from the early 1970s and evident in the emphasis on 'the primacy of the market, individualistic enterprise and private choice'.16 Brown argues that the 'complexities of this transition are too easily overlooked by the assumed integrity of the Australianism-professionalism-Keynesian synthesis'.17 In summary, Brown argues that the inter-war economic subject was conceived
as measurable within a ‘public space of citizenship’. This conception, which began to emerge in the late 1930s and 1940s and developed into the 1950s, conceived of the citizen as an ensemble of entitlements attached to specific identities. In the 1930s and 1940s the economy was increasingly understood in terms of the possibilities for its regulation, specifically ‘to make available the satisfactions individuals might pursue’. 18

This understanding of the relationship between the individual and the economy cast the consumer as a resource to be managed if Australia was to avoid what postwar economist Douglas Copland termed the ‘milk bar economy’. In his diagnosis, the consumer was constructed as both a resource for and a threat to prosperity and stability. On the one hand, there was a positive emphasis on personal economic freedom; on the other hand, there was a concern that this freedom would not be exercised sensibly. Copland’s analysis of Australia as a ‘milk bar economy’ encapsulated this concern that ‘excessive personal consumption perpetrated inflation, economic imbalance and inefficiency’. 19 Thus, managing this citizen (who enjoyed increased state derived entitlements) became a matter of inducing the citizen to be self-managing in relation to her or his private choices.

Brown has summarised this transition in governmentality more broadly:

Underpinning the reformism attributed to the ‘true believers’ of the 1940s was a concern that the scale of post-war social, political, economic and international change could ever be managed as once it had been through concepts such as class, race, social hygiene and hierarchy, public order and duty … this concern was transposed into, rather than superseded by, the practices of governing the new spaces of post-war prosperity—the more private spaces of citizenship, consumption, the local community, the intimacy of relationships and the individual personality. 20

New techniques of economic and social planning were based on an understanding of the interconnection of the individual and the state. This shift can be understood as representative of a new governmental rationality characterised by an emphasis on the importance of individual security, and the interconnection of this with the successful operation of the social whole. Nikolas Rose describes this governmental rationality as ‘welfarism’, a ‘new formula for the exercise of rule’ in which persons and ‘activities were to be governed through society … through acting upon them in relation to a social norm, and constituting their experiences and evaluations in a social form’. 21 No longer was the citizen conceived of as amenable to planning in relation to her or his external needs but was managed and, more importantly, trained to be self-managing in relation to her or his internal capacities. While at one level this transition in governmentality constructed the citizen in terms of the individual’s entitlement to certain sets of ‘freedoms’ and ‘rights’, for instance, in relation to ‘freedoms’ of consumption or ‘rights’ of welfare entitlement, it was precisely in these ‘private’ spaces that the citizen was most regulated.
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This civic 'freedom' of self-managing citizens required systems of governance which would equip citizens with the capacities necessary to be responsibly free. Thus it was in relation to the postwar 'problems' of consumption, leisure, and community that cultural programs were articulated as useful to the production of participatory citizens. In Australia, as in Britain, the use of art programs by voluntary and charitable associations with an interest in adult education has a history which can be traced to the mid-to-late-nineteenth century through organisations such as the Mechanics' Institutes and Schools of Art and later the Workers Educational Association (WEA). Peter Beilharz, Mark Considine and Rob Watts describe these charitable and voluntary organisations as the 'second welfare state'. For Beilharz et al the welfare state is not a homogeneous block attached to 'the state' but is a 'diversity of activities and responsibilities'. These 'activities' and 'responsibilities' are administered via reciprocal as well as conflicting relations between the two blocks of the welfare state. Beilharz et al describe these blocks as the national welfare state, which is primarily a post-World War 2 product, and the 'second welfare state' which is the 'partnership ... of voluntary organisations ... that emerged in the nineteenth century'.

The appeal to the 'plain Australian' was the primary rhetorical frame for advocacy of government support for the arts. In 1943 a series of radio talks were aired on the problem of relating Australian art to public life. Sydney Ure Smith, the Sydney art publisher, said:

"I do not believe that the people are apathetic to art. Give them a chance to absorb it, see it, understand it. Let it be part of their life. Don't keep it away in a remote building out of the main thoroughfare and expect them to go there without creating a demand for it. I believe in art for the people, because art comes from the people."

Note Ure Smith's twofold argument that art should relate to the 'life' of the people and that art should be physically accessible to the people. For Ure Smith it was only through addressing these two questions of access that the benefits of art could operate. One of these benefits was through the education of the citizen as consumer. Frank Medworth, artist and Head of the East Sydney Technical College from 1939, went to the heart of the belief in the uses of art to the reconstruction effort:

"Art ... is the common-sense solution to every problem. Whether it be the question of what picture shall decorate the wall, what chair you will feel comfortable in, or whether the sign over a shop window shall be well spaced and legible or not. Art is to be seen in suitable dress-wear as well as in a domestic interior which is comfortable and easy to keep clean. Art is the well-designed type-face which makes the reading of a good book a pleasure just as much as art is the arrangement of the printing on the page."
Thus, art was articulated as directly relevant to the everyday life of the 'plain Australian'. Through art the individual citizen could be trained to make 'correct' decisions as to the choice of furniture, clothes, and other consumables with which they chose to assert their individuality.

Three factors are integral to the construction of the relations between art, citizenship and government at this time. The first is an instrumental view of the benefits of art education in training citizens to be 'responsible' in their expenditure of leisure time and consumption. The second is the popular demand that art support should be a state responsibility. Arthur Phillips wrote, in an article titled 'Culture and Canberra', that the mating of the two terms was as 'comically improbable as Flossie and the Archbishop'. However, even Phillips was an advocate of state arts support, 'if our national life is not to wither before it has fully flowered ... a country cannot achieve nationhood until it has achieved articulateness [sic]'. The third factor characterising relations between art, citizenship and government during reconstruction was the assertion that art which appealed to the 'plain Australian' would produce the most beneficial effects for the nation at large. These themes emerge from discussions at the 'People's Conference on Culture in the War and the Peace' held in 1944. The conference agreed in its final organisational session that 'Culture must be made the possession of the people'.

Dorothy Helmrich (head of the Australian CEMA) gave us the best statement of why this was so—'When man thinks constructively and can use his imagination—which is common to all', she argued, 'then we have a complete being who will prove the perfect citizen'.

---

**COUNCIL FOR THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF MUSIC AND THE ARTS**

During postwar reconstruction a new rationality of government became dominant. Political economic theories such as 'New Dealism' and Keynesian economics made the field of the economic management of the state thinkable in new ways. New techniques of social planning were based on a notion of the citizen as a self-regulating individual to be governed from a distance. Importantly, for our purposes here, the articulation of art and government relations at this time understood art programs as an important strategy in the education of citizens for the exercise of private choice.

There was a multiplicity of suggestions for the organisation of cultural groups in Australia during and after World War 2. Coombs has described how advocacy for Government support was widespread, encouraged by awareness of what the Council for Education through Music and the Arts [sic] had achieved for the Arts and the community in Britain. Helmrich claimed that 'the Arts Council [was] ... a pioneering movement in the cultural field. It planted the seed of an idea and awoke in the community mind the need for stabilising and decentralising the Arts'. CEMA was established in Australia in 1943. It was set up on the model of the British CEMA. Its main stated purpose was
to bring art, in all its forms, to the people, to encourage them, not only to cultivate an appreciation of all that is beautiful in music, painting, sculpture, drama, ballet, and so forth, but also to express themselves in some one or other of the arts and crafts ... CEMA is based on the belief that art, in the widest sense of the word, is not a luxury for the few, but a necessity for all, in a community which aims to develop to the full the faculties of its citizens and so enable them to make the best of life.34

Like the advocates of government support for the arts, CEMA was structured around a belief in the educative value of the arts.

The Australian CEMA began in NSW mostly as a result of the efforts of Helmrich who worked with the British CEMA for two years. There was already, in these final years of the war, substantial advocacy for a government-funded arts body. In 1942, the year in which Helmrich returned to Australia, the painter Russell Drysdale wrote that the British CEMA was a good example of the ways in which artists could be made useful during wartime. Drysdale criticised the fact that no advantage was taken of artists in Australia. He argued that 'this is the very time to encourage and foster our cultural movements so that from this period of trial and sacrifice we shall be able to build a new and vigorous growth with its roots firmly planted in the interests and expression of the common people'.35 Helmrich became President of CEMA in 1943 and held this position for twenty years. She wrote that the 'objectives of the CEMA were primarily to take the arts to the people ... to provide a field in which artists could support themselves by their art and, perhaps the most important of all to take the live and fine arts into the schools'36

The central activity of CEMA was its regional tours. These included touring theatre productions, musical presentations, and visual art shows with attendant lecturers. There were one hundred and twenty exhibitions held in factories, offices, service camps, and other places between 1943 and 1945.37 Such tours were expensive and finance was sought from Coombs, as Director General of Post-War Reconstruction, and then from the Director of Post-War Reconstruction in the NSW State government. Both informed Helmrich that their respective governments 'had not made any financial provision for the Arts'.38

While CEMA developed along British lines, unlike the British organisation, CEMA was not organised as a centralised body. As a result of its emphasis on access for regional settlements, CEMA's policy encouraged the establishment of branches in country centres. Initially CEMA's actions were limited to NSW and the first country branches were set up there in 1944. These were administered on the basis that the branch committees would organise everything necessary for a touring show and would at least meet the cost of the artists. The costs of production and travelling were shared out amongst all the branches. In 1945 CEMA changed its name to the Arts Council of Australia. The new Council followed a decentralisation policy...
and thus by 1948 had autonomous divisions in each state, which were managed under the umbrella of the Federal Arts Council of Australia. Of these divisions only NSW and the ACT received any government assistance.

The example of CEMA illustrates three dominant discourses which I have argued were characteristic of the relations between art, government and citizenship in postwar Australia. First, the emphasis on 'the people' was translated into policy by the provision of access involving the use of regional tours. However, it was not a matter of simply providing physical access to culture, rather, the aim was educative. Thus, the second strategy was to make use of the lunchtime lecture; these provided access on an educative level to city workers and people in regional centres. The third strategy which enabled the Arts Council's provision of art 'to the people' was its organisation on the basis of a policy of decentralisation. This aim was to be facilitated by the Council's ethic of decentralisation. Through the 'Country Special Section' the Council aimed to develop a network of country branches which would work in cooperation with local authorities and 'carry on all the work attendant in developing the cultural talent of the district. Every locality has its own particular complexion, and different circumstances to be understood and made use of'.

The report of the first five years of the NSW division of the Arts Council is succinct in stating the Arts Council's aim:

The idea behind CEMA is that to have a better World we must have better citizens—men and women who not only have full employment, but are happy in their employment; men and women who not only have abundant leisure, but know how to make use of it to develop their bodies and their minds. Post-war reconstruction must take account, not only of the material, but also of the cultural and spiritual.

Thus the Arts Council viewed itself as contributing to the reconstruction effort by providing educational tools which would enable the citizen to manage their leisure and consumption in a way which was beneficial to the social whole.

— State Art Galleries—Victoria and New South Wales

My discussion of CEMA has analysed conjunctions of art, citizenship and government as evidenced by an organisation which could be described in Beilharz et al.'s phrase as belonging to 'the second welfare state'. The programs of the State art galleries of Victoria and NSW are also illustrative of how institutions of 'the second welfare state' adjusted their practices in light of the postwar reconstruction context. I have described postwar Australia as being characterised by a new rationality for the governance of the citizenry. This rationality sought to govern citizens by acting on them 'from a distance' and by equipping them with capacities to be self-governing in relation to choices defined as individual and/or private. This understanding has been discussed in postwar debates about government arts funding and in the
specific example of CEMA. I have described the postwar relationships between art, citizenship and government as being characterised by a focus on education—education for consumption and leisure. There are parallel tendencies in the ways that the National Gallery of Victoria and the Art Gallery of New South Wales sought to encompass postwar concerns.

It is fitting to begin with the National Gallery of Victoria. Not only was this the first State art gallery established in Australia but it was also, for various reasons, the most developed by the 1940s. Sir Keith Murdoch, Chairman of the Gallery Trustees from 1945, described the newly established National Gallery Society as answering a public interest in art. He wrote, this Society was 'to be of substantial use to the Government and to the Trustees in raising public interest ... I gather they hope to befriend country galleries and will go into the University and schools in the cause of education in art'. Particularly important was the architectural design of the space and its appropriateness to the Gallery's pedagogical function. Whilst there was no extra money forthcoming from either Commonwealth or State governments in this period, the Trustees of the Library (in which the Gallery and Museum were housed), as part of the increasing perception for the need for postwar planning, commissioned architects in 1943 'to report on the future development of the various institutions'.

One of the earliest articles on proposals for the new Gallery was written by Gallery Director, Daryl Lindsay, who on a trip overseas:

was interested to find out that 'museum fatigue' is a recognised evil that has to be combated by the judicious hanging and attractive layout of the exhibits ... Such a method of showing would greatly enhance the value of the collection both from an aesthetic and educational point of view.

In an issue of the Society of Artist's Book devoted to the role art should play in reconstruction, Lindsay commented that intimately 'tied up with the general attractiveness of a gallery is its value as an educational unit of the state'. Thus, Lindsay wrote that while:

it will be argued that with housing and other post-war problems to contend with, money cannot be spared ... [for] the annual expenditure on the administration of our principal Australian galleries ... [this] is a mere trifle compared to their capital value as educational assets of the Commonwealth, and is of as much importance to this country as the wheat crop or the wool clip.

In the same issue of the Society of Artist's Book Charles Lloyd Jones argued that art galleries the World over are realising that art must be encouraged by making art attractive to the many, and to do this they promote all kinds of events. Dare I say it—they run their institutions like retail stores—create attractions which draw the public to them.
The initial period of rebuilding and reconstruction focused debate on the best way to house art collections. In this debate the benchmark of success was perceived to be the institutions' attraction to the general public. However, it was not enough for people to simply attend; they were also to be educated.

The educational function of the Gallery informed its acquisition policy and was massively supported by the Felton Bequest. Leonard Cox explains that 'one aspect [of the acquisition policy] strongly held by its committee was his [Felton's] direction to select works of art which would improve and educate public taste'. In the launch of the Gallery bulletin Lindsay wrote:

To fall into line with the trend of modern life, our galleries of the future must be more informative and educational than those of the past—their progressive policy must depend largely on their educational value to the State and the interest and active co-operation of the public.

Note this stress on the 'active co-operation' of the public. The pedagogical function of the Gallery was understood not as a matter of educating a 'passive' public so much as encouraging the direct participation of the public. Thus, the public was not conceived of as a passive audience, instead it was understood as a citizenry which came to the gallery with particular needs and expectations.

While in some ways the development of the Art Gallery of New South Wales was more gradual and less organised than the National Gallery of Victoria, this was not the case with its travelling art exhibitions. The first exhibition of the Country Art Exhibition Scheme was 'One Hundred and Fifty Years of Australian Painting' which opened in 1944 at the School of Arts in Wagga Wagga. This exhibition was organised in association with the Department of Education and was the first touring exhibition of original works of art of 'historical and contemporary distinction' ever to be shown in a country town. In 1944 Bernard Smith was appointed Education Officer in charge of the Country Art Exhibition Scheme. The aim of the exhibitions was primarily educational, to this effect great importance was placed on the provision of catalogues and guest lecturers to appear as they opened in each town. However, the Gallery Trustees were sharply divided on the function of the travelling art exhibitions. Sir Lionel Lindsay led the anti-education element of the Trustees and the pro-education element was led by Ure Smith who, according to Bernard Smith, 'realised that a broader base had to found for art patronage in the post-war years'. In radio broadcasts and elsewhere Ure Smith argued that 'Art ... must be brought to the people'. In the first year of the scheme seven exhibitions were shown in thirty-nine country towns to over fifty-seven thousand people. Bernard Smith writes that the 'magnificent response vindicated the scheme, and largely silenced its critics'.

The NSW Premier William McKell tied the travelling art exhibition initiative to broader reconstruction aims in his speech at the opening of the first travelling art exhibition at Wagga Wagga:
One of our post-war aims in education will be to develop an interest in art by the average citizen. I believe that the post-war period will bring adjustments in our educational system and in these changes art will become an important subject. It is vital that growing children in country towns have the advantages of an art gallery.

The Country Art Exhibition Scheme illustrates some of the main coordinates which informed the postwar review of the function of the state art gallery as a public institution. Bernard Smith in a 1946 essay on ‘The Art Museum Today’ argued for an inclusive definition of the modern gallery’s role:

The first requirement is the recognition of the museum as an educational agency. This means a far closer connection, on the one hand with other educational agencies ... and closer contact with those whom the gallery is supposed theoretically to affect, the home, in the realm of domestic design, in the realm of industrial design, the town at large, in the realm of town and community planning.

The travelling art exhibitions, like other programs specifically directed towards the emphasis of a more educative role for the gallery, were an expression of the new set of relations which framed the conjunction of art and citizenship in postwar reconstruction.

— Conclusion

I have argued that the defining feature of the construction of relations between art, citizenship and government was the shaping of a citizen who would participate responsibly in her or his working, political, and social life. This does not suggest that the ‘freedom’ of citizens was an illusion or an ideological ‘trick’. Rather I have sought to analyse the governmentalisation of art in terms of Rose’s argument that ‘such practices have not suppressed freedom but, on the contrary, sought to “make up” subjects capable of exercising a regulated freedom and caring for themselves as free subjects’. In this relationship between government and citizenship, art was utilised in programs designed to equip the ‘plain Australian’ with the capacities needed to constitute her or himself as ‘free’.
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