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Synopsis

The thesis argues that the relations between culture and government are best viewed through an analysis of the programmatic and institutional contexts for the use of culture as an interface in the relations between citizenship and government. Discussion takes place through an analysis of the history of art programmes which, in seeking to target a ‘general’ population, have attempted to equip this population with various particular capacities. We aim to provide a history of rationalities of art administration. This will provide us with an approach through which we might understand some of the seemingly irreconcilable policy discourses which characterise contemporary discussion of government arts funding. Research for this thesis aims to make a contribution to historical research on arts institutions in Australia and provide a base from which to think about the role of government in culture in contemporary Australia.

In order to reflect on the relations between government and culture the thesis discusses the key rationales for the conjunction of art, citizenship and government in post-World War Two (WWII) Australia to the present day. Thus, the thesis aims to contribute an overview of the discursive origins of the main contemporary rationales framing arts subvention in post-WWII Australia. The relations involved in the government of culture in late eighteenth-century France, nineteenth-century Britain, America in the 1930s and Britain during WWII are examined by way of arguing that the discursive influences on government cultural policy in Australia have been diverse. It is suggested in relation to present day Australian cultural policy that more effective terms of engagement with policy imperatives might be found in a history of the funding of culture which emphasises the plurality of relations between governmental programmes and the self-shaping activities of citizens.
During this century there has been a shift in the political rationality which organises government in modern Western liberal democracies. The historical case studies which form section two of the thesis enable us to argue that, since WWII, cultural programmes have been increasingly deployed on the basis of a governmental rationality that can be described as advanced or neo-liberal. This is both in relation to the forms these programmes have taken and in relation to the character of the forms of conduct such programmes have sought to shape in the populations they act upon. Mechanisms characteristic of such neo-liberal forms of government are those associated with the welfare state and include cultural programmes. Analysis of governmental programmes using such conceptual tools allows us to interpret problems of modern social democratic government less in terms of oppositions between structure and agency and more in terms of the strategies and techniques of government which shape the activities of citizens. Thus, the thesis will approach the field of cultural management not as a field of monolithic decision making but as a domain in which there are a multiplicity of power effects, knowledges, and tactics, which react to, or are based upon, the management of the population through culture.

The thesis consists of two sections. Section one serves primarily to establish a set of historical and theoretical co-ordinates on which the more detailed historical work of the thesis in section two will be based. We conclude by emphasising the necessity for the continuation of a mix of policy frameworks in the construction of the relations between art, government and citizenship which will encompass a focus on diverse and sometimes competing policy goals.
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INTRODUCTION
In the midst of the Great Depression an American postmaster, advocating the post-office as a site for the display of art, asked ‘How can a finished citizen be made in an artless town?’ (in Park and Markowitz 1984, p. xvii). In Australia in 1998 the Federal Shadow Minister for Industrial Relations, Finance and the Arts, Bob McMullan, in a paper advocating the importance of the continuation of government support for the arts in ‘facilitating mass participation’, set his argument around the point that we are ‘not just consumers… [but] citizens’ (1998, p. 10). Although set in different countries, in different economic, social and political conditions, and sixty years apart, both these statements regarding the involvement of government in the arts emphasise the importance of art to the construction of citizens who can participate and contribute effectively in society. We must interrogate the terms of this conjunction. How is art useful to the construction of ‘good’ citizens?

Government involvement in culture has been the focus of considerable discussion in Australia over the last few years. The Commonwealth government launched its first systematic cultural policy Creative Nation in 1994 which, among other things, emphasised that arts organisations must be more proactive in seeking their own sponsorship. At the same time this policy assured the importance of government involvement in culture in order to ensure the production and consumption of a plurality of cultural forms.

Since Creative Nation we have continued to see a general shift in cultural policy rationales away from an overriding concern with public provision towards an emphasis on entrepreneurial principles such as the new imperatives of ‘arts marketing’. It can be argued that a shift away from the basic principles of public provision in favour of the introduction of entrepreneurial principles in cultural policy may not provide the plurality of cultural productions required in a modern democracy. However, the fact is that government resources are ever dwindling and, in any case, government arts funding has never been a
guarantee of a plurality of cultural production. These debates are irresolvable in the terms in which they are set. Via a historicisation of the rationales framing the conjunction of art, citizenship and government this thesis will provide a new way of reflecting on these current and pressing policy issues.

The need for a history of the major influences on cultural policy in Australia is clear. Jennifer Craik, a specialist in cultural tourism, has commented that analyses of arts or cultural funding in Australia ‘have been sporadic’ and, furthermore, the studies that have been published ‘have been more concerned with particular policies, cultural sectors or personalities than … the machinations that produce certain policy strategies rather than others’ (1996, p. 177). Research for this thesis aims to provide a significant contribution to historical research on arts institutions and programmes as well as providing a more informed base from which to think about the role of government in culture in contemporary Australia.

**Art, Citizenship and Government**

It is possible to provide a distinctive perspective on the history of the relations between culture and government by arguing that the relations between art, government and citizenship are best defined by the ways in which different strategies for the management of populations have been organised and deployed. These relations have been various. For instance, the strategic use of the arts in the Australian post-WWII reconstruction period was prescriptive in relation to the management of a citizenry that would participate constructively in the rebuilding of the Australian nation. Nicholas Brown has shown how these relations shifted during the late 1940s, with a more individualised conception of a self-regulating citizen as the central point of reference during (and beyond) the 1950s (Brown 1994 and 1995).
In arguing that the relations between art, citizenship and government are best understood by the ways in which government has strategically used art to act on ‘the social’, a distinctive set of theoretical perspectives are applied. Specifically, the thesis seeks to describe the intersection of the different organising principles which inform the conjunctions of art, citizenship and government in terms which emphasise the complex and contradictory nature of government rationales for arts administration. The thesis finds no single defining logic to explain the involvement of government in the arts. Rather, it is informed by a particular understanding of governmental power following the theories of Michel Foucault. There are three things in particular which are useful about Foucault’s concept of ‘governmentality’ for this inquiry (Foucault, 1991). The first is the notion that not all forms of political power have their origins in the state; rather, government refers to the activities of all institutions concerned with the regulation and management of populations. Second, and following from this, is the precept that government is not unified in its function. Governmental rationales and technologies are distinctive and have distinct histories. In Foucault’s words, government is actually a question of ‘a range of multiform tactics’ which ‘instead of seeking to found itself in transcendental rules, a cosmological model or philosophical-moral ideal, must find the principles of its rationality in that which constitutes the specific reality of the state’ (1991, p. 97). Third, and developing from the above is the notion that the object of government is population, and that to this object is brought an amalgam of techniques with particular objectives which are practical. In relation to this, Foucault suggests that government is intrinsically involved with moulding both public and private behaviour, or, to put it another way, government is concerned with the ‘conduct of conduct’.

Foucault’s conception of governmentality has been developed as a way of exploring the connections between the government of selves and the government of populations within modern states. Nikolas Rose has used the term ‘neo-liberal’ to refer to the specificity of modern advanced liberal forms of
government which seek to act on the population through society, by acting on it in relation to constructions of social norms. The terms ‘neo-liberal’ and ‘advanced liberal’ have been coined to characterise a shift in the rationality of liberal government which can be dated in Western liberal democracies to post-WWII. This neo-liberal rationality of government has been defined by Graeme Burchell as involving ‘…the rational principle for regulating and limiting governmental activity [which] must be determined by reference to artificially arranged or contrived forms of the free, entrepreneurial and competitive conduct of the economic-rational individual’ (1993, p. 271). Neo-liberal government operates by the generalisation of an ‘enterprise form’ to all forms of conduct (Burchell 1993, p. 275). Thus, where liberal governmentality managed the populace through ‘the social’, via a plethora of techniques for knowing and evaluating social norms; neo-liberal governmentality governs via a range of rationalities and technologies which govern ‘through regulated choices made by discrete and autonomous actors in the context of their particular commitments to families and communities’ (Rose 1996b, p. 328). Rose has coined the phrase ‘the death of the social’ to characterise this shift (1996b). It is possible to trace this shift in governmental rationalities, characterised by a movement away from policy rationales based on the precepts of public provision and towards the imperatives of entrepreneurial governance, through the post-WWII history of art programmes. We will approach the conjunctural specificities of articulations of art, citizenship and government by analysing the productive nature of these relations in terms of the capacities such conjunctions sought to equip in the populations which were their target.

Such a perspective, which ties analysis of the functions of cultural institutions and policy directly to their function as vehicles for the construction of particular kinds of citizenship, enables a shift away from more partisan forms of analysis. Such analysis has traditionally understood the relations between culture and government as negatively defined in terms of ‘dominant’ and ‘oppressed’ cultural forms.
Instead we can side-step this impasse by recognising the relations between art and government as integral to the production of various kinds of civic and ethical capacities. This focus on the purposes of government and the machinations of policy allows the possibility of making concrete interventions in the contemporary cultural policy debate.

During this century there has been a shift in the political rationality which organises government in modern Western liberal democracies. The historical case studies which form section two of the thesis enable us to argue that increasingly, since WWII, cultural programmes have been deployed on the basis of a governmental rationality that can be described as advanced or neo-liberal. This is both in relation to the forms these programmes have taken and in relation to the character of the forms of conduct such programmes have sought to shape in the populations they act upon.

What are we to make of the shift in political expectation which emerged primarily after WWII when support for the arts came to be considered a responsibility of government? This shift is best understood by tracing the relations between the categories of art, citizenship and government. The various conjunctions of these categories have been culturally and historically specific. The history of government involvement with the arts in Australia is best understood through the ways in which art programmes have been brought to bear on populations in order to equip them with particular capacities. We will characterise the programmes and technologies involved in this governmentalisation of art as classically ‘liberal’ and then increasingly, after WWII, as ‘neo-liberal’. Thus, this examination will locate its analysis of the history of arts administration within the broader patterns of the government of culture.¹

¹ We have decided to focus mainly on visual art programmes in this study as it is not possible here to engage with all the cultural forms which are usually defined as making up ‘the arts’. The main reason for this is that the various cultural forms and programmes assembled under this term have quite distinct albeit related histories.
Thesis Organisation

The thesis will be organised in two sections. The first section serves two major functions. First, in its discussion of a number of historically specific articulations of art, government and population it argues that these articulations must always be understood in relation to their conjunctural specificities. Chapter one involves an examination of the concepts ‘public’ and ‘citizenship’ and their historical emergence as terms in art programmes in late eighteenth-century France. This examination takes place via a review of a number of historical and theoretical works which discuss the period. The historical focus of this chapter is on France during the history of the Salon and then during the history of the Louvre art gallery during and immediately after the Revolution. An analysis of these moments allows us to trace a shift in the strategic use of art from a juridico-discursive model, in which art was enlisted in the assertion of an absolute monarch’s power in relation to a limited public, to a model in which, for the first time, it was claimed that art was the property of all the people and further, that it could be representative of and educational for a citizenry.

Chapter two furthers this theoretical and historical work by reflecting on the construction of concepts of ‘the people’ and the population and how these have been historically and theoretically understood in relation to art programmes. This chapter will proceed via a discussion of Antonio Gramsci’s theories of hegemony and the ethical state, and Foucault’s theories of power and governmentality. Specifically, we seek to establish which of these is ‘best to think with’ for the analysis of the relations between culture and government in the specific instance of art programmes which, in having the public as their target, seek to shape that public in various ways. This discussion argues that for our purposes a Foucaultian conception of power, which understands power as diffuse and as implicated in all relations, is a productive way of analysing cultural institutions. It is argued that such a conception allows us to
address the ‘micropolitics of power’ rather than analysing cultural practices and institutions as either designed to secure consent to existing social arrangements or as instances of opposition to hegemonic arrangements. This analysis proceeds via an engagement with the history of the government of art in nineteenth-century Britain. This period is important as the locus for an increase in the perception that art might be useful to the training of ‘good’ citizens. This can be seen in relation to a general shift towards a multiplication of strategies for the management of ‘the social’, which can be traced from the early nineteenth century in, for example, museum policy.

Chapters one and two establish the methodological underpinnings of the thesis. These chapters also allow us to trace some of the historical pre-conditions for our discussion of the relations between art, citizenship and government. In section two of the thesis we argue that this relation is best characterised by the ways in which different strategies for the management of populations through encouraging a citizenry to be self-regulating in various ways have been organised and deployed. Thus, section two can best be described as being to do with an analysis of cultural institutions in terms of the way in which they have been strategically deployed to govern ‘the social’. In the second section of the thesis we argue that there is no single logic to conjunctions of art, citizenship and government, rather, we emphasise the complex and contradictory nature of government rationalities of arts administration. As in section one, it is not possible to offer an exhaustive historical account of these moments. Rather, the purpose is to explore some of the framing discourses for the conjunction of art, citizenship and government in these milieux.

The discursive construction of art as the property of and educative for a general citizenry has formed the basic rationale for art’s governmentisation. The aims of art programmes have been various. Analysis of post-WWII art programmes allows us to reflect on the shifts in rationality which have
characterised government over the last fifty years. The main historical function of section two is to provide a history of the conjunctions of art, citizenship and government in post-war Australia. In order to achieve this aim the section will commence, in chapter three, with an analysis of art programmes in the American ‘New Deal’ and then in Britain during WWII. These historical moments are ones in which we can identify the emergence and development of certain sets of discourses which, in various manifestations, have continued to frame the administration of art to the present day. As with the eighteenth-century French relations between art, public and government discussed in chapter one, and the models for the conjunction of these spheres in nineteenth-century Britain, discussed in chapter two, articulations of art, citizenship and government during the American ‘New Deal’ and in WWII Britain have a paradigmatic status in establishing some of the basic vocabularies on which later conjunctions of art, citizenship and government have drawn. Primarily through an analysis of the Federal Art Project of the ‘New Deal’ and the history of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts (CEMA) (later the Arts Council of Great Britain), this chapter argues that the relations between art, citizenship and government in this period were motivated by a concern to produce a citizenry with the civic and ethical capacities of active participation and shared responsibility. Far from being thought of as the property of the few or the elite, the definitive art programmes of the 1930s and 1940s were titled ‘Art for the People’ and proudly proclaimed that art was the property of ‘Everyman’. The 1930s and 1940s are significant for the way in which cultural policy sought to act on the citizen ‘from a distance’, that is, these strategies hoped to produce and encourage citizens capable of self-regulation in a way that would ensure their active and productive contribution to the nation. An integral part of these various constructions of collectivity was the shaping of a citizen who would participate constructively in her or his working, political and social life.
Chapter four begins the exploration of Australian arts administration which is the subject of the rest of the thesis. In this analysis of the Australian arts funding milieu during post-WWII reconstruction we recognise many of the vocabularies for the articulation of art, citizenship and government which we note in ‘New Deal’ America and WWII Britain. In particular, art programmes were designed to educate individuals in a variety of specific capacities which would enable them to participate constructively in relation to their political, social and economic lives. But, this is not to argue that Australian art programmes emerged in any simply derivative way from developments in America or Britain. Rather, American and British developments were among many influences that Australian art programmes drew upon in specifically local circumstances to come up with distinctive institutions and practices. We will address some of these conjunctural specificities through an analysis of a variety of art programmes, which in having as their common aim the targeting of a wider public, will illustrate for us the vocabularies which framed the articulation of art, citizenship and government in post-war reconstruction Australia. This chapter analyses a variety of cultural programmes in the 1940s including the Australian CEMA, and the travelling exhibitions organised by the National Gallery of Victoria and the Art Gallery of New South Wales. The aim here is to describe some of the conditions of emergence of cultural policy in Australia. It is at this stage in the history of Australian cultural policy that government arts funding (and thereby increased access to art) began to be seen in terms of what would later be framed as a ‘right’ of citizenship, although at this stage it is better and modestly put as an ‘expectation’ of government.

Chapter five is an analysis of the history of the Australia Council from its establishment in 1968 to 1986. This chapter particularly focuses on the government inquiries of this period- the Industries Assistance Commission Report of 1976 and the McLeay Report of 1986. Through this analysis the chapter notes the range of policy discourses which have organised the conjunction of art, citizenship
and government in this period. In particular we argue that during this time frame it is possible to trace a number of important shifts in the nexus of art, citizenship and government. These articulations are best illustrated in the instance of the Australia Council by the increasing importance of economically based arguments in favour of government support for the arts and an increasingly pluralist understanding of the arts audience as made up of different communities with distinct needs and interests. It is here, in the mid to late 1980s, that access to and participation in a plurality of cultural forms comes to be constructed as a ‘right’ of citizenship. At the same time, in this period we can witness the construction of the arts as an industry. These discourses- ‘cultural rights’ and ‘art as industry’- are set up as a polarity in policy discourse and conventional debate.

The thesis will conclude with a discussion of the debates framing contemporary arts policy. Chapter six will continue the theme developed in chapter five of an analysis of the history of the discursive and instrumental understanding of the arts as an industry in Australia. Of particular interest here is an examination of how the competing discourses of ‘cultural rights’ v ‘the arts industry’ have been constructed in contemporary arts policy. This allows us, by way of conclusion, to reflect on some of the ways in which it might be possible to negotiate a way through the seemingly irreconcilable stand off posed by dichotomising the relations between industry and humanistic rationales for arts funding. To anticipate this conclusion we argue for the importance of the continuation of a mix in the contemporary construction of the relations between art, citizenship and government. This mix would seek to explore how the newer market based rationales for arts subvention might combine with rather than replace other important policy goals such as cultural pluralism, access, and research and development.
CHAPTER ONE:

Art and the Public Sphere
In 1794 Jacques-Louis David, the famous painter and leader of national cultural affairs under the French Revolutionary government, described the function of the Louvre:

…”to place everything under the revivifying eye of the people, to illuminate every object in the light of public attention, with that share of glory that it can rightfully claim, to establish in the museum, at last, an order worthy of the objects it houses, let us neglect nothing, citizen colleagues, and let us not forget that the culture of art is one more weapon we can use to awe our enemies. (italics added, in Sherman 1987, p. 40)

There are a number of characteristic assumptions in this statement; three are noteworthy here. For David, the public functions as a way of making open and honest that which is brought to its attention. This late eighteenth-century understanding of public opinion is singular; public opinion here was understood as ‘illuminating’ and was distinguished from the public life characteristic of court society, which was understood as artificial (Sennett 1986, p. 18). Integral to this conception of the public and the second point to note in David’s comment, is the constitution of this public. For David, speaking about an art gallery, its public is ‘the people’ redefined as ‘citizen colleagues’. While there were opportunities for the general public to view art prior to the Revolution- by 1737 the Salon was established as an event of pre-Revolutionary Parisian life- art in this context was not attributed with the ability to represent (or educate) a nation of citizens. The final point, which is related to the previous, is David’s understanding of the particular significance of the objects housed in the Gallery. In order for the revolutionaries to use the ‘culture of art’ as ‘a weapon… to awe our enemies’, art, as it was displayed in Revolutionary France was constructed as representative of the public, understood as a republican nation of citizens. Thus, the classificatory and representational models which organised the contents of the Louvre enabled it and its contents to be framed as representative of and imbued with a capacity to educate the citizens of the new French Republic.
It is in this double function of representation and education that we can trace a discursive model on which later art, citizenship and government relations have drawn. This is not to argue that this discursive model in late eighteenth-century France is the only or the most important conjunction of the relations between art, citizenship and government. Other historical conjunctions of these spheres have also provided important discursive resources for later organisations of the relations between art, citizenship and government. Shifts which occurred in mid to late nineteenth-century Britain in which the relations between art, citizenship and government were organised in terms of the ways in which art could be used strategically as a means to equip a citizenry (particularly the working classes) with certain capacities which would render them self governing in various ways have also been important to inter-war and post-war organisations of the relations between art and ‘the people’. We will trace moments of this nineteenth-century history in our next chapter before engaging in the more detailed analysis of inter-war and post-war constructions of the relations between art, citizenship and government in section two. Nevertheless, it was in France that art was first constructed as bearing a direct relation to a citizenry, it was here that exhibitions were first opened to a general public, and it was here that the first gallery was opened with the goal of formulating a strong relation between the state and its population, the latter framed as a citizenry. It will therefore repay our effort to consider these developments more closely.

A brief comparison of art programmes during the reign of Louis XIV, and the histories of the Salon and the Louvre, just prior to and immediately following the French Revolution demonstrates a significant shift in the discursive construction of the relations between art, citizenship and government. This was partly due to a shift in rationalities of rule which occurred during the eighteenth century. In this new rationality of rule the state was no longer defined as an extension of the Crown but defined in the name of a republican citizenry. This shift in rationalities of rule had a bearing on the discursive relations
between art, citizenship and government. We will argue that this was reflected in the use of cultural resources strategically deployed to act upon and from within a sphere defined as ‘public’. Our discussion here will be limited to the relations between this construction of a ‘public sphere’ and the policies of art institutions both immediately prior to and in the early days of the Revolutionary government. To anticipate our conclusion, it was following the Revolution that it became possible to discuss art programmes in terms of their functioning as sites for the training of the population as citizens. Thus, as well as emphasising the historical specificity of the relations between art, government and the public, this chapter also aims to contribute a description of some of the discursive co-ordinates that enabled the arts to be construed in such a way that they could be thought of as strategic to the formation and distribution of civic capacities. An analysis of the relations between art, government and citizenship can therefore contribute to our understanding of the ways in which citizens have historically acquired the attributes to function as responsible and civic minded. The Revolution is an important moment in this history. Colin Mercer put the significance of this period in concise terms when he commented that:

The Revolution provides for historical scrutiny in exemplary and concise forms a politics of national population and citizen-formation by a saturation of the capillary networks of everyday life… What is involved here is a fundamental re-orientation of the relationship between individuals and government, in this case, through a socio-legal identity which we know as citizenship. (1989, p. 127)

What was involved in this ‘fundamental re-orientation’ which conscripted art to the business of constructing ‘good’ citizens?

**The ‘Image Makers’ of Louis XIV**

The ‘public’ constituted by the arts policies of the reign of Louis XIV was not a public in the general modern conception of the term. In fact, the ‘public’ constituted by the arts administration under Louis only extended to the elite of French society and representatives of overseas monarchies. Under Louis, the
French Court and the King’s power became centralised at Versailles. Norbert Elias understands the distinctive nature of the Court of the European absolutist monarchs through his conception of ‘court rationality’. As he defines it: ‘Court “rationality”,… derived its specific character [not]…, like scientific rationality, from the endeavour to know and control extra-human natural phenomena, …it arose,… from the calculated planning of strategy in face of the possible gain or loss of status in the incessant competition for this kind of power’ (1983, p. 93). This status was directly linked to the relations of the courtiers with the King. This relationship was circular: ‘The nobility’s need for distinction, on which they depend for their existence, serves the king’s need for power’ (Elias 1983, p. 117). A defining feature of this rationality was the visual nature of the assertion of status. Elias argues that the ‘primary compulsion’ for the forms of display and behaviour which characterised the court of Louis XIV ‘sprang from these people’s need to assert their position as court aristocrats, in contra-distinction to the despised country nobility, to the nobility of office and to the people, and to maintain or increase the prestige they had once attained’ (1983, p. 101). The iron absolutism of Louis XIV was a direct response to the Fronde, the last violent rebellion of the old nobility against the new absolutist order. It was due to this that the assertion of centralised power was especially marked during the reign of Louis XIV. Forms of cultural production were a central tool in the representation and assertion of this power.

Echoing Caesar, Louis’s reign was based on the precept ‘l’état, c’est moi’. Thus, the state was taken to be co-extensive with the life and acts of the King. Furthermore, representations of the King were understood to actually be re-presentations, that is, portraits of the King actually were the King. Louis Marin sought to explain this practice as analogous to the practice of the Catholic Eucharist. The aim of his study was:
... to examine the various domains of language – historical narrative and eulogistic discourse – or of image – historical tableau, medal, or portrait – as expansions of the utterance ‘this is my body’ that the mouth of the prince would proffer, thus transforming his representations in their various modalities into so many signs of the political sacrament of the state in the real presence of the monarch. (Marin 1988, p. 9)

Thus, representations of the King were a central feature in the assertion of the King’s power. The official function of arts policy in this period of the ‘Sun King’ was to celebrate the King and emphasise his greatness. The assertion of Louis’s greatness was achieved through the calculated use of many art forms, including: the use of Roman triumphal forms in art and writing, the manufacture of medals to celebrate events during his reign, and the commission of paintings, poems and prose, similarly, to depict and celebrate the victories of Louis. Management of the proliferation of cultural displays glorifying the monarchy required a significant administrative system. In 1661 Louis declared his intention of ruling without a minister, instead he appointed an ‘assistant’- Jean-Baptiste Colbert. Colbert commissioned a report on the uses of the arts ‘for preserving the splendour of the King’s enterprises’ (Burke 1992, p. 50).

On the basis of the recommendations of this report a system of official institutions which organised artists, writers, and scholars in the service of the King was established. This administration was based on a system of academies and committees whose task was solely to supervise the creation of the King’s image (Burke 1992, p. 58). For Peter Burke, the interest in these developments lies in their nature as a rational bureaucratisation of the arts, at least in so far as they represented the organisation of the state’s cultural resources with the particular aim of the creation of a sophisticated body of practitioners enlisted to the task of producing representations of the King (1992, p. 28-9).

This brief sketch of the strategic use of art characteristic of court rationality during the reign of Louis XIV can be summarised by four main defining features: the public for art was specifically the Royal Court and its visitors; art was utilised in the assertion of the King’s power; forms of display utilising visual resources

---

2 Peter Burke (1992) has provided a detailed analysis of the administration of the iconography of the reign of Louis XIV.
and particularly artistic resources were important to the achievement of social status; and, thus, representation was central to the assertion of power in this milieu. The institutional and administrative forms introduced under this absolutist system had far reaching consequences for the eventual construction of a citizen public for art. We will see that some of the discursive forms framing this conjunction played a significant role in the way that, under the Revolutionary Government, the art gallery was constructed as representative of the state and its citizenry. Above all policies that had been in place for the use of royal art treasures as a means of cultivating a national identity in which the nation was defined as the monarch’s realm were redeployed to promote a civic identity in which the nation was defined as the territory of a republican citizenry.

**The Critics and the Public**

Even by the end of Louis’s reign there were shifts traceable in the discourses of power. Imagery was no longer organised in terms of the self-apparent nature of Louis’s closeness to God; rather, statistics of victories, prisoners, and so forth began to appear on medals, the use of vernacular was recommended on public monuments in order to allow the people ‘the pleasure of participating for once in the magnificence of the state and the glory of their prince’ (in Burke 1992, p. 158). Nevertheless, it was not until after mid-century that we can begin to trace a shift in conceptions of power away from a dominant conception of the monarchy as ‘absolute’.

Jürgen Habermas in *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (1989), argues that this period is significant as the ‘classical’ period of the bourgeois public sphere. In summary, Habermas argues that the emergence of the bourgeois public sphere went hand in hand with the development of public opinion. According to Habermas, the public sphere as it developed in the late eighteenth century comprised a set of

---

3 Also under this reorganisation the Academie Francaise received a quadrupling of state funds (Burke 1992, p. 28-9).
institutions— the press, coffee houses, salons, intellectual societies— in which public opinion could be formed and could be effective politically, that is, it could bear critically on the exercise of state authority. This public sphere presupposed a certain set of conditions; first, the existence of a body of citizens with an existence and interests separate from the state, and second, a modification to the basis on which power was exercised, that is, the emergence of the early modern state as a sphere of public authority. For Habermas, the function of the bourgeois public sphere was the mediation between society and the state:

> With the rise of a sphere of the social, over whose regulation public opinion battled with public power, the theme of the modern public sphere shifted from the properly political tasks of a citizenry acting in common (i.e. administration of law as regards internal affairs and military survival as regards external affairs) to the more properly civic tasks of a society engaged in critical public debate (i.e. the protection of a commercial economy). The political task of the bourgeois public sphere was the regulation of civic society. (1989, p. 52)

Crucial to Habermas’s argument is the fact that the bourgeois public sphere functioned on these terms as a result of the rational critical debate of private persons.

Once power in the state began to shift from absolutism to a state constructed in terms of a sphere of public authority, step ‘by step the absolutism of Parliament had to retreat before… [the bourgeoisie’s] sovereignty’ (Habermas 1989, p. 66). This shift constituted an attempt to make political authority rational by requiring that it be subordinated to the principles of reason arrived at by free and open debate between citizens unfettered by social and political compulsion. Thus, as ‘a consequence of the constitutional definition of the public realm and its functions, publicness became the organisational principle for the procedures of the organs of the state’ (Habermas 1989, p. 83). In other words, for Habermas, this ‘principle of publicity’ was central to the organisation of the democratic state in order for the public sphere to function effectively as the mediator between the interests of the amalgam of private individuals and public authority. Publicity was necessary for the process of rational critical debate which was central to the effective political functioning of the public sphere.
The oppositional nature of this public sphere is crucial to Habermas’s conception. The function of art in this milieu was twofold; it was to be critical and it was to be educational. Thus, he argues, there was a shift from a discursive understanding of the arts as based on representation and display to one in which ‘discussion became the medium through which people appropriated art’ (1989, p. 40). For Habermas, this new form of cultural consumption, while emanating from aristocratic society, was essentially bourgeois. Thus, he argues that while ‘the early institutions of the bourgeois public sphere originally were closely bound up with aristocratic society, as it became dissociated from the court, the “great” public that formed in the theatres, museums, and concerts was bourgeois in its social origin’ (1989, p. 43). These institutions were defined by their public nature: ‘publicness became the organisational principle for the procedures of the organs of the state themselves; in this sense one spoke of their publicity. The public character of parliamentary deliberations assured public opinion of its influence; it ensured the connection between delegates and voters as parts of one and the same public’ (Habermas 1989, p. 83). Thus, for Habermas, the emergence of this new specifically bourgeois form of cultural consumption was also a means for the assertion of bourgeois power. For Habermas, the dismantling of the classical bourgeois public sphere, which was unfettered by either private or state interests, came with the dismantling of this space in the mid nineteenth century principally via the dual action of the ‘societalisation’ of the state and the ‘statification’ of society. This ‘refeudalisation’ of society involved a process through which public functions were transferred to private firms and public authority was increasingly exercised over ‘society’ particularly through the institutions of the welfare state. For Habermas, only ‘this dialectic of a progressive “societalisation” of the state, simultaneously with an increasing “statification” of society gradually destroyed the basis of the bourgeois public sphere- the separation of state and society’ (1989, p. 141). Peter Uwe Hohendahl argues that it is possible to express the nub of Habermas’s analysis of the transformation of the classical bourgeois public sphere ‘as a transition from cultural discourse to
consumption’ (1982, p. 244). For Habermas, the most important point in this transformation is the commercialisation of the media. Once the vehicles of public opinion become beholden to private interest and opinion came to be influenced through irrational means, the integrity of the public sphere was destroyed.  

Habermas’s account of the formation of the classical bourgeois public sphere centres mainly on the British institutions of the press and the book industry. Craig Calhoun, in explaining why Britain is Habermas’s primary model, states that in ‘France a public that critically debated political issues arose only near the middle of the eighteenth century. Even then it lacked the capacity to institutionalise its critical impulses until the Revolution… Only in the years just before the Revolution did the philosophes turn their critical attention from art, literature, and religion to politics’ (1992, p. 14). This limits the degree to which Habermas’s account can be ‘measured’ against the historical circumstances of art programmes in late eighteenth-century France. However, there are other historians who, in elaborating on Habermas’s work, have specifically applied the model of the public sphere to French circumstances. The remaining part of this section will review some of this work which, in either elaborating on or being directly critical of Habermas’s model of the bourgeois public sphere, provide us with some useful historical and theoretical tools with which we might analyse the histories of the eighteenth-century Salon and the Revolutionary Louvre in sections three and four.  

Geoff Eley has argued that because Habermas uses a model of ‘communicative rationality’ to mark the rise of liberalism and by stressing the transition to a more interventionist state under advanced capitalism,  

---

4 Habermas’s model of the public sphere has been key in debates about mass communications and media studies. For an introduction to some of these debates by an influential theorist within the field see Garnham, 1992  
5 *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* first appeared in German in 1962 it was not translated into English until 1989; thus, Habermas has modified some of his original positions. This modification has been particularly in relation to the criticism that Habermas’s original conception took no account of other oppositional public spheres (particularly the plebeian public sphere) which, it has been argued, co-existed with the bourgeois public sphere, see Habermas 1992.
Habermas implies a weak state during the public sphere’s period of formation (1994, p. 320). Eley points out that ‘to deregulate society and confirm a protected space for the public, an entire regulative program was required’ (1994, p. 321). Elias shows how under Louis XIV the ‘bourgeoisie and the kings reciprocally elevated each other, while the remaining [aristocracy] declined’ (1983, p. 205). This was due to Louis’s strategy to remove actual power from the nobility; to this end he expelled the nobility from almost all posts in the higher judiciary and administration. ‘In this way the powerful stratum of the robe came into being, which counterbalanced the nobility in actual power if not in social esteem (Elias 1983, p. 180). For instance, in some ways the bourgeois administrator Colbert had ‘incomparably greater power at his disposal than most members of the high court aristocracy’ (Elias 1983, p. 270). Eley prefers to characterise the late eighteenth-century public sphere not solely in terms of a struggle against traditional authority but as consisting in a concern with the problem of popular containment as well. ‘Consequently’, he argues, ‘the public sphere makes more sense as the structured setting where cultural and ideological context or negotiation among a variety of publics takes place, rather than a spontaneous and class-specific achievement of the bourgeoisie in some sufficient sense’ (1994, p. 306). Elias too argues that the Revolution is not adequately explained in terms of the overthrow of the nobility by the bourgeoisie:

… the idea that the use of physical force by strata previously excluded from the control of the monopoly of force in France is to be explained simply as the struggle of the bourgeoisie against the nobility as the ruling class, is at best a simplification. At the root of this simplification is a confusion of social rank with social power. The nobility… was quite clearly the highest-ranking class in the ancien regime, but it was by no means as clearly the most powerful class. (1983, p. 269)

The dimension of Habermas’s account which limits explanation of the public sphere to a general account of the rise of a sphere which is specifically bourgeois is problematic.6

Keith Baker traces the discursive and institutional conditions which enabled the political relations between the public and the state to be so radically recast in late eighteenth-century France. Baker understands these
conditions and the political language of 1789 in terms of the competition between three strands of discourse—law, politics, and reason—attributes traditionally bound up with the concept of monarchical authority but which were reconceptualised through competing definitions of the ‘body politic’ (1990, p. 25). Thus, Baker argues that the term *opinion publique* emerged in the mid-century period as a ‘central rhetorical figure’ and designated ‘a new source of authority’ (1990, p. 168). While, according to Habermas, the concept emerged to mediate between the state and civil society, Baker emphasises instead that the concept took on meaning ‘in the context of a political crisis of absolute authority (neglected by Habermas, who underestimates the potential for political opposition under the Old Regime)’ (1990, p. 172). Elsewhere Baker argues this point in more detail when he describes his own work as characterising the emergence of the public sphere not on the basis of the appearance of market institutions, as for Habermas, but on the basis of the emergence of the concept ‘public opinion’. This concept he characterises ‘as a political invention in the context of a crisis of absolute authority in which actors within an absolute political system appealed to a “public” beyond as a way of reformulating claims that could no longer be negotiated within the traditional political language’ (1994, p. 193). Thus, Baker argues that the term needs to be understood as a political or ideological construct rather than as a sociological referent, as Habermas understands it. Due to the monarchy’s participation in pamphlet wars it ‘unwittingly conspired with its opposition to foster the transfer of ultimate authority from the public person of the sovereign to the sovereign person of the public’ (Baker 1990, p. 172). Baker accords with Eley’s point that it is problematic to base an understanding of the history of the Revolution on traditional class categorisations. Eley argues that ‘it is important to acknowledge the existence of competing publics not just later in the nineteenth century, when Habermas sees a fragmentation of the classical liberal model… but at every stage in the history of the public sphere…’ (1994, p. 306).\(^7\)

---

\(^6\) See Hohendahl, 1982 for an extensive review of some of the major criticisms of Habermas’s model of the public sphere. 
\(^7\) See also for example Garnham, 1992 who, while arguing that a modified model of the public sphere may be useful, sets out a list of the classic problems with Habermas’s account of the bourgeois public sphere including Habermas’s neglect of the
However, Craig Calhoun argues that ‘Habermas does not mean to suggest that what made the public sphere bourgeois was simply the class composition of its members. Rather, it was society that was bourgeois, and bourgeois society produced a certain form of public sphere’ (italics in original, 1992, p. 7).

This new sociability, defined by rational-critical discourse, depended on the rise of national and territorial power states on the basis of early capitalism which led to the idea of society as separate from the state and of the private as separate from the public (Calhoun 1992, p. 7). Thus, a new sphere of public authority was created by the development of public bureaucracies. Calhoun summarises the new public authority in this way: the ‘very idea of the public was based on the notion of a general interest sufficiently basic that discourse about it need not be distorted by particular interests (at least in principle) and could be a matter of rational approach to an objective order, that is to say of truth’ (1992, p. 9). Much of the criticism of Habermas’s model has been directed at this assertion of a universalist rationality. Calhoun argues for instance that when ‘Habermas treats identities and interests as settled within the private world and then brought fully formed into the public sphere, he impoverishes his own theory’ (1991, p. 35).  

Feminist criticisms of and elaborations on Habermas’s model of the public sphere have been influential in arguing for a model of the public sphere which takes account of plural interests and identities. Carol Pateman, Joan Landes and Nancy Fraser have argued that Habermas’s account idealises the public sphere and that the constitution of the bourgeois public sphere was gendered in a way which excluded women from public life. For both Pateman and Landes this is primarily because the bourgeois public sphere was

---

8 See Calhoun, 1995, for a more detailed account of the ways in which critical theory can be ‘rethought’ so that it can engage with categories of ‘difference’.

9 See also Outram, 1989, who argues that the construction of the body in the bourgeois public sphere was essentially male and that the male body was the bearer of public authority. If we recall our discussion above about the King’s body as the
constructed in a way which was essentially masculine. In fact it was dichotomised against the femininity of the ancien regime. Pateman argues that:

To dismiss Rousseau’s or the other contract theorists arguments about the political significance of sexual difference as irrelevant or merely peripheral to their theories, is to disregard a fundamental feature of the original contract said to create the modern world of citizenship. Women’s political disorder means that they must be excluded from the original agreement. The original contract is a masculine or fraternal pact. (italics in original, 1989, p. 6)

Landes’s analysis of the public sphere, with the French context in mind, reappraises Habermas’s conception of the public sphere. She argues that the early modern classical revival invested public action with a masculinist ethos and ‘this was compounded, not undermined, by the eighteenth century bourgeois repudiation of aristocratic splendour and artifice in favour of the values of nature, transparency, and law’ (1988, p. 3-4). Thus, the exclusion of women from the bourgeois public sphere was a central dimension of its construction (Landes 1988, p. 7). For Landes, this was due to the association of women with the ‘feminised culture of le monde’ where society was characterised as being based on irrationality and spectacle against which the ideals of a masculinist rationality and transparency were placed. Landes, like Habermas, emphasises the importance of cultural institutions in this transformation:

… the bourgeois model of public opinion predicated on universal reason, nature, and truth was a product of the bourgeoisie’s idealisation of the immediate, instantaneous forms of communication which seemed to exist between writer and public, and especially between artist and audience… in the new public spaces of Old Regime society. In other words, the transformation of the public sphere passed through a cultural grid. (1988, p. 48)

Also passing through this cultural grid was the discursive repositioning of femininity and masculinity which occurred during this transformation. Landes shows that the direct effect of this discursive refashioning of gender was the construction of femininity as non rational; thus, ‘the dominant associations of public women were with the spectacular and theatrical functions of the absolutist public’ (1988, p. 50).
While women played an important political and cultural role in the *ancien régime* they were excluded from the bourgeois public sphere. Landes concludes: ‘The shift from the iconic imagery of the Old Regime to the symbolic structure of bourgeois representation was constitutive of modern politics *as a relation of gender*’ (italics in original, 1988, p. 204).

Nancy Fraser, drawing especially on the work of Landes and Eley, argues that the main irony in Habermas’s account is that:

A discourse of publicity toting accessibility, rationality, and the suspension of status hierarchies is itself deployed as a strategy of distinction. Of course, in and of itself this irony does not fatally compromise the discourse of publicity… Nevertheless, it does suggest that the relationship between publicity and status is more complex than Habermas intimates, that declaring a deliberative arena to be a space where extant status distinctions are bracketed and neutralised is not sufficient to make it so. (1992, p. 115)  

For Fraser, the ‘bracketed’ nature of social distinctions in the public sphere is not an adequate guarantee of equality, in fact, ‘discursive interaction within the bourgeois public sphere was governed by protocols of style and decorum that were themselves correlates and markers of status inequality. These functioned informally to marginalise women and members of the plebeian classes and to prevent them from participating as peers’ (1992, p. 119). Stallybrass and White also argue that the bourgeois public sphere can be understood as organised by relations of distinction. The ‘classical’ public sphere was defined by its opposition not only to the aristocracy but also to the ‘low-Other’ (1986, p. 87). Thus, the new spaces of the public sphere were defined by certain distinctive practices which were exclusionary. Stallybrass and White argue that:

Concomitant with the establishing of the ‘refined’ public sphere and its distinct notion of professional authorship was a widespread attempt to regulate body and crowd behaviour so as to create conditions favourable to the operation of the sphere. This was not merely an incidental act of social hygiene. As new sites of assembly appeared these were regulated
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10 See also Fraser, 1989.
11 In relation to this point Fraser discusses the work of Mary Ryan who establishes the existence of a plurality of alternative public spheres in which women participated. These included a counter civil society of alternative, voluntary associations, and the participation of women in male-dominated working-class protest activities. See Ryan, 1992.
according to manners and norms significantly different from those of the places they were displacing. (1986, p. 83-84)

The regulation of such spaces through the accordance with new norms and forms of conduct was achieved partly by ‘an overall strategy of expulsion which clears a space for polite, cosmopolitan discourse by constructing popular culture as the “low-Other”, the dirty and crude outside to the emergent public sphere’ (1986, p. 87). Also discussing the British context Terry Eagleton has emphasised this aspect of the public sphere:

The English bourgeois public sphere of the early eighteenth century… is indeed animated by moral correction and satiric ridicule of a licentious, socially regressive aristocracy; but its major impulse is one of class-consolidation, a codifying of the norms and regulating of the practices whereby the English bourgeoisie may negotiate an historic alliance with its social superiors. (1991, p. 10)

For Eagleton, the operation of the public sphere is ideological in that its truth, defined as universal, ‘serves to mask the exploitation of civil society’ (1991, p. 117). Stallybrass and White criticise this aspect of Eagleton’s argument which follows Habermas in the sense that while Eagleton recognises the importance of the connection between ‘discourse and topographical network’, nevertheless, he ‘only gestures to the network of discursive sites and institutions within which eighteenth-century notions of the “public”, the “author” and “constituencies” were emerging’ (1986, p. 82).

In contrast to criticisms of Habermas’s model for its attachment to a universalist model of rationality, Hohendahl argues that ‘rational debate is possible without the presupposition of demonstrative universal norms’ (1992, p. 107). Elsewhere Hohendahl has argued at length that in Habermas’s ideal model of the public sphere it

… is precisely under the conditions of a fully differentiated social system in which traditional values and norms have been liquidated or have lost their influential power that Habermas now postulates the validity of a universalistic morality emerging from the fundamental norms of rational speech. This morality, however, is not deduced according to the form of metaphysical moral systems; on the contrary, it represents an open, amenable
system which can be developed further through collective learning processes. These norms are constructed through identity projections. (italics added, 1982, p. 278)

While this may be so, our concern here is not only with the discursive construction of ‘rational speech’. Our discussion of the Salon and the Louvre aims to account for the institutional conditions of discourse. Stallybrass and White have argued in favour of an analysis which recognises both the discursive and institutional logics which define the public sphere. For them, ‘discursive space is never completely independent of social place and the formation of new kinds of speech can be traced through the emergence of new public sites of discourse and the transformation of old ones’ (Stallybrass and White 1986, p. 80).

There have been two main sets of points accentuated in the previous review of work directly critical of and/or elaborating on Habermas’s model of the ‘classical’ bourgeois public sphere. The first main criticism of Habermas’s public sphere model is that it takes no account of the multiple factors which impinged on the construction of this sphere. Habermas constructs the public sphere as oppositional to court society. However, it is clear that the bourgeois public sphere was just as much constructed around a set of distinctive practices and norms of conduct which distinguished it from other public spheres. Thus, we can think of the bourgeois public sphere as defined not only by its rational-critique of the state but also in the way this rational-critical debate and the forms of conduct which were appropriate to its practice were reflected in particular habits of body and mind, and rules of conduct in public sphere institutions. The second set of points to be emphasised from the previous discussion is the importance of space and site to the emergence and operation of discursive constructs. This latter point emphasises the importance of recognising the network of discursive sites and institutions within which eighteenth-century notions of the relations between public, citizen and art emerged.
The Salon

With our above summary of the major criticisms of Habermas’s conception and some historical and theoretical elaborations of the bourgeois public sphere we are now placed to argue three interrelated points, particularly focusing on the institutional examples of the Louvre and the Salon. We shall argue, first, that the public sphere of eighteenth-century France was highly selective in the publics which participated in it. The second contention is that the character and origins of the late eighteenth-century bourgeois public sphere are not understandable by an analysis of its discursive properties only. Rather, an understanding of the public sphere’s institutional dimensions in relation to their proscription of certain codes of behaviour and rules of conduct is integral to understanding the relations between art, citizenship and government in this milieu. The third main point to the following discussion is that while we can describe the eighteenth-century histories of the Salon and the Louvre in terms of a shift in the discursive framing of the relations between art, the public and the state, at the same time there are also discursive continuities in the construction of these relations. As we have argued the shifting relations between art, public and state in eighteenth-century France cannot be described in terms of a developmentalist teleology. The discursive models which framed these conjunctions, the importance of ‘transparency’ in the late eighteenth-century Salon for instance, were significant in their influence on later conjunctions of the spheres of art, citizenship and government. Thus, we will emphasise the interrelations between the discourses of power which separate and characterise the ‘absolute’ state from the ‘governmental’ state in this period.

Art administration during the reign of Louis XIV was significant for the complex organisational systems which were established under Colbert. The institutional and administrative forms introduced under this system had far reaching effects on the eventual creation of a citizen public for art. Indeed after mid-
century Colbert and his reforms were idealised and their example was used to justify calls for extended state expenditure on the arts in the name of the French people. In terms of art administration, the system set up under Louis XIV for the glorification of the monarchy was crucial to the organisation of the system set up after the Revolution for the glorification of the citizenry.

R.G. Saisselin has argued that in order for art to be thought of as useful to a general citizenry the transformation of art into culture was required. This involved three general stages which are characterised overall by the shift from art as *divertissement* to a bourgeois aesthetics ‘in which the arts of moral and public utility were considered superior to the arts of divertissement’ (1970, p. 205). According to Saisselin in the first stage art was characterised simply as *divertissement*; art was not understood to have a connection with salvation or morality, art was simply a diversion (1970, p. 195). Art’s second transformation, as identified by Saisselin, was best exemplified by the abbé Du Bos who in 1719 ‘argued that the arts could in effect be a therapeutics of the passions and divert men from ennui’ (1970, p. 195). At this time an educated comportment in relation to art was an important social distinction; however, this was not connected to an understanding of art as a vehicle of moral and civic virtue. For Saisselin, the third stage of transformation took place in the late eighteenth century and involved the transformation of the classification of art from *divertissement* to a theory of aesthetics which was tied inextricably to the moral value of the art:

> The very real need for diversion within an aristocratic society was turned into a weakness by the philosophes who attached virtue to public utility… What they wanted was great art, to be founded upon permanent values such as the true, the good, and the beautiful… artists were exhorted to devote themselves to an art of moral, civic and therefore public utility; the artist was… to be first and foremost a citizen. (1970, p. 201-02)

For Saisselin, this shift from art as *divertissement* to art as a vehicle for the encouragement of moral and civic virtue is understood in terms of the hegemony of an aesthetics which is bourgeois. We have discussed how in the bourgeois public sphere art becomes an oppositional vehicle for free and rational
discussion, characterised above all by the ‘will to publicity’. In the history of the eighteenth-century Salon we can trace this discursive repositioning of the relations between art and public. For us, the two most important facets of this particular conjunction of art, public and state are, first, the requirement that art be available to the gaze of publicity if it was to be deemed ‘quality’; second and at the same time, art in this milieu was required to represent ideal republican qualities.

By 1737 the Salon had become an established fact of pre-Revolutionary Parisian life (Crow 1985, p. 3). Organised annually by the ‘Academie’, the Salon was free to any one who wanted to attend.\(^\text{12}\) Thus, the eighteenth-century Salon marked a substantial shift from earlier deployments of art as part of ritualistic ceremonies designed to display the glory of the monarchy to an elite few. The specificity of this shift is worth remarking. Thomas Crow argues that ‘the Salon was the first regularly repeated, open, and free display of contemporary art in France to be offered in a completely secular setting and for the purpose of encouraging a primarily aesthetic response in large numbers of people’ (1985, p. 3). The function of the Salon was to display the glory of the King via a display of the skill of the Academicians; nevertheless, it was crucial that this display was open to the general public and furthermore, unlike festivals and other public displays of the King’s glory, the Salon was institutionalised and constructed in such a way as to encourage critical discussion of the art on display.

The emphasis on publicity as essential to the production of quality art was based on a theme characteristic of the late eighteenth century, that of transparency. This rationale argued that the quality of art depended on public scrutiny and therefore quality would be reduced if the audience for art was restricted. In philosophical debate the notion of transparency was counterposed to the qualities of spectacle and theatre

\(^{12}\) In contrast, the exhibitions of the Royal Academy in London charged an entrance fee. According to Sir Joshua Reynolds in the ‘Advertisement’ to the exhibition of 1771 this cover charge was in order to discourage ‘improper persons’ from attending (in Barrell 1986, p. 77).
which were seen as characteristic of the *ancien regime*. For example, Jean-Jacques Rousseau in his search for transparency ‘sought not merely to reveal the truth of the world, but also to make manifest his own internal truth, his own authentic self’ (Jay 1994, p. 90). Jean Starobinski elaborates on the theme of transparency in Rousseau’s work. For Rousseau, transparency is linked to ‘social visibility’ through publicity, which

… does not legitimate what people have but what they are. Each person is ‘alienated’ in the gaze of others, and each restored to himself by means of universal ‘recognition’… what [the self] discovers is pure freedom, pure transparency, through its intimate association with other free and transparent souls, indeed, with the ‘communal soul’. (Starobinski 1988, p. 97)

In expressing the ideal conditions for transparent and authentic communication Rousseau above all idealised the gathering together of people (his ideal form was the festival). It is worth quoting his description of the festival ideal at length as it illustrates for us the main discursive relations of transparency and publicity:
Let us not opt for these *exclusive* spectacles, which sadly *enclose* a small number of people in a *dark cavern*; which restrain them, fearful and immobile, in silence and inaction; and which show nothing but *walls, steel blades*, soldiers, and other distressing images of *servitude* and *inequality*. No! happy nations, these festivals are not yours. It is in the *open air, beneath the sky* that you ought to gather…
But what will the objects of those spectacles be?… *make the spectators the spectacle*; make them actors; see to it that each person sees and loves himself in the others, for the greater unity of all. (in Starobinski, italics in original 1988, p. 94-95)

Thus, the signifiers of dark, silence, inequality, elite and opaque are juxtaposed against light, communication, people, open and transparent. In a quite different key, Jeremy Bentham was also an advocate of the benefits of transparency. For him it was based on an interest in promoting the rational working of political assemblies, particularly for the meeting of the Estates General in 1789. The function of transparency here was not simply in the interests of promoting the rational debate of individual persons; rather, it was also in the interests of surveillance. Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar and Robert McCarthy Jr. argue that while Bentham’s interest in a regime of publicity was partly in ‘its role in forming enlightened judgements among the elite’ his focus was ‘more sharply on publicity as a system of transparency that simultaneously makes the governors accountable and the governed confident’ (1994, p. 556). Bentham’s interest in publicity was as a pragmatic strategy for surveillance both of the public and of government officials. Rousseau too idealised a mutually beneficial surveillance. The goals of transparency were not simply in the interests of revealing Truth but also in making ‘the spectators the spectacle’. Thus, for Rousseau, his ideal meeting of the public was in the festival which he ‘counterposed to the superficial and illusory theatre he so disliked: the festival was a model of total participation’ (Jay 1994, p. 92).

The benefits of public participation and transparency underpinned the most well known and also the first public call for a public art gallery- *Reflexions sur quelques causes de l’état present de la peinture en France*¹³- written in 1747 by La Font de Saint-Yenne. This pamphlet was a critique of that year’s Salon, arguing that French painting had slid into decadence which, for the writer, was epitomised by the Rococo
Rather, La Font argued that France should return to the mandate provided by the arts policies of Louis XIV. Following this pamphlet there was an increase in the number of pamphlets advocating a publicly funded gallery. In direct response to this the *Directeur-General des Batiments*, Lenormand de Tournehem, put part of the royal collection on public display two days a week in the Luxembourg Palace. Crow is cautious of asserting a developmental sequence of events here. Rather, he points out that while the ‘institution of a regular public audience may well have revived the old authority and properties of state patronage… those in charge did not want that dependence overstressed’ (1985, p. 7). For example, there was an ‘angry, even violent’ reaction to La Font’s publication. One of the reasons so little is known about him is that the reaction succeeded in ‘hounding him back into obscurity’ (1985, p. 7). Nevertheless, it is clear that there developed in the Salon, for the first time, a space which linked art and the public in a way which was significantly different from the more traditional ceremonial uses of art. However, it would also be incorrect to argue that these older characteristic forms for the deployment of art, which interpellated the people simply as witnesses of power, were not exercised in this new space for the display of art. We will argue this point further below, for now it remains to analyse the construction of the Salon public.

The Salon was well attended by a broad public: eighteenth-century estimates range from 20,000 to 100,000 (Crow 1985, n1, p. 259). However, the audience attending the Salon who could ‘read’ the paintings on display was limited. Miriam Levin has argued that the use of images from classical culture ‘impose on the population an unfamiliar vision of society… along with reliance on scholarly rather than popular sources for the poses, makes it necessary to know the rules for “reading” the imagery to interpret

---

13 *Reflections on Some Causes of the Current State of Painting in France*

14 Rococo was a style of art and architecture which was characterised by its ornate nature but also by its intimate and playful subject matter. It emerged in France in the early eighteenth century. It was contrasted unfavourably, by critics such as La Font and Voltaire, to the heroic history style of painting whose function was to educate the audience in the classical virtues.

15 J.H. Plumb has argued that it was during the eighteenth century a mass audience for culture began to emerge (1974, p. 17).
the art’ (1982, p. 66). However, Crow has shown that quite a ‘general’ public was educated to recognise history painting as the highest genre and thus the noblest and most virtuous; an exact and detailed reading of the allegories in the paintings would not have been necessary to get the main point of the subject matter which was the virtuous nature of noble actions (1985, p. 107). Nevertheless, we must be aware that the public spoken to in the Salon was limited. This consideration is crucial to any assessment which gauges the political nature of the Salon space, particularly in the years just prior to the Revolution.

As part of the claim that Rococo painting epitomised the decline of French painting a parallel call was made for the reinstatement of history painting as the genre which could rightly claim to be the most prestigious. This was due to the genre’s subject matter which visually retold the heroic myths of classical Greece and Rome. The elevation of the history painting genre in the Salon meant that some knowledge of classical culture was required to fully appreciate, at least, these paintings. Crow comments that this ‘did not represent a wilful withdrawal of access, but it did unavoidably express the contradictory character of the public exhibition under the Old Regime’ (1985, p. 17). The effects of this shift from ‘art as divertissement’ to art defined as representative of moral, social and civil virtue were definite. ‘the social’ and cultural position of the artist changed from artisan to moral representative/guardian, and parallel to this shift was a corresponding shift which emphasised the morally improving aspects of art. As Crow comments ‘By 1790, the equation between the public good and the most advanced art was no longer a question of contested metaphor’ (1985, p. 258).

‘The emergence of [the Salon] public over the course of the eighteenth century is traceable as a force of disruption and recombination, accommodated at intervals, but always exceeding and challenging the received categories of high culture’ (Crow 1985, p. 254). It is thus that Crow traces the emergence of a particular kind of art and public conjunction out of the dynamic relationship between policies, critical
publications, the use of art by bourgeois families to gain political power, and the personalities and actions of the artists themselves. It is only in terms of this combination of factors that we can understand the political importance of the history paintings of the artist Jacques-Louis David in the years leading up to the Revolution. In his immensely popular paintings the political rhetoric of the Revolution was clear, anti-style versus style, plain speaking versus the ‘perfumed, overdressed, and affected’ (in Crow 1985, p. 223). David actively publicised himself as in opposition to the traditional institutions of art such as the Academy.\footnote{16 In fact after the Revolution David himself organised the demise of the Academy after the Salon of 1789.} For a brief moment, the public of the Salon could be defined as primarily oppositional to the state. However, as we have seen, and as Crow argues, the dynamic underlying this passage of art into the public sphere was initiated ‘from a state bureaucracy eager to use culture for its own ends. That official ambition expands the potential claim of art to stand for public interests and makes it imperative that some broadened audience be assembled to ratify that claim, if only by its simple existence’ (1985, p. 134).

**The Louvre**

Our brief discussion of Bentham’s design for the meeting of the Estates General in 1789 introduced a concern with the ways in which bodies, things, and spaces were positioned in a variety of regulatory contexts. The art museum, as it was fashioned in the late eighteenth century, was a new public context for art which above all organised its space and visitors to communicate the glory of the French nation and then, after the Revolution, of the French nation and its citizenry. This history has been read ‘negatively’, as one of the complicity of museums in the surveillance and confinement of passive citizens in the production of ‘docile bodies’ (Hooper-Greenhill 1989, p. 71). There is no doubt that the museum-going-public was organised on the basis of a complex set of procedures for organising the body in relation to its comportment, its dress, where it went within the museum and how it viewed the objects on display. However, rather than viewing the history of the museum as one of confinement we will follow Tony
Bennett when he argues that the history of the museum can be viewed positively as defined by ‘the opening of objects to more public contexts of inspection and visibility: this is the direction of movement embodied in the formation of the exhibitionary complex. A movement which simultaneously helped to form a new public and inscribe it in new relations of sight and vision…’ (1988, p. 85-86).

There was a multitude of initiatives for the shaping of a particular kind of French citizenry after the Revolution. In the official catalogue of the Salon of 1793 the Minister of the Interior wrote that the function of art was to ‘continually place before our eyes the events of our national history and those of ancient peoples worthy to serve us as examples. May the arts speak to us always of the love of country, of humanity and of virtue…’ (in Holt 1983, p. 46). The notion of art as useful for the education and encouragement of a particular kind of virtuosity in a citizenry entered official policy after the Revolution when art was used to create a citizenry imbued with republican values. In her analysis of the festivals of the French Revolution Mona Ozouf emphasises how these festivals acted to shape the people in certain ways. She comments, ‘the festival was an indispensable complement to the legislative system, for although the legislator makes laws for the people, festivals make the people for the laws’ (1988, p. 9). Thus, the festivals were designed to continue the republican training gained at school and to train those who had not received a republican education (Ozouf 1988, p. 197). Characteristic of the revolutionary festivals was their construction of the people as a gathering not a crowd, thus, participation in them was a lesson in civic behaviour. Ozouf puts the point this way when she writes that the festivals were organised on the basis that:

The whole of life should be caught up in the festival if one accepts that the festival is a lesson in everyday morals, the impregnation of every citizen by the spirit of the Republic. This presupposes trust in men’s ability to be educated: like the pedagogy of the

---

17 It is worth noting here that this notion of gatherings of people as productive in relation to an education in civic virtue (as we have also noted in Rousseau above) was not replicated in the same extent in Britain. Stallybrass and White make this point in a discussion of The Prelude where Wordsworth describes Bartholomew Fair as ‘a seething mass’ (1986, p.109-121).
Enlightenment, the organisers of the festivals inherited a fervent belief in the ability to train minds. (1988, p. 197)

Lynn Hunt also argues that cultural tools were an essential part of revolutionary politics. Indeed, Hunt, like Stallybrass and White, argues that the actual cultural forms and sites used by the revolutionaries were constitutive of their social and political reality. In Hunt’s words:

… political language was not merely an expression of an ideological position that was determined by underlying social or political interests. The language itself helped shape the perception of interests and hence the development of ideologies. In other words, revolutionary political discourse was rhetorical; it was a means of persuasion, a way of reconstituting the social and political world. (1986, p. 24).

Within the constitution of this social and political world the theme of transparency was dominant. Hunt argues that as well as the importance of transparency as a political discourse the ritual forms which sought to make the citizenry transparent to itself ‘were not metaphors of power; they were the means and ends of power itself’ (1986, p. 54). Thus, the cultural rituals in which the citizenry engaged- the Revolutionary festivals, the Louvre- while functioning metaphorically to assert the open and egalitarian nature of the new French Republic were, at the same time, didactic in their pedagogical aim to inscribe in the population new forms of civic conduct and identity. Thus, transparency ‘could only work if didacticism prepared the way’ (Hunt 1986, p. 73).

In the Republic culture was used strategically to educate the citizenry in the glory of French history, art, and the nation. The spaces of the museum and the festival were also spaces in which the French people could be shaped in terms of the particular comportments, both mental and physical, required of them by the Republican state. Now presented as the property of free citizens, art, along with good road systems, schooling, the nationalisation of language, propaganda in the army, and bureaucratic routine, was viewed as useful to social administration.18

---

18 For a discussion of the development and impact of such changes on the governmentisation of ‘the social’ in rural France see Weber, 1976.
In the late eighteenth century we find the origins of the modern museum’s mission to educate and conserve. Andrew McClellan has traced this history from an analysis of the hang installed in the Luxembourg Palace in 1750 to the early history of the Louvre. McClellan argues that while the modern museum form was based on the revolutionary principles of liberty, equality and fraternity, its history is one of tracing the competition between the principles of revolutionary ideals and those of princely taste and patronage (1994, p. 12). In organising the first hang at the Luxembourg in 1750 ‘a new set of priorities came into play’ which were ‘aimed at instructing artists and would-be amateurs in the art of painting’ (McClellan 1994, p. 2-3). While entry to the Luxembourg from 1750 was open to all and free of charge, the fact that it was primarily meant for the education of artists and amateurs was exemplified by its ‘mixed school’ arrangement of the works on display.¹⁹

In the 1770s and 1780s, during the administration of the Comte d’Angiviller, the King’s Director of Royal Buildings, plans were made for a Grand Gallery:

Aware of the museum’s political potential and influenced by Enlightenment ideas about the importance of public instruction, d’Angiviller intended to use the museum to address those segments of society whose voice made up ‘public opinion’ on issues of private morality, public service, and devotion to king and country. (McClellan 1994, p. 8)

McClellan argues that it was thanks largely to d’Angiviller’s efforts on this project that ‘the ideal of a museum as a princely cabinet, designed for an elite of artists and amateurs, was transformed into what in retrospect can be recognised as the modern museum of art, a state institution occupying centre stage in the public life of the capital’ (1994, p. 50). From mid century techniques of restoration were central to the definition of art as a state responsibility. As techniques of restoration improved, acquisitions which before would have been unthinkable now enabled d’Angivillier to take credit for the state’s act in preserving
what would otherwise have been left to decay.\textsuperscript{20} By late in the century the restoration of paintings and their display for public inspection was constructed as a government responsibility. In 1783 La Blancherie epitomised these sentiments when he wrote:

\begin{quote}
Artistic masterpieces belong less to those who own them than to the nation, especially when they are on public display. It is all too common an occurrence,… that the most beautiful things are allowed to perish through negligence or ignorance. It would be worthy of the government’s munificence to employ a reliable artist to supervise the conservation and restoration of all such paintings and valuable objects. (in McClellan 1994, p. 74)\textsuperscript{21}
\end{quote}

In the event, d’Angivillier’s Grand Gallery project was never finished. While we know that one of the chief goals of this project under Louis XVI was the glorification of French art and history and we can assume that this would have been reflected in the installation of the artwork, it was left to the Revolutionary museum to install a hang which was constructed on the basis of a relation between the nation and its art.

While McClellan argues convincingly that it is most likely that the Louvre hang under d’Angivillier’s Grand Gallery project would have been the same as the Revolutionary hang, the positioning of the public in the later space would necessarily have been constructed differently. The first installation at the Louvre, opened in 1793,\textsuperscript{22} was hung on the ‘mixed school’ arrangement. However, this decision was attacked and the museum was subsequently rehung in 1794 to reflect national school and historical sequence.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[19] The ‘mixed school’ arrangement was organised so that paintings were hung together either on the basis of an artist and his or her oeuvre or else organised by the comparison of different schools. The viewer was then meant to compare the works on the basis of a set of rules consisting of form, composition, drawing, colour, and expression (McClellan 1994, p. 34).
\item[20] Robert Picault, a restorer attached to the Luxembourg Gallery, perfected the technique of transferring a painting’s layers from one surface to another. McClellan describes how ‘Greeting the visitor to the Luxembourg Gallery in 1750 was Andrea del Sarto’s \textit{Charity}, and displayed next to it, on a second easel, was the wooden support from which the painting had been transferred. What better testimony to the government’s concern than the time-worn, worm-eaten panel juxtaposed with the revived masterpiece, brought back from the brink of ruin’ (1994, p. 27).
\item[21] The argument that those who would or could not restore Europe’s art treasures did not deserve them, was the justification used by Napoleon’s government when he confiscated Europe’s great art treasures.
\item[22] Also in 1793 the National Convention dissolved the Royal Academies and the Commune Generale des Arts (formed by David in 1790) was instituted officially. The Salon of 1793 was the largest salon of the eighteenth century with 367 artists showing, as compared to 88 in the 1789 Salon (Holt 1983, p. 39-42).
\end{footnotes}
The importance of the Louvre was emphasised soon after the Revolution. Jean-Marie Roland, Minister of the Interior and to whom the museum was assigned, wrote to David that:

This museum must demonstrate the nation’s great riches... France must extend its glory through the ages and to all peoples: the national museum will embrace knowledge in all its manifold beauty and will be the admiration of the universe. By embodying these grand ideas, worthy of a free people... the museum... will become among the most powerful illustrations of the French republic. (italics added, in McClellan 1994, p. 92)

Thus, the contents of the museum were presented as the property of the public and that public was constructed as a ‘free people’ or citizenry. The Louvre became an important institutional space for the shaping of a new set of relations between state and citizen.

Duncan and Wallach have argued that the Louvre is significant as the first ‘universal survey museum’ (1980). This type of museum, they argue, was developed as a technique for the display of a particular type of power- state power- rather than, the power of a monarch. Thus, the museum constructed a particular relation between the state and the people, one which displayed the state and its history to the inspection of its citizens through the display of royal treasures in a democratic public setting. This deployment of art reframed it as embodying a democratic public representativeness. Duncan and Wallach summarise this point by writing that ‘the creation of the public art museum did not merely involve opening up a royal ceremonial space to a newly constituted public. To serve the needs of the state, the collection had to be presented in a new way’ (1980, p. 455). Thus, the collection was hung in a way which depicted the glory of the nation and the state: ‘In this type of museum, the visitor moves through a programmed experience that casts him (sic) in the role of an ideal citizen- a member of an idealised “public” and heir to an ideal, civilised past’ (1980, p. 452). Duncan and Wallach go on to argue that:

---

23 The Museum was inaugurated on August 10th 1793 to celebrate the anniversary of the birth of the Republic, it was renamed the Musee Francais. In 1797 it was renamed the Musee Central des Arts.

24 For a further discussion of these arguments as they apply to museums and citizenship in general see Duncan 1994 and 1995.
Art can be used to realise the transcendent values the state claims to embody. It can make good the state’s claim to be the guardian of civilisation… Thus the museum is the site of a symbolic transaction between the visitor and the state. In exchange for the state’s spiritual wealth, the individual intensifies his (sic) attachment to the state. Hence the museum’s hegemonic function, the crucial role it can play in the experience of citizenship. (1980, p. 457)

The hegemonic role Duncan and Wallach accord to the museum is as a technological structure for the inculcation of bourgeois values by a conflation of these values and national ideology. Daniel Sherman argues that this position generalises the specific institutional histories of art museums, for him it is better to seek ‘to demonstrate that the apparent internal coherence of the art museum is itself a construction, the result of a complex historical evolution shaped as much by contingency as by system’ (1987, p. 39). It is for this reason that, in the prior discussion, we have briefly outlined the diversity of sources for the discursive conjunction of art, citizenship and government which characterised the Louvre. We discussed how in the space of the bourgeois public sphere of the late eighteenth century there were important continuities with the discursive and administrative organisation of cultural power in the ancien regime. These continuities are especially apparent in the cultural technologies developed or appropriated by the Revolutionary government to engender support and to educate its citizenry.

We have described the Louvre as constructed on the basis of a new set of relations between the nation and its citizenry. For Bennett, drawing on Marin, the main effect of this shift was the ‘organisation of a narrative (‘the history of state’) in which it was not the king but the citizen who functioned, simultaneously, as both archnarrator and metanarrator’ (1995, p. 38). Duncan and Wallach have argued that the museum functions as a space of ritual, in the universal survey museum ‘the visitor moves through a programmed experience that casts him (sic) in the role of an ideal citizen- a member of an idealised “public” and heir to an ideal, civilised past’ (1980, p. 451-52). In the post-revolutionary Louvre the royal collection was rehung on the basis of a historical narrative which depicted France as the rightful inheritor
of the classical civilisations of Greece and Rome. ‘The Louvre’s iconographic programme thus dramatises the triumph of French civilisation’ (Duncan and Wallach 1980, p. 459). In this way, by participation in these ritual spaces, the citizenry became both the subject and the object of the museum; both committed to the surveillance and glorification of the nation, symbolised by the art on display, and at the same time the subject of its own surveillance.

Conclusion

This chapter has described a shift in the conjunction of the spheres of art, the public and the state in France during the eighteenth century. We discussed first how during the reign of Louis XIV art was utilised in the production of spectacle and representation which would celebrate and assert the power of the monarch before, primarily, the court and the rural and foreign nobility. During the late eighteenth century the mode of art’s deployment began to shift for a variety of reasons, such as the weak nature of the monarchy under Louis XVI and the need to display and assert his power in a sphere which existed outside the court, thus giving rise to a public sphere. This sphere was constituted by a variety of spaces and institutions, not least amongst which was the press, and was characterised by the ideals of transparency, publicity, and rational-critical debate. Assessments of the quality of art came to be attached to the possibility of its public display and at the same time art’s quality came to be based on the public nature of its subject matter. Thus in 1747 La Font unfavourably compared Rococo, an intimate, playful and theatrical style of painting, to history painting, which depicted and glorified the classical virtues.

In Revolutionary rhetoric the link between art, the nation, and citizenship was made for the first time. Art’s function for the Revolutionaries was to educate the citizen of the new French Republic in ideal

25 Sherman has applied this theory to the history of the development of museums in regional France, see Sherman, 1989.
republican values. Also, in a way that was reminiscent of the reign of Louis XIV, art was to glorify the new Republic both to itself and particularly to foreign countries. In Revolutionary rhetoric art was constructed as representative of and imbued with a capacity to educate the citizens of the new French Republic.²⁶

This chapter has discussed and elaborated on a number of theoretical and historical points which are useful to this thesis’s discussion of the relations between culture and government in the specific instance of art programmes which, in having the public as their target, seek to shape that public in various ways. Specifically, this chapter has discussed a number of points regarding the conjunction of culture and government in the late eighteenth-century public sphere and the French Revolution. These points are useful in their functioning as a description of some models and resources on which later discursive constructions of the relations between art, citizenship and government have drawn. However, reflection on these late eighteenth-century models and resources and their bearing on post-WWII art, government and citizenship articulations is useful only if account is taken of later developments in the relations between culture and government most influentially (for our purposes) in mid to late nineteenth-century Britain.

²⁶ For a detailed discussion of the function of art in the republican programme of late-nineteenth-century France see Levin 1986.
CHAPTER TWO:

Art, Power and Government
How do we theoretically approach the history of culture? Much of the historical work done within cultural studies has been driven by an aim to uncover and expose the workings of a ‘dominant ideology’. Other approaches have applied the concept of ‘hegemony’ as developed by Antonio Gramsci. Another more recent influential framework has been that provided by studies of the history of cultural institutions which have been influenced by the theories of Michel Foucault. The post-Foucaultian work we particularly refer to is that which draws on Foucault’s theories of power and ‘governmentality’. It is not our aim in this chapter to embark on an exhaustive comparison of neo-Gramscian and post-Foucaultian theories; rather our interest is with respect to their bearing on the development of modern forms of government involvement in the spheres of culture. Thus, this chapter will be organised in four parts. Section one will elucidate the general properties of Gramsci’s and Gramscian theories of the ethical state and hegemony. Section two will elucidate the general properties of Foucault’s and Foucaultian theories of power and governmentality. Section three will allow us to critically review both positions and outline the aspects of these theoretical frameworks which we will utilise for our more historically specific discussion in section two of the thesis. Section four will compare and contrast the two theoretical approaches as they apply to the specific history of the relations between government and culture in the specific instance of the administration of art in nineteenth-century Britain. This historical moment is one where we can identify the emergence and development of certain sets of discourses which, in various manifestations, have continued to frame the administration of art to the present day. As with the French eighteenth-century relations between art, public and government which we discussed in chapter one, the models for the conjunction of these spheres in nineteenth-century Britain have a paradigmatic status in establishing some of the basic vocabularies on which later conjunctions of art, citizenship and government have drawn. In summary then, this chapter aims to further establish some historical and theoretical ‘stepping stones’ which will organise our discussion of the relations between art, citizenship and government post-WWII.
Our discussion of Gramscian and Foucaultian theoretical paradigms will aim to establish a set of conceptual tools which we will apply to our analysis of the relations between government and culture in the specific instance of the history of post-WWII art administration. This discussion will add to the theoretical and historical co-ordinates established in chapter one in relation to the examination of the concepts of the ‘public’ and ‘citizenship’ and their historical emergence as terms in arts programmes in late eighteenth-century France. We will do this via a discussion of some of the criticisms of Gramscian and Foucaultian theories of power and government. Of particular interest to us here will be how these different theoretical paradigms utilise the concepts of ‘the people’ and ‘the population’. This will allow us to establish a particular theoretical and historical approach to our more concrete analysis (in the second half of the thesis) of the relations between culture and government in specific instances of art programmes which have sought to act on populations in various ways.

**Gramsci and Gramscians**

In his now definitive article ‘Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms’ (1980) Stuart Hall describes the two dominant theoretical approaches to cultural studies as culturalist and structuralist. The culturalist and structuralist positions he characterises by the work of Raymond Williams and E.P Thompson, and Claude Levi-Strauss and Louis Althusser respectively. Hall argues that utilising a reworked version of Gramsci’s theory of hegemony it is possible to achieve a synthesis of these two positions in a manner which would overcome their respective weaknesses and thereby provide a better theoretical framework with which to study culture.

While allowing that Williams’s and Thompson’s contributions to cultural theory were substantial, Hall questions the ‘culturalist’ basis of their theoretical position that practices can be seen as variant forms
of praxis, or ‘general human activity and energy’ (1980, p. 60). Hall describes the ‘culturalist’ position, drawing mainly on Williams’s work, as consisting of two main ways of conceptualising culture. ‘The first relates “culture” to the sum of the available descriptions through which societies make sense of and reflect their common experiences’ (ibid., p. 59). In this way the concept of culture is pluralised and removed from a hierarchical structure of ‘high’ and ‘low’. Thus:

Even ‘art’- assigned in the earlier framework a privileged position, as touchstone of the highest vales of civilisation- is now redefined as only one, special, form of a general social process: the giving and taking of meanings, and the slow development of ‘common’ meanings- a common culture: ‘culture’, in this special sense, ‘is ordinary’. (ibid., p. 59)

This conception of the ‘ordinariness’ of culture denotes its attachment to the forms and processes in which it is produced and through which meaning is created. The second conceptualisation of culture emphasises culture as ‘social practices’. In this sense Williams defined culture as ‘a whole way of life’. Thus, what is analysed as culture are the patterns of organisation and the forms of interaction which characterise a community. Williams’s theoretical position was constructed against what he saw as the limiting base/ superstructure framework of traditional Marxist theory. Arguing for the effectivity and autonomy of the cultural sphere Williams offered ‘a radical interactionism’ where the ‘underlying patterns which distinguish the complex of practices in any specific society at any specific time are the characteristic “forms of organisation” which underlie them all, and which can therefore be traced in each’ (ibid., p. 60). In this discussion of Williams’s and Thompson’s work Hall argues that both their positions tend to give ‘lived experience’ too central a place in the analysis. ‘The experiential pull in this paradigm, and the emphasis on the creative and on historical agency, constitutes the two main elements in the humanism of the position outlined. Each, consequently accords “experience” an authenticating position in any cultural analysis’ (italics in original, 1980, p. 63). Thus, despite the ‘materialist’ nature of Williams’s and Thompson’s analyses of culture as ‘ordinary’ and as ‘a whole way of life’, ‘in their tendency to reduce practices to praxis and to find common and homologous “forms” underlying the
most apparently differentiated areas, their movement is “essentialising” (ibid., p. 64). For Hall while the opposition to a ‘vulgar materialism and an economic determinism’ (1980, p. 60) in the ‘culturalist’ position is correct, the analytical focus on ‘lived experience’ is ‘essentialising’.

The other main theoretical ‘paradigm’ Hall discerns in cultural studies is the structuralist tradition. Hall describes this theoretical focus as being influenced mainly by the work of Althusser and Levi-Strauss. The variety of structuralist positions have been mainly articulated around the concept of ideology. In his influential ‘Ideological State Apparatus’s’ essay Althusser argued that ideology is embedded in institutions (state apparatuses) and that its social function can be understood structurally as “constituting” concrete individuals as subjects’ (1971, p. 171). As Hall summarises it, Levi-Strauss and his ‘appropriation of the linguistic paradigm, after Saussure, offered the promise to the “human sciences of culture” of a paradigm capable of rendering them scientific and rigorous in a thoroughly new way’ (1980, p. 64). While, in Althusser’s work, this paradigm was utilised in a way in which ‘the more classical Marxist themes were recovered, it remained the case that Marx was “read”- and reconstituted- through the terms of the linguistic paradigm’ (Hall 1980, p. 64). In this a-historical emphasis on the ‘scientific’ analysis of ideological systems, structuralism was opposed to the historical emphases of ‘culturalism’. Structuralism, like ‘culturalism’, moved beyond the base/ superstructure terms of reference. Hall points out that, ‘Levi-Strauss and Althusser, too, were anti-reductionist and anti-economist in their very cast of thought, and critically attacked that transitive causality which, for so long, had passed itself off as “classical Marxism”’ (Hall 1980, p. 65). However, for Hall, the structuralist tradition of analysis also results in a reductive reading of cultural practices. While Hall argues that the structuralist tradition has more to offer concrete analyses of cultural practice, he also points to tendencies within the structuralist enterprise which give too functionalist a reading to conceptualisations of ideology (1980, p. 69).
The concept of ‘experience’ is the point at which the positions of structuralism and ‘culturalism’ mostly sharply diverge. Hall summarises the counter-positions succinctly:

Whereas, in ‘culturalism’, experience was the ground of ‘the lived’- where consciousness and conditions intersected, structuralism insisted that ‘experience’ could not, by definition, be the ground of anything, since one could only ‘live’ and experience one’s conditions in and through the categories, classifications and frameworks of the culture. These categories, however, did not arise from or in experience: rather, experience was their ‘effect’. (italics in original, 1980, p. 66)

For the structuralists these categories which framed experience were unconscious structures, thus experience was an ‘imaginary relation’ not, as for the culturalists, a source of authenticity. In Althusser’s ‘ISA’s’ essay this notion of experience as constructed enabled the development of an account which demonstrated how an ‘imaginary relation’ served the dominance of class interests and ‘through the reproduction of the relations of production, and the constitution of labour-power in a form fit for capitalist exploitation’, the reproduction of the mode of production (ibid., p. 66).

For Hall, the great strength of the structuralist position is its stress on the ‘determinate conditions’ of possibility for human actions and its focus on the application of abstract analysis. While noting a tendency to over-theorise in structuralism, Hall argues that the utilisation of analysis of different levels of abstraction is crucial to the understanding of ‘relationships and structures which cannot be visible to the naïve naked eye’ (1980, p. 67). In other words, Hall argues for a theoretical position which is capable of recognising that thought does not reflect reality, that experience is not authentic but rather these things are ‘articulated’ through particular (unconscious) systems of thought (1980, p. 68). Structuralism’s other strength for Hall is its conception of ‘the whole’. He argues that while culturalist analyses are radically particularist, nevertheless, these particularist analyses are underpinned by a notion of an ‘expressive totality’, thus, the particularism of practice is reduced to praxis or human
activity (1980, p. 68). Structuralism on the other hand, while over-reductive in its conception of structure, has a more complex theorisation of the complexity of the relations between the parts of the structure, it can thus theorise ‘difference’ (ibid.). However, as Hall points out, this focus on ‘difference’ can develop into an analysis which emphasises the ‘necessary non-correspondence’ of practices, as he accuses Foucault’s work of doing (we will discuss this criticism at length in section three) (ibid.). For Hall, this problem can be avoided through the theory of articulation. This theory enables us to think of disparate practices and discourses as groups even though they may have been ‘articulated around contradictions which do not all arise in the same way, at the same point, in the same moment’ (1980, p. 69). Thus, while recognising and accounting for the specificity of practices articulation allows us to recognise their operation within an ensemble (ibid.). In conclusion, Hall’s third point regarding structuralism is in relation to its decentreing of ‘experience’ and its focus on ‘ideology’. For Hall, without ‘ideology’ we cannot grasp the ‘effectivity’ of culture. However, Hall warns of the over-determining functionalist emphasis in structuralism where ideology is always dominant and there is no possibility for struggle. For Hall, these problems are most productively addressed in Gramsci’s work and in, particularly, Ernesto Laclau’s reworking of Gramsci within a post-structuralist framework (1980, p. 69). Before discussing further Hall’s particular version of Gramscian hegemony theory and Hall’s theory of articulation as derived from Laclau, we need to describe the main co-ordinates of Gramsci’s conception of hegemony and the ethical state.

One of the most significant aspects of Gramsci’s work was his understanding of the theory of hegemony. Gramsci’s theory of hegemony went beyond any simple idea of class alliance. Chantal Mouffe defines Gramsci’s notion of a hegemonic class as:

… a class which has been able to articulate the interests of other social groups to its own by means of ideological struggle. This… is only possible if this class renounces a strictly corporatist conception, since in order to exercise leadership it must genuinely concern
itself with the interests of those social groups over which it wishes to exercise hegemony. (1979, p. 181)

This notion of hegemony cannot be reduced to the Marxist idea of dominant ideology which establishes a direct relation between dominance, ideology and culture. Rather, for Gramsci:

A social group can, and indeed must, already exercise ‘leadership’ before winning governmental power (this indeed is one of the principal conditions for the winning of such power) it subsequently becomes dominant when it exercises power, but even if it holds it firmly in its grasp, it must continue to ‘lead’ as well. (1971, p. 57)

Thus, there is no simple relation between consent and dominant ideology in Gramsci’s theory of hegemony. Furthermore, there is no simple conception of class culture, rather there is a complex interplay of relations of social force followed by relations of political force. Gramsci describes the development of these relations as taking place in three stages: the first stage is economic, where members of a professional group are unified on an economic basis, much like guilds; in the second stage, ‘consciousness is reached of the solidarity of interests among all the members of a social class—but still in the purely economic field’, that is, in terms of winning political and juridical equality with the ruling class; the third stage is

… in which one becomes aware that one’s own corporate interests, in their present and future development, transcend the corporate limits of the purely economic class, and can and must become the interests of other subordinate groups too. This is the most purely political phase, and marks the decisive passage from the structure to the sphere of the complex superstructures; it is the phase in which previously germinated ideologies become ‘party’… bringing about not only a unison of economic and political aims, but also intellectual and moral unity, posing all questions around which the struggle rages not on a corporate but on a ‘universal’ plane, and thus creating a hegemony of a fundamental social group over a series of subordinate groups. (ibid., p. 182)

The ‘transcendence’ of the ‘corporate limits of the purely economic class’ does not involve the reflection or imposition of ‘class culture’. Rather, any successful hegemony demands that account be taken of the interests of the groups over which the hegemony is to be exercised. Thus, the effects of hegemony are contradictory. As Christine Buci-Glucksman points out the ‘more authentically
hegemonic a class really is, the more it leaves opposing classes the possibility of organising and forming themselves into an autonomous political force’ (1980, p. 57).

Central to Gramsci’s conception of hegemony is that it works through an ensemble of apparatuses, both state and private. Thus, for Gramsci there is no division between state and civil society; this relation is expressed in his equation ‘State = political society + civil society’ (1971, p. 258). Gramsci conceives of the state as functioning positively and productively rather than negatively and repressively, thus, the state is not simply an instrument of the ruling classes. Buci-Glucksman explains this important point when she writes:

If the state is not just an instrument in the hands of a class that ‘wields’ it, this is because it extends beyond this class or fraction, bringing into play mechanisms that are indefinitely more complex than the state apparatus itself: the ‘power bloc’ that supports it, the place of the ‘pertinent effects’ caused by the intervention of non-state strata in the life of the state. Here, again, no fatalism is involved, since everything depends on the relation of the forces present. (1980, p. 99)

In this theoretical construction, the state is a site of struggle where competing interests negotiate and modify each other in relation to the construction of hegemonic strategies. This ideological struggle is not limited to the imposition of a particular ideology via the mechanisms of state; this would be to reduce Gramsci’s problematic to a relation between government, ideology and force. Rather, hegemonic relations are constantly renegotiated in the space of the institutional structures of society (public or private). Hall has summarised this set of points:

The state,… is the site of a permanent struggle to conform- that is, to bring into line or harness- the whole complex of social relations, including those of civil society, to the imperatives of development in a social formation. It constitutes one of the principle forces which mediates between cultural formations and class relations, drawing these into particular configurations and harnessing them to particular hegemonic strategies. (1986, p. 22-23)

The analysis of these relations and strategies necessarily involves an historical component. The work, for Gramscian cultural studies, therefore, has been to identify the social arrangements which operate to
ensure consent to hegemony and also to identify those arrangements which embody alternative values and thus provide a source of opposition to hegemony.

Hall’s ‘Two Paradigms’ essay was written at the beginning of a theoretical shift in cultural studies which Tony Bennett described as ‘the turn to Gramsci’ (1986). This ‘turn to Gramsci’ was institutionalised in the form of a course at the Open University on popular culture. In the introduction to one of the edited collections of essays which were published in association with this course Bennett defined the Gramscian approach to the study of popular culture in this way: ‘In Gramsci’s conspectus, popular culture is viewed neither as the site of the people’s cultural deformation nor as that of their cultural self-affirmation or… of their own self-making; rather, it is viewed as a force field of relations shaped, precisely, by these contradictory pressures and tendencies.’ (1986, p. xiii). Bennett further summarises the course’s theoretical co-ordinates:

For Gramsci… cultural and ideological practices are to be understood and assessed in terms of their functioning within the antagonistic relations between the bourgeoisie and the working class as the two fundamental classes of capitalist society… Where Gramsci departed from the earlier Marxist tradition was in arguing that the cultural and ideological relations between ruling and subordinate classes in capitalist societies consist less in the domination of the latter by the former than in the struggle for hegemony - that is, for moral, cultural, intellectual and, thereby, political leadership over the whole of society- between the ruling class and, as the principle subordinate class, the working class. (italics in original, 1986, p. xiv)

Thus, the study of popular culture was framed as a political activity; through the study of popular and oppositional cultural values, spaces could be secured whereby such cultural values could become influential in framing experience. Hall defined his approach to the study of popular culture in this way:

Popular culture is neither, in the ‘pure’ sense, the popular traditions of resistance to … [the] processes [of transformation]; nor is it the forms which are superimposed on and over them. It is the ground on which the transformations are worked… In the study of popular culture, we would always start here: with the… double movement of containment and resistance… (1981, p. 228)

---

27 For a overall summary of the main theoretical influences on British cultural studies see Graeme Turner 1990.
28 For a more recent discussion of the themes of this course see Bennett, 1996.
For Hall, as for Bennett, there is no ‘authentic’ popular culture and neither is culture imposed on a passive people. Rather, popular culture is defined by ‘those forms and activities which have their roots in the social and material conditions of particular classes; which have been embodied in popular traditions and practices’ (ibid., p. 235). An analysis of these forms and activities would look ‘at the relations which constantly structure this field into dominant and subordinate formations. It looks at the process by which these relations of dominance and subordination are articulated… Its main focus of attention is the relation between culture and questions of hegemony’ (ibid.). Bennett and Hall’s Gramscian approach to popular culture would make little sense without reference to a class perspective; however, Hall argues ‘it is also clear that there is no one-to-one relationship between a class and a particular cultural form or practice… There are no wholly separate “cultures” paradigmatically attached, in a relation of historical fixity, to specific “whole” classes- although there are clearly distinct and variable class-cultural formations’ (1981, p. 238). This relation between the economic, the cultural and ‘the people’ was theorised by Hall in his theory of articulation which was inspired originally by Laclau (McGuigan 1992, p. 33-34).

Laclau and Mouffe have re-theorised the Gramscian position described above. They have argued in favour of the abandonment of the theoretical framework which required discursive formations to be thought through the concept of a superstructure which required an appeal to class: ‘once this essentialist assumption is abandoned, the category of articulation acquired a different theoretical status: articulation is now a discursive practice which does not have a plane of constitution prior to, or outside, the dispersion of the articulated elements’ (1985, p. 109). On this reading subject positions are discursively constructed and are not fixed; articulation describes the relations between these discursive positions. Thus, Laclau and Mouffe argue that they
… retain from the Gramscian view the logic of articulation and the political centrality of the frontier effects, but we will eliminate the assumption of a single political space as the necessary framework for those phenomena to arise. We will therefore speak of democratic struggles where these imply a plurality of political spaces, and of popular struggles where certain discourses tendentially construct the division of a single political space in two opposed fields. (italics in original, 1985, p. 137)

In this definition it is apparent that Laclau and Mouffe do not follow a classical Marxist or Gramscian analysis of power; they do not search for the dominant block or the class which is at the centre of a hegemonic formation. However, they also argue that

… it is equally wrong to propose as an alternative, either pluralism or the total diffusion of power within the social, as this would blind the analysis to the presence of… the partial concentrations of power existing in every concrete social formation. This is the point at which many of the concepts of classical analysis- ‘centre’, ‘power’, ‘autonomy’, etc.- can be reintroduced, if their status is redefined: all of them are contingent social logics which, as such, acquire their meaning in precise conjunctural and relational contexts, where they will be limited by other- frequently contradictory- logics… (italics in original, ibid.).

Laclau and Mouffe theorise the operation of power via a modified theory of articulation which allows them to argue that disparate discourses are articulated to a single political space. However, and this is the central difference to earlier theorisations of articulation, this process of articulation as a discursive practice does not have a necessary logic which is outside the process of articulation itself. In particular there is no necessary class logic to conjunctural contexts. Laclau and Mouffe do not advocate the theoretical pluralism that such a conception of articulation could result in, rather they argue that every formation involves concentrations of power. In this way they reintroduce the concepts of classical analysis- centre, power, opposition and autonomy. In section two we will discuss in detail this theoretical problem of an analysis of power which requires a move away from essentialist conceptions of power while at the same time not reducing our conception of power effects to a radical plurality.

For Hall and his attempt to synthesise culturalism and structuralism via a revised theory of hegemony, it is through this revised theory of articulation that he avoids the determinacy of structuralism. Like
Laclau and Mouffe, Hall does not seek to analyse discursive formations from the perspective of a single logic. Hall argues that ‘as soon as you begin to look at a discursive formation, not just as a single discipline but as a formation, you have to talk about the relations of power which structure the inter-discursivity, or the inter-textuality, of the field of knowledge’ (italics in original, in Grossberg 1996, p. 136). Thus, discursive formations are not simply explicable by class or any other logic. However, for Hall these formations ‘are not simply “plural”- they define an ideological field of force’ (in Grossberg 1996, p. 135-36). Hall argues that discursive formations are not reducible to any one logic which is constituted outside the articulation of the elements of a formation, instead we must analyse the relations of power which structure the conjunction of the elements of the formation. For Hall, as for Laclau and Mouffe, these relations of power between elements of a formation can still be characterised in terms of practices of domination and subordination. Thus, no matter how circumscribed, Hall’s conception of power still has embedded within it the notion that power works on a binary principle, that operations of power are in binary opposition to operations of resistance. We will discuss this set of problems further in the next section, for now to conclude this section it will be useful to summarise the main positions of Gramscian theory.

In general then we can say that Gramscian analysis describes cultural practices as collective but that culture is neither the ‘authentic’ practice of ‘the people’ nor simply a means of ‘manipulation’ by capitalist forces. Rather, culture is a site of local struggle where opposing interests are articulated to the political affiliations of a hegemonic group. Further, subject positions cannot be related simply to a class position, there are class-cultural formations but these are variable. Gramscian conceptions of articulation have been modified so that the logic of a social formation is understood as not existing outside that formation but rather as being established by the relations of power between the discursive elements of the formation. It is in this way that Laclau and Mouffe and Hall retain the notion of ‘the
popular’. For instance, Laclau and Mouffe argue in favour of an analysis which recognises ‘popular struggles where certain discourses tendentially construct the division of a single political space in two opposed fields’ (italics in original, 1985, p. 137). The state, on this reading, is ‘one of the principle forces which mediates between cultural formations and class relations, drawing these into particular configurations and harnessing them to particular hegemonic strategies’ (Hall 1986, p. 22-23).

**Foucault and Foucaultians**

In his ‘Two Paradigms’ essay Hall wrote that the most productive and concrete work being undertaken in cultural studies was from either a Gramscian or a Foucaultian theoretical perspective (1980, p. 71). However, in this article Hall argues that ‘Foucault so resolutely suspends judgement, and adopts so thoroughgoing a scepticism about any determinacy or relationship between practices, other than the largely contingent, that we are entitled to see him, not as an agnostic on these questions, but as deeply committed to the necessary non-correspondence of all practices to one another’ (1980, p. 71). In an interview with Lawrence Grossberg, Hall argued that Foucault’s analysis of the relations between practices as largely contingent and his notion of power as diffuse results in a position that cannot imagine resistance to relations of power. ‘If Foucault is to prevent the regime of truth from collapsing into a synonym for the dominant ideology, he has to recognise that there are different regimes of truth in the social formation. And these are not simply “plural”- they define an ideological field of force’ (in Grossberg 1996, p. 135-36). For Hall, Foucault ‘denies himself a politics because he has no idea of the relations of force’ (italics in original, in Grossberg 1996, p. 136). Hall’s interpretation of Foucault here is a result of his own conception of power which is grounded in traditional Marxist categories of power which understand the operation of power as binary. According to Foucault every relation is the instance of the exercise of force. As Foucault puts it:
… resistances… will have to be analysed in tactical and strategic terms, positing that each offensive from the one side serves as leverage for a counter offensive from the other. The analysis of power-mechanisms has no built-in tendency to show power as being at once anonymous and always victorious. It is a matter rather of establishing the positions occupied and modes of actions used by each of the forces at work, the possibilities of resistance and counter-attack on either side. (1980b, p. 163-64)

The exercise of power and resistance to power are one and the same thing, one always implies the other. Thus, for Foucault power does not operate on the basis of domination and resistance, as in Hall’s analysis, rather what exists is always and specifically a power relation. The relations of force between resistance and domination are never necessary but are always conditional and contingent.

There are two of Foucault’s conceptions that will be particularly useful to this thesis. The first is his conception of the nature of power; second, is his theory of governmentality. Foucault warns that:

One impoverishes the question of power if one poses it solely in terms of legislation and constitution, in terms solely of the state and the state apparatus. Power is quite different from and more complicated, dense and pervasive than a set of laws or a state apparatus. It’s impossible to get the development of productive forces characteristic of capitalism if you don’t at the same time have apparatuses of power. (1980b, p. 158)

Foucault argues that a view of power that equates it simply with the control of state apparatuses is reductive. Further, Foucault’s conception of power is radically different to traditional theories of power that conceive of power as repressive in some essential way. Rather, Foucault conceives of power as diffuse, as implied in every relation and interaction. Thus, it is not a matter of who has more power and who less,

---

29 Foucault’s work has been described as shifting from an archaeological mapping out of knowledge to a genealogical concern with the strategic role of knowledges in relation to the construction of ‘the social’. The key text in relation to this earlier ‘archaeological’ project was The Archaeology of Knowledge where Foucault defined his quite distinctive use of the concept of discourse. In summary Foucault sets himself up against the ‘History of Ideas’ tradition of historical analysis primarily by not utilising the notions of History and the Idea. For Foucault human knowledge is not explainable in terms of History, as this implies an underlying logic or design to the emergence of particular human knowledges or as Foucault sees it ‘the historical analysis of discourse as the quest for and the repetition of an origin that eludes all historical determination’ (1972 p.25). Instead he argues that ‘We must be ready to receive every moment of discourse in its sudden irruption… Discourse must not be referred to as the distant presence of the origin, but treated as and when it occurs’(1972, p. 25). For a critical analysis of Foucault’s theory of discourse see especially Brown and Cousins, 1980.
... power... is not that which makes the difference between those who exclusively possess and retain it, and those who do not have it and submit to it... Power is employed and exercised through a net-like organisation... individuals... are always in a position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power... The individual is an effect of power, and at the same time, or precisely to the extent to which it is the effect, it is the element of its articulation. (Foucault 1980a, p. 98)

We will further discuss the implications of Foucault’s theory of power regarding the relations of consent and repression in section three. First, how do we analyse social relations given this understanding of power? For Foucault it is not a question of what is power but of how does power operate.

To approach the theme of power by an analysis of ‘how’ is therefore to introduce several critical shifts in relation to the supposition of a fundamental power. It is to give oneself as the object of analysis power relations and not power itself... This is as much as saying that power relations can be grasped in the diversity of their logical sequence, their abilities, and their interrelationships. (Foucault 1982b, p.219)

Crucial to this formulation of power is the conception of power as productive not repressive. Colin Gordon’s formulation is that, ‘programmes/technologies of power have essentially to do with the formation of the social real’ (italics in original, 1980, p. 251). This is in contrast to an understanding of power which has it emerging out of an already formed set of social relationships. For Foucault, power operates on the modern construction of ‘the social’ through a rationality of power which he has termed ‘governmentality’. He writes that power has been ‘progressively governmentalised, that is to say, elaborated, rationalised, and centralised in the form of, or under the auspices of, state institutions’ (Foucault 1982a, p. 224). This is not to return to a conception of the ‘state’ as in Marxism. As Barry Hindess points out, ‘what matters in the study of governmental power is not so much the state itself, considered as a more or less unified set of instrumentalities, but rather the broader strategies of government within which the instrumentalities of the state are incorporated and deployed’ (1996, p. 109). Thus, this analysis of ‘power relations’ rejects the notion of a ‘fundamental power’ and replaces it with the notion of governmentality. This notion of government is particular: ‘To govern, in this sense,
is to structure the possible field of action of others’ (Foucault 1982a, p. 221). How do we understand the specific workings of power through the conceptual tool of governmentality?

In ‘Governmentality’ (1991) Foucault coins the title term as referring to a new form of management of the population which began to emerge in the sixteenth century. Foucault defines governmentality thus:

The ensemble formed by the institutions, procedures, analyses and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of this very specific albeit complex form of power, which has as its target population, as its principle form of knowledge political economy, and as its essential technical means apparatus of security. (1991, p. 102)

There are three things in particular which make Foucault’s concept of governmentality useful to our analysis of the relations between culture and government. The first is the notion that not all forms of political power have their origins in the state; rather, government refers to the activities of all institutions concerned with the regulation and management of populations. Second, and following from this, is the precept that government is not unified in its function. Governmental rationales and technologies are distinctive and have distinct histories. In Foucault’s words, government is actually a question of ‘a range of multiform tactics’ which ‘instead of seeking to found itself in transcendental rules, a cosmological model or philosophical-moral ideal, must find the principles of its rationality in that which constitutes the specific reality of the state’ (1991, p. 97). Third, and developing from the above is the notion that the object of government is population, and that to this object is brought an amalgam of techniques with particular objectives which are practical. In relation to this, Foucault suggests that government is intrinsically involved with the moulding of both public and private behaviour, or, to put it another way, government is concerned with the ‘conduct of conduct’.

This new form of governmental power engendered a multiplication of forms of knowledge about the subject and the population. The role of expertise is central to this productive relationship between
governmentality and the production of forms of knowledge necessary to govern a population in this way. This is a very different role for expertise to that imagined by Gramsci for intellectuals, we will return to discuss this set of issues in section three. The productive relations between governmental power and expertise ‘focused the development of knowledge of man around two roles: one, globalising and quantitative, concerning the population; the other, analytical, concerning the individual’ (Foucault 1982a, p. 215). While, on the one hand, it can be said that power has been progressively governmentalised, that is, rationalised in the form of institutions concerned with the regulation and management of populations, it is also possible to point to the way in which subjects have become self governing in particular ways. For Foucault, this mode of objectification which makes human beings subjects is due to a new political form of power which has been developing in Western societies since the sixteenth century. Foucault dubs this form of power ‘pastoral power’. Above all pastoral power is defined by the production of truth- the truth of the individual (1982a, p. 214). If pastoral power is based on the construction of the truth of the individual, then the exercise of this form of power by government ‘..implies a knowledge of the conscience and the ability to direct it’ (1982b, p. 214). It is thus for Foucault that:

In effect, what defines a relationship of power is that it is a mode of action which does not act directly and immediately on others. Instead it acts upon their actions: an action upon an action, on existing actions or on those which may arise in the present or the future. (1982b, p. 220)

What does such an analysis of power mean for our understanding of the relationship between the subject and power? If Foucault is right it means that rather than defining one (adversarial) relationship between subject and power, it might be possible to focus on the hows of the relationship: how is power exercised on the subject and through the subject? how do subjects exercise power on themselves and others?
According to Foucault ‘power relations have been progressively governmentalised, that is to say, elaborated, rationalised, and centralised in the form of, or under the auspices of, state institutions’ (1982a, p. 224). This has important implications for the study of the relations between government and culture. Foucault prescribes that in order to analyse power relations:

One can analyse such relationships… by focusing on carefully defined institutions. The latter constitute a privileged point of observation, diversified, concentrated, put in order, and carried through to the highest point of their efficacy… I wish to suggest that one must analyse institutions from the standpoint of power relations, rather than visa versa, and that the fundamental point of anchorage of the relationships, even if they are embodied and crystallised in an institution, is to be found outside the institution. (1982b, p. 222)

This analysis establishes five main points: first, the system of differentiations which permits one strategy to act on others; two, types of objectives; three, means of bringing power relations into being; four, forms of institutionalisation; and five, degrees of rationalisation (Foucault 1982b, p. 223-24). Finally, Foucault writes that ‘one may call power strategy the totality of the means put into operation to implement power effectively or to maintain it… One can therefore interpret the mechanisms brought into play in power relations in terms of strategies’ (1982b, p. 225).30 Thus, as Colin Gordon has put it, whereas ‘programmes/ technologies of power have essentially to do with the formation of the social real, strategic activity consists in the instrumentalisation of the real’ (italics in original, 1980, p. 251). Thus, the main area of analysis consists in the conflict between governmental strategies.

Foucault has argued that ‘Democracy and the State of Law have not been inevitably liberal, nor is liberalism necessarily democratic or attached to forms of law… Rather than a politics pursuing a certain number of more or less defined objectives, I would be tempted to see in liberalism a form of critical

30 The perspective of strategy is central to Foucault’s ‘genealogical’ project. Foucault has defined this genealogical project thus, ‘What it really does is to entertain the claims to attention of local, discontinuous, disqualified, illegitimate knowledges against the claims of a unitary body of theory which would filter, hierarchise and order them in the name of some true knowledge and some arbitrary idea of what constitutes a science and its objects’ (1980a, p. 83). Discourse in this analysis is a resource for strategy not a medium. Thus, as Gordon puts it, ‘the point where the perspective of strategy becomes
reflection on governmental practice’ (1981a, p. 357). Thus, Foucault characterises liberalism as a particular mode or rationality of government which he defines as

... the relations between political power at work within the state as a legal framework of unity, and a power we can call ‘pastoral’, whose role is to constantly ensure, sustain, and improve the lives of each and every one. The well-known ‘welfare state problem’ does not only bring the needs or the new governmental techniques of today’s world to light. It must be recognised for what it is: one of the extremely numerous reappearance’s of the tricky adjustment between political power wielded over legal subjects and pastoral power wielded over live individuals. (1981b, p. 235)

Thus, within a liberal rationality of government pastoral power manages to combine individualising techniques with totalisation procedures (Foucault 1982b, p. 213). Pastoral power operates through the provision of state services but is also to do with the use of techniques aimed at the formation of personalities which will have desirable attributes and characteristics. However, 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. Above all in Nikolas Rose’s words 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 systemically linked to the practice of freedom’ (1992, p. 5).

We have described two different theoretical frameworks which have been influential to work done within cultural studies. The main theoretical differences we have been interested in stem primarily from the different approaches to the understanding and analysis of power. As we have seen this different understanding of power results in a different understanding of both the state and the population. In summary, the Gramscian approach analyses power in terms of a set of relations in which power is always working on ‘the people’. In contrast, Foucaultian analyses do not understand power as explicable in terms of dominant and subordinate formations but understand power as equally involved indispensable for genealogy is where the non-correspondence of discourse, practices and effects creates possibilities for
in every relationship. Due to the Gramscian understanding of power as binary one of the main aims for Gramscian influenced cultural studies has been to understand ‘the people’ and ‘popular culture’ in terms of the process by which relations of dominance and subordination are articulated. On this reading of the relations between power and ‘the people’ cultural programmes become part of a hegemonic apparatus designed to engender ‘consent’ from ‘the people’. Hall summarises this position when he ascribes the multiplication of governmental institutions in late nineteenth-century Britain to the rise of democracy:

This posed quite new problems of political, social and cultural management. The leading social classes and their interests had to sustain their position of dominance- yet, somehow, within a state which claimed that political power had been equalised and ‘democratised’. The question, then, was how to contain democracy while, at the same time, maintaining popular consent… this required a programme of social reconstruction-to modernise, renovate and restructure society and the state, while retaining the existing hierarchy of power and authority, and securing to this national programme the cohesion of popular consent: a problem, in short, not of ‘democracy’ but of hegemony! (italics in original, 1986, p. 39)

On the other hand, Foucaultians have sought to analyse the relations between government and population in terms of the ways in which governmental programmes seek to shape the population in ways which will equip it with a range of capacities which will allow it to function effectively and productively. In this theoretical model the form of culture, ‘popular’ or ‘elite’, is not as important as the positive effects the programme seeks to have in managing all aspects of the behaviour of populations. In summary, the Gramscian theoretical model understands the workings of power via the relations between hegemonic apparatuses and ‘the people’ as primarily negative. The Foucaultian model understands the operation of power in the relations between governmental technologies and the population as productive. For our purposes in the analysis of the relations between government and culture in the specific instances of arts programmes in the post-WWII anglophone world, which set of conceptual tools is ‘better to think with’?

operations whose sense is, in various ways, either unstated or unstateable within any one discourse’ (1980, p. 251).
Critical Assessment

Bennett has argued that Foucault is ‘better to think with’ than Gramsci (1998, p. 62). In summary this is because in the Gramscian tradition the function of apparatuses and institutions is taken as being pre-given, that is, in terms of their function in relation to the engendering of consent. Thus, these institutions and programmes are analysed as the neutral carriers of ideologies. It is ideology which becomes the focus in a Gramscian analysis. This means most crucially that this form of analysis cannot account for the specific and concrete workings of the institutions or programmes themselves. A Foucaultian perspective, on the other hand, argues that culture is best understood by a history which emphasises how it has been (increasingly) governmentally constructed (Bennett, 1998). However, if culture is understood in relation to the workings of particular liberal-governmental forms of power and the programmes generated within this rationality have no general explanation, other than the management of population, how are we to critically analyse the workings of particular programmes for the government of culture?

We have already foreshadowed how Foucault’s relativistic theory of power relations has been a major point of criticism. Specifically, criticism is aimed at Foucault’s notion of the contingent nature of the relations between practices and his enlarged conception of power which finds power and relations of force everywhere. For Hall, this means that Foucault cannot hold a ‘position’ on anything (1980, p. 71 and 1996, p. 136). This is primarily because, according to Hall, there is no space in Foucault’s analyses for a theory of resistance. For instance, Hall argues that Foucault’s genealogy constructs ‘docile bodies’, in Hall’s words, ‘there is no theorised account of how or why bodies should not always-forever turn up, in place, at the right time’ (1996, p. 12). Instead, Hall argues in favour of a theory which retains Foucault’s emphasis on discursive structures but reduces the constructivist emphasis of
Foucault’s analyses by retaining a theory of the interiority of the subject. In order to do this Hall argues for the usefulness of theories of psychoanalysis. This is a move which Foucault cannot make due to his theoretical approach to the history of psychoanalysis as a historically and culturally specific category for the management of populations. Therefore, according to Hall, Foucault undertakes a ‘discursive phenomenology of the subject and a genealogy of the technologies of the self. But it is a phenomenology which is in danger of being overwhelmed by an emphasis on intentionality- precisely because it cannot engage with the unconscious’ (italics in original, 1996, p. 14). Peter Dews also argues that Foucault’s position is radically determinist. In making a similar point to Hall, Dews argues that:

On the one hand, Foucault continues to speak as if the political struggle were a matter of contest between classes and social groups with irreconcilable aims and interests. On the other, this theoretically unelaborated notion of ‘resistance’, a corporeally grounded opposition to the power which- at the most fundamental level- moulds human beings into self-identical subjects, implies a hostility to any form of conscious formulation of aims or strategic calculation. (1987, p. 164)

Dews goes on to argue that because, in Foucault’s theorisation, power is everywhere there is nothing to which it can be opposed and thus the concept ‘loses all explanatory content and becomes a ubiquitous, metaphysical principle. For only if we can produce a counterfactual, specifying conscious, can these concepts be empirically applied’ (1987, p. 167).

There are two points to be made regarding these criticisms. The first point is simple and relates to Hall’s advocacy of the use of psychoanalysis to understand the human subject. As Rose points out there is a logical fault here in the sense that such an argument accounts for the historicity of the subject through the use of a set of categories which are themselves historically and culturally specific. Rose problematises accounts which rely on psychoanalysis to account for the ways in which certain practices of the self become inscribed within the body of the subject. For Rose, ‘such a view is paradoxical, for it requires us to adopt a particular way of understanding the human being- that carved out at the end of the
nineteenth century- as the basis for an investigation of the historicity of being human’ (1996, p. 142). The second more important point relates to the common criticism of Foucault that his theory of power leaves no room for ‘resistance’. K-H Chen has commented specifically in relation to Hall’s critique of Foucault along these lines that ‘this attack reveals more of Hall’s own problematical concept of power grounded as it is in traditional Marxist categories of power. For Foucault defines power as the relation of (confrontational) forces always multiple and multidirectional’ (italics in original, 1996, p. 313). More generally, in regard to the possibilities for different relations (including ‘oppositional’ relations) with governmental strategies and their programmes, Rose has argued in contrast to Hall and Dews that ‘resistance… requires no theory of agency’ as human beings are constantly shifting in relation to the different programmes that they are involved with and which interpolate them in different ways:

The humanist demand that one decipher oneself in terms of the authenticity of one’s actions runs up against the political or institutional demand that one abides by the collective responsibility of organisational decision-making even when one is personally opposed to it. Thus the existence of contestation, conflict and opposition in practices which conduct the conduct of persons is no surprise and requires no appeal to the particular qualities of human agency. Thus, in any one site or locale, humans turn programmes intended for one end to the service of others… (1996, p. 141)

Foucault’s theory of power does not rule out the possibility of ‘opposition’. While Foucault posited the pervasiveness of power effects it is important to remember that these power effects do not operate with a single logic. Rather, Foucault argued that:

These tactics were invented and organised from the starting points of local conditions and particular needs. They took shape in piecemeal fashion, prior to any class strategy designed to weld them into vast, coherent ensembles. It should be noted that these ensembles don’t consist in a homogenisation, but rather of a complex play of supports in mutual engagement, different mechanisms of power which retain their specific character. (1980b, p. 159)
Thus, it is in the contestation between these different strategies and programmes that there are possibilities for ‘opposition’ or, more correctly, different relations of engagement with forms of power:

The analysis of power-mechanisms has no built-in tendency to show power as being at once anonymous and always victorious. It is a matter rather of establishing the positions occupied and modes of actions used by each of the forces at work, the possibilities of resistance and counter-attack on either side. (Foucault 1996, p. 163-64)

These ‘possibilities of resistance and counter-attack’ are also operations of power and furthermore there is nothing necessarily ‘good’ about such ‘oppositional’ power effects. Rose comments:

To designate some dimensions of these conflicts ‘resistance’ is itself perspectival: it can only ever be a matter of judgement. It is fruitless to complain here that such a perspective gives one no place to stand in the making of ethical critique and in the evaluation of ethical positions- the history of all those attempts to ground ethics that do appeal to some transcendental guarantor is plain enough- they cannot close conflicts over regimes of the person, but simply occupy one more position within the field of contestation. (1996, p. 141)  

For Rose this does not mean that ‘contestation’ is useless but instead that rather than appealing to a ‘transcendental guarantor’ the possibility for critique lies, in part, ‘through historical investigations which can unsettle and de-value the regime[s] of subjectification’ (1996, p. 147).

Even though Gramsci expanded the traditional Marxist base/superstructure notion of the operation of power, in a Gramscian theoretical framework power is still understood in its adversarial and dichotomous sense. In a Gramscian cultural history the possible relations of power are structured by this assumption. Thus, one can either consent to operations of power or one can resist. As Bennett has summarised this position:

The family, the media, popular schooling, the art and culture industries: these tend to be viewed, in the Gramscian tradition very much as the neutral carriers of ideologies with the result that the analysis focuses less on the properties of these institutions as institutions than on the content of the ideologies they relay. (1998, p.69)

---

31 For a similar position but specifically in relation to the use of Foucaultian theory for a socialist politics see Minson 1980 and 1985. For a critical assessment of Minson’s 1985 position see Frow 1988.
On the other hand, for Foucault hegemony operates not by force or consent but constitutes a form of social cohesion which acts

… most effectively by way of practices, techniques, and methods which infiltrate minds and bodies, cultural practices which cultivate behaviours and beliefs, tastes, desires, and needs as seemingly naturally occurring qualities and properties embodied in the psychic and physical reality (or ‘Truth’) of the human subject. (Smart 1986, p. 160)

While there have been some attempts to marry Foucaultian and Gramscian theory around the concept of hegemony, both Bennett (1990b) and Smart (1986) have demonstrated that in fact these theories of hegemony and the state are essentially different. As our discussion above in sections one and two has shown, Gramscian hegemony theory, no matter how circumscribed, is still based on a notion of ideology which functions through institutions and programmes and is analysed in relation to the exercise of a general form of power. On the other hand, as we have discussed above and using Smart’s succinct formulation, ‘Foucault’s work pries open the problem of hegemony in so far as it de-centres the question of state, introduces a non-reductionist conception of power, and displaces the concept of ideology’ (1986, p. 162). We have argued that the history of culture is best understood in relation to government. Thus, if ‘cultural interests and attributes can only be formulated and shaped in the context of delimited norms and techniques, then the forms of their articulation and the degree of their integration must also be normative, contingent, and “organisational”’ (Hunter 1988, p. 113). However, we have further argued that this does not mean that relations in such cultural programmes are always predictable, in Bennett’s formulation, ‘a micro-politics of power begets a micro-politics of resistance’ (1990b, p. 247). Instead we have posited an understanding of practices as the product of definite and limited norms of reasoning which are specific to the strategies and programmes to which they are attached. Most crucially these rationalities are not reducible to one general explanation, whether that be economic or social. While we described in section two how, particularly, Laclau and Mouffe have theorised an earlier version of Gramscian theory and removed its essentialising conception of class, we
argued that nevertheless in the theory of articulation ‘ideology’ and hegemony were retained as general terms of analysis. Hunter has succinctly outlined the problem with this general line of analysis as being that

... it puts cultural and political interests and capacities (the ‘system of values’) on both sides of the equation-as something formed by ideological practices or processes of articulation which possess no necessary relation to particular classes or groups; and as something that classes and groups must already possess as the stake in the ‘ideological struggle’, as that which they seek to win consent to and hence express through ideology... Instead of appealing to the ideological articulation (in either sense) of class interests, we must look to the differentiated array of organisational forms in which cultural interests and capacities are formulated, if we are to engage with the forms in which they are assessed and argued over. (italics in original, 1988, p. 118)

Thus, effective involvement by intellectuals in the cultural sphere must move away from a generalised politics and towards a ‘politics of detail’ (Bennett 1998, p. 84). Or as Foucault put it in response to a criticism that his work produced an ‘anaesthetising effect’: ‘it seems to me that “what is to be done” ought not to be determined from above by reformers, be they prophetic or legislative, but by the long work of comings and goings, of exchanges, reflections, trials, [and] different analyses’ (1981c, p. 12-13).

In terms of our project to analyse the relations between culture and government as they have been constructed in particular programmes for the administration of art there are three main methodological outcomes as a result of the above summaries and discussions. The field of cultural management will be viewed not in terms of a site of hegemonic struggle but as a site in which there are a multiplicity of power effects, knowledges and tactics, which react or are based upon the management of the population through culture. Agency will be analysed not in terms of something which simply acts or is acted upon but which has a share in the power/knowledge relationship. Finally, the analysis will focus on the

---

32 See for example Fiske, 1996, who argues in favour of Hall’s theory of articulation which allows the concept of a bloc to be thought of as ‘an alliance of social forces formed to promote common social interests as they can be brought together in particular historical conditions’ (1996, p. 213).
programmatic and institutional contexts for the use of culture as an interface for the relations between citizenship and government. This focus is an outcome of the theoretical move to look at the ‘how’ of power, Foucault argues that institutions are a ‘privileged point of observation, diversified, concentrated, put in order, and carried through to the highest point of their efficacy’ (1982b, p. 222).

However, while inducing us to analyse the institutional relations of power Foucault also warns against too simple a conception of the interaction of strategies and technologies and the agents on which they act. Rather, he suggests, ‘one must analyse institutions from the standpoint of power relations, rather than visa versa, and that the fundamental point of anchorage of the relationships, even if they are embodied and crystallised in an institution, is to be found outside the institution’ (Foucault 1982b, p. 222). When analysing the strategies and technologies that have constructed the historically specific relations between the fields of art, government and citizenship, we must be aware of how these strategies and technologies have been effected by the agents on which they act. Colin Gordon writes that ‘The field of strategies is a field of conflict: the human material operated on by programmes and technologies is inherently a resistant material. If this were not the case, history itself would become unthinkable’ (1980, p. 255). It is not that agency is understood in any personal or ontological sense; it is not that the individual is imagined as the unwilling target of governmental strategy and would be better left to develop itself naturally, free from constraints. Rather, it is that the individual is a positive construct, the bearer of particular capacities, which both allow that individual to be acted upon and to act on others.

**Culture and Government in Nineteenth-Century Britain**

The development of strategies to enable the poor to access art in nineteenth-century Britain can be interpreted as a moment in the extension of a cultural hegemony. Much of the work that has been done
on this period has analysed it from precisely this perspective. Indeed, it seems clear that the opening of museums to the public and the development of art shows in the poor areas of London were self-consciously designed as part of a more general strategy to make the conduct of the poor conform to bourgeois expectations of ‘proper behaviour’. This historical interpretation has led to a particular conception of the history of arts administration in Britain. We will situate our discussion of art programmes in late nineteenth-century Britain in a comparison of theoretical analyses of nineteenth-century strategies to provide access to art for the London poor. This comparison will first draw on some histories of the relations between the state and the arts in nineteenth-century Britain which are based on Gramscian theoretical concepts. The resultant general historical conclusions will be compared to those resulting from a Foucaultian reading of the same history. It will first be useful to sketch in some general historical background.

In 1768 the Royal Academy of the Arts was founded in London. Due to its status as a publicly funded institution, it became necessary to insist that it had a public function. To this end the public uses of art were understood in the language of civic humanism which constructed the individual as a citizen member of a polis governed above all by actions which were beneficial to the public (Pocock 1972, p. 86). John Barrell argues that:

> If the Academy was to be represented, and its existence justified, as a public body, this could be done only by reiterating the claim that painting was an art whose function was to promote the public interest, and that claim could be made only by reasserting, in the language of civic humanism, that painting could create or confirm the ‘public spirit’ in a nation. (1986, p. 2)

However, as in eighteenth-century France this public was not a ‘general’ public in any modern conception of the term. The first President of the Academy, Sir Josuah Reynolds, conceived of art on
two different levels, on the one hand, painting as a liberal profession, on the other, painting as a mechanical trade. Painting as a liberal profession had a ‘public’ benefit because it could depict the ideal public spirit; the highest genre of painting was heroic history painting because it depicted the ‘great men’ of the past so that the ‘great men’ of the present could emulate them. Within the discourses of civic humanism this ‘great man’ was a citizen who pursued no end which was not public. For Reynolds, there was no distinction between an appreciation of ‘fine’ art and civic virtue. In a lecture at the Academy in 1776 Reynolds suggested that ‘all men of taste are also men of virtue,… because they have cultivated a particular habit of mind: the habit of… subordinating their personal interests… to the interests… of some wider “whole”’ (in Barrell 1986, p. 69). Thus, Reynolds was dedicated to the ‘attempt to establish a public painting, whose function will be to confirm the audience for art as the members of a republic, or a community, of taste and, by that means, to confirm their membership also of a political public’ (in Barrell 1986, p. 70). By the nineteenth century the most common approach to art was that appreciation of art could lead the mind to a higher plane. However, the public which was Reynolds’ concern was precisely a political public, which in late-eighteenth and early nineteenth-century Britain was highly limited. In chapter one we described how, by the late eighteenth-century, French republican conceptions of the relations between art and the public constituted them as productive particularly in terms of art’s use for the education of a citizenry. In marked contrast to this is the contemporaneous British conception of art’s civic functions which explicitly ruled out the possibility that any civic advantage might result from circulating art outside elite society. The ‘mechanick classes’ were thought to be constitutively incapable of deriving any benefit from art.34

33 His notion of painting as a liberal profession was unusual for the late 1700s as painting was thought of as a profession not fit for gentlemen.
34 A museum model which encouraged access to a broadly defined citizenry, such as the Louvre, was actively resisted in Britain until the mid-nineteenth century, in summary because administrators reacted negatively to the French experience and the views of art and culture which prevailed provided no discursive basis which would allow public access to be thinkable.
Nevertheless, when the British Government did begin to give support to the arts it was precisely these ‘mechanick classes’ which it sought to target with its programmes.

In the early part of the nineteenth century government spending on art was minimal and fickle. Janet Minihan points out that ‘...prevailing theories of state intervention and the very structure of the British Government at the time placed implicit restrictions on official subsidies to art. In the 1820s, the state’s responsibilities were held to begin and end with administering justice, collecting taxes, and defending the country...’ (1977, p. 28). It was not until the mid 1830s that government began to give more funds to art. Nevertheless, this initial conjunction of art, government and a wider public was not based on art’s link to a higher sensibility but on the mechanical aspects of art and how training in them could benefit the production of manufactured goods. The case for art was put succinctly by Benjamin Robert Haydon who was a major agitator in favour of government support of the arts. He wrote in a letter to the Duke of Wellington:

...the public establishment and encouragement of High Art is essentially requisite to a manufacturing country. Taste in design can only be generated by excellence in elevated Art. Our Manchester cottons were refused in Italy at the conclusion of the war in 1816, because their designs were tasteless... This is a fact, I can assure your Grace, and I submit that it goes far to prove the importance of design to a nation so far advanced as we are. (in Minihan 1977, p. 42)

As a result of concerns such as those voiced by Haydon a Select Committee was appointed in 1835-6 to look specifically at ‘the best means of extending a knowledge of the Arts, and of the Principle of Design among the People (especially the Manufacturing Population) of the country...’ (in Borzello 1980, p. 10). One of the major recommendations of this Committee was to establish schools to educate artisans in good design. In 1837 a School for Design opened in London and thereafter schools opened in other major centres of the country. The function of these schools was to impart a commercial knowledge of design,
with the aim of improving the design standard of British manufactured goods. \textsuperscript{35} In 1852 the schools’ administration came under the auspices of the Department of Practical Art under the leadership of Henry Cole.\textsuperscript{36} Minihan describes the Department in this way: ‘No beguiling dreams of high art distracted them from their daily tasks. They were practical men, working to include art in the national elementary school curriculum and to educate the taste of artisans and consumers alike in the interests of British industry and trade’ (1977, p. 96).

We will best be able to analyse the discursive construction of the governmental utility of culture in the interface between art and the wider public through an analysis of two different late nineteenth-century art programmes. The following discussion will be split into two sections which will describe two influential art programmes characteristic of the second half of the nineteenth century. The first section consists of a discussion of the South Kensington Museum, which was the first state funded museum which had a specific policy of the provision of access to art to the working classes. The second section will discuss the Whitechapel Loan Exhibitions. These exhibitions, organised by the philanthropists Reverend Samuel and Henrietta Barnett, were the first (and most successful) exhibitions to specifically target the poor of London’s slums. As well as this examination of the models and resources which framed the conjunction of art, government and citizenship in Britain in the second half of the nineteenth century, the following discussion will provide a vehicle for a comparative analysis of Gramscian influenced and Foucaultian influenced histories of art programmes in this time frame.

\textsuperscript{35} Advocacy of government involvement in the promotion of good design received a boost when in 1843 Prince Albert accepted the presidency of the Society of the Arts. According to E.P. Alexander, Albert’s aim was to ‘further the arts and science and use them to improve British manufacturing, especially in the field of the applied or decorative arts’ (1983, p. 143). Cole became a member of the Society in 1946. Albert and Cole were influential in their advocacy of providing wider public access to culture and both believed that culture ‘should have practical utility in applying science and art to productive industry, as well as democratic social value in educating the masses and providing them with improving entertainment’ (Alexander 1983, p. 158).

\textsuperscript{36} Cole attacked the Schools of Design repeatedly for their lack of quality until the Board of Trade, on the basis of his management and organisation of the Great Exhibition, asked him to take over the management of a new division, the
A Gramscian reading of the relations between culture and government in nineteenth-century Britain characterises them in relation to the rise of democracy and how the dominant social classes retained their position of dominance. In *The State and the Visual Arts* (1982) Nicholas Pearson examines state involvement in art from the perspective of analysing art programmes as ‘one of the ways in which the British State has become involved in developing and reproducing moral concepts and a moral authority’ (1982, p. 2). For Pearson, in his Gramscian account of this history, the involvement of the state in art has not been neutral, state ‘intervention has not simply supported art, in the sense of lending credence and succour to a pre-given and value-free set of practices… Particular tendencies, assumptions and values have been marginalised and neglected. The State is not and cannot be morally neutral’ (italics in original, 1982, p. 7). Furthermore, the state’s involvement with art is definable above all by the process of making art ‘anti-popular’: ‘State intervention has played an important and powerful part in developing and reproducing these values and associations, and in making art into a thing that is, in various ways, un-popular and anti-popular’ (ibid.). Thus, art programmes are one of the forms through which the state has operated to institutionalise a particular pattern of political, social and cultural relations. Above all, for Pearson, this hegemonic apparatus has acted to ‘marginalise’ the ‘popular’ cultural forms of ‘the people’.

On the other hand, Bennett has applied a Foucaultian perspective to an analysis of the history of the relations between culture and government as evidenced by the specific example of the history of museums in nineteenth-century Britain. This Foucaultian perspective has argued that the relations between culture and government in nineteenth-century Britain are best characterised in relation to the use of culture by government to act on ‘the social’. Thus, for Bennett, cultural programmes in the mid
to late nineteenth century were generated by quite specific strategies in relation to the governing of a citizenry. The characteristic difference here is that for Bennett there is no ‘grand designer’ of this strategy, there is no ‘state’ from which it emerges. Rather, there is ‘a range of multiform tactics’ which emerge in separate and diverse institutional spaces and are not governed by the same logics.

**The Department of Practical Art and the South Kensington Museum**

At the time that artisans were not ‘distracted’ by the study of ‘High Art’ in their design classes, government was taking a multitude of measures to encourage the poorer classes to attend museums to see examples of fine art. In the mid 1850s there was a proliferation of reform initiated by the Department of Science and Art. For Cole, the most important aspect of the Department’s endeavours was to spread art ‘among all classes of the community’ (Minihan 1977, p. 107-8). One policy established to achieve this goal was the introduction of art as a subject in elementary schools. However, as with the Schools of Design, the aim of this strategy was not to impart a sensibility towards the complexities of ‘fine’ art; rather, the methodology was primarily aimed at instruction in the skills of industrial drawing.37 Through these multiple strategies, including the South Kensington Museum, Cole ‘hoped that the Department will continue to be instrumental in raising the character of our manufactures, as well as the intellectual appreciation of those who have to produce and consume them’ (in Minihan 1977, p. 119). It was not until the second half of the century that art came to be more generally considered as a reflection of and useful to society’s moral health.

Increasingly, from mid century, culture was seen in relation to the moral and intellectual improvement of the poor. From state museums to the loan exhibitions established by philanthropic private individuals and

---

37 This division and indeed, in the tradition of Reynolds, this hierarchy- art as liberal versus art as mechanical- has become fundamental to the way visual art has been institutionalised.
organisations, there was an overriding emphasis on the ability of art to morally and intellectually improve the poor. We must remember that this aim was pressing in the mid years of the nineteenth century when there was much social upheaval, particularly in the form of: the Irish famine and the resultant mass migration to Britain and the already overcrowded and unsanitary slums; the Chartist uprising; mass unemployment; and, a high crime rate. We can view these efforts to improve the poor through the use of art along with nineteenth-century schemes of urban planning, mass education, organised policing, and the like. These were schemes designed to make the populace calculable and manageable, particularly the inaccessible and unknown reaches of London’s poorer quarters. In 1841 the Select Committee on National Museums and Works of Art was established ‘to consider the best means for their protection and for affording facilities to the Public for their inspection, as a means of moral and intellectual improvement for the People’ (in Minihan 1977, p. 87). Allan Cunningham, in a submission to the Committee, expressed the hope of the Victorian planners. When asked by the Committee to class the people he saw in museums during holidays, he described them in this way: ‘Men who are usually called “mob”; but they cease to become mob when they get a taste’ (in Minihan 1977, p. 89). There is a stark difference between this and Reynolds’s point of view not half a century previous that the ‘mechanick classes’ were constitutively incapable of deriving any benefit from culture.

Why did this change so radically in the space of fifty or so years? We have outlined briefly above that a new way of thinking about the population from about the mid-nineteenth century on constituted the conduct of the working classes as a moral and political problem. In relation to some of those contexts outlined above, the Chartist uprising, high crime rate and so forth, it was seen as essential that the working classes be inducted into a new form of life, one governed by sobriety and restraint. This theme was posed in terms of the survival of the civilised species. The second main change was a shift in the discursive relations between culture and the people which enabled the provision of wider access to
culture to be understood as useful and beneficial. Thus, partly as a result of the Romantic movement, receptivity to culture was no longer held to be restricted to an elite audience, culture was now imbued with a capacity to civilise and as an aid in attaining ‘whole’ humanity.

The latter half of the nineteenth century saw a marked increase in museums in Britain. The South Kensington Museum, administered through the Department of Science and Art, was opened in 1857. While the Department of Practical Art and its Design Schools had primarily been concerned with improving the design of British artisans, with the aim of improving British manufacturing, Cole had a slightly broader aim for the new Department of Science and Art. While the South Kensington Museum was designed specifically around a philosophy of educating the ‘common’ person in the principles of design, Cole hoped that the Museum experience would also be a successful alternative to the Gin Palace. In his *Introductory Address on the Functions of the Science and Art Department* Cole said:

The working man comes to the Museum from one or two dimly lighted, cheerless dwelling rooms, in his fustian jacket, with his shirt collars a little trimmed up, accompanied by his threes and fours, and fives of little fustian jackets, a wife in her best bonnet, and a baby, of course, under her shawl. The looks of surprise and pleasure of the whole party when they first observe the brilliant lighting inside the Museum show what a new, acceptable, and wholesome excitement this evening entertainment affords to all of them. Perhaps the evening opening of Public Museums may furnish a powerful antidote to the gin palace. (in Purbrick 1994, p. 83)

The South Kensington Museum was established by Cole’s Department of Science and Art with surplus profits from the Great Exhibition. The South Kensington Museum was the first museum to open on weekday evenings and was the first state supported museum with unrestricted entry to the wider public.

---

38 In 1845 the Museums Act allowed Councils with boroughs of over 10 000 to levy a rate for the establishment of a museum, in 1850 Libraries were added to this legislation. But in fact few Councils took advantage of this legislation until after the 1870s (Bennett 1997b, p. 172).

39 In 1899 the South Kensington Museum became the Victoria and Albert Museum.
How should we understand Cole’s goals here? Are they explicable as an example of a strategy for the engendering of consent from the working classes to a bourgeois cultural hegemony?

Pearson argues that we can distinguish between two different types of approach to the use of culture, these are the ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ approaches. According to Pearson, the ‘hard’ approach involves the direct inculcation of cultural competences and attitudes by the state. Thus, for Pearson, despite the fact that techniques of art education in the Design and elementary schools were broadened from a concern specifically with practical drawing to more general drawing skills, ‘the promotion of art and knowledge about art via direct schooling can continue to be understood as a “hard” form of State intervention’ (1982, p. 35). On the other hand, in the South Kensington Museum the audience controlled itself through accordance with certain standards of behaviour. For Pearson, this is representative of a ‘soft’ form of state intervention where power operates through the consent of the groups being controlled. Pearson draws specifically on Gramsci’s characterisation of state educative activities as having positive and negative functions (Pearson 1982, p. 28). As we have seen above, for Gramsci, these functions were not limited to state apparatuses but the range of private and other initiatives which act on the people also form the apparatus of hegemony. Pearson describes the different technologies involved in the governance of culture as being more and less coercive in Gramsci’s sense of educative activities having a positive (productive) educative function and also a negative (repressive) function (1982, p. 36). In his analysis of state involvement with art in late nineteenth-century Britain, Stedman Jones also draws on Gramsci in order to describe the various sets of techniques for the ‘civilisation’ of the poor in terms of ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ approaches. He writes: ‘Two major stratagems can be detected in this christianising and “civilising” activity. The first was to use legislation to create a physical and institutional environment in which undesirable working-class habits and attitudes would be deterred, while private philanthropy could undertake the active propagation of a new moral code’ (Stedman Jones 1982, p. 98). We will discuss the
example of private philanthropy later; first, we need to explore whether or not Victorian efforts to manage the poor are explicable simply in terms of ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ or ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ educative effects and through the direct imposition of state power and the hegemonic engendering of consent.

Bennett has argued that by exploring the relations between knowledge and power in the museum we can conclude that the ‘significance of the formation of the exhibitionary complex,… was that of providing new instruments for the moral and cultural regulation of the working classes’ (1988, p. 85-86). Characteristic of museums after the mid-nineteenth century was their strategic use of culture to act in a positive and productive way on the mental, moral and intellectual attributes of the general population. Thus, for Bennett, the crucial point is that the relations of power and knowledge in the museum cannot be read in terms of either the direct or ‘hard’ inculcation of capacities by the state or ‘soft’ forms of state intervention which operate through securing working-class consent. Rather, the museum operates on the basis of distinct fields of political relations which are specific to the logics operating within the museum. Thus, the ‘museum, viewed as a technology of behaviour management, served to organise new types of social cohesion precisely through the new forms of both differentiating and aligning populations it brought into being’ (Bennett 1990, p. 48). The aims and expected outcomes of these strategies for the regulation of the population and indeed the knowledges of the population which they involved were not general but were (and are) productive in their invention of new ways of categorising the population in order to work on it for new purposes. For instance, Bennett argues, the utilisation of culture through programmes for the establishment of ‘public’ museums is linked to a shift in the ‘construction of the poor that made it intelligible to think of art and culture as resources that might be enlisted in the service of governing’ (1994, p. 31). These new strategies of population management (of which public museums were just one) represented a new form of moral regulation. The specific function of these strategies after mid century was
to have the population (and particularly the working classes) ‘choose’ a moral and industrious ‘course of life for themselves as a matter of personal responsibility or self-regulation’ (ibid., p. 30).

This form of population management cannot be ascribed to any single power ‘bloc’ or general form of cultural politics, such as, the ‘state’, or hegemony. The knowledge/power relations involved are not reducible in this way, as Bennett comments, there is no reason ‘to seek their reconciliation in some common principle. For the needs to which they responded were different’ (1988, p. 99). Instead we can theorise the operation of power in this example as being primarily productive. This would require us to understand the operation of power not in terms of either the ‘hard’ or ‘soft’ intervention of a ‘state’ on ‘the people’ but the operation of power as integral to the development of a population’s capacities. In the second half of the nineteenth century the museum was part of a network of institutional sites which sought to manage the population in a diversity of ways, ‘the most ardent advocates of public museums, free libraries and the like typically spoke of these in connection with courts, prisons, poor-houses and, more mundanely, the provision of public sanitation and fresh water supplies’ (Bennett 1994, p. 5). As we have seen, in a Gramscian theoretical framework we could view this rapid development of institutions for the management of the population as the establishment of a hegemonic formation through which the state operated on ‘the people’ through a range of institutions and practices in order to institutionalise a particular pattern of (political) relations between the cultures and the classes in society. Above all this would be to argue that the development of these diverse institutions and the multitude of practices they sought to organise and encourage is definable as the construction of a hegemony which operated in the interests of a particular set of class based social and economic relations. Bennett argues instead that we can view this multiplication of strategies for the management of the social ‘in light of the endeavour to make populations self-regulating that was associated with the development of liberal forms of government’ (1994, p. 6). Most importantly Bennett does not define these new techniques of management
as ‘restrictive’ in the way they sought to inculcate in populations (and particularly the working classes) conducts which required ‘the people’ to participate in cultural forms which were not representative of their ‘class consciousness’. Rather, Bennett argues that the effects of these new programmes for the management of the social, and especially the public museum, were positive and productive in the sense that they aimed to equip individuals with a diverse range capacities necessary to conduct themselves in relation to their ‘freedom’. In this, Bennett’s historicisation of the museum accords with Rose’s history of the psychological sciences in that both argue that these programmes for the management of populations were directly related to acquiring appropriate techniques of self in relation to the exercise of freedom.

Whitechapel Loan Exhibitions

The Barnett’s Whitechapel Loan Exhibitions were the first and the most successful of the exhibitions for the poor in the late nineteenth century. The exhibitions’ successes were due in part to the Barnett’s large circle of wealthy and influential friends who were prepared to lend their private collections for no charge. In order to ensure access, the exhibitions were free and open on Sundays and affordable catalogues were produced to go with each exhibition.

Unlike the British National Museum, the Barnett’s catalogues did not choose a path of classification and dating but rather one of refining and elevating. The catalogues, like the lectures, took the opportunity of highlighting for the audience the morally uplifting qualities of the paintings’ subject matter. For one

---

40 The exhibitions were held at Easter every year from 1881.
41 The exhibitions success is reflected in their attendance figures, 10,000 people attended the first exhibition in 1881 and the attendance figures peaked at 73, 271 in 1892 (Koven 1994, p. 35).
42 The Barnetts’ policy of Sunday openings of the exhibitions was subject to much disapproval on religious grounds. It was not until 1896 that a motion was passed in Parliament for the Sunday opening of Museums. The catalogues too were unusual for their time, catalogues produced to accompany exhibitions in the Royal Academy of Art or the National Museum had no interpretative or didactive quality, like the Whitechapel catalogues, but were simply classifications of the art on display.
43 The Whitechapel catalogues were a success, as Koven notes, sale of the catalogues remained constant at about a third of visitors, this figure is significant given that most visitors to the exhibitions would have been in parties of families or school children (1994, p. 47).
picture, ‘The Poverty of the Poor’, Henrietta Barnett wrote: ‘One of our hopes for the future; and not the least conspicuous as a moral training ground, is the family dinner table. There the mother can teach the little lessons of good manners and neat ways, and the larger truths of unselfishness and thoughtfulness...’ (in Borzello 1980, p. 95). Thus, the paintings were used as a platform to educate the audience in certain lessons of civility. Following the theories of John Ruskin, art’s relation to an ideal world took on an almost religious status for the Barnetts. Borzello writes that for Samuel Barnett, ‘...pictures and artists had a link with a superior state of existence... Because of his belief that artists made the beauties of life and nature steadfast, he saw pictures as a medium between God and the people and endowed them with a quasi-holy status’ (1980, p. 72). The Whitechapel exhibitions are examples of a belief that the poor only had to be shown correct behaviour and they would govern themselves accordingly. Samuel Barnett outlined the aim of the exhibitions as to impart the message of culture ‘seen as a converting influence which can turn the poor from sin to an awareness of life’s grandeur’ (in Borzello 1980, p. 69).

Like most philanthropists in the latter part of the nineteenth century, the Barnetts were influenced by Ruskin’s views that the appreciation of art was a morally improving activity. Ruskin’s assertion of the ability of art to uplift ‘man’ spiritually led him to dedicate *Modern Painters* ‘to exhibit the moral function and end of art; to prove the share which it ought to have in the thoughts, and the influence on the lives, of all of us; to attach to the artist the responsibility of a preacher, and to kindle in the general mind that regard which such an office must demand’ (in Landow 1971, p. 55). Ruskin argued that there existed an art experience which was specifically ‘British’. This British art experience was found in the depiction of the British landscape through which Ruskin argued the painter could depict and the audience view the work of God. However, while Ruskin argued for the broadening of opportunities for the viewing of art he did not believe the uneducated would be able to derive the same benefits from art as educated people. Helsinger points out that Ruskin proposed a separate system of primarily educational museums for the
working classes while ‘treasured’ artefacts would be kept in museums with limited access to the working class. Thus, she argues that ‘Art offered Ruskin a means of shaping national viewers in many different sites, both public and private, as he set out to make looking at art central to the experience of being British. But the national polity constituted by the viewers in these multiple spaces was never envisioned as a homogenous nation’ (Helsinger 1994, p. 19). Ruskin did not believe that exposure to ‘fine’ art would have any beneficial effect on the poor. The Barnetts took selectively from Ruskin’s ideals. They were influenced by Ruskin’s argument that art had a spiritually uplifting quality but unlike him they thought that exposure to art would have a civilising effect on London’s slum dwellers.44

In Borzello’s history of the Whitechapel exhibitions, *Civilising Caliban: The Misuse of Art 1875-1980* (1987), she argues that there has been an historical distinction between art as ‘elevation’ and art as ‘education’. Borzello argues that these separate discourses have influenced the administration of art but that the former as a ‘misuse of art’ can be ascribed to the Barnetts and the latter, which for her is the more democratic use of art, can be ascribed to William Morris. Borzello argues that it is the former discourse of art as ‘elevation’ which frames the history of the administration of art from the Barnetts to the Arts Council of Great Britain. While it is clear that the Barnetts hoped their exhibitions would ‘elevate’ the poor is this accurately analysed as a ‘misuse’ or ‘undemocratic’ use of art?45

Borzello’s argument that the Whitechapel art exhibitions can be understood as a ‘misuse’ of art rests on her point that there were two theoretical approaches to the provision of access to art for the poor in the latter part of the nineteenth century: ‘One wants to show the best art to all, the other to involve everyone in an art that is more flexibly defined than the first group would allow’ (Borzello 1987, p.

---

44 For a discussion of similar programmes in Manchester see MacDonald, 1986.

45 See Taylor, 1994 for a discussion of how the aim of ‘elevation’ or ‘metaphors of improvement’ established the Tate Gallery ‘as a site of culture and leisure (mostly) for the middle-class English public’ (1994, p. 27).
For Borzello, these approaches have political effects. The first approach, in seeking to expose ‘the people’ to the ‘best’ art, also sought to inculcate in them bourgeois capacities which would ensure consent by ‘the people’ to bourgeois rule. The second approach, which in extending access and especially participation in the production of cultural forms to the working classes, was more flexible and ‘democratic’ in that it allowed the development of specifically ‘popular’ cultural forms. For Borzello, the Barnetts were associated with the first approach. Borzello argues that they had ‘no interest at all in letting … [the poor] get their hands on a paintbrush’ (1987, p. 53). Furthermore, she writes that the Barnetts ‘never wavered in their belief that craft could not be art’ (Borzello 1987, p. 58). Thus, according to Borzello, due to the Barnett’s limited (bourgeois) definition of what constituted art and the ‘passive’ forms of participation encouraged at the Whitechapel exhibitions, the Barnett’s exhibitions can be viewed as a ‘misuse’ of art. In contrast, in ‘The Whitechapel Picture Exhibitions and the Politics of Seeing’ (1994), Seth Koven argues that the ‘Barnetts promoted the exhibitions, along with university extension lectures, clubs, debating societies, and classes in arts and crafts, in an attempt to build a national culture based not on the competing interests of class, but on a consensual citizenship’ (1994, p. 23). Arguing specifically against Borzello, Koven further points out that

... the Barnetts were anxious to promote East Londoners’ direct participation in the production of art as well as their instruction in its appreciation... At the turn of the century, the Whitechapel Free Art Gallery encouraged East Londoners to produce their own art through periodic shows devoted to local artists, both adults and children. (1994, p. 45)

---

46 Borzello’s argument rests on a Marxist division of culture into the aesthetic and culture as a form of self-constitutive labour which is closer to the interests of the labouring classes. This division has been questioned by Ian Hunter. He argues, ‘there is every reason to suspect that Marxist conceptions of culture as a form of “production” modelled on self-constitutive labour are in fact an optional variant of the aesthetic model of culture... by disavowing the historically available institutions of cultural formation as partial expressions of incomplete historical (classes), the Marxist conception of culture removes itself from the actual norms and forms of calculation in which cultural interests and attributes are formulated and assessed’ (1988, p. 113). See also Bennett 1983 and 1985, who argues that the problem with Marxist aesthetics is that it locates a universal value in the object and thus the role of cultural policy is either to educate ‘the masses’ or a transformation in social relations (1985, p. 47).
Thus, while it is clear that the Barnett’s aim for the art exhibitions was in terms of their ability to ‘elevate’ the poor, this aim is not understandable simply in terms of the imposition of bourgeois cultural forms which the poor were required to passively consume.

Borzello argues that ‘the Barnetts were in a position to be more aware than most of social sore-spots and the alienated state of the poor. Despite this awareness- or perhaps because of it- one of their self-appointed tasks was to defuse possibly incendiary dissatisfactions with society’ (1987, p. 66). Stedman Jones, in a more self-consciously Gramscian reading of working-class culture in London in the late nineteenth century, also describes the Barnetts as part of the ‘respectable and well-to-do [who] had to win the “hearts and minds” of the masses to the new moral order and to assert their right to act as its priesthood’ (1982, p. 97). Thus, for Stedman Jones, as for Borzello, the Whitechapel exhibitions were part of an ‘attempt to establish harmony’ by engendering consent in the working classes to bourgeois rule (Stedman Jones 1982, p. 98). Koven uses the example of the role the Barnetts played in the Great Dock Strike of 1889 to argue that the types of analysis illustrated by Borzello or Stedman Jones fail to take account of the fact that far from promoting the status quo Samuel Barnett was among ‘one of the most influential figures to support the cause of the strikers’ (Koven 1994, p. 40). In his annual address Barnett stressed that the dockers had ‘felt the ennobling impulse which belongs to common action and common suffering’ (Barnett in Koven 1994, p. 40). Koven’s point, and it is a good one, is that the fact that the exhibitions were popular is notable because ‘it disaggregates specific cultural activities like museum going as the exclusive behaviours of the bourgeoisie. There is no reason to believe that in attending the exhibitions working-class East Londoners were betraying (or seeking to escape from) their culture or class’ (1994, p. 40).
In the discussion of the South Kensington Museum and the Whitechapel Art Exhibitions and the characteristics of the conjunction of art and citizenship which framed these art programmes, we have also contrasted two different theoretical models for analysing the relations between art, citizenship and government. We have described Gramscian influenced accounts as seeking to understand the South Kensington Museum and the Whitechapel Art Exhibitions in terms of their role as part of a hegemonic apparatus which sought to ‘civilise’ the working classes by engendering their consent to certain (bourgeois) practices and modes of conduct. Above all, for Pearson, Stedman Jones and Borzello, this process involved the *restriction* of the ‘popular’ cultural forms of ‘the people’. It is clear that cultural programmes based on theories of ‘rational recreation’ in mid nineteenth-century Britain were specifically targeted at working-class men in the hope that attendance at the museum, for instance, would encourage them to stay out of the Gin Palaces. However, Bennett provided us with a different viewpoint by arguing that to view these programmes only as instances of the descending flow of bourgeois cultural power which reached into and reorganised the ‘everyday culture’ and class consciousness of the working classes is ‘one-eyed’ (Bennett 1993, p. 73). This is not to deny the importance of the middle-class cultural forms these programmes took nor their political aims but rather to emphasise that these dimensions are points in a wider field of competing strategies and effects. Thus, while the semantics and the politics of culture are important what is of most significance in understanding the nature of such programmes is the way that the different meanings of culture are utilised in their governmental and technological refashioning (Bennett 1993, p.77). In a history of nineteenth-century art programmes the bourgeois nature of the uses of ‘high’ culture is not as significant as the way such cultural production and forms of cultural consumption were instrumentalised by governmental programmes which sought to act on the population to encourage the formation of a citizenry with particular attributes. For our purposes, we have argued that we can best understand the function of culture as an interface between government and the population by understanding that the goals of art programmes were diverse in their
aims and outcomes. Therefore, we have viewed the relations between art, government and citizenship as *productive* by understanding art programmes in terms of the ways they sought to construct a citizenry which was capable of managing itself in relation to its own ‘freedom’.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter and in chapter one we have discussed a number of contrasting art, citizenship and government articulations within particular programmes of arts administration. One of the points we have sought to emphasise is that art, citizenship and government articulations must always be understood in relation to their conjunctural specificities. It will be the specificities of the conjunctions of art, citizenship and government in post-WWII art programmes which we will interrogate in section two of the thesis. Our reason for choosing the moments we have- late eighteenth century France, mid to late nineteenth-century Britain, and, in the next chapter, the 1930s in America and Britain during WWII- has to do with these periods paradigmatic status in establishing some of the basic vocabularies for the conjunction of the spheres of art, citizenship and government and their shifting concerns.

We will understand post-WWII art programmes in terms of the ways in which these programmes are utilised within a liberal governmental rationality. We have argued that, for us, the key defining feature of this liberal governmentality is the way in which it combines techniques for constructing and managing individual citizens with procedures for the calculation and management of the population in its totality. We argued that these relations are 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. Thus, in our analysis of various influential conjunctions of art, citizenship and government we have argued that such conjunctions are
best viewed in terms of the ways government has sought to act *positively* on a population by equipping it with various capacities.

The terms ‘neo-liberal’ and ‘advanced’ liberal have been coined to characterise a shift in the rationality of liberal government which can be dated in Western liberal democracies to post-WWII. This neo-liberal rationality of government has been defined by Graeme Burchell as involving ‘…the rational principle for regulating and limiting governmental activity [which] must be determined by reference to artificially arranged or contrived forms of the free, entrepreneurial and competitive conduct of the economic-rational individual’ (1993, p. 271). Neo-liberal government operates by the generalisation of an ‘enterprise form’ to all forms of conduct (Burchell 1993, p. 275). Thus, where liberal governmentality managed the populace through ‘the social’, via a plethora of techniques for knowing and evaluating social norms; neo-liberal governmentality governs via a range of rationalities and technologies which govern ‘through regulated choices made by discrete and autonomous actors in the context of their particular commitments to families and communities’ (Rose 1996b, p. 328). Rose has coined the phrase ‘the death of the social’ to characterise this shift (1996b). We will further elucidate this theory of a shift from a liberal to a neo-liberal form of government in the rest of the thesis where we will be able to illustrate this theory through a history of the relations constructed between government and culture during the American ‘New Deal’, WWII Britain, and the history of arts administration in Australia from the 1940s to the present day.

47 This Foucaultian analysis has been developed in relation to a genealogy of the psychological sciences in Britain; see for instance Miller and Rose, 1994; Rose, 1988; and, Rose, 1990.
CHAPTER THREE:

A ‘New Deal’ for Art: Art, Citizenship and Government During the Depression in America and World War Two in Britain
This chapter analyses two moments in the history of twentieth-century western government arts subvention. The main focus of these moments is, first, government art programmes in ‘New Deal’ America, particularly examining the history of the Federal Art Project (FAP) and, second, an analysis of art programmes in Britain during WWII, particularly focusing on the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts (CEMA). The period of the 1930s and 1940s is especially significant for the ways in which government arts funding came to be institutionalised in the post-war anglophone world. During the 1930s and 1940s there was a significant shift in the degree to which governments administered the arts. This had two direct outcomes. The first outcome was that there was an increased political expectation that it was a responsibility of government to fund and administer art. This meant that in a time of dire economic and political circumstance, due first to the Depression and then to WWII, there were multiple initiatives for administering the arts with the aim of extending access and participation more generally throughout the nation. In the second place, linked to this shift in arts management, there was a shift in the way ‘the people’ were constructed in relation to art. Far from art being thought of as the property of the few or the elite, the definitive art programmes of the 1930s and early 1940s were titled ‘Art for the People’ and proudly proclaimed that art was the property of ‘Everyman’. Both of these discursive shifts were the outcome of much longer histories.\(^48\) Specifically, they can be seen in relation to the more general shift towards different strategies for the management of ‘the social’, which can be traced from the early nineteenth century in, for example, museum policy. Nevertheless, the 1930s and 1940s are significant for the ways in which cultural policy sought to act on the citizen from a distance. These strategies hoped to produce and encourage citizens capable of self regulation in a way that would ensure their active and productive contribution to the nation. Thus, artists in America were encouraged to paint ‘American’, and British culture became a symbol of ‘what we are fighting for’. In both countries the promise of cultural access was part of the promise of a new

---

\(^{48}\) While the similarity of the citizen constructed in these milieux is described, it is emphasised that each milieu is the product
reconstructed nation. An integral part of these various constructions of collectivity was the shaping of a citizen who would participate constructively in her or his working, political and social life.

Since the late eighteenth century ‘Western’ government has taken a liberal form, this political rationality has been characterised above all by a conception of government which places limits on the legitimate exercise of political authority. In other words, liberalism constructs certain spheres, for instance, civil society, as being ‘outside’ government (Miller and Rose 1992, p. 174-75). Liberalism seeks to manage these ‘private’ realms through the development of various programmes of government which translate the concerns of liberalism into discursive models which can be actioned while at the same time preserving the autonomy of ‘private’ spheres. Thus, the language of welfare in the 1930s and 1940s constituted the citizen as involved in a relation of mutual responsibility. On the one hand, this citizen’s rights and freedoms were guaranteed, on the other, citizenship was also articulated in the language of social responsibility and obligation. These programmes were articulated and made effective through governmental technologies. The characteristic form of governmental technologies under liberal rationalities of government was to operate on the population ‘from a distance’. Governmental technologies are the mundane mechanisms which articulate and make effective programmes of government; these technologies are the mechanisms which render the real knowable and enable its management through statistics, modes of accounting, methods of calculating and measuring, and so forth (ibid., p. 175). This conception of government, far from understanding liberalism as an ideology disguising state domination, understands the political rationality characteristic of governmentality as the management of populations in such a way as to equip them with the capacities to manage themselves, and further to manage their own freedom. In this conception of freedom and government, freedom becomes a technique and an element of government. Nikolas Rose’s formulation is that freedom is a
“certain way of administering a population that depends upon the capacities of free individuals” (1992, p. 2). We will argue that art programmes have been a key technology in the construction and management of such a ‘free’ citizenry. Since the mid twentieth century in the western anglophone world art programmes have been increasingly governmentalised with the general aim of equipping a citizenry with a range of ethical and civic capacities which will enable them to be self-managing in various ways.

The ‘New Deal’: 1930s America

This analysis of art programmes in ‘New Deal’ America will be organised around two main questions. What were the dominant discourses which informed and organised the administration of art and its relation to the public? How was the public constructed by the conjunction of these organising principles? In order to address these questions we will focus on two art programmes, the Treasury Department’s Section of Painting and Sculpture and the FAP.49 Both of these programmes were framed in terms of particular constructions of ‘the people’. These emphasised the interconnectedness of the citizen with the state and discursively reconstructed the American nation in terms of a collective of participatory citizens. Cultural programmes in general were governmentalised around the inculcation of a variety of conducts in accordance with these ideals of the citizen. Art programmes in particular played a central role in this relationship.

In 1932 the Democrat Franklin Delano Roosevelt defeated Herbert Hoover to become President of the United States of America. Roosevelt won the election on the basis of his platform promising that the conditions which led to the “Great Crash” of 1929 would never occur again and that there would be a

49 Later the Section of Painting and Sculpture became the Section of Fine Art.
‘New Deal’ for Americans which would bring the country out of depression. The ‘New Deal’ was an innovative programme involving the abandonment of the gold standard, devaluation of the dollar, state intervention in the credit market, agricultural price support, the passage of a Social Security Act (1935), which provided for unemployment and old age insurance, and the establishment of extensive work creation schemes. The main rhetorical appeals of the ‘New Deal’ are apparent in Roosevelt’s inaugural speech where he warned against the ‘evils of the old order’ and stated that his ‘primary task’ was to ‘put people to work’ (1973 [1933], p. 241). His central claim was that, ‘If I read the temper of our people correctly, we now realise as we have never before, our interdependence on each other; that we cannot merely take, but we must give as well’ (ibid.). Thus, the ‘New Deal’ was established (in its rhetoric at least) as a deal which would give economic equality, fair working conditions, decent housing, and increased leisure time to the common people, in return for ‘good’ citizenship.

Many analyses of this period in American history is full of praise for the radical, socialistic nature of Roosevelt’s reforms (see de Hart Matthews 1973 for example). In fact, while it is undeniable that these reforms were significant (for the first time the Federal government took responsibility for the welfare of unemployed people, for instance), the ‘New Deal’ was not as radical as has sometimes been claimed. Barton Bernstein questioned the extent of the ‘Roosevelt Revolution’ when he argued that the ‘Liberal reforms of the New Deal did not transform the American system; they conserved and protected American corporate capitalism... There was no significant redistribution of power in American society...’ (1968, p. 264). Conkin makes a similar point when he argues against the generalisation that it was the ‘New Deal’ which dismantled free enterprise in America. He points out that even ‘by the twenties, internal controls in highly collective enterprises had so lowered the range of choice as to threaten the very idea of a free market’ (1975, p. 25). Add to this the point that, although nationalising

50 The repeal of prohibition was also a vital platform issue in this election with Roosevelt in favour of a ‘New Deal for
the banks was a much discussed option in Roosevelt’s first one hundred days of reform, he stopped short of implementing this more socialistic measure. In summary, then, the ‘New Deal’ was not the revolution claimed by some. Conkin makes an interesting point when he writes that in fact the ‘New Deal was most traditional, not only echoing the language of many self-styled progressives but of an earlier Puritanism. The idea of broad opportunity, the sense of moral responsibility, was an older and deeper orthodoxy than laissez-faire…’ (1975, p. 53). This notion of moral responsibility or to use Roosevelt’s term the ‘interdependence’ of people and state was the ideological underpinning of the ‘New Deal’. In this context art was reclaimed from its fringe in ‘high society’ and placed at the centre of the community as part of culture understood in its wider definition as a ‘whole way of life’. Thus the educator John Dewey had an important influence on the FAP.51 Dewey argued that art must be experienced via direct participation and engagement with the ‘everyday’. In a radio address for NBC Blue Network in 1940 he put the importance of ‘New Deal’ art this way:

For if you could see for yourselves reproductions of the murals which are now found in public buildings from Maine to the Gulf… you could see that the paintings combine the values of the arts which nourish the human spirit with the accomplishments of our past history which strengthen that legitimate pride which enables one to say, ‘I am an American citizen’…. (in Park and Markowitz 1984, p. vii)

In this role art’s function was to depict, celebrate and educate the ‘New Deal’ citizen.

The Research Committee on Social Trends appointed by Hoover in 1929 reported in 1933 that ‘for the overwhelming majority of the American people the fine arts of painting and sculpture, in their non-commercial, non-industrial forms, do not exist’ (in McKinzie 1973, p. 4). There are two primary reasons why government organised and funded the large art projects of the ‘New Deal’. First,
supporting art projects was symptomatic of a particular philosophical view of the relationship of government and the people. This view envisaged the people as citizens participating in the working of the nation in an informed manner. Related to this was an ideal citizen posed in terms of a self-regulating and discerning consumer. This citizen/consumer would be equipped not only with the attributes to participate effectively through the exercise of her or his social and political responsibilities but also through the thrifty expenditure of her or his capital and the sensible expenditure of her or his (increased) leisure time. Holger Cahill, Director of the FAP from 1935, expressed how art might add to the interconnectedness of state and consumer/citizen when he wrote that ‘We are not particularly interested in developing what is known as art appreciation... We are interested in raising a generation... sensitive to their visual environment and capable of helping to improve it’ (in McKinzie 1973, p. 130). Thus, consumption, when practised in the appropriate way, was another level at which the citizen could participate in reconstructing the American nation in new and better ways. The second main reason for government art subvention was based on the aim of provision of work for unemployed artists. While there was an increase in exhibitions, collections, galleries and patrons of the arts in the United States during the 1920s, with the advent of the Depression this growth declined (Harris 1995, p. 13). Audrey McMahon, Director of the FAP in New York City argued that even before the Depression very few artists were able to make a living from art and what the Depression had in fact removed was the availability of secondary employment (ibid., p. 13-14). In any case, prior to the stock market crash of 1929 much of the trade in ‘fine’ art had been in foreign markets, as Cahill commented, during ‘the middle twenties there was an art boom of respectable proportions associated with the stock market boom in those years, but in this, the American artist hardly shared at all. He had become a step-child in his own country’ (in Harris 1995, p. 15). These two main priorities of the projects- education and work creation- manifested themselves in different ways in the Section of Painting and Sculpture and the FAP.
By 1932, in response to the dire conditions, artists involved with Communist and Labour groups had begun to organise hunger strikes in major cities. Attention was focused particularly on New York, where most of America’s artists resided. At the same time an old class mate of Roosevelt’s, the artist George Biddle, wrote a letter to Roosevelt proposing a programme where artists were commissioned to create works of art in public spaces celebrating the ‘New Deal’. Biddle’s inspiration for this came from a 1920s Mexican experiment sponsored by the Communist government in which artists were commissioned to paint murals on public buildings expressing the ideas of the Mexican revolution. While Biddle received a sympathetic response from the President, no immediate action was taken.

In 1933, after Edward Bruce had taken over Biddle’s lobbying, the Public Works of Art Project (1933-1934) was created under the Public Works Administration with Bruce as its head. This project was an experiment and funding lasted four months (McKinzie 1973, p. 5-10). The Section of Painting and Sculpture (1934-43) came directly out of this experiment as did the Treasury Relief Art Project (1935-1943). In 1935 the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act was passed by Congress, this Act gave government broad powers to centralise the administration of and provide funds for the problem of unemployment relief. To administer this problem the Federal Works Agency was inaugurated in 1935 and was made up of the Works Progress Administration (WPA), the Public Building Administration, the Public Roads Administration, the Public Works Administration, and the U.S. Housing Authority. The WPA, directed by Harry Hopkins, was responsible for a variety of public works schemes (Harris 1995, p. 28). Within the WPA a Division of Professional and Service Projects was established with a section titled Federal Project Number One. Federal One, as it was called, was made up of the FAP, the

---

52 Towards the end of the New Deal in 1939 the WPA, as part of restructuring, was renamed the Work Projects Administration, this was in response to pressure that the title Progress was too radical (Harris 1995, p. 129-30)
Federal Theatre Project, the Federal Music Project, the Federal Writers Project, and the Historical Records Survey.\textsuperscript{53}

\textbf{Section of Painting and Sculpture}

As outlined above there were two art projects administered by the Treasury, these were the Section of Painting and Sculpture and the Treasury Relief Art Project. The Treasury Relief Art Project operated within the work creation regulations of the WPA, which meant mainly that it had to make up a quota of seventy-five percent of its artists from the relief rolls. This requirement militated against the Treasury preference of appointing only ‘quality’ artists and the Treasury Relief Art Project began a slow phase out in 1936, by which time it had been replaced by the much larger FAP (McKinzie 1973, p. 39). Harris points out that as the Treasury Relief Art Project employed only four hundred and forty artists in its total operating life its impact and effect as a work creation scheme was limited (Harris 1995, p. 27). Thus, we will focus on the Section of Painting and Sculpture which was the larger of the two programmes.

In the Public Works of Art Project it became obvious that there was a conflict between its two goals, of aiding unemployed artists and of acquiring quality works of art for the government (O’Connor 1969, p. 21). After the Public Works of Art Project finished Bruce organised and established the Section of Painting and Sculpture which received its funds directly from the Treasury. Bruce’s original idea for the funding of this programme was that one percent of the cost of new Federal buildings be set aside to embellish them. Bruce’s idea proved difficult to implement and the less ambitious approach of

\textsuperscript{53} The WPA art projects were the largest art projects in the New Deal. Each of the Projects had distinct histories, for example, communism was a more central influence in the history of the Writers and Theatre Projects as compared to the Art Project. This factor was especially important towards the end of the 1930s when community support for the Projects, and indeed the New Deal in general, was lost. After the Committee for Un-American Activities was formed, in response to the Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact, the art projects were accused of harbouring communist sympathiser’s.
commissioning works was undertaken (McKinzie 1973, p. 37). Much of the selection process was done by competitions, where proposals were chosen on the basis of their quality. Unlike the FAP, the Section was not a work creation scheme and therefore did not have to fill large quotas of unemployed artists. O’Connor points out that the task of embellishing state buildings was already administered under the Treasury (1969, p. 17). Thus, the Section was continuous with previous practices of state administration of the arts in America.

O’Connor claims that Section administrators were attempting to initiate a government driven mural renaissance comparable to that of Mexico. Reflecting the typically socialist nature of cultural programmes in the 1930s the influence of ‘Socialist Realism’ was important in both the art produced by Section painters and more significantly in the form this cultural programme took. The requirements of Section art were quite specific. The members of the advisory committee of the Section of Painting and Sculpture were proponents of realist art depicting the ‘American scene’ and they were antagonistic to European modernist art (Harris 1995, p. 26). The realist style practised in and encouraged by the Section was a realism which favoured themes such as the common man and woman at work. Thus, Section art was able to be understood by ‘everyman’ as it was a direct depiction and heroisation of the ‘common’ person’s experience of life. Above all, realist art was considered to be a better vehicle for ready understanding by the uninitiated public. In a similar sense to the way history painting was the favoured style of the early days of the French Revolution in that it was felt this style could best communicate and glorify a particular range of civic virtues, in the ‘New Deal’ realist art depicted the ‘common’ person practising a civic responsibility in her or his work and social occupations. T.R. Adam writing for the American Association of Adult Education in the late 1930s summarises the ideal of cultural programmes which above all functioned to inculcate civic virtue into the population. For
Adam, reflecting a common emphasis in the 1930s, this was specifically to preserve democracy in the face of the threat of fascism:

Under democratic conditions, the direction of our social culture must depend on the nature of the mass mind. Minorities of scholars may comprehend the past and seek to move toward the future, but they have no power to direct society until they have shared their understanding with the general run of citizenry. An instrument that can speak directly to the minds of the untrained is an invaluable aid to democratic culture. Art in all its forms is probably the soundest popular historian of our civilisation. (1937, p. 28)

However, when Adam refers to an art which can ‘speak directly to the minds of the untrained’ he was not speaking of the abstract art which was popular with the cognoscenti at this time. Rather, he wrote that the ‘community needs art as an interpretation of daily life, and not as a distant luxury’ (1937, p. 38). Indeed the Section had this anti-abstract emphasis in common with all the 1930s art projects, we will be better able to discuss this point below with the example of the FAP. This emphasis on the use of cultural programmes in popular education was also applied to museums and libraries as well as other organisations that had an educative role- such as, trade unions, businesses, churches- which were called on to use cultural programmes for the effective education of the populace (see Adam, 1937 and 1939).54

Above all the emphasis in these programmes was on their participatory nature, as opposed to passive educational techniques. In this way *participation* in an art activity was understood as connecting the people with their social responsibilities. For instance T.L. Low following Adam’s philosophy of the museum as an instrument for popular education writes that this ‘education… must be active, not passive, and it must always be intimately connected with the life of the people’ (1944, p. 21). In the same report, written just prior to the end of WWII for the American Association of Museums, Low emphasises that active ‘public libraries and active public museums are an American creation and as such they can play an exceedingly important role in maintaining and strengthening that thing which we

54 Indeed during the 1930s the emphasis on education in museums was more influential that in Britain at the same time. In Britain while during WWI the museums which were able to stay open had an important role in exhibiting educational exhibitions, as Kavanagh points out, after the war this ‘lapsed ion the face of curatorial indifference and a failing post-war economy’ (1994, p. 170). Indeed, the more pervasive influence of educational philosophies on American museums at this
like to call “the American Way of Life”, there is now an urgency about it’ (1944, p. 27). In the 1930s and in the 1940s culture, as a tool for the education of a citizenry in various capacities, was posed specifically in terms of the perceived threat of fascism, although at the same time the threat America protected itself against was in the process of shifting from the Nazi’s and Fascists’ in Germany, Italy and Japan and towards the Communist regime in Russia which was seen to present more pressing internal threats.

While it was important that artists celebrated the ‘American Way of Life’ in their commissioned works, in the Section this art also had to be representative of the best of American talent. The primary goal of the Section, as stated in the first Section Bulletin in 1935, was to ‘secure suitable art of the best quality for the embellishment of public buildings’ (in O’Connor 1969, p. 21). Bruce put the aim of the Section this way:

> Our objective should be to enrich the lives of all our people by making things of the spirit, the creation of beauty part of their daily lives, by giving them new hopes and sources of interest to fill their leisure, by eradicating the mere utility, and by fostering all the simple pleasures of life which are not important in terms of dollars spent but are immensely important in terms of a higher standard of living. (in Park and Markowitz 1992, p. 132)

The envisaged outcome of the Section art project was not only the education of the ‘everyman’ in the civic virtues but also the training of ‘good’ citizenship was indivisible from a training in ‘good’ consumption. This emphasis had two main configurations; first, as the above quote from Bruce shows there was an interest in an education for the proper use of leisure time; second, there was an emphasis on training the people to recognise, produce and purchase good quality design. Thus, Adam argues that ‘the people, as consumers, have need for firsthand knowledge of design in order to use their purchasing power to best advantage’ (1937, p. 35).

time was also partly to do with the influence of the ‘dime museum’, a popular and commercial museum form which had always claimed some measure of educative function.
This insertion of quality art into the daily lives of the people was to be achieved by the nation-wide distribution of art in small federal buildings, such as post offices. It is important to understand that in many communities the post office was one of the only official buildings and as the locus of contact with the outside world, functioned as an important centre for communication both within and without the community. A Section Bulletin described the post office as ‘the one concrete link between every community of individuals and the Federal government’ that functioned ‘importantly in the human structure of the community’ (in Park and Markowitz 1984, p. 8). The distribution of art in this way was instrumental in terms of the establishment of a visual connection between art, government, and the people. The murals in the post offices interpreted this relation and depicted it as a celebration of nation and citizenship. These national representations were at the same time local and regional. Most artists worked extensively with the local communities in which their work was installed. Indeed, Park and Markowitz have shown that in cases where works did not reflect the community or which the community did not like, these works were not installed (1984, p. 8). In this way the ‘common’ person was tied into a national ideal, as one post-master remarked, ‘How can a finished citizen be made in an artless town?’ (in Park and Markowitz 1984, p. xvii). While the process of negotiation between community and artist may have been participatory at the level of subject matter for local murals, it was not pluralist. The citizen represented in Section art was homogeneous, the Section, like the ‘New Deal’ in general, sought to play down distinctions based on class, race or sex.

**Federal Art Project**

The FAP was framed in terms of a particular construction of ‘the people’. This construction emphasised the interconnectedness of the citizen with the state and reconstructed the American nation in terms of a
collective of participatory citizens. Art played a central role in this relationship. O’Connor summarises the essays in a 1936 FAP national report in the following way:55

…the idea of ‘art for art’s sakes’ was firmly rejected as the basis for the FAP. This rejection was in keeping not only with the theoretical tenor of Cahill’s thought and the desires of the socialist-oriented artist’s organisations, but with the practical necessities of setting up an effective art-relief program, on a national scale, designed to employ all needy artists regardless of skill or aesthetic proclivity. The ideal was collectivism, not individualism. Cahill’s achievement was to create a program open to the artist’s ‘everyman’. (1973, p. 18)

The goals of the FAP were social work orientated. This emphasis extended not only towards unemployed artists but also to the FAP’s wider dealings with communities. In this the FAP was typical of the ‘New Deal’ in that it operated not only on the immediate aim of aid to artists but rather with a greater social goal in mind. Roosevelt commented in 1939 that the ‘WPA artist exemplifies with great force the essential place which the arts have in a democratic society’ (in O’Connor 1993, p. 2).

We have already alerted the reader to the fact that while much of the rhetoric of the ‘New Deal’ was radical its reforms fell short. We are not so interested here as to whether or not the FAP (or the ‘New Deal’ in general) was successful in achieving its more radical political goals. Our aims are more limited than that. Rather we hope to analyse the principal discourses which organised the relations between art programmes and citizens and through this to shed some light on the surprising fact that during a depression of the magnitude of America’s in the 1930s a government thought that a series of art programmes could be useful in managing the crisis. There will be three major points which will organise our analysis. First, we will discuss the Community Art Centre Programme of the FAP, in order to explore the extent to which the FAP can be understood as based on programmes informed by an adult education and social work philosophy. The second theme will examine the way the FAP art programmes used a specific content and style to achieve a set of particular aims. The FAP art

---

55 In 1968 the FAP historian Francis O’Connor gained permission from Holger Cahill’s wife to publish a collection of essays written in 1936 by project workers and administrators as a national report on the FAP (O’Connor, 1973).
programmes in their function as programmes to manage a population in desperate conditions were designed to instruct this extended population in a particular range of capacities. We have already discussed the way the Section of Painting and Sculpture was an educational vehicle for the inculcation of a range of skills which would induce and enable the citizen to play an effective role in the reconstruction of the American nation. The FAP too had these goals but due to the different organisation and governmental goals of the Project, the relations between art, citizen and government operated in a slightly different way in FAP organised programmes.

Cahill worked at the Newark Museum in the 1920s under John Cotton Dana.\textsuperscript{56} This was a period when the Museum was one of the few committed to the exhibition of contemporary American art and had a policy of actively encouraging public access by holding evening classes for immigrants, loan exhibitions for schools and churches, and so forth (de Hart Matthews 1975, p. 318). Cahill was a proponent of Dewey’s philosophy that real ‘understanding of art… came not from passive observation but from intense participation in the creative process. The task of the federal art project, therefore, was to make possible “democracy in the arts: through “community participation”’ (de Hart Matthews 1975, p. 322-23). Cahill’s theoretical approach to the FAP was not simply as a work relief programme for artists but also as a programme which could provide an education in the civic capacities which would be required under the more collectively aligned ‘New Deal’ state. This argument was clearly born out by Cahill when he outlined the aims of the FAP in an operating manual in 1935:

\begin{quote}
The plan of the FAP provides for the employment of artists in varied enterprises. Through employment of creative artists it is hoped… through art teaching and recreational activities to create a broader national art consciousness and work out
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{56} E.P. Alexander has argued that Dana and T.R. Adam were the main protagonists to focus the American museum movement on education and community service. Dana, who preferred the term ‘institute of visual instruction’ had a modernising conception of the museum. This expressed itself in a multitude of ways, Dana advocated and organised extensive advertising and publicity for his museum, including display’s in vacant shop fronts. He organised lecture series and night workshops, travelling exhibitions, branch museums and enlisted collectors from the community. As well as this Dana’s exhibition programme displayed the manufactures of local firms and was one of the first museums to display American folk art in an exhibition titled \textit{American Primitive Painting} in 1930 (1983).
constructive ways of using leisure time, through services in applied art to aid various campaigns of social value… The aim of the project will be to work toward an integration of the arts with the daily life of the community, and an integration of the fine arts and practical arts. (in O’Connor 1969, p. 28)

There are a number of emphases expressed in this quotation which we have already identified as typical of the ‘New Deal’ in our discussion of the Section of Painting and Sculpture. In contrast to the Section of Painting and Sculpture the FAP was above all a work relief project; however, as we can see in Cahill’s statement this did not limit his expectations for the project. There are three linked aims in this statement which emphasise the social use of art: art programmes would encourage a more artistically aware population who would then be able to expend their leisure time in constructive ways; applied art would be utilised in campaigns advocating particular social values (such as, murals in hospitals, schools, public art in government housing spaces and so forth); and through these types of programmes, the FAP would engender a bonding of applied and fine art. These aims would result in the production and consumption of better design, more widely accessible (both physically and intellectually) cultural production; in a phrase the Project would produce and advocate ‘useful culture’. Cahill supported activities which had at their core ‘active participation, doing and sharing, and not merely passive seeing’ (in O’Connor 1973, p. 43). However, while this rhetoric framed an understanding of the FAP the reality was not so clear cut.

In his detailed administrative history of the ‘New Deal’ art projects W.F. McDonald argues that we can locate the projects and the thinking behind them via the history of the philosophy of social work. He writes: ‘The WPA represented within a limited domain and for a limited time the assumption of public power within the federal government by the professional social worker’ (1969, p. 1). Thus, McDonald asserts that the ‘New Deal’ art projects can be understood in terms of the introduction of social
services: ‘The introduction of urban amenities, both material and cultural, into rural America was one of the basic purposes of the New Deal, and manifested itself in the arts no less than in rural electrification’ (1969, p. 185). Social service principles are certainly evident if we look at the example of the Community Art Centre Programme. A 1937 statement of purpose for the Community Art Centre Programme states that:

> In the arts… there has been in our time a development of professionalism without a corresponding development of community participation. The art centre program should be directed towards not only building larger audiences for the arts, but also toward guiding and encouraging group activity and group expression leading to a more complete community sharing in the experience of art. (in McDonald 1969, p. 465)

This ideal of a ‘community sharing in the experience of art’ was based on educational principles and sought to have a civilising influence in neighbourhoods where Community Art Centre’s existed. Indeed, McKinzie states that ‘Evening classes, frankly aimed at taking young people “from the frequently disastrous influences of the streets”, proved so successful that administrators could show that juvenile delinquency declined in areas around teaching locations’ (1973, p. 130). All Community Art Centre’s were open until nine at night, thus encouraging adults to attend, by 1940 adults had increased to 35% of attendees (McKinzie 1973, p. 131). Most Community Art Centre’s were successful in their communities, which was probably due in part to the fact that the local community (and not just the local government) had to bear some of the cost of the Community Art Centre’s operation; furthermore, the artist sent to run the centre was to adapt the centre to the community’s needs and interests rather than impose her or his own art standards on the community (ibid., p. 142). The main principles of these centres were twofold- to provide democratic access to culture and art as therapy. Irving Marantz, an FAP artist teacher, put the utility of art in this way when he commented that art was ‘a great therapy’ which could turn juveniles (and by implication other misfits) ‘into useful social beings’ (ibid., p. 198).

---

57 In 1930 the US Bureau of the Census officially recognised social work as a distinct profession for the first time. McDonald writes that ‘It was no accident that in March, 1933, the professional social worker, like the professional economist and the political scientist, descended upon Washington’ (1969, p. 12).
Thomas Parker of the FAP said of the centres that they were devoted ‘to returning art to the people, to all the people’ (in McKinzie 1973, p. 141). Thus, the Community Art Centre Programme targeted areas which were considered ‘culturally needy’- rural and desert areas, deprived urban communities, and new housing developments.

Due to political pressure from artist’s unions and other professional organisations, art projects under the WPA were based above all on the provision of relief. Nevertheless, social realist art theory and style was politicised in the rhetoric of Roosevelt, Cahill, and others in terms of ‘New Deal’ art reclaiming art for the people. We have seen that the Section of Painting and Sculpture required social realist art from its artists. The FAP did not require this style of art but, as McKinzie argues:

… few in 1935 escaped the influence of Midwestern ‘regionalist’ artists,… or… ‘social realism’… Regionalists and social realists built their art on American themes and sought to register their message in the untutored American mind. The roots of these modes lay in the ‘country-wide revival of Americanism’ (1973, p. 106).

The ‘New Deal’ rhetoric was that prior to the ‘New Deal’, art, like so much else, was only accessible to the wealthy and the wealthy only had a taste for foreign art. Thus, the ‘New Deal’ not only gave ‘ordinary’ people access to art but also allowed the American artist to paint ‘American’. These sentiments are apparent in Roosevelt’s 1941 speech at an address in dedication of the National Gallery of Art:

A few generations ago, the people of this country were taught… to believe that art was something foreign to America and to themselves… something they had no part in, save to go and see it in a guarded room on holidays or Sundays. But recently… they have discovered that they have a part… They have seen, across these last few years, rooms full of paintings by Americans,… all of it painted by their own kind in their own country, and painted about things they know and look at often and have touched and loved. (in Park and Markowitz 1984, p. 6)
The appeal was to art for the people and about the people. In this rhetoric art practice is reformed as not only representational of the nation but in the larger sense as ‘national’. Thus, in order for realist art to be reframed as national a dichotomy was set up between ‘foreign’ art which was based on ‘art for art’s sake’, and therefore had limited appeal to the people, and social realist art which spoke to and represented the American citizen. This rhetoric enabled the FAP to claim that the gallery was no ‘longer an esoteric space for the cognoscenti… the art gallery now belongs to the ordinary people’ (in Harris 1995, p. 40). Within this understanding the mural in particular functioned by its very nature as an art form which allowed the conjunction of government and art and was both representational of the people and in public space. Harris shows how via the mural programme the FAP interacted with other state activities, for example, housing, hospitals, prisons, schools. In these sites art functioned as a tool for the refashioning of children, delinquents, prisoners, mental patients, as citizens. Thus, via these murals with their representations of both the ideal of ‘New Deal’ America and the glorious past, people were to be constructed as useful citizens, contributing to the general well-being of society both at work and at play.

Harris has argued that art ‘and the social relations involved in its production were transformed…, in Project rhetoric, from objects of conflict and antagonism in industrial-capitalist society into objects of reconciliation, bringing order, reason and collective will’ (1995, p. 52). Thus, art acted as part of a strategy that attempted to achieve ‘a set of social identities or subjectivities that the state wished people to adopt’ (Harris 1995, p. 8). For Harris, the problem with this is that the ‘New Deal’ figured subjects as citizens and not as revolutionaries, thus the ‘Roosevelt revolution’ was confined, and reproduced ‘monopoly-capitalist dominance in the United States’ (1995, p. 21-22). While this may be the case, an over emphasis of this point leads us away from the meaning of these reforms in the 1930s. Park and Markowitz have argued for instance that although to ‘some, the Section’s art [and ‘New Deal’ art in
general] may seem to promote a middle-class, consensus view of the world,… in the 1930s,… labor and the left saw the New Deal as an ally in transforming society… It was not a picture of the status quo but of a society undergoing fundamental improvement’ (1984, p. 179). Chet La More of The Artist’s Union of America put the art, citizenship, government relationship this way:

The importance of government support is that it constitutes support for art by the people as a whole. Culturally such support is important in that it demands a growth within the art movement itself toward the entire people… The WPA/FAP is the historical beginning of a new and democratic movement of art in America. (1973, p. 237)

In the event it is well documented that while there may have been a left leaning consensus amongst intellectuals and artists during the 1930s which manifested itself in the concern with realist art and socially useful art, this emphasis retreated in the face of the modernist art movements of the 1940s and 1950s (see Brookeman, 1984).

In late eighteenth-century France we described how the conception of art and its relation to the public shifted from playing a strategic role in relation to King and Court to a relation which constructed it as representative of and as imbued with a capacity to educate the citizens of the new French Republic. The example of the Salon allowed discussion of the strategic use of art in absolutist regimes prior to the Revolution. While the Salon may have been open and free to the public, most of the public were excluded from its message. In this milieu art was used strategically to communicate the splendour of the King to his own and foreign Courts. After the Revolution it was claimed that art was the property of all the people and further that it was representative of, and of educational benefit to, the French citizenry. ‘New Deal’ FAP rhetoric constituted the individual as a citizen and, as a citizen, part of the great collective America. We have emphasised that articulations of art, citizenship and government are not describable in terms of a modernist teleology that instead these articulations must be addressed in their conjunctural specificities. In chapter one we argued that the importance of representation and
education in art programmes in the late eighteenth-century lay in their influence as basic vocabularies on which later articulations of art, citizenship and government have drawn. This model for the conjunction of art and the people based on a double function of representation and education, which in constituting art as the property of the people also constituted the people as part of a nation, has been central to the history of art programmes which have a general population as their target. In the ‘New Deal’ while addressing the conjunctural specificities of the relations between art, citizenship and government we must also recognise that this model of representation and education was central for the articulation of art, citizenship and government in the ‘New Deal’. Here American art was presented as the property of the public and that public was constructed as a ‘free people’ or citizenry.

How was the public framed in the FAP art programmes? De Hart Matthews has argued that the term ‘cultural democracy’ best encompasses the ideas and aspirations of the ‘New Deal’ (1975, p. 316). She breaks down the ‘New Deal’ concept of cultural democracy into three parts ‘cultural accessibility for the public, social and economic integration for the arts, and the promise of a new national art’ (1975, p. 325). However, as we have mentioned, the ‘New Deal’ art programmes did not construct the American citizenry as a pluralist citizenry. On the contrary, the rhetoric of the provision of culture to the needy meant that the American citizen was represented as homogeneous; sex, class, ethnicity were not emphasised, even though artists tried to make their murals community specific. Via access to art the people were to become ideal citizens, willing to work hard, able to carry out their political duties responsibly, and able to expend their increased leisure constructively. Thus, while it is true that the FAP was committed to ‘returning art to the people’ and to providing employment for unemployed artists, to what extent was the FAP committed to encouraging a participatory cultural democracy within its programmes? In the first instance McDonald points out that while many have argued that the FAP’s major motivation was the relation of art to the community ‘an employment quota for education of
between 10 and 25 per cent does not betoken a major emphasis’ (1969, p. 422-23). In the second instance, for all the denial of interest in the development of art appreciation, Cahill wanted the FAP to operate in such a manner that ‘genuine creative talent comes to the top’ and the ‘lesser lights’ worked in socially constructive ways (in McKinzie 1973, p. 95). Thus, while the FAP may have begun by attempting to meet both the goals of community service and the production of high standard works of art, in fact, it increasingly needed to stake its reputation on its artistic accomplishments rather than its community services. This was especially so towards the end of the 1930s when Federal One projects were accused of the production of ‘bad art’.

In the economic decline of 1937-39 work creation schemes became the target of much criticism. The legitimacy of state involvement with art had never been solid as each year the FAP suffered large reductions in its budget. In 1938 two Fine Art Bills were introduced by Representative John Coffee and Senator Claude Pepper. Both of these Bills were defeated on the basis that it was felt that government involvement with art would produce a lowering in standards (McKinzie 1973, p. 152). By the end of the 1930s these concerns were extended generally to what was seen as an over-centralised and overspending government. In 1942 the WPA Art Programme became the Graphic Section of the War Services Programme and all state art projects were closed by 1943. Already by 1942 it was possible to state, in an art exhibition catalogue, that the artist had been ‘almost totally liberated from the demands of society… he (sic) had only himself (sic) to answer to’ (in Harris 1995, p. 156). In contrast, in the aborted FAP report Stuart Davis of the American Artists Congress put the importance of conserving the arts under the ‘New Deal’ in this way:

---

58 This is in comparison to the figure that the production of works of art never employed less than 50% of personnel (McDonald 1969, p. 422-23).

59 These Bills ‘proceeded from the assumption that cultural enlightenment was a primary factor of democratic government… Coffee saw a parallel between the tasks of eradication of illiteracy and that of bringing culture to the people in terms understandable to the people, and for him the campaign for a permanent art programme was comparable in almost exact degree to the free school movement of the previous century’ (McKinzie 1973, p. 151).
Such conservation can continue only with the support of a government administration that will regard the arts, along with proper housing, playgrounds, health service, social security legislation, and educational facilities for all, as part of the basic obligations of a democratic government of all people towards the welfare of its citizens. (1973, p. 250)

The Section of Painting and Sculpture and the FAP can be defined as concerned with the utility of art in the construction and representation of a new America and its citizenry, in a phrase- art for the (American) people.

The ‘New Deal’ art programmes sought to shape the American people in various ways via the deployment of art in cultural programmes which sought to bear directly on the lives of ‘the people’. Specifically, the programmes of the ‘New Deal’ were aimed at the inculcation of a variety of norms and forms of conduct. We have shown that the primary role that culture played in the relations between citizen and state was in the ways in which art programmes emphasised the interconnectedness of the citizen with the state. We have shown, for instance in the ‘post office’ art programmes, that ‘New Deal’ art programmes discursively reconstructed the American nation in terms of a collective of participatory citizens. Thus, the citizenry was encouraged to think of itself as a participating part of a collective America. We have stated that the 1930s and 1940s are particularly important to a history of the post-WWII relations between art, citizenship and government. The 1930s and 1940s are significant for the ways in which cultural policy sought to act on the citizen from a distance. These strategies hoped to produce and encourage citizens capable of self regulation in a way that would ensure their active and productive contribution to the nation. While the conjunction of art, citizenship and government in Britain at this time is the outcome of specific historical and cultural circumstances there are parallel developments in the way culture was governmentalised. Cultural programmes in general were governmentalised around the inculcation of a variety of conducts in accordance with a certain set of
ideals which constructed the citizen as an actively participating part of a reconstructed nation. Art programmes in particular played a central role in this relationship.

**Britain in World War Two**

Two surprising points confront us about the history of government administration of the arts in Britain in the 1930s and 1940s. First, that the government chose the extreme circumstances of WWII to begin direct government subvention of a body organised to administer the arts. Second, immediately after the close of the war when the country was in dire economic straits (Britain’s war debt to America was £10,000 million) Parliament formally constituted this arts body as a Council with direct funding from Treasury. Our aim in surveying this history is threefold; first to describe and analyse the principles which framed the establishment of CEMA in 1939 and then governed its policies throughout the war. This will allow us, as our second aim, to explore how these principles were transferred to the constituting Charter of the Arts Council of Great Britain (Arts Council from here on in). This small snapshot of the history of the Arts Council will allow us, most crucially, to explore how some of its framing characteristics were formed. As above, in our analysis of the ‘New Deal’ art programmes, we will be examining here the relations between art, citizenship and government.

In an analysis of the framing discourses of arts subvention in Britain during WWII there are three main correspondences with our history of arts programmes in the ‘New Deal’. First, that socialist ideology was an important framing influence on the art, citizenship, government conjunction between the wars in both America and Britain. This influence is not necessarily of an overtly political nature. We have not found that any self-consciously socialist ideology necessarily framed art programmes in America, neither, will we find such specific necessary links in the UK. However, at a general level we find that socialist influenced art programmes have been important for their provision of discursive models for
the conjunction of the spheres of art, citizenship and government in the 1930s and 1940s in America and Britain. It is important to emphasise at this early point of the section that while the ‘New Deal’ was an important influence on British state policies in the 1930s and 1940s we do not suggest that the specific forms that government involvement with culture took in the 1940s in Britain emerged out of the ‘New Deal’ in any straightforward way, but rather were the product of a specifically British history.

The second and third main points of this section are interlinked. In the 1930s in America we saw that the individual was reframed as a citizen participating in the creation of an ideal ‘New Deal’ America. The art projects were thus part of a strategy for the formation and distribution of an image of the participatory citizen in a collective state. We find a similar connection of the citizen to a collective state in Britain during WWII. WWII has commonly been termed ‘the people’s war’ encapsulating the sense in which an appeal was made to ‘the people’ who, particularly because of the stringency’s of the Total War, were intricately involved in Britain’s campaign. As part of this appeal to a citizen actively contributing to the war effort, the war time arts organisations acted to construct and distribute a culture which could be claimed by all. These constructions were various as we shall see.

The Arts Between World War One and World War Two

A combination of factors meant that during the 1930s art’s function in society was discussed within a framework of government responsibility. Prime among these factors was a vogue for the concept of ‘planning’. The economic situation in the UK did not become acute until 1931, slightly later than in the USA; furthermore, the depression in the UK was not as severe as in America. Marwick argues it ‘was

---

60 In WWII the home front was also a war front, therefore, the appeal to the people was more integral to the social conditions of WWII than WWI due to the large civilian death toll- 60,000 civilians were killed, the Merchant Navy lost 30,000 and 300,000 soldiers were killed (Marwick 1971, p. 97).
61 Marwick argues that the economic situation in the 1930s in the UK was an extension of the crash which occurred in 1920, this is despite a temporary recovery in 1923-24 and some progress between 1924-29. However, the realities of the situation were to some extent concealed because the high unemployment was concentrated mainly in the North due to the collapse of
the great economic and political crisis which provided the necessary psychological snap, pointing clearly to the need for a more thorough abandonment of economic traditions and bringing the concept of “planning” right into the foreground of the nation’s consciousness’ (1971, p. 71). These sentiments were expressed clearly by the economist John Maynard Keynes in an article in 1936 where he argued that our ‘present policies are a just reflection of a certain political philosophy. I suggest that this philosophy is profoundly mistaken’ (1936, p. 373). Economic experiments carried out elsewhere had a strong impact on this belief in the failure of laissez faire, particularly the achievements of Roosevelt’s ‘New Deal’ and the reconstruction in the Soviet Union were watched closely by British intellectuals (Marwick 1971, p. 72).

The intellectual focus of the 1930s on social and political problems is known for its left-leaning consensus. The dominance of the Tories over Labour in the National government of 1931 and their failure to solve or ease the economic situation, and the growth of fascism and Nazism in continental Europe meant that many intellectuals turned to the extreme left wing. However, while there was much interest in the Soviet Union, Communist Party membership was not strong. Nevertheless, it is generally agreed that towards the end of the 1930s and during the war there was a general left consensus on the part of intellectuals. This can be traced in a variety of symptoms such as: an increasing rise in trade union membership, a movement characterised by growing respectability; a new working class demand for adult education which was taken up, predominantly, by left influenced institutions such as, the Workers Educational Association (WEA) (Kelly 1970, p. 246); the growth
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62 While the Communist Party were staunchly anti Nazi and anti Fascist, Communist Party supporters had to make a substantial readjustment (if only a brief one) after the dramatic volte-face of the Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact in 1939.
63 Trade union membership declined until 1933 after a peak in the years immediately after WWI, in 1927 general strikes were declared illegal in the Trade Union Act (Marwick 1971, p. 77).
64 For instance, during the Depression a WEA experiment in 1936 established a class in art appreciation in Ashington, a colliery town outside Newcastle-Upon-Tyne. At this time in Ashington there were no cultural facilities only two Workmen’s
and popularity of the Left Book Club, founded in 1935; and the arrival of the first cheap paperbacks in the form of Penguin Books (established in 1935) and the socialist flavour of its educational series (the ‘Specials’) under Pelican (Calder 1969, p. 512-513). The first volume of this series in 1937 was Bernard Shaw’s *Intelligent Woman’s Guide to Socialism* (Kelly 1970, p. 311). It was also a Penguin paperback which published the first general introduction to art in Britain, a book whose stated audience was the general public ‘which is becoming more and more interested in the visual arts’ (Lambert, 1938, p. 5). Interestingly the essays in this book (which were primarily taken from *The Listener*) were not limited to reflections on the style and content of British art but examine a range of issues including state sponsorship of art and the educational function of art.

Integral to the ‘New Deal’ and debate in the UK during the Depression was a new notion of the integrated nature of state and citizen and following from this the idea of government responsibility to those without equal access to, particularly, health, employment and education. In the arts this general trend manifested itself in art experiments which had an educational flavour. Above all art was to be accessible; thus, R. Hinks, in the Penguin book on art in Britain, argued that ‘it is necessary… to convince the public that art is an integral part of life, and not a mere ornamental excrescence upon its surface, and secondly, to remind artists of their own responsibilities to the public’ (1938, p. 75-76). Art became a subject in adult extension classes in the 1930s for the first time. This was part of a more general move away from education for workers and their social emancipation and towards a notion which ‘began to look at adult education more in terms of the cultural needs of society as a whole’ (Kelly 1970, p. 274). Kelly expands this point further to write that while:

---

Institutes; according to the report of the tutor (a lecturer from the University of Newcastle) the classes were very successful particularly due to the organisation of the classes and their basis in participation not contemplation (Lyon 1938, p. 119).

Advances had been made in some of the more basic requirements of life such as health and hygiene after WWI, for example, the campaign of a bath for every house, and the improvement in the general level of dress (Marwick 1971, p. 47).
The motives of personal culture and personal advancement were... to be found among students in every form of organisation,... In the ‘twenties and especially in the ‘thirties there was a change. The driving forces of social reform and religious service became noticeably weaker, and the motive of personal culture reasserted itself. (1970, p. 285-86)

In relation to art education, while in the 1920s either moral improvement or social reform was emphasised, by the 1930s the rhetoric had started to shift away from notions of moral improvement towards a clearer notion of personal improvement. A study by the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies expresses the difference as a shift in the concern with content. Thus, according to this study, by the 1930s the concern with socialist content and control of education for the working class was increasingly replaced by questions of access and environment (1981, p. 42). This shift was reflected in the Labour Party which gradually moved away from being primarily a movement underpinned by a broad ‘ethical egalitarianism, critical of capitalist society in its social and moral effects’ and towards a ‘tradition of Fabian social engineering, a tendency not incompatible with a collectivist liberalism or a more efficient and just capitalist order’ (Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies 1981, p. 44). The ideal system was summarised in *The Economist* in 1934 as ‘a possible halfway house, a reformed capitalism utilising the immense driving force, elasticity and experimentalism of private enterprise, while at the same time limiting it within the requirements of the public interest’ (in Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies 1981, p. 50). The concept of citizenship became central to this ideal and with it the construction of a shared classless ‘nationhood’ (1981, p. 47). The winning of consent from the ‘everyman’ and the need for co-operation against fascism overrode all else: ‘For these reasons citizenship became ubiquitous, and by the early years of the war the middle ground priorities- planning, reconstruction, education for citizenship- were at the centre of the political stage’ (Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies 1981, p. 54). Within this environment cultural programmes became less directly proscriptive in their aims, whether these were in relation to education in a religious notion of moral duty or, in the radical socialist programmes, an education for the assertion of political rights.
Instead cultural programmes (including art programmes) were designed to be accessible to all and were underpinned by a notion of a person who *desired* to equip her/himself with the competencies needed to *contribute effectively to society*.66

While from WWI to WWII there was clearly an effort to introduce the arts more widely in society, these efforts resulted primarily from the actions of private and municipal bodies rather than Parliament. At the parliamentary level, while little was actually done, Labour showed a more active interest in the arts than either the Tories or the Liberals. A Labour Party statement in 1918 called for

… the greatly increased public provision… for scientific investigation and original research, in every branch of knowledge, not to say also for the promotion of music, literature, and fine art, which have been under Capitalism so greatly neglected, and upon which, so the Labour Party holds, any real development of civilisation fundamentally depends. (in Minihan 1977, p. 185)

When Labour actually took office it attempted to abolish the entertainment tax but was not successful until after the war.67 In fact, while for some (particularly in adult education), the growth of Fascism and Nazism overseas were all the more reason to educate people in the ‘civilising’ arts, there was at the same time a concern that public expenditure to subsidise the arts would follow the same route as efforts in the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany to nationalise culture (Leventhal 1990, p. 289). Thus, most initiatives were private, such as the ‘Art for the People’ travelling exhibitions of visual art which began in 1935. These exhibitions were organised by the British Institute of Adult Education (founded on a voluntary basis in 1921) and were funded mainly by private initiative, although some costs were met by the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust and the Pilgrims Trust (Minihan 1977, p. 183). There was also a small rise in local authority involvement with the arts. In 1918 the Education Act enabled local
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66 Not the least factor to influence this shift was the vastly extended franchise of 1918, ‘universal’ suffrage was granted and included women over 30. However, university graduates and business men still got two votes each. In 1928 women over 21 were able to vote.

67 It was the Socialist government of 1930 which was the first to support opera in the form of a subsidy to the BBC (Bennett 1995, p. 202).
authorities to make grants to museums and the Public Libraries Act of 1919 removed the limit on funds that could be spent from the collection of rates on museums. However, Sidney Markham’s 1938 report on museums showed that many collections were still in poor repair and, furthermore, that many substantially sized towns did not have a museum or gallery at all. Markham’s ideal was typical of the 1930s and is worth quoting at length

These curators and governing bodies will, I hope, be imbued with the idea that in this democratic age the task is not primarily that of assisting in a narrow field of research scholars or potential artists, but rather of bringing enlightenment and knowledge to the average wage-earner and his family. The art gallery of the future will have a policy based upon the fact that the man in the street is the greatest purchaser of art the world has ever known, and that almost every object used in the average home is in some way an art object with its influence for beauty or otherwise upon the family. Art galleries must endeavour to educate our democracy not only in pictorial art and in pottery, but also in the selection of its wall-papers, radio sets, table-cloths, and furniture. (1938, p. 174)

We saw in chapter two that this interest in the education of consumption has a history in Britain dating from the mid-nineteenth century. In the 1930s and 1940s these discourses, combined with the fact of the extended franchise, the perceived totalitarian threat, and the need to engender consent in the face of the developing arms race with Germany, meant an increasing interest in cultural programmes as a form of population management which would produce a self-regulating citizenry. The exigencies of war furthered this emphasis.

The theory and practice of Total War was developed in WWII much more than it had been in WWI. This meant that one of the major rhetorics of WWII was an appeal to ‘you’, meaning the people (Marwick 1976, p. 110). Churchill in a speech early in the war made the trade unions an estate of the realm, indicating the importance of the working classes to the war. Cardiff and Scannell, writing about the BBC during the war, emphasise precisely this point:

Behind both the populist and popular radio was a new and sudden recognition of the importance of the working class both as a subject for representation in programmes, and as a major component of the national audience… this recognition sprang from expedient
need: from a recognition that the war emergency made labour the ultimate resource, the crucial factor… (1981, p. 48)68

It is not an overstatement to state that during WWII there was a consensus about what Britain wanted and expected after the war. A Mass Observation69 survey taken in 1941 showed that the majority of people wanted and expected ‘more state control’, ‘educational reforms’, and ‘less class distinction’ (Hewison 1995, p. 26). However, A. Sinfield argues that Mass Observation reports also show that even before the Blitz popular commitment to the state was not as unproblematic as has often been claimed; it was ‘acquiescent rather than enthusiastic’ (Sinfield 1997, p. 10-11). A more solid mobilisation of the people was needed to generate a populace which would accept the stringencies of the war, it is easy to forget how extreme these circumstances were, for instance, during the first three years of the war there were more civilians killed than soldiers (ibid., p. 7). It was in this context that the war rhetoric of ‘things will be better after the war’ and that this was ‘what we are fighting for’ generated the strong expectation of substantial reconstruction, reflected in the 1941 Mass Observation survey. Indeed Sinfield argues that this commitment to reform was not original to the war, rather, ‘a section of the governing class… had been developing through the 1930s the idea that social reform was necessary’ (1997, p. 14). Angus Calder, the WWII historian, disagrees with Marwick’s argument that the social and political changes which occurred after the war occurred as a direct result of the war. Rather he argues that these changes are better explained as emerging out of a longer period of change, the war hastening a process which was already occurring. As he argues after ‘1945 it was for a long time fashionable to talk as if something like a revolution had in fact occurred. But at this distance we can see clearly enough that the effect of the war was not to sweep society on to a new course, but to hasten its

68 See also Cardiff and Scannell 1993.
69 The application of anthropological methods to the British population, in what was termed Mass Observation, was pioneered in 1937 by Tom Harrison, Charles Madge and Humphrey Jennings. These surveys were carried out by field observation and by a ‘National Panel’ who were a group of volunteers who wrote detailed accounts of their day to day lives (Calder and Sheridan 1985). These surveys had an important function during the war gauging the people’s responses to the various war pressures (Marwick 1971, p. 81).
progress along the old grooves’ (1969, p. 17). Certainly in the case of state administration of the arts it is clear that while the war hastened a process already begun, particularly in relation to the state’s use of cultural programmes during the war to ‘raise morale’, state funding of the arts emerged out of a much longer and more complex history than one which can be explained by the war-driven creation of welfare state institutions. Yet, as Sinfield argues, historians ‘dispute that a historic shift towards a new kind of civilisation occurred in 1945… Nevertheless, a distinctive ideology of welfare-capitalism was propagated, and it constituted an unprecedentedly ambitious project of state legitimation’ (1997, p. 15-16). While uncomfortable with Sinfield’s understanding of this shift in terms of ‘ideology’ we too must underline the importance of this new rationality of government, a rationality which was (and is) integral to the form taken by state administration of the arts, when it finally occurred early in the war.

The Establishment of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts

CEMA was not the first government funded arts organisation in the UK. Throughout the 1930s the British government became more involved in the arts. Apart from the BBC there was also the British Film Institute established in 1933 and set up as a semi-autonomous government agency, the introduction of a quota system to protect the British film industry, and the establishment of the British Council in 1934.70 Nevertheless, CEMA is particularly important to this study of the conjunction of art, citizenship and government for four reasons. It was the first government funded agency established to actively promote the arts (including the performing arts and music) to a wider civilian audience; second, after the war it was set up by Charter as the Arts Council of Great Britain; third, it proved conclusively that audiences existed for the arts among people of a widely varied social and educational background; fourth, an analysis of CEMA and its policies allows us to discuss how the discourses
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70 The British Council was set up in response to a growing propaganda battle with Italy and Germany (Hewison 1995 p. 31).
which framed the relationship of art and citizenship were organised in the context of a welfare-capitalist political rationality.

In September 1939 discussions took place between Treasury and the Board of Education on the provision of financial assistance to organisations involved in adult education on the basis of the need to preserve the national framework of culture, with special reference to music, drama and the arts during the emergency and to provide sufficient entertainment to sustain the morale of the civilian population (in Leventhal 1990, p. 290). It is unlikely that the government would have left the encouragement and preservation of morale to voluntary initiatives and the BBC; nevertheless, the Board of Education chose to justify its support in terms of the rhetoric of the protection of ‘Britishness’ and ‘what we are fighting for’. Thus, it was essential

… to show publicly and unmistakably that the Government cares about the cultural life of the country. This country is supposed to be fighting for civilisation and democracy and if these things mean anything they mean a way of life where people have liberty and opportunity to pursue the things of peace. It should be part of the national war policy that the Government is actively interested in these things. Such an assurance needs to be given equally for the sake of our own people and for the sake of British pride abroad. (in Leventhal 1990, p. 293)

The two major framing principles of CEMA are to be found in this statement. CEMA was concerned with national quality and thus needed to associate itself with art in which ‘British pride’ could be placed. Second, it needed to be accessible to all and thus demonstrate and encompass the British qualities of ‘democracy’, ‘liberty’ and ‘opportunity’. In the event these two framing principles were negotiated in such a way that they were defined as oppositional to each other.

CEMA was set up under the management of the Board of Education, although little policy guidance was forthcoming and CEMA in fact developed its own policies. The initiative for the establishment of CEMA came from Thomas Jones, Pilgrim’s Trust Secretary from 1930-1945, who had been impressed
by the touring exhibitions of British Institute of Adult Education.71 After a meeting between Jones, Lord Macmillian (Chairman of the Pilgrim’s Trust from 1935-45, and Minister of Information in 1939), and Lord De La Warr (President of the Board of Education), CEMA was established as a private committee under the Pilgrim’s Trust with financial aid from the Pilgrim’s Trust and the Board of Education.72 By early 1940 this committee had become a Council appointed by the Board of Education with Macmillan as Chair and Jones as Vice-Chairman. E.W. White, Assistant Secretary to CEMA in 1942 explains the terms of reference as:

a) The preservation in wartime of the highest standards in the arts of music, drama and painting; b) The widespread provision of opportunities for hearing good music and the enjoyment of the arts generally for people, who, on account of wartime conditions, have been cut off from these things; c) The encouragement of music-making and play-acting by the people themselves; d) Through the above activities, the rendering of indirect assistance to professional singers and players who may be suffering from a wartime lack of demand for their work. (1975, p. 25-26)

Although the Council’s earliest policy was framed in terms of helping unemployed artists, due to the influence of the Pilgrim’s Trust its orientation soon became predominantly towards amateur and educational activity.73 Leventhal comments that as ‘educational missionaries, CEMA’s founders believed that “enjoyment of the arts is closely linked with their practice”, that ordinary people should experience art as practitioners, not as consumers’ (1990, p. 295). However, the exclusive concern with amateur activities was abandoned early with the appointment in early 1940 of six professional music travellers to stimulate amateur activity in the towns and villages they visited (Leventhal 1990, p. 296). ‘The Best for the Most’ became CEMA’s slogan. However, CEMA retained its commitment to amateur and participatory activity and rejected applications for assistance from opera, ballet and professional

71 The Pilgrim’s Trust was established in 1930 as the result of a donation by the American millionaire Edward Harkness who made a gift of two million pounds ‘to help conserve the heritage of Great Britain’ (White 1975, p. 24).
72 CEMA began with a £25,000 donation from the Trust which was matched by government.
73 The Trust was known for its social service orientation, it was mainly involved in projects for the education of the working classes.
theatre companies, apart from underwriting a tour of the ‘Old Vic’ (ibid., p. 298). Instead CEMA organised concerts in factories, mines, air-raid shelters, town halls, hostels, convalescent homes; in fact, any where there was a building appropriate and sometimes where there was not.

In 1940 the Council part funded the British Institute of Adult Education’s ‘Art for the People’ touring exhibitions. These exhibitions were the idea of and were organised by W.E. Williams, Secretary of the British Institute of Adult Education from 1934-1940. Williams, a protégé of Jones, became a member of CEMA and continued to organise the exhibitions. In 1938 Williams described the object of these exhibitions: ‘Our chief object has been to “expose” people to art, simply to put them in contact with really good pictures and hope that they will catch the infection’ (1938, p. 115). Reginald Jacques, another member of the Council, also described the exhibitions. He wrote, ‘Collections of pictures travelled the countryside, to be hung in any convenient room with a suitable light, and stared at by people whose lack of knowledge was only equalled by their inherent and unsuspected good taste… Many a village hall,… suffered a sea change into something rich and strange’ (1945, p. 276). This kind of rhetoric, while patronising to our ears, characterised CEMA reports and media releases. Minihan comments helpfully on this point that:

Despite the pompous rhetoric… CEMA’s aim was not the preservation of the cultural status quo. From the start, it sought to develop new audiences, and reported proudly on the warm receptions accorded CEMA artists in the most unlikely places. It tried, furthermore, to promote local initiative in the arts, encouraging the establishment of arts clubs, and music or drama societies, whenever touring exhibitions or performers aroused sufficient local interest. (1977, p. 218-19)

Indeed, Jacques goes on to write a passage which is worth quoting at length as it expresses the essence of the aim of CEMA both before and after 1942:

74 Director of ABCA from 1941-1945, and Chief Editor at Penguin Books, Williams was also to become Secretary-General of the Arts Council after Mary Glasgow.
75 Interestingly, in an echo of some of the sentiments we have described during the New Deal, Williams writes of these touring exhibitions that ‘Over and over again the majority come down in favour of paintings which represent things they
I believe that most of us have at last realised that we can no longer put Art on to a shelf, to be taken down and admired at infrequent intervals by a severely limited and select company. Art is, or should be, the possession of EVERYMAN. I believe that Art can bind together peoples and nations in an all-embracing effectiveness which is equalled by no other force. (1945, p. 281)

Like the ‘New Deal’ rhetoric, CEMA’s policies were characterised in opposition to a construction of the ‘old world’ where art was available only to the few; rather, CEMA enabled art to be the possession of ‘everyman’ and thus art would express the nature of and bring together the people of the nation. In the early CEMA, this emphasis was manifest in policies encouraging actual participation in art activities and amateur activity.

There was opposition to this amateur emphasis from the beginning. Kenneth Clark (later Sir), Director of the National Gallery from 1934-1945 and Chairman of the Arts Council from 1953-1960, was one of the main advocates from within the Council in favour of a policy of concentration on raising professional standards and taste. In fact the policy shift began early, indeed after the first year, by which time the National Council of Social Service and other educational bodies had facilitated the movement of amateur bodies over to county organisations managed under the Pilgrim’s Trust (Leventhal 1990, p. 302). Possibly as a result of criticism the Pilgrim’s Trust decided to detach itself from CEMA in 1942 and the post of Chairman was offered to Keynes. Keynes had been a critic of the Council’s polices and was unsure about accepting the position. He wrote that he had ‘only limited sympathy with the principles’ of the Council and ‘was worried lest what one may call the welfare side was to be developed at the expense of the artistic side and of standards generally’ (in Leventhal 1990, p. 305). This kind of rhetoric demonstrates that from early on a dichotomy was entrenched within discussion of the Council and its policies between, on the one hand, those who were committed to the encouragement of amateur artistic activity defined as the ‘people’s culture’ and, on the other, those who defined the Council’s role...
as supporting ‘quality’ art which was framed as the ‘the best of British’. Of course, as we have already seen in chapter two, the dichotomous relations between these discourses did not originate with CEMA and the Arts Council, nevertheless, these discourses of cultural value were enshrined as competing policy goals within the Arts Council from the moment of its establishment.

Entertainment National Service Association

The familiar division between entertainment and the arts was already made and institutionalised in WWII in a perceived opposition between CEMA and the Entertainment National Service Association (ENSA). CEMA’s aid was 5% of that given to ENSA; ENSA cost £14 million to run and played to a quarter of a billion people; four out of five professional British artists worked for it at some time during the war; it was truly a huge operation (Pick 1986, p. 37). In Pick’s words it ‘was however all fatally entertaining’ (1986, p. 37). While there is no denying the general conception of ENSA as ‘entertainment’ and this as different to the ‘Art’ distributed by CEMA, we need to be more careful about any straightforward assumption that the division between ENSA and CEMA is reducible to one between ‘low’- non-legitimate and ‘high’- legitimate culture.

ENSA was the idea of, and directed by, Basil Dean who was a theatre and film producer and had been a pioneer of troop entertainment towards the end of WWI. The organisation’s grant was administered under the Navy, Army and Air Force Institutes (NAAFI), a non-profit company established to provide

know..’ (1938, p. 117).

76 The ‘fatally entertaining’ nature of ENSA might also explain why there is a limited amount of scholarly work about it. Other than fairly brief mentions in articles and books devoted primarily to a history of the Arts Council or the BBC,
amenities for British servicemen. From its base at the Theatre Royal on Drury Lane, ENSA employed a substantial force of artists (almost 4000 by the end of 1944); initially there was a massive interest in signing up, as many theatres had closed down and unemployment was severe amongst artists. However, due to the large numbers of artists needed Dean went for quantity not necessarily quality; thus, from the beginning ENSA had a reputation for being unreliable in the quality of its productions (Fawkes 1978, p. 17). ENSA productions included plays, variety, concert parties, classical music, dance bands, lectures, film, and wrestling. ENSA was most famous for its variety shows; early on administration worried that the troops did not want anything that ‘smacked of high-brow’ (Fawkes 1978, p. 20).

While ENSA was known for its ‘popular entertainment’, as Pick classifies it, he omits to mention that ENSA also distributed, what Pick might term, ‘high’ culture. ENSA had an Advisory Music Council ‘with responsibility for fostering serious musical activities among military personnel, defence workers, miners, and members of the Woman’s Land Army’ (Harris 1970, p. 22). Harris also describes how gramophone circles were popular with troops and civilians; music for these circles was obtained from ENSA libraries (1970, p. 22). ENSA also hosted two large concerts for war workers in 1943 and for miners in 1944 featuring ‘the nation’s finest orchestras and soloists’ (ibid., p. 22). Before Sadler’s Wells became associated with CEMA it toured garrison theatres under ENSA (Minihan 1977, p. 226). The BBC Symphony Orchestra gave the first ENSA Symphony Concert to the Army. This show broke the ENSA box office record which had previously been held by Gracie Fields (Fawkes 1978, p. 81).

Clearly, Pick’s argument that, ‘everything CEMA supported, or directly promoted, was “Art”,
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77 Work for both CEMA and ENSA was classified as National Service.
78 ENSA was not the only organisation providing civilian and army entertainment, although it was certainly the biggest. Other organisations included Stars in Battledress established in 1941, Mobile Entertainments for the Southern Area (MESA), and the RAF Gang Shows (Fawkes 1978).
improving, refined, in conscious opposition to the broad populist vulgaries of ENSA’ (1986, p. 39), is problematic.

We have already established that we do not deny the general perception of ENSA as ‘lowbrow’, indeed there were many complaints as to the quality of ENSA shows. A Mass Observation report printed a note from the works manager at one war factory, revealing that the workers’ committee had ‘actually complained about the low quality of the humour in many ENSA concerts, and requested more music and straight stuff. Two CEMA concerts… have been very successful, and attempts have been made for more’ (in Calder 1969, p. 372). In response to such complaints a clause was inserted into ENSA contracts that employees were ‘not to give expression to any vulgarity, words having double meaning, nor to use any objectionable gesture’ (in Fawkes 1978, p. 33). There are two main points that will contextualise the rhetorical division made between ENSA and CEMA. First, ENSA was established for a very specific purpose, to provide entertainment to the troops. Although after Dunkirk in 1940 ENSA’s mandate was expanded to include civilians, it remained largely restricted to the armed forces. Glasgow and Evans argue that the functions of CEMA and ENSA were essentially different. ENSA was always conceived as a temporary organisation established to provide music and plays to the largest possible audience in the Services and factories, CEMA on the other hand was ‘to explore the more elusive double function of supporting audience and artists together under some permanent system of State-aid’ (1949, p. 42). Second, it is clear that ENSA was not simply a provider of popular ‘vulgarity’. Fawkes writes that although ‘ENSA continued to attract criticism and be the butt of jokes… the Government recognised the value of its work and in March, 1941 issued a report recommending the Treasury to take over financing its work from NAAFI’ (1978, p. 71). Thus, while ENSA may have presented a more pluralist cultural fare, the fact that CEMA became a permanent state funded organisation has less to do with the ‘fatally entertaining’ nature of most of ENSA’s production and more to do with the original
governmental constructions of the two organisations. Indeed, the perceived function of the Arts Council meant that it could not support a plurality of cultural productions due to the way that the relations between art, citizenship and government were framed by the end of the war. Before we explore this point in detail it will be useful in getting a sense of these relations and their construction to examine the case of the Army Bureau of Current Affairs.

**Army Bureau of Current Affairs**

The Army Bureau of Current Affairs was another wartime institution whose main principles were based on a philosophy that art and education should be distributed by techniques based on participation. The Army Bureau of Current Affairs was set up after Dunkirk to counter the lowering of morale. It used a technique developed by the Federal Theatre in the ‘New Deal’ termed ‘the living newspaper’. This involved soldiers acting out news stories which would lead to free ranging discussion of current affairs. There were also traditional discussion groups led by an officer. Marwick writes of this as reflecting an important change as compared to WWI: ‘There was one important new feature of army life, and that was the emphasis throughout the services upon education. It was this that gave hope for a broader base for democratic development and cultural innovation after the war’ (1971, p. 104). When education was introduced into the army the novelty is that it chose to use popular and ‘democratic’ forms of learning. The rationale for this is similar to that used in discussion of CEMA- in both of these organisations the category of *citizen* became central. This citizen was defined very specifically, she/he was *British*, thus emphasising the importance of nation- ‘what we are fighting for’, and she/he *participated* - ‘did their bit’.

In the Army Bureau of Current Affairs ‘the future being fought for’ was an important political question. N. Grant writes that:
The propaganda of the period often projected an optimistic vision of future possibilities, but at the same time set limits on popular aspirations by referring back to notions of political citizenship, its rights and duties. The category of the citizen thus became central to the state’s more explicitly educative role in mobilising support for the war… (1984, p. 171)

Thus, as we have seen with the discourses configuring art in relation to citizenship, the individual was constructed as a citizen in a mutual relationship with the state. There were concrete reasons why army education was introduced in WWII. The main reason was that people generally were more reluctant to be conscripted for this war than they had been for WWI. In this circumstance military training alone was not enough; also, as we have already discussed and as Grant points out, the ‘idea of education for citizenship had already been floated in the 1930s, often in terms of the need to develop a defence against totalitarianism’ (1984, p. 171). Nevertheless, even though the general idea was the formation of citizen-soldiers fighting for ‘democratic’ Britain, the Army Bureau of Current Affairs was mistrusted and restrictions were placed on it. For instance, when William Beveridge was asked to write a summary of his Report for the army publication Current Affairs, this issue was withdrawn from circulation by the War Office on the orders of Churchill. According to Calder, this event was taken by the public as expressing the Government’s non-support of this immensely popular Report (1969, p.531). Indeed many of the more conservative sections of the government considered the Army Bureau of Current Affairs dangerous. A Conservative politician after the election of 1945 said, ‘the forces’ vote, in particular, had been virtually won over by the left-wing influence of the Army Bureau of Current Affairs. Socialism provided them with a vision and doctrine to which we had no authoritative answer or articulated alternative’ (in Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies 1981, p.57). Thus, despite the censorship, Grant argues that the ‘effects of Army Bureau of Current Affairs can… not be simply reduced to the motives of those who initiated the schemes. Many other factors helped shape the Army.

79 The Beveridge Report had a large impact on the British population, the Ministry of Information had publicised it extensively and the queues to buy it outside His Majesty’s Stationary Office were ‘the most significant… of the war’. A
Bureau of Current Affairs experience, not least the self-conscious efforts of those who sought to conduct another kind of politics within its parameters’ (italics in original, 1984, p. 186). Grant is timely in his assertion above that government policies and strategies are subject to negotiation. The Army Bureau of Current Affairs educational programme sought to construct a citizen-soldier who was to be self-disciplining in the name of ‘Britishness’. This self-regulation was particularly important in the face of the fascist threat which was perceived to operate best on an uninformed and dissatisfied populace. While the Army Bureau of Current Affairs was established with quite conservative political goals in mind, nevertheless, it reflected the general Left consensus which had emerged clearly by the end of the war. However, as Sinfield argues, and this point is important to understanding the way the Arts Council came to be constituted, this left consensus took its base values from the leisured elite and thus culture was constructed within a framework of ‘good’ culture (1997).

CEMA From 1942 and the Establishment of the Arts Council of Great Britain

Hewison writes that by 1945 the distinction between the ‘welfare’ side of CEMA and its professional focus

… had been almost entirely resolved in favour of art and the professional artists, an assumed obligation to act as a form of social service has always exerted a contrary pull against the Council’s responsibility for ‘standards’, and the consensus among policymakers has shifted accordingly. The conflict was to resurface in the battles between the Arts Council and ‘community artists’ in the early seventies and was to influence policies towards ethnic and other minorities in the eighties. (1995, p. 34)

What then were the circumstances under which this division was formulated? Keynes’s first act on appointment was to reorganise CEMA on the basis of expert panels which each had a Vice Chair who met under Keynes (CEMA 1943, p. 4). According to the Arts Council report The First Ten Years, this reorganisation stabilised the organisation and enabled CEMA ‘to exchange the procedures of first aid and emergency action for those of a more deliberate and planned existence’ (1956, p. 9). CEMA began

Gallup Poll taken two weeks after the Report’s release found that nineteen people out of twenty had heard of it and nine out
the fiscal year with an income of £100,000 given in the form of an Exchequer grant-in-aid on the vote of the Board of Education; part of this money was spent on the purchase of paintings to form a travelling exhibition (CEMA 1943, p. 6). These purchases were as a result of CEMA’s withdrawal of funding from the British Institute of Adult Education ‘Art for the People’ touring exhibitions. Williams and Keynes disagreed on the function of these tours. As CEMA wanted its own touring exhibition this disagreement was not the reason for the withdrawal of funding, nevertheless, the terms of the disagreement are enlightening as they are representative of the older notion of the Council’s task and its new emphasis under Keynes’s Chairmanship. In essence the disagreement between Williams and Keynes arose because Keynes did not want to spend extra money on the guide lecturers who had traditionally accompanied the ‘Art for the People’ touring exhibitions. Keynes considered this aspect of the exhibitions unnecessary. Williams argued that the ‘Institute time and time again reminded [Keynes] that we were not a mere provider of touring exhibitions but an educational body with a mission to enlighten people about art’ (in White 1975, p. 41). Keynes also reversed the decision not to fund work in London and saw to it that future subsidy would be concentrated on professional organisations. Thus, in 1942 the Sadler’s Wells Opera and Ballet companies became associated with CEMA. Mary Glasgow, Secretary-General to CEMA commented that during Keynes management the ‘pattern of activity at CEMA did not immediately change… There was no abatement of the emergency work with which it had all started… What he did, as his consistent policy, was to guide the Council towards giving more attention to the arts as such’ (1975, p. 263).

---

80 In 1944, the final year of CEMA, the grant was increased to £175,000 (CEMA, 1944). The 1945 Council grant for the first full year of operation was £235,000 (Pick 1980, p. 14).

81 However, when Williams took the Secretary-General position on the Council it seems he left his educational zeal behind. Shaw describes how, ‘Writing in the Daily Telegraph an article … titled “Art is for a Minority”, Williams, former champion of “art for the people”, claimed that… [o]f course art was the privilege of a minority, he argued, but “the minority which wants and enjoys the arts is a classless one”’ (1987, p.124).
The decision to set up the Arts Council of Great Britain was taken by the war-time Coalition government, the announcement was made by the Conservative ‘caretaker’ government and the implementation of the decision was made by the 1945 Labour government (White 1975, p. 62). The Arts Council was established as a Body Corporate under Royal Charter in 1946 to develop … a greater knowledge, understanding and practice of the fine arts exclusively, and in particular to increase the accessibility of the fine arts to the public through-out Our Realm, to improve the standard of execution of the fine arts and to advise and co-operate with Our Government departments, local authorities and other bodies on any matters concerned directly or indirectly with these objects. (Arts Council 1950, p. 3)

Immediately after the Council was established Keynes spoke on the BBC and detailed the aims and direction of the Council. Parts of this speech are worth quoting at length. One of the surprising things, at least in retrospect, is the ease with which the Council was established. This point is expressed by Keynes when he said:

I do not believe it is yet realised what an important thing has happened. State patronage of the arts has crept in. It has happened in a very English, informal, unostentatious way-half-baked if you like… At last the public exchequer has recognised the support and encouragement of the civilising arts of life as a part of his duty. But we do not intend to socialise this side of social endeavour. Whatever views may be held by the lately warring parties, who you have been hearing every evening at this hour, about socialising industry, everyone, I fancy, recognises that the work of the artist in all its aspects is, of its nature, individual and free, undisciplined, unregimented, uncontrolled. (1945, p. 31)

The election after the war brought Labour to power with its largest majority ever, one of the reasons for this was the clear commitment of Labour, in Marwick’s words, to ‘speed up the trend towards collectivism; and collectivism, in the form of nationalisation and socialisation continued to be the basic tenet of government to the end of the forties’ (1971, p. 104). Thus, we can read the establishment of the Arts Council as a part of this wider governmental trend.82

---

82 Churchill and his party were hesitant in their implementation of the Beveridge Report presented in 1942 and followed by two White Papers on Social Insurance in 1944. The Labour Party however embraced the Report and in the years immediately following the war did much to nationalise industry and establish a welfare state, for example, one of the governments first acts was to restore the legal position of trade unions, also, the Bank of England was nationalised in 1946, Coal Mines in 1947, Electricity, Railways and Road Transport in 1948, and the 1949 Housing Act was the first housing act to omit the phrase ‘working class’. While these reforms did not produce equality, the commitment to welfare schemes and
Nevertheless, for all this collective trend the Arts Council made a decision early to focus on the professional aspects of the arts. The Arts Council’s ten year review put the decision this way—while admitting that the amateur arts were important it argued that ‘very rarely is it possible for the amateur to attain professional proficiency…’ The achievement and preservation of standards in the arts is, primarily, then, the role of the professional’ (1956, p. 11). Further on this point the report stated that

The primary responsibility imposed by its Royal Charter is to preserve and improve standards of performance in the various arts. The Arts Council interprets this injunction, in relation to its income, as implying the support of a limited number of institutions where exemplary standards may be developed. (1956, p. 19)

The Arts Council believes… that the first claim upon its attention and assistance is that of maintaining in London and the larger cities effective power-houses of opera, music and drama; for unless these quality-institutions can be maintained the arts are bound to decline into mediocrity. (1956, p. 22)

Nicholas Pearson and John Pick have critiqued the Arts Council’s interpretation of its Charter. Their main point is that despite the commitment to access contained within its Charter, the Council responded to cultural initiatives of quality rather than creating opportunities for wider access (Pearson 1982, p. 55 and Pick 1986, p. 50). This policy was coined ‘few but roses’ by the Council. For Pearson and Pick the development of the Council towards a focus on quality cultural initiatives, to the detriment of policies encouraging access, was a result of the influence of Keynes (Pearson 1982, p. 55 and Pick 1986, p. 58). There are two points to made in response to this position. First, it is clear that, at least in the early years, the Council retained a strong commitment to broad based audience development. In his BBC speech Keynes stated his ideal thus:

How satisfactory it would be if different parts of the country would again walk their several ways as they once did and learn to develop something different from their

the dominance of a notion of the unity of community rather than its fragmentation into classes is undeniable (Marwick 1971, p. 104-114).

83 Dick Hebdige has questioned the terms in which discussions of British ‘popular culture’ as dichotomised against ‘high’ culture have been set. Hebdige argues that analyses of post-WWII British ‘popular’ culture ‘have been mediated through aesthetic concepts like “quality” and “taste”’ (1981, p. 39).
neighbours and characteristic of themselves. Nothing can be more damaging than the excessive prestige of metropolitan standards and fashions. Let every part of Merry England be merry in its own way. Death to Hollywood. (1945, p. 32)\(^84\)

However, while the Council may have been committed to audience development it is undeniable that Keynes’s proposal for the Council was, in Leventhal’s words:\(^85\)

Unabashedly elitist, he disdained those, mainly on the political left, who extolled the merits of popular culture or sought to revive participatory folk traditions; hostile to state interference, he regarded a Ministry of Culture as inimical to genuine creativity. The scheme which he imposed, with only minor modifications, was, like the welfare proposals of fellow Liberal William Beveridge, a compromise between private initiative and state control. (1990, p. 317)

This leads us to a second point of response to Pick and Pearson’s argument that the elitist bias of the Council is undeniable. As Sinfield argues the primary definition of culture in the Left consensus by the end of the war was in terms of ‘good’ culture which was ‘made to embody the spiritual and human values that consumer capitalism and “mass” culture seemed to slight and, at the same time, were deployed as indicators for educational success and social mobility’ (1997, p. 2). This was the formation of culture from which the Arts Council took its tasks, its personnel and its tone. However, although this discursive formation of culture was clearly elite in the forms of behaviour and values which underpinned it, nevertheless, it is undeniable that for the first time a mass audience had been created for the products of this cultural formation. Keynes in his speech on the establishment of the Arts Council stated that,

Our war-time experience has led us already to one clear discovery: the unsatisfied demand and the enormous public for serious and fine entertainment. This certainly did not exist a few years ago. I do not believe that it is merely a war-time phenomenon. I fancy that the BBC has played a big part, the predominant part, in creating this public demand, by bringing to everybody in the country the possibility of learning these new games which only a few used to play... (1945, p. 32)\(^86\)

\(^84\) For more on the post war anti-American sentiment in the UK see Hebdige 1981.
\(^85\) Keynes wrote the proposal for the Council which was then debated for nine months by CEMA members and officials at the Ministry of Education and the Treasury (Leventhal 1990, p. 315).
\(^86\) See also Lindsay 1945 which, in a review of British art and music during the war years, advocates for the same function of the arts as framed in the policies of the Arts Council, particularly, its importance to the continuing stimulation of demand, or ‘pump-priming’ in Keynes terminology.
Thus the Council remained committed to audience development. Pearson and Pick critique the Council for the large amounts of money it spent on Covent Garden immediately following the war. At the same time as this expense, due to CEMA’s wartime experience of the shortage of adequate housing for the arts in many towns and villages, the Council took an active interest in the planning of local art centres. The Council also helped local education authorities provide concerts for youth clubs and, in conjunction with the Miner’s Welfare Commission, toured theatre companies to one hundred small towns and villages (Minihan 1977, p. 231). However, the Council was careful to distance these initiatives from a ‘social work’ approach to culture. An Arts Council brochure on art centres stated that ‘we must rid ourselves of the false idea that art is a palliative for social evils or a branch of welfare work’ (1945, p. 6).

**Conclusion**

We have raised many points in this chapter. In conclusion we can make two general points. First, in Depression America and in WWII UK a new conception of the relationship between state and individual became dominant, central to this conception was a particular construction of the category of citizen. We have argued that this citizen was conceived of above all as a citizen with the capacities to share in a relationship of *mutual responsibility* with the state. Second, art programmes were increasingly administered by the state as a means for acting on and producing certain capacities in a citizenry. Above all the shifts we have described can be characterised by the way in which art programmes were enlisted in state strategies to do the work of acting on a citizenry in its ‘private’ spaces and moments, on its morale, on its capacity to choose ‘freely’ in its purchases. These shifts are best characterised by an understanding of the government rationality that produced them as ‘welfarist’. Miller and Rose have argued that to understand these shifts in this way is to understand it less as the moment of the birth of a new form of state- the ‘welfare state’- and rather as a ‘new mode of government of the economic, social
and personal lives of citizens. This mode of government, that we term ‘welfarism’, is constituted by a political rationality embodying certain principles and ideals, and is based upon a particular conception of the nature of society and its inhabitants’ (1992, p.191). One of the defining factors of this ‘welfarist’ rationality of government is the way programmes for the management of the ‘social’ were increasingly attached to the state. By the ‘social’ we mean not a given range of social ‘issues’ but, following Miller and Rose, the ‘terrain brought into existence by government itself- the location of certain problems, the repository of specific hopes and fears, the target of programmes and the space traced out by a particular administrative machinery’ (1992, p.191). So while programmes for the government of ‘the social’ proliferated towards the end of the nineteenth century, these programmes were organised initially by complex networks of private and professional organisations, increasingly in the first half of the twentieth century these programmes were gradually linked up with the apparatus of the state (Miller and Rose 1992, p.191). We have sketched out part of this historical shift in this chapter. Above all we have shown that the citizen constructed by art programmes generated within this ‘welfarist’ rationality of government was to be one which would participate in a relationship of mutual responsibility. In this sense, as we will see in the next chapter, that art programmes within this welfarist rationality were comparatively proscriptive in the way they constructed the relationship of mutual obligation with the state. The state would accept responsibility to attack the ‘five giants of Want, Disease, Idleness, Ignorance and Squalor’, in return the citizen would be thrifty, industrious and responsible.
CHAPTER FOUR:

Art in the Australian Post-world War

Two Reconstruction
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. (The Arts Council of Australia 1947, p. 3-4)

This chapter’s aim is to describe some of the conditions of emergence of post-war Australian cultural policy. It does not aim to provide an exhaustive account of institutional funding of the arts but to describe the dominant discourses which framed the conjunction of the spheres of art, citizenship and government in the years immediately following World War Two (WWII). This description of some of the conditions of emergence of cultural policy in the crucial period of post-war reconstruction will argue two things. First, it will argue that these conditions resulted in a distinct set of objectives for government in relation to art and citizenship, and that these objectives were framed around a particular notion of training for participatory citizenship and training for leisure and consumption. Second, we will argue that these objectives were the result of a particular understanding of the relationship between art and citizenship, one which recast the citizenry as amenable to management through a rationalised system of ‘planning’ and which sought to manage the citizenry through a rationale of mutual responsibility. Integral to this rationale of mutual responsibility was the construction of a citizenry as a resource to be enlisted in its own self management. This set of rationales sought to act on the citizen through her or his formation as an individual. In describing the Arts Council of Great Britain as a governmental technology which sought to act on a populace ‘from a distance’ we have argued that the foundational policies of the Arts Council are best understood in relation to their aim to construct a citizenry capable of managing itself in a variety of particular ways. In the Australian relations between culture and government, in the specific instance of the administration of visual art, Commonwealth government involvement in the management and funding of art programmes along the lines of the Arts Council of Great Britain did not occur until the late 1960s with the establishment of the Australian
Council for the Arts in 1968. Discussion of this institution and its history will be the subject of chapter five. It is important to emphasise at the outset that a discussion of Australian art programmes post-WWII is not a matter of tracing how they are simply derivative of British developments. Rather, British influences are among many overseas influences that Australian art programmes mixed with specifically Australian circumstances to come up with distinctive institutions and practices. It is the function of this chapter to investigate some of these discursive co-ordinates for the conjunction of art, citizenship and government in the period of reconstruction in Australia.

In both Australia and Britain art was mobilised in terms of evidence of a new reconstructed life in which the horrors of the Depression and the World Wars would never again occur. It is during this time that government arts funding and increased access to art came to be seen in terms of what is later (in the 1980s) constructed as a ‘right’ of citizenship, although at this stage it is better and more modestly put as an ‘expectation’ of government. The conditions of emergence for this ‘expectation’ will be described by way of asking three interrelated questions. One- what were the relations between art, citizenship and government? Two- what were the conditions of emergence for these relations? Three- what were the technologies of administration which enabled art to be mobilised as directly bearing on the lives of ‘the people’?

It will be helpful to begin this chapter with an overview of the reconstruction debates in Australia. This overview will seek to describe the type of citizen the post-war planners sought to construct to operate effectively in the new reconstructed world. Most crucial in this discussion are the three primary post-war concerns of full employment, welfare, and consumption. Section two, on culture and reconstruction, will discuss some of the frames of reference within which government funding of the arts was advocated. By establishing the themes which were dominant in these debates about art and
citizenship this section will show that concerns about art funding and art administration were directly linked to the broader governmental concerns of the reconstruction period. The roles envisaged for these art programmes were many but primarily art programmes were seen as useful in training the individual for citizenship, particularly through training for the useful expenditure of leisure and training for considered and informed consumption. While no visual arts body received all its funding from government until 1968, there are some organisations which are illustrative of particular discourses in the governmental relationship between art and citizenship. Thus, our third and forth sections will discuss the conjunction of art and citizenship as evidenced by 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. The common theme to programmes administered by these three bodies is the theme of decentralisation. Analysis of this theme as it framed art programmes will allow us to discuss some of the contradictory and, possibly, constitutively irresolvable aims which informed discussion of art and government. 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. Some of the discursive co-ordinates against which this shift can be understood are central to understanding the dynamics of contemporary Australian cultural policy.

Reconstruction

The immediate post-war period was characterised by a consensus on proposals for the reconstruction of Australia. Above all this consensus was based on the notion that social and economic planning would

---

87 The Commonwealth government funded the Commonwealth Literary Fund which was founded in 1908, the Commonwealth Arts Advisory Board from 1912 (see Wong-See 1991) and the Australian Broadcasting Corporation from 1932. The Commonwealth Art Advisory Board was established to advise the Historic Memorials Committee set up in 1912 to secure portraits of ‘representative men’ (Steven 1982, p. 10). ‘The Historic Memorials Committee … survived to be the oldest cultural institution in the Commonwealth’ and was ‘traditionally composed of the Prime Minister, as Chairman, the Vice-President of the Federal Executive Council, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the two Leaders of the opposition in the Senate and the House of Representatives’ (ibid.).
result in an Australia which ‘had a destiny to achieve the aspirations of Everyman by enlightened extensions of state action’ (Rowse 1978, p. 175-76). Tim Rowse has summarised the main dimensions of this liberal consensus. His summary is worth quoting at length:

It included a series of connected affirmations, made repeatedly by liberals of the 1930s: a holistic and multidisciplinary approach to social problems- economists needed to be politically and psychologically informed; a social planning approach to ameliorate the destructive operation of economic individualism in the market (Keynes’ macroeconomics fitted in here); a psychological approach to the individual, replacing the WEA’s presumption of rationality; the ethic of social holism to replace the ethic of self-interest of ‘group interest’… They were looking for a middle way, a pragmatic non-doctrinal solution to the economic difficulties of capitalist democracies which averted social chaos while not falling into the totalitarian embrace. (1978, p.148)

This consensus was reflected in government policy of the period. As Rowse indicates many of these theories of social, political and economic reconstruction, while increasingly ascendant with the return of relative prosperity towards the end of the 1930s, became effectual in the context of war and reconstruction in providing the opportunity for experimentation with centralised planning. However, WWII 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,88 and the necessity, at least initially, for government to ‘sell’ the war to the Australian people.89 This was done with the promise of a new reconstructed post-war world. While many of these factors were set in motion prior to WWII the circumstances of the war enabled the implementation of a different form of planning.

D. Lee argues that the expansion in the powers of government during the war produced lasting changes

88 Jim Tomlinson argues that there was never a ‘Keynesian Revolution’, rather, he states that Keynesian policy was ‘articulated within a field of pre-existing problems rather than “creating” its own’ (1981, p. 75). However, Tomlinson concedes that ‘The Second World War created the political climate in which full employment became a central government commitment, and the Keynesian revolution provided the theoretical means to translate this commitment into actuality’ (1981, p. 74). For a later version of this argument see Tomlinson 1991.

89 Australians were not immediately enthusiastic about involvement in WWII due to painful memories of WWI. However, conscription and mobilisation did not divide the populace as it had in WWI, primarily because of the immediacy of the threat posed by Japan in 1942, thus the anti-war movement was small (Saunders 1993, p.6).
in patterns of governance and public attitudes about the role of national government (1996, p. 82). During WWII, 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-Labor parties, in particular the collapse of the coalition between the United Australia Party and the Country Party. J.B. Chifley led the Labor Party in the post-war years and while his 1946 victory was not as strong as Curtin’s 1943 victory in the House of Representatives, nevertheless, it gave Labor, for the first time since 1913, control of both houses (Lee 1996, p. 102). However, the goal of extensive reconstruction was limited by the defeat of the Powers Referendum of 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 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…’ (1996, p. 99).

It would be incorrect 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. Many historians have revised accounts of the reforming ‘true believers’ of the 1940s and described their commitment to the construction of an egalitarian society as limited (see Beilharz, Considine and Watts, 1992, Garton, 1990, Rowse, 1978, and Watts, 1987). For instance, Rowse argues that the reformers of the 1940s attached their hopes to reconstruction but at the expense of visualising a socialist democracy. Instead the Labour movement sought to ‘rationalise and “humanise” Australian capitalism’ (1978, p.145). Thus, while the rhetoric of reform was posed in terms of the reconstruction of a new egalitarian society based on consensus and full employment, the reformers did not seek ‘an end to the basic material social relations of capitalism’ (Rowse 1978, p. 175-76).

90 By the mid 1940s these had regrouped in the new Liberal Party under Robert Menzies. This party was formed in 1944 out
Nicholas Brown has also interrogated the set of antitheses which have been constructed around the customary interpretations of government in Australia during the post-war period (see Brown, 1997, Brown, 1995, and Brown, 1994). According to Brown’s summary two themes dominate the customary analyses. First, during the inter-war years and reconstruction there was a pronounced ‘Australianism’, ‘consolidating professionalism’ and a ‘triumphant Keynesianism’ which ‘shaped an impressive disciplinary orthodoxy in … economics centring on state intervention and social welfare commitments’ which endured until the late 1970s (Brown 1997, p. 234-235). The second main theme dominating analyses of post-war government in Australia is that by the 1970s the ‘intimations of the neo-liberal plague were evident’ through an emphasis on ‘the primacy of the market, individualistic enterprise and private choice’ (1997, p. 234). Thus, the customary analyses of this shift assume an ‘integrity’ to the ‘Australianism-professionalism-Keynesian synthesis’ which was subsequently lost. Brown argues that the ‘complexities of this transition are too easily overlooked by the assumed integrity of the Australianism-professionalism-Keynesian synthesis’ (1997, p. 242). In interrogating the ‘Australianism’, ‘professionalism’, and ‘Keynesian’ themes which characterise the inter-war years and reconstruction, Brown aims to provide ‘an assessment of the ways in which the new rationalities of post-war government,…reconfigured the relations between economic knowledge and the subjects and forms of economic and social analysis’ (1997, p. 237). 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, was one which conceived of the citizen as an ensemble of entitlements attached to specific identities. In the 1930s and 1940s the economy, ‘now conceived as a largely autonomous entity to be governed in itself” was increasingly understood in terms of the possibilities for its regulation ‘to make available the
satisfactions individuals might pursue’ (1997, p. 242). In this conception of the relationship between the individual and the economy the figure of the consumer came to be cast as something which must be managed if Australia was to avoid what D.B. Copland, the economist, termed the ‘milk bar economy’. In this diagnosis the consumer was constructed as both a testament and a threat to prosperity and stability. On the one hand, in the ideal image of the consumer there was a positive emphasis on personal economic freedom, on the other hand however, 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’ (Brown 1995, p. 89). Thus, managing this citizen with her or his 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. (1995, p. 5)"

New techniques of economic and social planning were based on a notion of the interconnection of the individual and the state. This was in terms of the individual citizen’s capacity for particular forms of self-government and at the same time a closer involvement of government in areas which were previously understood as primarily private. Following Brown we can view this shift as representative of a new governmental rationality, one which is characterised by a conception of the importance of

---

91 Copland was a highly influential economist, he was Professor of Economics at the University of Tasmania from 1920 to 1924 and Professor of Commerce at the University of Melbourne from 1924 to 1944. Among other positions, in 1931 he was...
individual security and the interconnection of this with the operation of the social whole. In chapter three we discussed Nikolas Rose’s formulation of this shift as ‘welfarism’, a ‘new formula for the exercise of rule’ in which persons and ‘activities were to be governed through society, this is to say, through acting upon them in relation to a social norm, and constituting their experiences and evaluations in a social form’ (1993, p.245).\(^9\) 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 was 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 an individual 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. Most often in the 1940s these programmes of government ‘from a distance’ were based on a rationale of the interconnection of the state and the citizen posed in terms of mutual responsibility.

An analysis of some of the seminar papers from an Australian Institute of Political Science conference on reconstruction held in 1943 illustrate the importance of this rationale of mutual responsibility, particularly in the area of the regulation of consumption.\(^9\) On the 22nd of December 1942 the Ministry of Post-War Reconstruction was established by the Curtin government. Chifley was appointed the first Minister while remaining Government Treasurer; H.C. Coombs was appointed Director General of

---

\(^9\) See also Miller and Rose, 1990.

\(^9\) The Fabian Socialist nature of discussions at the Institute are notable during this period; however, unlike the example of Britain where Fabian organisations remained popular during the inter-war years, in Australia Fabian organisations died off and the locus of Fabian thinking during the inter-war years was mainly organisations such as the Workers Educational Association and the Australian Institute of Political Science (Mathews 1993, p.231). Nevertheless, the Fabian minded nature of the administrators who dominated in Canberra during and after WWII has been noted (see for instance Beilharz, Considine, and Watts, 1992, Mathews, 1993 and Rowse, 1978). Fabian societies re-emerged in the 1940s and early 1950s. The Victorian Fabian Society acted as the national Fabian society and was an important platform for Whitlam’s reformation of the Labor Party (Mathews 1993, p.231-232).
Post-War Reconstruction early in 1943.\textsuperscript{94} The department was small until 1945 and initially functioned as a locus of research on reconstruction. In his official history of WWII Paul Hasluck provides a compelling account of the commitment to post-war reconstruction. He argues that:

> Animating all the planning was the doctrine of full employment… Work, as well as being available, should be adequately rewarded and directed towards worthwhile ends. It meant raising consumption by those now on low incomes, improving the environment by housing, town and country planning, modern transport and social services. (1970, p. 512)

The centrality of the aim of full employment to all other reconstruction aims is illustrated by Chifley in one of his earliest statements about the new Department of Reconstruction:

> The primary aim of our post-war economic policy must be a high and stable level of employment… Above all… it means placing permanently within the reach of every one of us freedom from basic economic worries, the realisation of some of our ambitions for personal development, and the opportunity of bringing up happy, healthy, well-educated families. (in Hasluck 1970, p. 512)

Papers from the 1943 conference held at the Australian Institute of Political Science illustrate the main themes of the reconstruction debate. The main rhetorics of the debate are apparent in the lectures of Coombs and Copland. There are four main dimensions to this debate: a strong relationship between the state and the individual posed in terms of ‘security’ and ‘responsibility’; the aim of full employment; the problem of consumption; and, state growth.

The main argument in both Coombs’s and Copland’s lectures is that of the necessity for a planned economy. This rhetoric was not new with reconstruction, rather it originated in the 1930s and the circumstances of the war enabled government to implement a more closely controlled economy. Andreas Mamchak points out that the ‘developments in the United Kingdom and in America which brought planning to the fore and which established a precedent of direct government intervention in the

\textsuperscript{94} Coombs was appointed Director-General of Post-War Reconstruction in 1943, in 1949 he was appointed Governor of the Commonwealth Bank and held this position until he became Governor of the Reserve Bank from 1959 to 1968. As well as many other positions he was the first Chairman of the Elizabethan Theatre Trust from 1964 and the first Chairman of the Australian Council for the Arts from 1968 (Atkinson 1992, p.55-56).
economy, were not replicated in Australia in the early and middle thirties to the same degree’ (1981, p. 38). Nevertheless, there was an awareness and interest in planning but it was the circumstances of war that provided the conditions for the centralisation of planning and showed that a constructive government could successfully ensure full employment, economic growth and at the same time go some way towards achieving security for the individual and thus for the state.\textsuperscript{95} Copland illustrated the interest with which Australian economists and bureaucrats viewed overseas governmental experiments when he commented that, the ‘US experience in the 30s of the New Deal and of pump-priming, and various similar experiments elsewhere, have shown that progress in economic understanding has been realistic, and that it can secure at least the now widely recognised objective of a higher level of unemployment’ (in Mamchak 1981, p. 42).\textsuperscript{96} In fact, by the mid to late war years the association between a welfare state and an ‘interventionist state’ committed to securing full employment had entered into received opinion. This ‘social’ security was placed against the ‘insecurity’ of the pre-war years by Coombs when he argued that, the ‘history of the depression years completely destroyed the belief that insecurity is an effective stimulus to endeavour’ (1944, p. 83). Furthermore, the ‘fatalism which regarded the fluctuations of economic activity as something we must take for granted, and the miseries which attended them as inevitable burdens which we must patiently bear, was the first casualty of the war’ (Coombs 1944, p. 85). Thus, the pre-war ideal of the free uncontrolled economy was redefined in terms of social inequality and insecurity.

\textsuperscript{95} While the initial wartime steps towards central government provided social services were taken by the Menzies government in 1941, it was the Labor governments of Curtin and Chifley (1941-49) which laid the foundations of the welfare state in a more substantial way. Labor extended coverage of child endowments in 1941, established widow’s pensions and maternity benefits for Aboriginal mothers in 1942, extended the old age pension, and provided benefits for invalids and funeral benefits in 1942, and established unemployment, sickness and pharmaceutical benefits in 1944 (Haig-Muir and Hay 1996, p.126).

\textsuperscript{96} See also Lloyd Ross in the 1943 seminar at the Australian Institute for Political Science for a further discussion of the ways in which Australian economists and social theorists of the time were influenced by developments in America under Roosevelt and by Keynesian economics (1944, p.209).
As we have already commented it is not useful to view this shift towards welfarism in necessarily egalitarian terms. The basis of Keynes’s argument for full employment was state growth via pump-priming. Thus, Chifley as the Post-War Reconstruction Minister, stated in a newspaper article in 1943:

[Full employment and social security are] ultimately indispensable to the other. Even at the best of times there will be many calls upon each of Australia’s social security services. Comprehensive and adequate provision against these calls will sustain purchasing power which is half the battle in maintaining full employment. (in Watts, 1987, p. 115)

Along with the aims of full employment and social security came the problem of consumption. Thus, the ‘idealism’ of the reconstruction rhetoric is better understood in terms of economic theory based on planned patterns of consumption and state growth than on any solely social reformist agenda. As Brown has argued:

The most significant and controversial measures in wartime economic policy were not over issues of the socialisation of private assets but over devising a system of controls capable of regulating the consumer, with the emphasis on indirect rather than direct measures so as to preserve at least that illusion of private autonomy which was an integral part not only of morale campaigns and the struggle for political legitimacy, but also of the new rationalities of government themselves. (Brown 1997, p. 250-51)

Characteristic of discussion about reconstruction was the concern with the regulation of consumption and, connected to this, the regulation of leisure. The strategic use of culture was one important way in which individuals could be trained ‘from a distance’ as responsible citizens, especially in relation to their roles as consumers and in their use of their increased leisure time.
Culture and Reconstruction

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. (Coombs 1981, p. 26)

As we have already intimated and as the above comment from Coombs makes apparent, a dominant theme regarding discussions on reconstruction was the governance of ‘human relationships’ and the ‘physical and social environment’ in which they were conducted. The primary rhetoric of such discussions was the notion of training for a particular kind of citizenship. The attributes of this citizen were constructed in relation to three main themes: consumption, leisure, and community. These themes were predominant in the advocacy of government involvement with the arts, discussions of which increased significantly during this period. It will be useful to begin analysis of these themes, as they figured in advocacy of government involvement with the arts, by a brief discussion of adult education and the Australian Army Education Service. This is particularly because, as will become apparent, it was in relation to programmes of adult education that a strategic function for art in relation to a general citizenry first came to be imagined.

In Australia, as in Britain, the use of art programmes 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 (see Candy and Laurent, 1994 and Smith, 1993b [1945]) and later the WEA (see Stewart, 1944 and Whitelock, 1974). Beilharz, Considine and Watts describe this diversity of charitable and voluntary organisations as the ‘second
welfare state’ (1992, p. 57). For Beilharz, Considine and Watts the welfare state is not adequately understandable as one single homogeneous block attached to ‘the state’ but rather as a ‘diversity of activities and responsibilities’ (1992, p. 100). These ‘activities’ and ‘responsibilities’ are administered via reciprocal as well as conflicting relations between the two blocks of the welfare state. Beilharz, Considine and Watts describe these blocks as the national welfare state, which is a product mostly of the twentieth century, primarily post-WWII, and the ‘second welfare state’ which is the ‘partnership… of voluntary organisations… that emerged in the nineteenth century (1992, p. 57). We described in chapter three how in Britain art programmes came to be seen as a responsibility of government and thus the Arts Council of Great Britain was established to look after ‘the hearts and minds of the people’ alongside legislation establishing the ‘national welfare state’. In Australia similar expectations dominated discussion during reconstruction. These included the state’s responsibility for the provision of an economic safety net for the people and the state’s responsibility for the provision of ‘Culture’. However, in Australia the Commonwealth government did not became involved in the administration of art programmes in a significant way during the reconstruction of the 1940s. There are a number of possible reasons for the comparative lateness of the Commonwealth government’s entrance into the field of arts administration. We will explore some of these by way of our continuing analysis of the relations between art, citizenship and government as evidenced in discussions about government involvement with culture during post-war reconstruction in Australia.

The Australian Army Education Service, established in 1943, had a substantial influence on post-war adult education. The Australian Army Education Service had two publications throughout the war. SAL'T was a newspaper which included short stories, poems, cartoons and other light entertainment, and the Current Affairs Bulletin was distributed to all officers in the Army to provide a basis for

97 Salt was first established in 1941 when it was a weekly publication, it became a fortnightly publication in 1942 and continued until 1946 (Whitelock 1974, p.246).
organised discussion with the troops. A passage from the very first *Current Affairs Bulletin* echoes the wartime and post-war philosophy that ‘war begins in the minds of men’:98

In the short run it is comparatively easy for the dictators to mobilise the minds of their people… Ordinary people are not encouraged, or even allowed, to think for themselves… The democracies, on the other hand, hold that men and women should think for themselves, and... are convinced that mental vigour and independence are sources of strength in time of war. (1942, p. 2)

The Australian Army Education Service’s aim, as stated in a memorandum of 1942, was to imbue a

… realisation that we are fighting for something which is of significance to all of us collectively and as individuals... The fact that we are fighting for the survival of democracy and free political institutions... What Army Education has to do is to make these ideals real to the men, to clarify their significance and to revivify them as ideals and incentives. (in Whitelock 1974, p.233)

We will notice a number of themes here that we have argued were characteristic of reconstruction.

Above all there is the sense that training should be more than ‘practical’. R.C. Mills, who became Director of the Council of Adult Education, argued that ‘one of the most difficult problems’ was to ‘educate adults to a sense of their responsibilities as citizens in a democracy’ (1944, p.19), therefore, educational,

… content should be adjusted to meet the needs of the individual’s chosen vocation, of his position as a citizen, and of his own particular bent... Vocational training makes the competent worker, citizenship training makes the good citizen, and these two together with leisure training, make the complete man (sic). (1944, p. 21)

As in Britain in the Army Bureau of Current Affairs, discussed in chapter three, it was in the ironic context of the army that programmes for training in ‘participatory citizenship’ were developed in a governmental context.99

---

98 This was the foundational philosophy of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) when it was established in 1946.

99 Also like the Army Bureau of Current Affairs, the Australian Army Education Service was thought by some to be too open to domination by left wing thinkers (‘the socialist private’). According to Whitelock, ‘Menzies… on more than one occasion anathematised Australian Army Education Service personnel and implied that their activities were at least partly to blame for the misfortune of his party at the polls’ (1974, p.242).
According to Colonel R.B. Madgewick, Director of Army Education, before WWII adult education was ‘a thing of shreds and patches’ (in Whitelock 1970, p. 15). Not only did adult education receive no government funding but it was also based on an emphasis of ‘charitable, remedial and vocational instruction’ (ibid., p. 3). It was the Australian Army Education Service which, for the first time, emphasised the use of education not only to improve morale in the forces but also to educate individual soldiers, the rationale being to ‘let the servicemen know and understand what they were fighting for’ (Madgewick in Whitelock 1970, p. 16). Adult education in the Australian Army Education Service was a matter not simply of the provision of vocational training but of reconstructing the individual soldier in terms of ‘participatory citizenship’.

Madgewick and his advisers were determined that provision should be made in the scheme for cultural as well as political and vocational education… The object… was not so much to teach individuals how to sing, act and paint as to foster among troops generally an interest in and appreciation of the arts, which it was believed would be a valuable long-term contribution to the Australian way of life. (in Whitelock 1974, p.253)

In this comment from a member of the Australian Army Education Service staff, Major L.C. Wilcher, we get a sense of the reasoning behind the use of art programmes in the Service. The soldier was a citizen and the subject of political and vocational education but also, and most importantly for us, the soldier-citizen was to be educated to develop an ‘independence of mind’. This was to be achieved particularly through the use of aesthetic education. These new educational strategies emphasised the training of the ‘personality’ of the citizen and, as the quote above makes clear, the aim was to train citizens in all facets of their personality or their ‘way of life’, from their capacities in work to their capacities in the expenditure of their leisure.
Both Bernard Smith, the respected art historian,\(^{100}\) and Coombs have commented that after the war there was an increased public interest in the arts. These opinions are exemplified by *SALT* in a 1945 review of the ‘Australia Present Day Art Exhibition’ in Melbourne:

> Art is open slather these days. The modern v old art controversy has raged… furiously… Newspapers are getting some of their brightest stories from art- the Dobell case for one… Art shows are on all the time, and many of those who flock in would rather go to them for entertainment than to the movies. (1945, p. 33)

It is undeniable that there was an increased interest in the arts in the post-war period. Margaret Steven writes that during the war, ‘sales of paintings and visits to galleries had increased markedly. The feeling that it was part of the State’s responsibility to nurture creative artists was an almost universal post-war legacy’ (1982, p. 13). Smith also argues that ‘the years of tension that came with the Second World War provided a stimulus to art in Australia as a whole’ (1956, p. 24). While at one level the war was a direct factor in this stimulus, for instance, due to the return of Australian artists from Europe between 1938 and 1940, and the relative cultural isolation of Australia during the war, there are other reasons more central to understanding the particular connections made between art, citizenship and government at this time.

We have already discussed how through the mediums of *SALT* and the *Current Affairs Bulletin* servicemen and women were encouraged to take an active interest in art. Indeed, Smith comments that although ‘for most Australians the arts were still exotic curiosities of the mind, there was, none the less, a widespread interest in all the arts among the servicemen’ (1995, p. 226-27).\(^{101}\) It was possible for returning servicemen to further this interest as courses in art were available through the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme. Like the Australian Army Education Service the aims of the

\(^{100}\) Smith was also the writer of ‘The Antipodean Manifesto’ which was signed by Charles Blackman, Arthur Boyd, David Boyd, John Brack, Bob Dickerson, John Perceval, Clifton Pugh, as well as Smith. Primarily this manifesto and the exhibition it accompanied was a statement against the dominance of abstract expressionism in the Australian art world.
Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme were not only vocational. Of course vocational training was accorded first priority, due to the necessary retraining of servicemen; however, the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme also aimed to prepare personnel psychologically for a post-war world which would involve an ‘individual adjustment to a life vastly different’ (Australian Department of Post-War Reconstruction 1944, p. 1). The ex-servicemen (such as, John Brack, Clifton Pugh, David Boyd) who were trained by these schemes exercised a great influence on Australian art by the late 1950s (Smith 1995, p. 305). Furthermore, the war and later the training schemes employed artists. For instance, Daryl Lindsay (later the Director of the National Gallery of Victoria from 1941 to 1955) began his artistic career as a war artist in WWI (Moore 1934, p. 51), he also wrote about art for SALT and the Current Affairs Bulletin in WWII. William Dobell was employed at the East Sydney Technical College (the main College for art training in the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme) from 1939, and then in 1942 he was commissioned by the Allied Works Council to paint murals of its wartime activities (Smith 1995, p. 263). The media attention to Dobell’s 1944 Archibald Prize winning ‘A Portrait of an Artist’ and the subsequent court case attracted a great deal of public notice. A lesser-mentioned but equally important media influence was Russell Drysdale’s commission from the Sydney Morning Herald in 1944 to paint the effects of drought in Western New South Wales, a commission which produced some of Drysdale’s most renowned paintings. Also in 1947 Claudio Alcorso, Chairman of Silk and Textile Printers Ltd. commissioned thirty Australian painters to design fabrics. These included painters as distinguished as Dobell, Margaret Preston, Drysdale, Donald Friend, and Hal Missingham. Joseph Burke, who was appointed the first Herald Professor of Fine Arts in the University of Melbourne in 1947, regarded this project as

Centrally the Antipodeans asserted their right to draw on images from life, while at the same time being critical of the restraints imposed by social realism (see Smith, 1976a).

Except for ancillary roles on the homefront the services were almost wholly male at this time.
... the most important in all my years in Australia. Only galleries and rich collectors can afford the paintings of these artists, but this bold experiment made it possible for the humblest homes to afford Drysdale, Dobell and other originals. Moreover, these fabrics were a functional part of the man-made environment, not simply ornaments or articles of luxury. (1982, p.21)

The rhetoric in this speech on the importance of providing access to art to the average or ‘plain Australian’ was dominant in advocacy for government involvement in art in the 1940s. We have briefly sketched above a number of concrete occurrences in the early and mid 1940s which had the effect of making art a more general topic of discussion. There was also much discussion of and advocacy for a Commonwealth government role in art which took many of its themes from the more general themes of the reconstruction.

The appeal to the ‘plain Australian’ was the primary rhetorical frame in which advocacy for government arts funding was set. 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… (in Smith [1945] 1993, p. 262)

We will note here some themes which are familiar from our discussion in chapter three. In particular, we should recognise the theme that art should relate to the ‘life’ of the people and that art should be physically accessible to the people. It was only through addressing these two questions of access that the benefits of art could operate. One of these benefits, as we have already stated, was in relation to

102 Sydney Ure Smith as an individual made an important impact on Australian art, he was an artist but his most important contribution was in his capacity as a publisher and his promotion of, particularly, Australian contemporary art (Smith 1956, p. 24). For instance, Ure Smith published an exhaustive listing of all the cultural societies, boards, associations and so forth in existence in Australia as early as 1939 (see Ure Smith 1939). Nancy Underhill in her biography of Ure Smith argues that he was one of the greatest Australian art patrons, administrators, and art publishers (Underhill 1991).
educating the consuming citizen. Frank Medworth, artist and Head of the East Sydney Technical College from 1939, made the most direct statement of why art was useful to the reconstruction:

Art, in my present meaning, 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. (in Smith 1993, [1945] p. 263)

Thus, art was 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 so forth with which they chose to assert their individuality. An Australian Army Education Service discussion pamphlet emphasised the responsibility of the individual citizen in this when it asserted ‘We’ve got to accept some of the responsibility ourselves. There are many fields in which our indifference to design may saddle us with things we want no more of. We must, at home be prepared to combat useless expenditure…’ (1945, p. 23).

The community arts centre idea became the focus of much discussion on the role of art in the reconstruction. In his discussion of ‘The Position of the Arts in Australian Society’ in which the above radio talks are discussed, Smith gives an extensive statement as to why community art centres would be one of the best ways to utilise art in the reconstruction:

A well designed exhibition room in every town and suburb should be an important item in any imaginative post-war planning… The exhibition of local manufactures and the criticism of local industrial design, as with the exhibition of any local crafts, should proceed continuously. The interchange of such exhibitions by cities, suburbs and country centres would be of inestimable value in raising the intellectual and aesthetic standards of the community.
Such problems, and a thousand kindred ones, can be solved by a vigorous and imaginative policy for post-war Australia. But whether the solution of such problems is even attempted depends upon the defeat of the obscurantism common to the advocates of ‘art for art’s sake’, on the one hand, and those on the other who are determined that art is only justifiable if it can guarantee a regular and consistent return in cash dividends. (italics in original, 1993 [1945], p. 264)

These themes, of anti-elitism in art, the advocacy of art’s relationship to the everyday, art’s ability to speak directly to the people, and art’s ability to train the individual citizen in correct consumption were central to the discussion of community art centres. According to Brown, this theme of decentralisation played a dominant role in post-war discussion, thus the ‘inter-war concept of an evolutionary social totality became instead an economy or “community” of citizens. This emphasis placed a new stress on the “adjustment” of the individuals and on the origins of that adjustment not only in public allegiance but also in private assent’ (1995, p.168). Governance became a matter of educating private choice understood in relation to ‘the community’ and ‘the family’. As in the quote from Smith above, the local nature of the community centre was associated with its ability to be more relevant to the lives of the individual citizen.

We have seen in chapter three that the community centre movement was strong in America during the ‘New Deal’ and in Britain during post-WWII reconstruction. In Australia, too reconstruction brought with it a conception that ‘community’ and ‘locality’ figured importantly in an individual’s life. The individual was conceived of as being attached by ties of loyalty to a range of local groups- the family, community groups, charitable groups, sporting groups and so forth. Via these ties the ‘individual as citizen’ was attached to the larger identity groupings of the nation or the Commonwealth. Brown highlights the characteristic nature of this shift in this formulation: ‘The individual was defined through familial privacy, voluntarism and civic-mindedness, rather than through the ties of labour, class or neighbourhood’ (1995, p. 140). In this context the community centre was the ideal site for the education
of the ‘individual as citizen’ via a range of programmes. In particular through the community centre the
‘individual in the community’ could be governed ‘from a distance’. That is, the individual could be
educated or encouraged to be self managing in various particular ways without the threat of ‘the state’
encroaching in their private lives.

Brown argues that this ‘decentralist ethic’ was ‘based partly on a desire to reclaim a sense of social
citizenship from centralised planning. Yet it also embodied an essentially conservative desire to contain
the demands of the individual within the loyalties of family, privacy and established roles’ (1995, p.
164). However, the ‘essentially conservative’ nature of this advocacy for decentralisation is less clear
than Brown asserts. We have already discussed above Smith’s particular understanding of the
community art centre. In his conception of the community art centre Smith draws on a long tradition of
‘the communal’ as a theme in socialist influenced community groups and organisations. C.R. Badger,
the adult educationalist, had a different but related definition of the ideal community art centre:

In the first place, it stresses citizenship in the widest sense, the aim being the
development of a sense of responsibility and self-discipline, the stimulation of a desire to
know more about current affairs, economic, political and social. In the second, it
emphasises quite naturally the idea of self-training for intelligent use of leisure. (1944, p.
6)

Badger goes on to advocate the importance of this kind of citizenship education in a socialist co-
operative society (1944, p.12). In his *War Aims of a Plain Australian* the war historian C.E.W. Bean
has a similar statement in relation to the importance of the ‘community centre’ in training a ‘co-
operator’ (1943, p. 114-15). Thus, there were a range of different political connotations to
decentralisation. If it is problematic to describe decentralisation as a politically ‘conservative’
movement can we describe is as ‘conservative’ in some other way?
Brown, above, describes decentralisation as a conservative movement in the way it sought to *limit* the individual in relation to the family and ‘established roles’. Here Brown undermines his own argument that understanding the transition of governmental rationality which characterised the late 1940s as essentially conservative is to reduce a complex shift to the changing of an ‘ideological guard’ (1995, p. 5). Rowse, in his review of Brown’s book, asks whether it makes ‘sense to characterise the shift from the management of populations to the government of subjectivities as a move from reformism to conservatism…’ (1996, p. 51). Rowse argues that instead of analysing the shift towards the governance of the spaces of the individual, home and community as conservative, as Brown does when he understands this rationality as limiting to the individual, what we need is ‘an account of what was enabled and disabled by such a regime’ (1996, p. 22). We have argued throughout this thesis that an analysis of governmental programmes which focuses on how a programme seeks to effect a population and what it seeks to effect in them allows us to understand the relations involved as more complex that a view which characterises them as essentially ‘conservative’ or ‘reformist’.

So what was enabled and disabled by the major themes of advocacy for government involvement in the arts in the 1940s? There are three main themes which are integral to the construction of the relations between art, citizenship and government at this time. The first dominant theme was the instrumental nature of views on the benefits of art education in constructing the ‘individual as citizen’ in a way that would enable this citizen to exercise an ‘informed’ choice in decisions as to the expenditure of leisure and practices of consumption. The second major theme in the relations between art, citizenship and government is that advocacy of a state responsibility in art support became a popular demand. 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’ (1946, p. 99). However, even Phillips advocated government support for the arts ‘if our national life is not to wither before it has fully flowered’, 
arguing that, a ‘country cannot achieve nationhood until it has achieved articulateness (sic)’ (ibid.). The third theme framing the relations between art, citizenship and government in Australian reconstruction was the assertion that art which appealed to the ‘plain Australian’ was central to attaining the most beneficial effects from art for the nation. These themes are clearly illustrated by discussion in 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’ (1944, p. 15). Dorothy Helmrich (the head of the Australian CEMA) gave us the best statement of why this was so- ‘When man (sic) thinks constructively and can use his (sic) imagination- which is common to all’, she argued, ‘then we have a complete being who will prove the perfect citizen’ (in People’s Conference on Culture in the War and the Peace 1944, p. 4). John Metcalfe argued in favour of community arts centres:

Public institutions are still more democratic when the people take a hand in their management and feel they own them. And the more local they are in their provision and administration the more democratic they are likely to be. It has been well said that the only real politics are local politics. (1945-6, p. 95)

Smith summed up the importance of the conference in an article titled ‘Art and the People’ when he argued that the ‘conference helped to underline a vital weakness in the educational structure. Australian art education is still conceived to a large extent as the exaltation and laudation of individual genius and not as a process heightening national standards of taste’ (1944, p. 56).

Brown has argued that an appeal to ‘the popular’, as understood in America and Britain at this time, was noticeably absent in Australia. Rather, Australian debate framed the notion of the ‘plain Australian’ who ‘exemplified moderate needs and capacities’, it is the ‘averaging’ nature of this strategy which was specific to Australia (Brown 1994, p. 173-75). According to Brown, the possible reasons for this are multiple. These included the fact that Australia did not need to undergo restructuring to the same degree
as Britain after WWII or America during the 1930s (Brown 1995, p. 180). We have already pointed out, for instance, that the defeat of the Powers Referendum in 1944 meant that reconstruction in Australia was limited. In chapter three we described how the management of art programmes were included in the construction of the national welfare state in Britain. How do we explain the continuance of art programmes managed by the set of institutions characteristic of the ‘second welfare state’, the amalgam of non-central government institutions, and not the national welfare state in Australia? Apart from the fact that reconstruction in Australia was not as thoroughgoing as in Britain post-WWII, there are two other points to consider in relation to the lack of Commonwealth government involvement with the arts at this time. First, there was not the same relationship generated between the civilian population and bodies like the (British) CEMA, which had an almost mythical relationship with the people, particularly due to its morale raising efforts during the Blitz. Second, while, as we have seen, there was strong advocacy in favour of Commonwealth government involvement in the arts, there was also opposition from both sides of politics. There was a suspicion that state involvement in art would result in the kind of censorship which artists had endured under the Fascist governments in Europe. It is interesting to note that one of the voices in opposition to government involvement in art was future Chair of the Australia Council Donald Horne, who wrote that ‘the real dangers will begin if a cultural “plan” is evolved’ (italics in original, 1945, p. 134). Related to this was a general suspicion of centralised government agencies which became increasingly predominant by the time R.G. Menzies took over government in 1949.

The attempt to establish an Australian Academy of the Arts in the late 1930s is illustrative in these respects. Surprisingly, the attempt was spearheaded by Menzies (who later described government art support as ‘a galloping socialist plan’) whose aim was to ‘commit patronage of the arts to the commonwealth government’ which would also ‘enable the building of a new and genuinely “national”’
gallery in Canberra’ (Haese 1988, p. 39). Support for the Academy came from two positions, a conservative position, for which Menzies was the spokesperson, and a more liberal position, for which Ure Smith was spokesperson. Haese argues that the ‘difference between these two men represented broad and fundamental differences in Australian culture and politics, these related to differences in values and a sense of Australian nationality deeply rooted in the colonial experience of Australians in the late nineteenth century’ (1988, p.40) Predictably Menzies’s idea of the Academy was as a ‘national’ institution in the sense that it had no space for the diversity of Australian art. As a space for the display of this diversity, particularly in relation to the Australian reaction to modernism, was precisely how Ure Smith envisaged the Academy (ibid., p. 40). In the event the Academy was dominated by Menzies’s influence. Ure Smith commented that Menzies was besotted by ‘pomp and ceremony, by the outward, by “names” and “labels” as such… an annual dinner, with all the nob of the land invited, the Church, the Navy, the Army, the G.G., etc. etc. on the lines of the Royal Academy dinner’ (in Haese 1988, p.42). By 1938 Menzies was forced to admit that a Royal Charter for the Academy would not be forthcoming as ‘he had been unable to muster sufficient support in Canberra to make an official submission for a charter. The Lyons government, it soon became apparent, was not prepared to put such a request before the Crown while any sizeable group of established artists made their opposition known’ (ibid., p. 45). In the event, the Commonwealth government did not develop a national programme for the management of the arts until the late 1960s. Until then arts management was the sphere of the ‘second welfare state’, programmes organised by voluntary, charitable, entrepreneurial, state and local government organisations. Where art was utilised in programmes which aimed to educate the people in various ways how were these programmes constructed and what did they seek to affect in the populations they targeted?
Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts

Thus far we have argued that in the period of post-war 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 and thus to be governed from a distance. Importantly, for our purposes here, the relations between art, citizenship and government at this time meant that art programmes were understood to be an important strategy in the education of citizens in the exercise of their private choice. In the 1940s the Australian organisation which came closest to the organisational structure and philosophy of the Arts Council of Great Britain was the Australian Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts (CEMA), later the Arts Council of Australia.

Helmrich has argued that ‘the Arts Council can claim, in truth to be 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’ (1969, p.2). There was a multiplicity of suggestions for the organisation of cultural groups in Australia during and after WWII. Coombs wrote that, ‘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’ (1981, p. 218). 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. (Arts Council of Australia 1947, p. 3)

In this statement of purpose we can see some of the main themes which characterise the relations between art and citizenship in the 1940s. Like the advocates of government involvement with the arts, CEMA was structured around a belief in the educative value of the arts, particularly, art programmes designed to enable citizens ‘to make the best of life’.

The Australian CEMA began in NSW mostly as a result of the efforts of Helmrich who worked with the British CEMA for two years. As we have discussed above there was already, in these final years of the war, substantial advocacy for a government funded arts body. Indeed in 1942, the year in which Helmrich returned to Australia, Drysdale wrote regarding the British CEMA that it was a good example of the ways in which artists could be made useful in wartime. Drysdale criticised the fact that no advantage was taken of artists in Australia, it ‘occurs to me 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’ (1942, p. 70). Helmrich became President of CEMA in 1943 and she held this position for twenty years. She wrote that the ‘objectives of the CEMA were primarily to take the arts to the people- the country people- to encourage amateur groups- 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’ (1969, p. 2). This emphasis on ‘the people’, which was common to arts advocacy at this time, meant that CEMA took on quite specific goals and mechanisms.
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 and C.C.C. camps, and other places between 1943 and 1945 (Hoff 1945, p. 46). 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’ (Helmrich 1969, p. 2).

CEMA’s first organised event was a small arts festival in Woolloomooloo. This festival consisted of music, theatre and visual art with attendant lunch-time lectures. It received a small grant from the State Advisory Board of Adult Education and Associated Newspapers Limited guaranteed the festival against loss to the sum of £250. After Helmrich was appointed to the Advisory Board of Adult Education CEMA received a yearly grant of £600 which, according to Helmrich, ‘was made possible by the generous sacrifice of portions of … grants by other members of the Board’ (1969, p. 4). This grant increased slightly every year until eventually CEMA received its money directly from the State Department of Education, rather than through its advisory board.  

In 1945 Helmrich was invited to Britain for three months by the British Council to study the Arts Council of Great Britain. 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 guarantee at least 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 basis of the work planned for the new Arts Council of Australia was the firm premise, the ‘arts are not a luxury. They are a necessity’ (in Carrell and Dean 1982, p.61). A decentralisation policy was followed by the new Council, thus, by 1948 the Council 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.

There are three main strategies that emerge from this ‘potted history’ of the establishment of the Arts Council. First, the emphasis on ‘the people’ which 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 lunch-time lecture, these provided access on a educative level to both 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 ensured that each division and regional branch was specific in the way in which it dealt with local needs. What was the aim of these policies?

It is worth quoting in full one paragraph from a report of the first five years of the NSW division of the Arts Council:

> 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. (1947, p. 3-4)

103 For instance in 1949 the NSW Arts Council received £800 from the State Department of Education as part of its allocation for adult education. This money was 90% of CEMA’s income (Arts Council of Australia 1949, p. 3).
This statement echoes sentiments we have already heard in the previous discussion of arts funding advocacy. We have seen how the theme of education for citizenship, leisure, and consumption was connected to an ethic of decentralisation in the Council, as it was by many of the advocates of Commonwealth government arts support. Through the ‘Country Special Section’ the Council aimed to develop a network of country branches which would work in co-operation 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’ (Australian Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts nd, p. 6). The Arts Council was the archetypal arts organisation of this era as illustrated by its particular understanding of the relations between art and citizenship, its regional tours, and its policy of decentralisation.

When organisations were established with substantial government support, first the Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust\textsuperscript{104} and later the Australia Council for the Arts, neither of these organisations liaised or collaborated with the Arts Council in any way. Helmrich makes this point and it is worth quoting at length:

\begin{quote}
In our own early days we had encouragement from all kinds of sources including banks, commerce, the Department of Education and, of course, individual members and groups of the public. When the Trust and then, later, the Council for the Arts were formed with their immense government support, I was hoping we would form one big organisation, which would be perhaps a little like the Arts Council of Great Britain. But it soon became increasingly clear that there was no desire on the part of the incoming organisations to join forces with us at all. In fact, we were often forced to fight for what we felt were our rights. (in Dean and Carrell 1982, p. 84-85)\textsuperscript{105}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{104} The Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust worked on an primarily entrepreneurial basis but received some Commonwealth funds from 1954 and these funds were also supplemented by grants from state governments. However, it became too hard to reconcile the Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust’s entrepreneurial qualities with government requirements ‘that funds be broadly distributed’. Partly in answer to this problem the Australia Council for the Arts was established under the sole control of the Commonwealth government in 1968 (Battersby, 1980, p. 20).

\textsuperscript{105} At this time the Arts Council still concentrated its efforts in the country, while the Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust was based in capital cities only and was entrepreneurial in function (Dean and Carrell 1982, p.99).
This fact reveals an important point about the governmental understanding of the Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust and the Australia Council for the Arts as compared to the Arts Council of Australia. The Arts Council of Australia was primarily seen as educational and regional and therefore a State government matter. The Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust and the Australia Council, on the other hand, were seen as organisations which would present cultural productions which were primarily a matter of ‘National Quality’, therefore, these organisation were a Commonwealth government matter. Thus, a dichotomy was established at an early stage between rationales of cultural policy and the institutions that managed them. Most significantly ‘the national’ and ‘the local’ (and all that these terms have encompassed at different times) were established as competing rationales for government arts funding. We will discuss the discursive co-ordinates informing government involvement with art in the specific instance of the Australia Council in the following chapter. For now it is enough to note that during the 1940s, even given the prevalence of discussion on the appropriateness of government involvement in the arts and the context of reconstruction, the reality of Commonwealth government support for the arts was inconceivable. Gordon Horswell, secretary of the Council at this time, has commented that when asked for financial contributions to the Arts Council Prime Minister Chifley, during the most extensive period of reconstruction, replied that, ‘it would be political suicide for any government to agree to do such a thing’ (in Dean and Carrell 1982, p. 99).

State Art Galleries- Victoria and New South Wales

In our discussion of CEMA we have analysed some specific conjunctions of art, citizenship and government as evidenced by an organisation which could be described as belonging to ‘the second welfare state’. This final section of the chapter, in its discussion of some of the programmes of the state art galleries of Victoria and NSW, will also illustrate how institutions of ‘the second welfare state’ adjusted their practices in light of the post-war reconstruction context. We have argued that in post-war
Australia there was evidence of a new rationality for the governance of the citizenry. This new 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. We have discussed this understanding in post-war debates about government arts funding and in the specific example of CEMA. Through these discussions we have described the relationship between art, citizenship and government as being based on educative strategies, particularly targeted at education for consumption and education for leisure. We can trace parallel tendencies in the way that the art programmes of the National Gallery of Victoria and the Art Gallery of New South Wales sought to encompass these concerns. Our discussion of the National Gallery of Victoria in the post-war reconstruction period will focus on its multiplication of practices for the combination of art and citizenship. Our discussion of the Art Gallery of New South Wales will focus on the establishment of its Travelling Art Exhibition Programme.

It is fitting to begin with the National Gallery of Victoria. Not only was this the first art gallery established in Australia it was also, for various reasons, the most developed in our time frame. As we have argued, after the war culture increasingly came to be seen as an important tool for the education of the citizenry, particularly in relation to inculcating within this citizenry particular capacities to do with their role as consumers and their increased leisure time. 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

---

106 See Westbrook 1968 for a detailed history of the National Gallery of Victoria. Eric Westbrook replaced Sir Daryl Lindsay in 1955 as the Gallery Director. Westbrook’s Directorship is noted for its expansion of the Gallery collection to stronger holdings in both contemporary and Australian art (Cox 1970, p.263). See Goodman 1990 for an interesting discussion of the founding of the National Museum of Victoria which shows how the Museum emerged out of a range of competing interests, primarily those between academic, amateur and professional expertise.

107 Redmond Barry (later Sir), a Senior Trustee of the Victorian Public Library was the driving force behind the establishment of the Victorian Gallery in 1854. See Galbally (1995) for a detailed biography of his life and his contribution to Victorian legal and cultural institutions.
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’ (1947, p. 2). 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 post-war planning, commissioned architects in 1943 ‘to report on the future development of the various institutions’ (Westbrook 1973, p. 16).

An educative aim played an important role at every level of the Gallery plans. Particularly important, as with all such institutional spaces, was the architectural design of the space and its appropriateness to the Gallery’s pedagogical function. 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. (1945, p. 2)

In an issue of the Society of Artist’s Book devoted to the role art could play in the reconstruction, Lindsay commented that intimately ‘tied up with the general attractiveness of a gallery is its value as an educational unit of the state’ (1945-46, p. 22). Thus, Lindsay argued 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. (ibid., p.23)

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’ (Jones 1945-6, p. 50). 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 the people to simply attend, they were also to be educated. This pedagogic function is even more apparent in the debates about gallery collection policy.

The educational function of the Gallery was reflected in its acquisition policy and supported by the dictates of 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’ (1970, p. 214). The organisation of gallery space was just one strategy to ensure the pedagogic functioning of the Gallery. An effect of the Bequest requirement that works were selected for their value to the improvement of public taste meant that the Committee had two acquisition policies. On the one hand, it was committed to acquiring high quality past and contemporary works and on the other, to acquiring ‘works of sufficiently high standard that would be suitable for Travelling Loan Exhibitions...’ (ibid., p. 202). Cox makes the point that the notion that ‘medium-good paintings were sufficient for exhibition in the country was... a refreshing improvement on the nineteenth century policy, which rarely permitted loans of other than unwanted works to country galleries’ (1970, p. 202).

There was much debate on the issue of acquisition policy which emphasised the importance of the Gallery as a public institution and its function as an educator of the new post-war citizen. 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

---

108 The Felton Bequest, donated in 1904, was influential to the development of the National Gallery of Victoria. There were legal stipulations on the Felton Bequest which meant that the Gallery’s acquisitions had to be purchased to a particular set of regulations.
largely on their educational value to the State and the interest and active co-operation of the public. It is with a view to further stimulating this mounting interest that the Quarterly Bulletin of the National Gallery of Victoria has come into being. (italics added, 1945, p. 2)

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. We have already described this form of educational strategy above in the example of the Australian Army Education Service. We have seen in discussions about Gallery collection policy and plans for the new building of the Gallery that the public was not conceived of as a passive audience; rather, the gallery public was understood as a national 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 (Smith 1988, p. 35) Also in 1944, a travelling art exhibition was arranged in association with CEMA, the War Art Council, and the Department of Education (Colsey 1971, p. 583). Titled the ‘National Exhibition of Art: Australia at War’, its object was to ‘bring the work artists were doing in every phase of the war effort before the public’ (Missingham 1945, p. 6).

---

109 See Capon and Meek, 1984 and Daniel Thomas (1960 and 1972), official gallery historian, for histories of the Gallery. See also Hal Missingham’s autobiography (1973), Missingham was Director of the Gallery for twenty-six years from 1945. 110 See Colsey (1971) for a history of the Travelling Exhibition Service. The service was originally named the Country Art Exhibition Scheme from 1944 until 1948, when Bernard Smith was responsible for its administration. The scheme closed in 1954 and was reopened in 1968 as the Art Gallery of NSW Travelling Art Exhibition Scheme under the direction of Dennis Colsey. The scheme was discontinued in 1987 when its funds were allocated to exhibitions held in regional galleries (Smith 1988, p.46).
In 1944 Bernard Smith was appointed Education Officer in charge of the Country Art Exhibition Scheme. The aim of the exhibitions was primarily educational and to this effect great importance was placed on the provision of catalogues and guest lecturers to appear at the exhibitions as they opened in each town. 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 Smith, ‘realised that a broader base had to found for art patronage in the post-war years’ (Smith 1988, p. 36). In radio broadcasts and elsewhere Ure Smith argued that ‘Art… must be brought to the people’ (in ibid.). It was largely as a result of Ure Smith’s machinations that Bernard Smith was appointed as administrator of the scheme. Nancy Underhill argues that to ‘most trustees, Ure Smith’s support for Bernard Smith and for an active public education programme branded him as a supporter of dangerous changes in the administration of the Gallery’ (1991, p. 121).\footnote{Smith joined the Teachers Branch of the Communist Party in 1940 (Smith 1990, p.277).} In the first year of the scheme seven exhibitions were shown in thirty-nine country towns to over fifty-seven thousand people. Smith writes that the ‘magnificent response vindicated the scheme, and largely silenced its critics’ (1988, p. 40).

Initiatives like the travelling art exhibitions were tied to the broader reconstruction aims by the NSW Premier William McKell, who gave a speech at the opening of the first travelling art exhibition at Wagga Wagga. He stated that ‘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’ (in Smith 1988, p. 44). For Smith, the first exhibitions were a response to a demand from the country centres. He wrote, ‘... the enthusiasm aroused
by these exhibitions indicates that a large section of country people feel that they have been cut off from any direct appreciation of the arts’ (1945, p. 30).

The example of the Country Art Exhibition Scheme demonstrates some of the main co-ordinates which framed the review of the function of the art gallery as a public institution during reconstruction. A dominant theme in this review was the reconstruction of the art gallery as having a responsibility to civic education. 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... (1946, p. 130)

The travelling art exhibitions, as well as other programmes specifically directed towards the emphasis of a more educative role for the gallery, despite initial opposition, were a reflection of the new set of relations which framed the conjunction of art and citizenship in post-war reconstruction. In this new relationship art was to be relevant to the lives of ‘plain Australians’ and thus art could play a role in the education of the ‘plain Australian’ in relation to a range of private choices.

**Conclusion**

We have discussed the contingent and varied nature of the principles informing governmental rationalities of arts administration in Australia during post-war reconstruction. This discussion has shown that in the 1930s and 1940s there were significant similarities in the discursive framing of government administration of art in America, Australia and Britain. We have emphasised that the relations between art, citizenship and government in each of these milieux were the product of a specific history. Nevertheless, it is a surprising point that in each of these three case studies increased
government arts subvention occurred in a time of dire social and economic circumstances. This curious point has been explored by an analysis of art programmes which in extending access to art to the citizenry sought to affect this citizenry in various ways. These relations were framed in terms of various types of collectivity. We have argued that an integral part of these various constructions of collectivity was the shaping of a citizen who would participate constructively in her or his working, political, and, social life. In the words of Rose this perspective ‘opens up for investigation the complexity and diversity of the relations between authorities and subjects, and the ways in which 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’ (1993, p. 288). Thus, the historically informed relations between art, government and citizenship are best defined by the ways in which different strategies, for the management of populations through encouraging a citizenry to be self regulating in various ways, have been organised and deployed.

On one view it would be conceivable to use these histories to trace a governmental recognition of democratic cultural rights. Populist calls for broader access to culture were certainly constructed in terms of an ideal of public participation. However, this ‘freely’ participating citizen was never unregulated. Most crucially in this pre and post-WWII milieu it was hoped that the construction of such a citizen would guard against the corruption of totalitarian politics which were seen to trade on the ignorance of ‘the people’. In 1945 Hal Missingham, the Director of the Art Gallery of New South Wales, quoted from an American report to make this point:

If society is to maintain its health and sanity, the people at large must be trained to accept the guidance and direction of a special call, whether of economic masters or of soldiers, or else it must be trained to take part in the knowledge, the culture, the thought, and the concepts upon which its civilisation rests. (italics added, in Missingham 1945-6, p. 67)

It is evident here that cultural access here was not formulated as a natural right of citizenship, but as a
tool in the formation of ‘good’ citizens.
CHAPTER FIVE:

The Australia Council
Arts Council: Grants and bursaries from this detestable and destructive body in effect pay producers, writers and such in advance. This is a straight invitation to them to sod the public, whose ticket- money they are no longer obliged to attract, and to seek the more immediate approval of their colleagues and friends (see Club). The system encourages a habit of thought whereby ‘creative’ people can be divided into artists who deliver serious, innovative, difficult stuff and so, of course, have to have financial help, and entertainers, whose work is easy to understand, enjoyable and therefore popular... Thus an organisation created to foster art and bring it to the public turns out to be damaging to art and cutting it off from the public. Only those in the trade profit. Compare Nationalised Industries and Modernism. (Kingsley Amis in Harper-Nelson, 1987, p. 5)

In this chapter we turn our focus to the Australia Council. The arts council technology of arts administration, as we saw in chapter three with the example of the British Arts Council, is not without its critics. Indeed it seems that the life of the Australia Council has been one of a constant process of review. Accordingly, this chapter will be organised by three particular moments, the establishment of the Australia Council, the Industries Assistance Commission (IAC) Report Assistance to the Performing Arts (1976), and the Report of the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Expenditure Patronage, Power and the Muse: Inquiry into Commonwealth Assistance to the Arts (1986) (more commonly known as the McLeay Report after Leo McLeay, the Chairman).

Let us briefly recap to this point. The general theoretical aim of the thesis is to explore the relations which exist between the spheres of culture and government. We have argued that these relations are most significantly those of mutual interdependency. By this we mean that the relations between culture and government are best understood by the ways in which culture has been managed with a view to equipping populations with particular ethical and civic capacities. These relations have been explored by way of describing various culturally and historically specific moments of arts administration. We have argued that since World War Two (WWII) art programmes have been increasingly governmentalised with the general aim of equipping a citizenry with a range of ethical and civic capacities which will enable them to be self managing in various ways. We described
these programmes as most typically emerging out of a governmental rationality understood as ‘welfarist’. In arguing this we have examined arts policies in America during the ‘New Deal’, the establishment of the British Arts Council post-WWII, and some of the conditions of emergence of cultural policy in Australia in the period of post-war reconstruction. It needs to be emphasised that history is not sympathetic to an interpretation which traces the development of the art-government relationship in which government finally realises the necessity of subsidy for the arts. In fact, the relations between art, citizenship and government have been governed by different organising principles. Above all we have defined these relations in terms of the ways in which different strategies have been organised and deployed for the management of populations through encouraging a citizenry to be self regulating in various ways. This examination, therefore, has argued for the location of arts administration within the broader patterns of the government of culture.

The period from 1968 to the late 1980s is notable for being the period in which the Commonwealth Government entered into the administration of the arts with a comparatively concrete commitment in terms of levels of funding and administrative organisation. However, this time frame does not represent the dominance of one particular discourse framing the relationship between art, citizenship and government. As we will see there have been a number of shifts in this period. Rather, in this time frame there are three important moments of Commonwealth Government policy, 1968, when the Australia Council was established, 1976 when the IAC Report into subsidy of the performing arts was released, and 1986 when the McLeay Report was tabled in Parliament.

The Australia Council is a classic example of a ‘patron state’ model of subsidy.\footnote{Hillman and McCaughey describe three models of arts administration, in addition to the patron state model illustrated by the Australia Council, these are: the facilitator, where donations to the arts are tax deductible; the architect, which} Such a model of subsidy typically seeks to manage a direct government grant to the arts at ‘arm’s length’ from
government. In this sense we will argue that the Australia Council can be understood as an arts administrative technology typical of a ‘welfarist’ governmental rationality. In relation to this we will argue that the process of review that the Australia Council has gone through since its inception has been as a result of the increasing shift in governmental rationality towards one which we have described in our opening chapters as advanced or neo-liberal. This shift has been variously described as ‘the death of the social’ (Rose, 1996b) or in terms of a disintegration of the welfare state (Sinfield, 1997 for instance). This shift has invariably been met with a negative reaction from those on the left. Nikolas Rose has queried the terms in which this reaction has been posed. According to him, ‘we need to interrogate this opposition, in which the forces of progress seem obliged to take the side of the social against the forces of reaction which stand for individualism, competition, the market and the like’ (1996b, p. 328). In our analysis of the history of the Australia Council from its inception in 1968 to the late 1980s we will be arguing that it is possible to trace a gradual shift in the governmental rationality organising state support of the arts over this period. This shift is best illustrated in the instance of the Australia Council by the increasing importance of economically based arguments in favour of government support for the arts and an increasingly pluralist understanding of the arts audience as distinct communities with distinct needs and interests. However, (in Australia in the specific instance of Commonwealth arts administration) it is not until the 1990s that we begin to see the dominance of the kinds of discourses that could be described as neo-liberal. Rather, what we trace during the period of interest here is the ‘micro’ shifts which have occurred in the discourses governing Commonwealth Government arts subvention.

In the instance of Commonwealth Government involvement in arts administration the relations between culture and government have been negotiated within a Council established on the principle of ‘arm’s length’ government. In a recent obituary for Coombs, Jean Battersby wrote that when

usually involves a Ministry of Culture; and, the engineer, where the state owns the means of artistic production, such as is the case with most national television and radio broadcasters for instance (1989, p. 48-52).
establishing the Council they ‘were keenly aware of the dangers for artists of too close a connection
to political regimes and officialdom. You only had too look at Germany in the ‘30s, or Russia, or
China. Nugget wanted a council to stay at arm’s length from day-to-day politics’ (1997, p.7). We
noted this ‘wariness’ of government involvement with art in the previous chapter. In 1968 this
‘wariness’ was for two main reasons. First, in the midst of Cold War there was a concern with the
protection of freedom of expression. Battersby stated that:

Nugget was an admirer of Maynard Keynes, and Keynes had made a marvellous
broadcast on this theme on the Home Service of the BBC when he was setting up the
Arts Council of Great Britain. It was all about what the Government was NOT going
to do… Keynes’ speech became our mission statement. We wanted to be door-
openers for Australian artists. We did not want to tell them what to do. (1997, p. 7)

The immediate post-war concern about the perceived threat of fascist politics came to frame the
establishment of the Australia Council in the late 1960s. Thus, the Australia Council was
established as a council organised on the principle of ‘arm’s length’ government. According to
Rose, the ‘arm’s length’ governmental technology is a typical form for a welfarist governmental
rationality. By governing at ‘arm’s length’ political ‘forces… act to accord autonomy to expert
authorities whilst simultaneously seeking to secure that autonomy through various forms of
licensure, through professionalisation and through bureaucratisation’ (1993, p. 292). Through this
particular kind of governmentalisation of the state liberalism ‘inaugurates a kind of perpetual
dissatisfaction with government, a perpetual questioning of whether the desired effects are being
produced, of the mistakes of thought or policy that hamper the efficacy of government, the
imperative not necessarily to govern more but to govern better’ (Rose 1993, p. 292). There are a
number of themes we can pick out here which are central to our discussion of the Australia Council.
First, the professionalisation of the arts sector involves a process whereby this sector can be thought
of as just that, a sector. And, in order for this sector to be amenable to effective management it can
be calculated and assessed through the invention of various kinds of statistical and public opinion

113 The writer Frank Moorhouse provides a contemporaneous expression of this concern in his statement that ‘My smoky
opposition comes from fear of the State… It is also fear of attracting attention to art. The more money politicians put
measuring techniques which need various kinds of expertise to understand them and generate programmes for their management. As well as this Cummings and Katz note that with greater bureaucratisation and politicisation of the arts, members of the arts sector organise themselves into powerful political lobbying groups (1987, p. 366). This process of increasing bureaucratisation, professionalisation and politicisation of the arts sector is traceable in Australia over the period 1968 to the late 1980s. The second focus of analysis which runs through this chapter is a discussion of the technology of ‘arm’s length’ government as it is illustrated in the reviews of the Australia Council during this time frame. It will be argued that the principle of ‘arm’s length’ government is one of constant negotiation. Particularly from the period of the McLeay Report on, the Commonwealth Government has played an increasingly direct role in the management of culture. This has been part of a more general process where the governmental definition of culture has expanded, the governmental understanding of the strategic uses of cultural programmes has expanded and so the technologies for its management have multiplied.

Throughout chapter four it was argued that the art/citizen relationship in the immediate post-WWII period was framed primarily by a notion of the participatory citizen. Thus, art was not simply educative and civilising but it was understood to encourage the making of a citizen who would be actively involved in the reconstruction of the nation. These participatory themes continue to inform the art/citizen relationship. In chapter four we also noted a rationale for arts subvention which advocated state involvement in the arts in order to ensure the production of ‘excellent’ art which would be representative of the Australian nation. The tension between the policy discourses of access and participation on the one hand and excellence and nation on the other frames debates about the relations between art, citizenship and government throughout this examination of the Australia Council. In section two of this chapter we will sketch the events which led from the
establishment of the Australia Council in 1968 to the formation of the Australia Council in 1973 and the period of Gough Whitlam’s Labor Government from late 1972 to 1975. The debates around the formation of the Australia Council were based on three major themes: community consultation, access and participation, and excellence. Section three of this chapter is characterised by two main factors, the 1976 IAC Report and Malcolm Fraser’s Liberal Government, which came into power in 1976, and the effects of its notorious ‘razor gang’. While the IAC Report was dismissed as excessively instrumental we will argue that it had an important impact on the way the arts sector came to frame itself. In reaction to this report the Australia Council began to commission reports which gave, for the first time, statistical information on, among other things, public attitudes to the arts, the working conditions of artists, and national earnings from the arts. These statistics were crucial for the later understanding of the arts as an industry; it was with these reports that the arts sector was able to construct itself as an industry for the first time. The final section of this chapter finds its locus during the Labor Government of Bob Hawke. This section focuses on two major issues, the McLeay Report, and the notion of cultural rights as formulated by Donald Horne, Chair of the Australia Council from 1984 to 1991. During the 1980s debates about the definition of excellence and the Australia Council’s commitment to the policy goals of access and participation came to a head on a number of fronts. The main co-ordinates of these discussions can be analysed through debates initiated by the release of the McLeay Report and discussion of Donald Horne’s formulation of cultural rights, which provided the basis for the Australia Council’s reaction to the criticisms of the McLeay Report.

**The Australia Council for the Arts**

The period 1968-1975 is integral to an understanding of the history of Commonwealth Government involvement in the arts. In 1968 the Australia Council was created and in 1975 it was established by an Act of Parliament. In this period the foundational philosophies for government subvention of the
arts were laid and so too were some of the tensions which have come to characterise discussion of arts funding in Australia.

A little known fact is that the formation of the Australia Council was announced on the 1st November, 1967 by that most unfortunate of Liberal Prime Ministers, Harold Holt. Holt and H.C.Coombs had extensive discussions about the form the Council would take. The formation of the Council was in response to an ongoing debate about the need for a National Theatre. The Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust was the main organisation involved in organising the performing arts at this time. The Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust was a semi-commercial and part government funded entrepreneurial performing arts organisation which was responsible for establishing some of Australia’s most enduring companies, such as, the Australian Opera and the Australian Ballet. In 1966 it recommended that the government establish an agency to assume responsibility for those functions performed by the Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust which were most connected with government; it ‘recommended that the Government establish a Council for the Performing Arts to advise it and to administer the funds provided for their support’ (Coombs 1981, p. 243). According to Coombs, in discussions between Holt and himself on the form of the Council, Holt wanted to ‘widen the scope… he was interested in the Council having a co-ordinating role in relation to Government policies for all Arts forms’. Coombs did not agree (1981, p. 243-44).

After Holt’s disappearance John Grey Gorton took over the Australia Council as part of the Prime Minister’s portfolio. The Australia Council was organised as a Council responsible for the performing arts only and with Coombs as its head. Gorton was the first politician to embrace the arts for their political importance and to believe that support for them could win the Government

---

114 This discussion became prevalent especially after WWII, and indeed proposals for a National Theatre were endorsed in principle in Cabinet in 1949 under Chifley’s Labor Government. However, this government lost the 1949 election and was replaced by a Liberal Government under Menzies. Coombs comments that ‘It was quickly apparent that the new Government regarded Commonwealth support for the Arts... as part of the galloping socialist planning of the Chifley regime, to be nobbled before the punters became too interested’ (1981, p. 222). Gough Whitlam has commented that Menzies was reluctant to take on any arts related initiatives ‘he had been especially discouraged by the failure of his
votes. Coombs writes, there ‘can be little doubt … that John Gorton changed the prevailing view among politicians of the significance of the Arts from their own professional point of view’ (1981, p. 246). We can recognise the distinctiveness of this view in the Australian political landscape if we put it in the context of Menzies’ view who considered direct government involvement with the arts ‘a galloping socialist plan…, to be nobbled before the punters got interested in it’ (Coombs 1981, p. 222). Gorton was not himself a big fan of the arts and tended to let the Council run itself, apart from in the area of film, where he actively advocated the establishment of a National Film School and for film to be part of the new Australia Council. Coombs received $1.66 million to establish the Council (he asked for $2.3 million) and appointed Dr. Jean Battersby Executive Director. At this early stage the Council was established according to Coombs’s priorities, which were that the Council was primarily responsible for helping to establish two performing arts companies which could develop full national status. These companies were to represent the excellence of the nation. Coombs’s opposition to the idea of a Council responsible for other art forms was due to his belief that ‘bureaucracies… are not in my opinion good for an organisation which seeks to achieve an imaginative and creative role in the arts’ (1969, p. 62). He further makes this point specifically regarding his approach to the functions of the Australia Council:

… the Council sees itself not as a source of direction, not as a source of artistic policy, but as a kind of enabling body, one whose function it is to make possible within the limits of its resources not the things which it may want to have done but rather those things which the best, the most adventurous and the most creative of our artists wish to do… The hand of the official guide is, to my mind, death to real creativeness. (1969, p. 60)

It is important to underline this stance of Coombs’s, this position of art as intrinsically incompatible with government has shaped the formation of Commonwealth arts funding bodies. We have already

---

115 These initiatives were held up during the MacMahon-Howson period of government; however, they were brought very quickly to completion by the Whitlam government’s reforms in 1973.
116 During Gorton’s administration the Budget increased from $1.66 million in 1968-69, to $2.85 million in 1969-70, and $3.85 in 1970-71. At the time of the establishment of the AC the Arts Council of Great Britain received $15.5 million (Dutton 1968, p.12).
117 This anti-bureaucratic argument from Coombs is most interestingly considering his personal history as an Australian public service mandarin.
discussed in section one the proposition that the relations between culture and government are constitutively oppositional. We have argued instead that the relations between culture and government are ones of mutual interdependence.

The fact that the Australia Council focused on the creation of performing arts companies which would be national ‘flagships’ met with much criticism; the Australia Council responded by forming a Special Projects Fund which had a budget of $160,000. Coombs was enlightening on the establishment of this fund and at the same time his vision for the new Council at a lecture he gave to a UNESCO seminar on the performing arts. Firstly, Coombs argued that since the Council had very limited money it ‘concluded…, that its prime responsibility was to make possible the pursuit of excellence in the professional theatre’ (1969, p. 55). In relation to other art forms he believed that the Council’s major task was to research and report on possible strategies of arts funding. In response to criticism of the Council for its focus on a few companies only he responded that ‘it would be idle to pretend that the Council was wholly content with this solution to the problem… the Council felt that the pursuit of excellence needs to be supplemented by the encouragement of diversity and above all, by the stimulus of creative innovation’ (1969, p. 56). This was the responsibility of the Special Projects Fund. However, while acknowledging that the encouragement of diversity was important, above all, Coombs justified direct government arts funding in the language of ‘excellence’ and ‘creative innovation’. Thus, the young Australia Council followed the British example of ‘few but roses’.

In 1971 William MacMahon became Prime Minister\textsuperscript{118} and gave responsibility for the Australia Council to Peter Howson, who was the first Commonwealth Minister to have the arts as part of his title. Unlike Gorton’s laissez-faire approach, Howson actively involved himself in the day to day

\textsuperscript{118} The series of events leading up to MacMahon becoming leader of the Party must be among the strangest in Australian political history. MacMahon gained his position as a result of Gorton voting against himself as leader in the party room!
running of the Council; nevertheless, under Howson the Australia Council did not change either its structure or its emphasis. MacMahon rather than Howson made the first formal Ministerial statement on the arts in the House of Representatives in 1971.\textsuperscript{119} This first Commonwealth arts statement given by a Liberal Prime Minister was, in fact, similar to the way in which Gough Whitlam later summarised his government’s view of the arts. MacMahon stated that his Government approached the arts ‘not as an adornment but as an integral part of life;… not as the preserve of the rich and the sophisticated but as a source of delight for all’ (1971, p. 1). However, for all its rhetoric, this statement reaffirmed that the Australia Council’s primary responsibility was excellence and the performing arts. In response, Bill Hayden, for the Labor opposition, argued that it would be better to have one Council which drew all the different art spheres together and that its major concern should be with arts, education, and ‘regional creative activity’. In his history of Commonwealth Government arts ministers, \textit{Arts Minister? Government Policy and the Arts}, Justin Macdonnell argues that:

\begin{quote}
In the real sense then, 26\textsuperscript{th} October was historic in government relations with the arts not only because of that first ministerial statement, but also because it drew the attitudinal battle lines between the Liberal and the Labor parties. Their respective methods of approach were to remain fundamental to those parties until the mid-80s. (1992, p. 59)
\end{quote}

This position, that an approach which favoured access versus an approach which favoured excellence belonged to the different sides of politics, Liberal and Labor respectively, can be reviewed as problematic in light of arts policy during the Whitlam and the Fraser governments.

The unpopularity of the MacMahon-Howson period of arts administration was emphasised by the mobilisation of the arts community, which formed ‘Artists’ for Whitlam’ advocacy groups during the election campaign. David Throsby comments that, ‘the idea of an Australian cultural renaissance was very much consistent with the spirit of a newly-awakened national consciousness being

\footnote{MacMahon rather than Howson gave this speech due to MacMahon’s concern about his popularity. The centre of this speech was a popular 17\% increase in funds to the AC to $4.5 million.}
promulgated by the Labor Party at that time’ (1977, p.6). Whitlam became Prime Minister late in 1972 and like much of his time in government there has been much mythologising of his government’s involvement in the arts. The arts component of the Labor Party policy emphasised democratisation of the arts with greater support for community activities; also, as we mentioned above, the Labor Party was critical of the large amounts of money which was being directed to only a few companies. But in real terms under Labor a minimal percentage of funds went to programmes which promoted access and participation in the arts and the ‘flagship’ companies fared well as a result of the large increase of funds injected into the arts. Most importantly, however, the Labor Party stated that in government it would establish an Arts Council by statute which would be responsible for a broad range of arts activities. This was primarily in response to the perceived need not only to broaden the activities covered by the Council but also to streamline the diverse bodies responsible for the various sectors of the arts. Up to 1972 support for the arts was organised by disparate bodies including the Literary Fund, the Art Advisory Board, and the Australia Council. In a paper prepared for Whitlam on the future administration of the arts Battersby wrote that:

… the present situation is not satisfactory from an administrative point of view or relevant to the needs of the arts. It is slow, cumbersome, ill-defined and tends to give decisions relating to areas of authority priority over those relating to the interest of the arts. Some of the agencies have different proprieties, policies and even philosophies. Their administrative procedures are not co-ordinated. The advisory role of the Department vis-à-vis the specialist boards to the Minister is obscure and inconsistent. (in Whitlam, 1985, p. 557)

It was proposed that one council would be established with responsibility for all these various activities. This council would be established by statute and thus government arts policy would be regulated by statutory obligations.

The arts were made the responsibility of the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. Before Labor had even won the election, Whitlam invited Coombs to be Chairman of the new Council and Battersby to be its Executive Officer. Both accepted. During the first half of 1972 the new Australia Council was formed. It consisted of a thirteen-member Council overseeing- policy development,
liaison with government, and common services. Seven Boards were set up- Aboriginal Arts, Crafts, Film and Television, Literature, Music, Theatre, and Visual Arts. A series of Council committees were also established to administer the areas of Community Arts, Entrepreneurial Activities, International Cultural Exchanges, Publicity and Information, and Research (Australia Council, AR 1973, p. 17). The concerns of the various pre-existing government boards such as the Commonwealth Arts Advisory Board, the Commonwealth Literary Fund, and the Commonwealth Assistance to Australian Composers Board, which had been involved in monthly meetings with the Council during the previous government’s term, were to be brought together in the new Council. The Council structure was decided upon and appointments to the Council and Board Chairs were made within fifty-four days of Labor taking government and the Boards appointed a further twenty-one days later.

The new Council and Government were accused of a lack of consultation both from the arts community and the government bodies previously responsible for the arts. Sir William Dargie, Chair of the Commonwealth Arts Advisory Board at the time, resigned in disgust (Macdonnell 1991, p. 95). In response to these criticisms the 1973 Annual Report of the Council argued that:

Although, one can sympathise …, it is difficult even in retrospect to see what other procedures could have been followed without producing a breakdown in the continuity of support for the arts or losing the opportunity for a major increase in funds in the course of 1973… A national inquiry at that point would have seriously delayed developments the need for which was not in question. (1973, p. 9)

Nevertheless, even after the Interim Report in mid 1973 the Council continued to be accused of lack of consultation and elitism. Coombs writes of this report that:

The most interesting aspect of the Report and the subsequent legislation based upon it, was its attempt to come to terms with the ‘Guild Socialism’ or ‘participatory democracy’ component in the views expressed by artists and by many of the Government’s supporters. (1981, p. 253)

To this end both the Interim and the Final Report to the Prime Minister stated that:
… the Council is conscious that its long-term task is to help create a social environment in which the arts will flourish. To this end it should seek to develop more widely through the community an interest and involvement in the arts which will lead to and express a higher valuation of the arts as a component in the quality of life. It will therefore need to take account of the aspirations and interests of actual and potential consumers of the arts, and will need to call upon the skills and enthusiasm of a wide range of people whose professional and occupational skills lie primarily outside the arts themselves. (Australia Council 1973a, p. 6)

In the event this participatory democratic model did not extend significantly to community involvement, membership of the Boards reflected arts ‘expertise’ and consisted of artists and professionals. This lack of community consultation was attested to in the IAC’s report three years later, which described the Australia Council’s arts funding pattern as totally irrelevant to community involvement with the arts.

The mission statement of the Council was, ‘to promote a standard of excellence in the arts; to widen access to and the understanding and application of the arts in the community generally; to help and express an Australian identity through the arts; to promote an awareness of Australian culture abroad’ (Australia Council 1973a, p. 1). Whilst the rhetoric of access and participation was not new, this was the first time that the Commonwealth Government had formalised such policy objectives in relation to funds for the arts administered by a government agency. However, even for this ‘worthy’ objective there was criticism. Bernard Smith criticised the Government’s attempts to provide better access to art when he wrote in 1976 that:

… no national policy, such as we might have hoped for from the Labor Party, directed towards encouraging creative activity and a better understanding of the arts at a broad popular level exists. True, some lip service continues to be paid, as in the $15,000 allocated to the Community Arts Committee. But it is pin-money compared with the total budget…. (1976b, p. 96)

---

120 This mission statement was foreshadowed in the Labor Party Policy Speech given during the election. This Speech in turn was lifted almost directly from a confidential report written by Battersby for Whitlam at the end of 1972 on the future administration of the arts. This paper encapsulated the view of Coombs, Battersby and most of the arts community (Radbourne 1992, p. 176).

121 See also the poet Les Murray’s criticism of the appropriations directed to the large performing arts bodies (1972, p. 75).
Thus, despite the support of the arts community for Whitlam during the election the fast reform process, which resulted in the establishment of the Australia Council with double the funds, did not have absolute support.

Criticisms, particularly of the Whitlam government’s ‘lip service’ to the objectives of access and participation, have been expressed in contemporary assessments of his government’s arts policies. In *Arguing the Arts: The Funding of the Arts in Australia* Tim Rowse argues that Whitlam merely boosted an already occurring growth in government involvement with the arts. Rowse argues that the Whitlam Government continued the status quo of government frameworks for arts funding. He writes:

> They became the architects of an emerging system of patronage… The Governments of Gorton, MacMahon and Whitlam endorsed their definition of a duty to the public- to provide it with theatre, ballet, touring art exhibitions, performances of classical music, crafts and non commercial films… [They] never doubted their responsibility or capacity for cultural leadership and they had a clear and confident view that their constituency was the nation as a whole. (1985, p. 11)

According to Rowse the main policy objectives of all of these governments was their commitment to ‘nation’ and ‘excellence’. For Rowse, the problem with these discourses is that they only constitute one definition of excellence, this ‘implies [that] the user has an authority to make distinctions of quality and intelligence and to have those distinctions accepted as authoritative throughout the nation. It implies a … sovereignty of good taste’ (1985, p. 33). As we will see in section two this sovereignty was challenged from a number of quarters throughout the 1970s and increasingly in the 1980s.

---

122 This book was the first to analyse Commonwealth Government arts subvention from a viewpoint which emphasised the connection of arts policy with social policy. Although it is now somewhat out of date it remains one of the few examinations published to date to analyse Australian Commonwealth Government arts policy in this way. See Frow 1986 and Withers 1986 for very different critical reviews of Rowse’s main points.
Gay Hawkins, drawing on Rowse in *From Nimbin to Mardi Gras: Constructing Community Arts,* describes the version of access and participation that was dominant in the 1970s as based on a ‘disadvantage model’ of arts funding. The main element of this understanding of access and participation was that increasing access to the arts was to do with better distribution of art to sections of the community who needed help getting this access. The dissemination of art was based on a therapeutic notion of art. In this model the civilising and educative effects of ‘Culture’ were brought to bear on those who were geographically or socially disadvantaged by either their inability to physically access ‘Culture’ or their lack of ‘Cultural’ education. This rhetoric is illustrated by a statement made in a report from the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation conference of Commonwealth arts councils. It states that, the ‘aim is to move towards the realisation of the concept of the arts as being essential to the complete person and to a golden vista of enriched leisure time, as well as providing a palliative for chronic unemployment or for the physically, socially or economically deprived’ (1981, p. 52). We will recall from chapter four that these were some of the rationales framing touring exhibitions organised by CEMA and the Art Gallery of NSW during and after WWII. Indeed, Whitlam’s social democratic political philosophy was continuous with some of the political philosophy which drove the post-war reformers. Common elements were a concern to encourage ‘participation’ posed in terms of the mutual responsibility of state and citizen, and a focus on community. Hawkins argues that ‘Whitlam’s version of social democracy relied less on the identification of class as the central axis of inequality and more on a generalised concept of disadvantage’ (1993, p. 32). In this calculation of disadvantage the figure of the community was central. For Hawkins, the Whitlam government’s reforms were most important in terms of the spaces they opened up for change, particularly in its mobilisation of the concept of community (1993, p. 32).

123 For reviews of this book see Anderson 1993 and O’Regan 1994.
Coombs wrote in the Australia Council 1973 Annual Report that:

To some extent, of course, the arts are elitist. At their best they are the work of the exceptionally talented, and historically have been enjoyed by the relatively few. Nevertheless the charter of the Council, as it will be embodied in legislation, clearly calls on it and the Boards to widen opportunities for the practice of the arts and to widen access to, and understanding, enjoyment and application of the arts in the community generally. But it also calls upon the Council to promote standards of excellence. The problem facing the Council and the Boards is essentially that of achieving a proper balance…. (1973, p. 16)

It has been argued that the Whitlam Government left much to be desired in its balance between the objectives of access and participation, and excellence, and that its major focus was on those sections of the arts which were felt to embody national excellence. Nevertheless, while the discourses organising arts subvention may not have undergone a major shift during the time of the Whitlam administration, the administrative organisation of the arts did. In 1973 there was a 100% increase in Commonwealth Government subvention to the arts, in that year’s budget the appropriation was $14 million. This large resourcing coming after a time of relevant inactivity under MacMahon and Howson had many consequences, it injected funds into the arts at a rate which directly increased the amount of arts activity. The effects of this cannot be underestimated. The Annual Report for 1973 states that:

Throughout the community people and institutions are developing new objectives… Even in this first year these changes have been reflected in requests to the Council for specialist help and advice from many different Government Departments, organisation and enterprises… The Council and the Boards are being seen and their services sought as resource centres offering access to a creative imagination as well as to a wide range of professional skills. (Australia Council 1973, p. 13)

The injection of funds and the establishment of a central body responsible for arts administration focused the attention and resources of the arts community. We will further argue in section three and four that this focus of resources and the existence of a government body whose function was to

---

124 Battersby’s (1980) report, commissioned by UNESCO, is also illustrative of this point in its description of Australian cultural policy. It is clear from this report that at the time government assistance to art was thought about in terms of a dichotomous relation between quality and excellence on the one hand, and art as therapy on the other.

125 In 1974 the budget was raised a further 50% to 21 million and in 1975 it was raised to 24 million (Whitlam 1985, p. 561).
research the arts and play the role of advocate to government for the arts community was central to the extension of government involvement with the arts at the level of policy and legislation.

The Australia Council Bill was first introduced to Parliament in 1974 and then reintroduced after the double dissolution election. The Act was finally passed in the autumn session of Parliament in 1975 (Whitlam 1985, p. 561). By 1975 the Australia Council rarely seemed to be portrayed well in the media. Criticism came on numerous points but particularly for: administrative waste, lack of consultation, excessive centralism, and rapid growth without adequate policy development. These were becoming familiar attacks on the Whitlam government’s policies in general, it was accused of doing ‘too much too soon’ (Hawkins 1993, p. 47-8). Late in 1974, in an attempt to solve some of the escalating attacks on the Australia Council, Whitlam appointed the IAC to look into whether the Australia Council had a role in providing subsidy to commercial theatre, given its support to galleries, museums, and the like. Macdonnell argues that the directions to the IAC signed by Whitlam should have contained a preamble to the effect that the Government was committed to its organisation of subsidy. As there was no such preamble the IAC investigated the whole concept of government support for the arts as it applied to the performing arts, including the Australia Council. Whitlam has since said:

.. the IAC’s report took a rather extreme stand against certain forms of public subsidy to the arts, and in retrospect I was not a little relieved that its provocative, well-reasoned, widely misunderstood and in many ways salutary examination of the issues involved in public subvention for the arts finished up on Fraser’s desk rather than mine. (1985, p. 564)

The Industries Assistance Commission Report

The period of Liberal Government under Fraser is a good example of the point that neither political party epitomised one single approach to the arts. On the one hand, this period of government is well known as one which first gave direct line funding to the flagship organisations, and which allowed
funding for the arts to fall radically below 1973 levels. On the other hand, this Government also turned the Community Arts Committee into the Community Arts Board and by 1980 out of all the smaller boards the Community Arts Board had done well in terms of its percentage of funding. This was despite the McKinsey Report, a report commissioned by the Australia Council to assess its structure and operations. This report was used by the other art form boards in an attempt to have the Community Arts Committee disbanded as an autonomous body. The major report of this period was the IAC Report. Even though the IAC Report received short shift from politicians, the arts community and the Australia Council, we will argue that it had a substantial impact on the way the arts community came to be framed and to frame itself by the mid 1980s. The IAC Report and the reaction to it provided some of the main co-ordinates for a shift in the conception of the arts to an understanding of the arts as an industry. We have discussed in the previous section how the Australia Council carried out its statuary obligations to provide access to the arts and to support excellence through programmes which emphasised the provision of access to excellent art (or in Rowse’s terms the ‘disadvantage model’). During the period from the mid 1970s to the mid 1980s this understanding of the Australia Council’s statuary obligations as providing access to excellent art increasingly came under attack. The IAC Report had a productive effect on the challenges to the Council’s homogeneous view of ‘excellent’ art which were emerging with increasing insistence at this time. These challenges emerged initially from the community arts movement but became central to the gradual shifts in Council policy, particularly after the establishment of the Community Arts Committee as a Board during the period of the Fraser Government.

The single biggest effect on the Australia Council during the period of the Fraser Government of 1976 to 1984 was a reduction of funds. The arts remained in the Prime Minister’s Department, with effective responsibility residing with Tony Staley, the Minister assisting the Prime Minister in the arts. In a Ministerial statement on the arts Fraser stated his government’s position thus: ‘We believe a genuinely vigorous and stimulating artistic climate will emerge only when governments,
individuals, private enterprises and corporations are actively and co-operatively offering decentralised and diversified patronage for the arts in our community’ (Australia Council, AR 1975/76, p. 1). The Australia Council welcomed this position in its 1975/76 annual report; however, the 1976/77 budget represented a 12.7% decrease of funds in real terms. Subsequent reports throughout the period of the Fraser administration reflect the Australia Council’s concern, with almost every report beginning with a plea for extra funds (Australia Council, AR 1975/76-1983/84). However, this reduction of funds is not explicable in terms of a conservative attack on either centralised government institutions or the arts. Rather, as Macdonnell points out, in Labor’s last budget of 1975/76 the then Treasurer Bill Hayden reduced the arts budget in real terms, thus the reduction in funds that occurred under the Liberal Government may also have occurred under a Labor Government (1992, p. 178). The Australia Council when only four years old was confronted with the fact that while it had been hailed as beginning something of a cultural renaissance in the Australian arts community, at the same time it had to respond to the ever increasing requests for money with an ever decreasing budget and furthermore an ever increasing challenge for it to justify its relevance to the community.

On Fraser’s appointment the bulk of his statement on the arts dealt with the management of the Australia Council:

The operations of the Australia Council and its expenditure on the arts have been reported on by the Auditor-General and the Public Accounts Committee. They have been the subject of questions in Parliament and debate in the media. The Council has attracted criticism, particularly from artists and the arts’ community, concerning extravagance and excessive administrative costs. (Australia Council, AR 1976, p. 1)

This statement then went on to outline structural changes to be made to the Australia Council. These changes were designed to increase the administrative efficiency of the Council. They included: the Council was to have increased control over the Boards, and would be reduced in size; the Council’s Film, Radio and TV Board would be abolished and responsibility transferred to the Australian Film Commission; the Australian Ballet School and NIDA would be removed from the Australia Council
and would receive direct funding from government; and the position of General Manager would become a statutory Chief Executive Officer on a seven year appointment to be elected by the Council but with Cabinet approval (Macdonnell 1992, p. 182-186). One of the most damaging critiques of the Australia Council at the time and the one which had the most effect in terms of the philosophy on which it based its subventions was an investigation which was commissioned by the Australia Council itself.

In 1975 the Australia Council commissioned the management consultants McKinsey and Company to inquire into its administration and structure. This move was in response to almost continual attacks on the Council during its period of reform since 1973. The Report was released in the context of a Liberal Government committed to cost cutting. It recommended, in summary, that due to a fast growth period the Council now needed to be consolidated and streamlined. The recommendations covered three main areas: the Australia Council needed to cut back and streamline its administrative structures, including the abolition of committees; it needed to devolve small grants to State and local organisations and ‘refocus grant-making activities to strengthen attention to large grantee organisations’; and, a reduction in the size and frequency of Council and Board meetings was advised (Radbourne 1992, p. 214). There are two important points to note here- the abolition of committees and the focus on large grantee organisations. In effect, this meant that those bodies representing ‘national excellence’ would stay with the Council and those programmes focused on general access and participation, which involved smaller grants, would be devolved.127

Hawkins argues that:

126 Coombs left the Council in 1974 at the first change of membership, Jennifer Radbourne argues that ‘over the years Battersby had gradually assumed a manner of protective proprietorship over the Council’, she was the obvious person to step into the new position of General Manager. However, her involvement with the Council over the years of continuous criticism meant that she was unpopular with much of the Council. The internal administrative changes in the Council structure initiated by the McKinsey report became the guise under which Battersby was finally ousted, she did not get the position of Chief Executive Officer (1992, p. 216).
The logic of devolution seemed abundantly clear: the small, the local, the amateur could claim no impacts on the ‘nation’ and therefore could not make a legitimate claim to federal money. ‘Community’ could not escape the connotations of the parochial. In contrast, the idea of ‘national significance’ went unexamined; like excellence it was a category often invoked but rarely examined. (1993, p. 49)

It was in this climate that the future of the Community Arts Committee, the only programme whose main focus was access and participation, was to be decided. Hawkins shows that while it gained a temporary reprieve from government this did not protect it from internal attacks. The Community Arts Committee’s budget was slashed and responsibility for community projects was devolved to the Boards along the lines of McKinsey’s recommendations. It soon became apparent that the Boards were misusing this money to shore up the effects of general budget cuts (Hawkins 1993, p. 50-51).

Both Hawkins and Rowse have emphasised the fact that the Australia Council responded to the reduction in its funds by isolating the funding of the major art form Boards. The Theatre and Music Boards gained a greater proportion of the Australia Council budget under Fraser, and the funding of those Boards focused on ‘community’, such as Aboriginal Arts, and Crafts were slashed (Hawkins 1993, p. 51 and Rowse 1985, p. 21-2). The future of the Community Arts Committee was uncertain. Hawkins describes a year of political lobbying at the end of which the Council requested the government to establish Community Arts as a board (1993, p. 54). The Board was finally established in 1977. Hawkins comments, if ‘community arts meant increased participation in the arts then the Liberals were for it, for they, like their Labor colleagues, believed in the civilising benefits of culture’ (1993, p. 55).

In describing the increasing lobbying pressure of the community arts ‘movement’ on government and the Council, Hawkins does not describe the process as involving an oppositional relationship.

127 As we will see in section four these recommendations were very similar to those of the McLeay Report a decade later.
between community arts and government, with community arts existing in a vacuum from government. Rather, Hawkins argues that this process is one in which ‘community arts’ comes to be deployed as an object of government. Or, in other words, it was the mobilisation of notions of community art in policy discourse which enabled community art to become an increasingly important object of government. However, Hawkins emphasises the two-way nature of this relationship. As O’Regan points out:

Hawkins is careful not to see policy as wholly exhausting the possibilities for action. Here analysis and history is full of examples which suggest a more complex story than the ‘invention’ thesis of idea to policy to programme in seamless sequence. Here the entrepreneurial activities of the ‘subjects of policy’ and ‘policy developers alike’ for their own sometimes recondite, sometimes obvious, purposes. In this case we can think of policy as providing ‘possibility spaces’ that intersect with other ‘possibility spaces. (1994, 113)

Thus, if we think of policy in terms of the construction of ‘possibility spaces’ then we can understand the importance of the Community Arts Board’s advocacy of an expanded definition of quality and excellent art. Not only did the Community Arts Board provide a focus for direct advocacy of these policy shifts in Council but this also opened up ‘possibility spaces’ for the extension of art form support in a variety of directions. We will discuss some of these in section four for now it is enough to note that during this period the Community Arts Board received a significant boost by becoming a Board. By 1980 funds for the Community Arts Board represented 8% of the Australia Council’s budget. This made the Community Arts Board the biggest of the smaller Boards including Aboriginal Arts, Crafts, Literature, and Visual Arts (Hawkins 1993, p. 59). While it is true that ‘national’ art forms continued to be favoured in the Australia Council budget, the gain in the fortunes of the Community Arts Board in this same time frame is important to understanding the eventual shift in the Council’s conception of its statutory obligations to provide access to art, as well as supporting excellence. These issues were played out in debate about the IAC Report.
The original brief from Whitlam to the IAC was to examine ‘whether assistance should be accorded the performing arts in Australia and if so what should be the nature and extent of such assistance’ (IAC 1976, p. 137). The IAC Act constituted the form of the inquiry along guidelines which directed the IAC

… to take account of the Government’s overall objective of improving and promoting the well-being of the people of Australia. In doing this it must have regard to specific government objectives such as the efficient use of the Community’s productive resources, facilitating change, serving the interests of the consumers and the achievement of rising and generally enjoyed standards of living. (1976, p. 43)

The findings of the Commission were based on an examination of public benefit arising from government subvention to the performing arts. The emphasis on public benefit was unusual as arts subvention at this time was most commonly framed in terms of the support of excellence. The Report’s findings were and have been misunderstood and misrepresented. The Report’s major finding was that there should be a redirection of government funds to be based on the encouragement of three major objectives- improving education, encouraging innovation, and expanding dissemination. In defining these objectives the Commission ‘eschewed any narrow or elitist definition of “culture” and took it to mean, in broad terms, the expression of a community’s way of life’ (1976, p. 2). The Commission argued that funding of the performing arts did not provide maximum public benefit as it was concentrated on a small group of companies and thus did not encourage diversity. The Committee’s alternative model of funding was based on the precept that ‘the performing arts are no more than means to cultural ends, not ends in themselves’; therefore, government assistance should be concentrated on education (1976, p. 5). In recommending a model of subvention based on education the Committee argued that:

In education generally the individual is exposed to and assisted to understand, a wide variety of interests and activities. The fundamental object of this is to broaden and enrich his (sic) ability to choose between alternative careers, lifestyles and interest. It is then accepted that he (sic) should be free to choose among the opportunities available to him (sic). (1976, p. 49)

For the Committee, education was the way to achieve public benefit from arts subvention. The Committee recommended that the major performing arts companies should receive a gradual
reduction in their direct funding over eight years, in this way they would eventually have to compete on their merits in the open market.

The IAC approached their investigation from an angle which considered all aspects of what we now consider the arts ‘industry’. They considered questions of taxation, artist’s working conditions, ticket pricing, and so forth. This highly instrumental approach proved unacceptable. The Fraser Government totally dismissed the Report, as did the opposition and the community generally. In response to a question in the House of Representatives Fraser took the opportunity to explain his government’s position:

The Government is committed not only to the support of individual art but also to the support of the major performing companies in Australia,- the opera, ballet and drama. That will be its continuing policy. The Government has this view because art is not something which can be judged merely by harsh economic criteria. I do not know of any country which pursues an adequate artistic talent and performance by adopting the user-pays principle. (italics added, in Anderson 1990 p.133)

The much quoted section of this speech, that ‘art is not something which can be judged by harsh economic criteria’ indicates the unwillingness for politicians and community alike to see the arts as an industry at this time. Later on the same day the Liberal member for Isaacs, Mr. Hamer, backed up the Prime Minister when he critiqued the IAC’s report on the basis that ‘[t]he arts are not an industry and should never have been referred to the Industries Assistance Commission… [i]t was a downright silly inquiry’ (in Anderson 1990, p.133). The Australia Council expressed its response somewhat defensively:

The Council was established to implement objectives already declared to be politically desirable and supported by Government policy statements. It is bound by its Act to foster the arts and create a social climate in which they can flourish. These objectives are determined by the Government and are based more on political judgements than economic arguments. (Artforce 1976, p. 2)

It is interesting to note against these accusations of excessive instrumentalism that the Commission did not see itself this way. In the Report the Commissioners commented that:

… the Commission does not consider that the ‘slide rule approach of the cost accountant’ should determine the nature of assistance to the performing arts. But nor
can it accept that the ‘revealed truths of the artist’ will lead to a rationale that is even handed as between recipients and publicly justifiable in terms of equity to the population as a whole which provides the assistance and are the recipients of the artists’ endeavours. (1976, p. 29)

Nevertheless, although the Report may have aimed for this balance, the Fraser Government was in a confident enough electoral position to ignore it.

The fact that the Government was able to totally reject the IAC Report’s recommendations indicates that the Report viewed the relationship between government and the arts in a way which was totally unacceptable to the way it was contemporaneously understood by government and the arts community. Even David Throsby, whose reports on community benefit to the arts became crucial to the arts community’s definition of itself as a profitable industry, expressed some ambivalence about some of the Commissioner’s more ‘radical’ proposals for extending access. He wrote after the release of the Draft Report that:

It will be a sad outcome if in the end the shortcomings of the Draft Report prevent worthwhile reforms from being implemented… Some of the most exciting and far-reaching developments in the future are very likely to lie in education and innovation-two of the fields suggested as priorities by the IAC. And while one might have reservations about the commissioners’ enthusiasm for electronic dissemination, their desire to see interest in and practice of the performing arts spreading through the community is likely to be shared by many… (1977, p. 12) 128

The following excerpt from the Report is telling in the way that it approached the arts as the same as any other industry:

Many of the proponents of public support of the performing arts adopt, implicitly, a ‘merit goods’ approach. This implies that individuals, if faced with the true cost of the performing arts, would be irrational in their consumption patterns. This approach relies on someone taking the view that ‘individuals do not know what is good for them’. As stated, in the absence of sound evidence and arguments the Commission

---

128 See Thompson, Throsby and Withers 1983 for the initial research funded by the Australia Council and Macquarie University assessing ‘the extent of public perception of the arts as a social good and to measure community willingness to pay for the benefits perceived’ (1983, p. 2). See Throsby for an account of this research (1982). See Throsby and Withers for a critical response to the IAC’s claim that the performing arts could be evaluated economically as producing a public good (1979). See Throsby and Withers (1984) for the first of many surveys undertaken for and published by the Australia Council.
cannot evaluate, and finds itself unable to accept, assertions of this nature. (italics added, 1976, p. 179)

In fact, this approach, relying on someone taking the view that ‘individuals do not know what is good for them’ was precisely the approach that informed arts funding with the goal of wider community involvement.

There were, however, problems with the way in which the IAC depended on education as the great equaliser. The Commission noted that there was ‘an important association between income levels, home environment and education on the one hand, and effective demand for some performing arts on the other’ (1976, p. 51). Pierre Bourdieu’s work on the attachment of ‘cultural capital’ to education explores this factor.129 Rowse takes up this point when he criticises the IAC Report for assuming that the education system is not class differentiating. Rowse argued that:

… the IAC’s Report seemed to be unaware of this class differentiating logic of the school system when it argued for Arts education… To decide to place something in the curriculum is surely to imply that it is important knowledge which is worth taking seriously, because like other knowledge learned at school, its mastery confers distinction. (1985, p. 44-45)

The IAC’s logic was that of equal access to cultural information via the education system. According to the IAC this would provide a basis for equality of access to culture. However, education on its own cannot address the inequitable distribution of cultural capital because of the differentiating logic of the school system, and also its tendency to focus on a limited range of (high) cultural forms. Nevertheless, it is important to note that in the IAC Report the issue of community access to a diverse array of cultural choices was formed as a policy problem.

For the purposes of this analysis there are two particularly important influences on government arts administration during the 1970s. In our brief analysis of the establishment of the Community Arts

Board and the IAC Report we have argued that there was a shift to a new way of thinking about the public’s relationship with art. This was framed in terms of the problem of public access to a diversity of cultural choices. This was different from a view of government involvement with art which framed access to art in terms of a ‘disadvantage’ model, in which access was provided only to certain types of (predominantly European) art. The IAC refused to accept this singular definition of ‘great Art’, citing three problems with subvention of art based on this particular notion of excellence- that it catered to minority tastes, that it did not deal with economic reality, and that it lacked public accountability (1976, p. 3-4).\textsuperscript{130} The IAC Report treated the arts as one industry among many. This meant that the Report brought to bear the normal forms of industry analysis on the performing arts for the first time. We have noted the reaction that this approach engendered. However, the Report, which critiqued submissions based on ‘faith, emotion, subjective judgement…’ (1976, p. 3), was crucial to the way the arts came to form themselves as an industry, in part as a response to this Inquiry’s criticisms.

\textbf{Measuring the Audience, the McLeay Report and Cultural Rights}

In this final section of the chapter we will explore how, in the ten years from the IAC Report to the McLeay Report, the way in which the relationship between art, citizenship and government was framed changed. We can summarise the major forms of problematisation which came to define arts funding into three main points. The first relates to the reframing of the arts as industry, thus, the artist (or ‘art worker’ as artists came to be renamed in the new industry-based rhetoric) and the arts came to be problematised in relation to instrumental considerations, such as, working conditions, equal opportunity, and taxation questions. Second, access and participation debates increasingly came to be reframed in relation to questions of cultural pluralism, community arts and, along with these considerations, the devolution of arts support to local and State organisations. Third, and in

\textsuperscript{130} These criticisms were particularly for the ‘flagship’ philosophy of arts funding which the IAC argued characterised current government arts funding.
relation to the above, access to and participation in culture came to be predominantly understood in terms of cultural rights. Access and participation constructed as a right of citizenship came to define the relationship between art, citizenship and government.

The Australia Council continued to be the focus of criticism in the years of Liberal administration after the IAC Report. These years also saw an increasing tendency for government to allocate new arts programmes to Departmental control rather than to the Australia Council. Under Bob Ellicott (Minister from 1977-1980) for the first time there was a separate department with responsibility for government arts policy under the Ministry of Home Affairs. Macdonnell argues that:

If Ellicott has a legacy it is his demonstration that bodies like the Australia Council could be side-stepped- by single line funding, by alternative methods of funding such as 10BA, Artbank, and ICCA [International Cultural Corporation of Australia] controlled through his department. (1992, p. 246)\textsuperscript{131}

The policy of single line funding to the major ‘flagship’ companies resulted in a major backlash. This ‘crisis’ was in response to the continuation of decreased funding in the Australia Council yearly budget (Macdonnell 1992, p. 262). The Australia Council Annual Report for 1979-80 asserted that combined Commonwealth and State funding for the arts was not adequate for the main priorities of that year (1979-80, p. 9). In response to the budget decrease of that year the Australia Council reduced funding to some of the more prestigious companies not receiving single line funding. The subsequent lobbying of government by, particularly, the performing arts community resulted in an additional grant to the Australia Council.

\textsuperscript{131} The Cultural Minister’s Council, a body which met yearly and represented the State and Federal arts Minister’s, also met for the first time in 1979.
We cannot simply read this policy of single line funding as Liberal favouritism of ‘elite’ companies. In fact, Ian Wilson, Minister from 1981 to 1982, and Tom McVeigh, Minister from 1982 to 1983, were both committed to community based projects. However, Wilson’s philosophy was that ‘state and local government support for the arts must increase in both financial terms and responsibility… apart from support for individual artists and initiatives at community arts level, the role of the Council should be reduced (Radbourne 1992, p. 250).\(^{132}\) The relative quarantine of the major performing arts companies from budget cuts can be read in terms of a commitment on the part of the Liberal Government to the ‘high’ arts in its arts funding priorities. However, the recognition of initiatives in arts funding strategies framed in terms of community access during the period of Liberal Government means that we cannot simply label this government’s arts policy elitist. We also need to read the reduced Australia Council budgets under the Liberal Government in terms of a dramatic increase in arts support at the local and State government levels over the period since the establishment of the Australia Council in 1968. The McLeay Inquiry argued that with the elimination of arrears in capital spending requirements State and local government expenditure would be increasingly directed towards ‘recurrent expenditure’ (1986, p. 32). Nevertheless, Labor gained support for its active disapproval of the government’s arts management. In its election platform, Labor proposed significant changes including, a restoration of funding for the arts (including the Australia Council) to 1975-76 funding levels,\(^{133}\) the withdrawal of some of the funding from the major performing arts companies, and the return of the performing arts companies to the Council, competing for grants with other applicants (Radbourne 1992, p. 25-53).

\(^{132}\) The major initiative of McVeigh’s term, announced in 1983, was the National Touring and Access Fund for the touring of the major performing arts companies to rural areas in each State (Radbourne 1992, p. 251).

\(^{133}\) This promise was supposed to be fulfilled within Labor’s first term of office, in the event this did not occur, although the AC did receive a substantial increase in funds (Australia Council, AR 1983-84, p. 17). However, real level of funding was maintained for the 1984-85 financial year (Artforce 1985, p. 4).
i. Measuring the Audience

There is a clear relationship between some of the reports commissioned and published in response to the IAC Report and the issue of reduced arts funding in the final years of the Liberal Government administration. This fed directly into the debates following the release of the McLeay Report in late 1986. These debates can be characterised as industry arguments and were usually based on one of three related assertions— that the production and funding of culture can be viewed economically, that the arts are a highly profitable national industry, and that the public, whether they attend arts events or not, are highly supportive of government assistance to the arts. These arguments emerged out of a process of analysis and fact finding which was begun with the appointment of the Australia Council as an advisory body to government with responsibility for research into the arts community. Hawkins has argued that the growth of research activities in the Australia Council framed the cultural sector as ‘knowable and therefore manageable or open to governmental calculation…’ (1997, p. 66-67). This process of the generation of cultural statistics was more significant than simply the provision of information about a particular sector or sectors. This process was productive in that it opened up for calculation and management new cultural areas. Hawkins makes the further point that statistics ‘and other research knowledges about cultural industries have challenged outdated and exclusivist policy meanings for art. They represent art and culture in different terms and, in this difference, new policy processes have emerged’ (1997, p. 68). This process was encouraged by the IAC Report which repeatedly rejected the arguments put to it by the arts community who argued from a position of the self-evident nature of government arts funding, or, as the commission quipped, a rationale based on the ‘the revealed truths of the artist’ (1976, p. 29).

Thus, in the later 1970s and early 1980s (and indeed to date) a stream of reports commissioned by

---

134 See Hacking, 1991, who argues that ‘the collection of statistics has created, at the least, a great bureaucratic machinery. It may think of itself as providing only information, but it is itself part of the technology of power in a modern state’ (1991, p. 181).

135 For instance in 1985 the Cultural Minister’s Council established a Statistical Advisory Group. This group developed a National Culture/Leisure Industry Statistical Framework using the UNESCO Framework for Cultural Statistics as a model. The Statistical Advisory Group argued that ‘Effective management of the culture-leisure industry is not possible in the absence of adequate data. Unless there is the means to monitor, measure and evaluate all facets of the nation’s
the Australia Council were released which demonstrated the economic success of the arts industry and the popularity of the subsidised arts to the general public. Although, as we will see, some of the arguments these surveys and reports were based on were questionable, there was a direct connection between these reports and the arguments mounted by the Australia Council and the arts community for increased government support.

The IAC’s main criticism of the arts community was that it did not give enough importance to public benefit from the arts. In response to this, the first reports commissioned by the Australia Council were surveys of public attitudes to the arts. The first of these surveys *Australian Attitudes to the Arts* (1980) showed that ‘Australians are deeply involved in a wide range of social and cultural activities, of which the arts are an integral part; levels of interest and participation in the arts are high; people believe that the arts are for everyone, not for a select minority.’ (Australia Council, AR 1980-81, p. 9). At the time of the preparation of the 1980-81 Annual Report the Australia Council had already received notice of the 1981-82 budget which represented a steep decline in funds. After warning that the financial position of some companies was precarious and that ‘Companies cannot be re-established if they fail’, the report goes on in the next paragraph to state that two thirds of those 1,700 interviewed for the survey ‘favoured’ Commonwealth Government funding (Australia Council, AR 1980-81, p. 9). This report and others commissioned with increasing frequency in the early 1980s helped to create an arts constituency defined, for the first time, as the general public which, whether they actually attended arts events or not, supported the arts. The arts sector could now claim that there was broad based public support for government funding of the arts, no longer was the arts constituency limited and elitist but was representative, and more crucially it was expected to be representative, of the entire community.
The *Australian Attitudes to the Arts* survey asked whether or not people ‘liked’ and/or ‘liked and attended’ the arts. Rowse argues that due to the vague meaning of the term ‘like’ the survey did not guide against a tendency for people to respond to such questions with a ‘correct’ answer (1985, p. 42). What Price Culture? a more sophisticated survey conducted in 1984 by the economists David Throsby and Glen Withers showed that Australians were ‘in favour of raising support to at least two or three times the current financial level’ (Australia Council, AR 1984-85, p. 18). Furthermore, and even more specifically:

The facts on arts involvement and attitudes indicate broad community endorsement of continued and growing government support, of ‘arms length’ funding principles, and of enhanced diversity in arts funding, including improved taxation provisions. *The notion of the arts as a luxury and as only an elite pleasure foisted on an unknowing or resentful public is simply wrong.* (italics added, 1984, p. 26)

Arguments about the validity of the opinion survey method are aired in the McLeay Report, where there was concern about the gap between actual attendances and those expressing what could be a ‘deferential’, as opposed to a truly supportive response. Peter Anderson argues that the lack of definition of what exactly constitutes the ‘arts industry’ in such figures renders them problematic. Anderson points out, for example, that on the one hand, television is included in statistics on industry profit, but on the other hand television watching is not considered a ‘creative’ activity and assessed in public attitudes to the arts surveys (1990/91, p. 227-232). These kinds of arguments were also aired in the McLeay Report, where the Committee commented on the lack of funding for contemporary music to the effect that the ‘established arts have little interest in the condition of

---

136 See also Pierre Bourdieu (1979) who challenges three basic assumptions of public opinion surveys- first, that everyone can have an opinion, and that the production of opinion is within everyone’s range, second, that all opinions have the same value, and third, that the fact of asking a broad range of people about a particular issue implies that there is consensus about it.

137 Withers directly responded to Rowse’s criticism that opinion survey methods tended to reflect a ‘deferential’ response by arguing that ‘It might be false consciousness, but the survey evidence for those who pay for arts support, the taxpayer, shows strong attachment to the notions derided by Rowse’ (1986, p.128-29). For detail on Withers principles
contemporary music, except it appears, to include its production statistics in analyses arguing the importance of the arts’ (1986, p. 169). As with the rhetorics of excellence and nation, there remained within this industry discourse a division between ‘high’ culture and the subsidised arts, and ‘low’ culture and ‘entertainment’.

A number of reports from the early 1980s on have demonstrated that the arts sector is a highly profitable one. In the year following the release of Throsby and Withers *What Price Culture?*, the second edition of the Council publication *The Arts: Some Australian Data* was published. These publications, which first began in 1982, presented statistical information about the arts industry—how many people it employed, profit, and so forth. Such statistics made possible arguments which sought to justify government arts subvention on the basis that the arts industry was in fact highly profitable. The 1984-85 Australia Council *Annual Report* stated that *The Arts: Some Australian Data* showed that in 1983-84 the estimated total value of goods and services of the arts, cultural and related industry groups was approximately $5, 900 million and that these findings ‘strongly refute the argument that the arts are a narrow and isolated range of activities of interest or benefit only to a few’ (1984-85, p. 18).

There are problems with such arguments. T.B. Hansen has argued persuasively against justifying subvention of the arts simply on the basis of the arts as an economic good.¹³⁸ Hansen develops two arguments which question the value of those analyses which establish the arts as a highly profitable sector. In the first place, he argues, that while

… there is no doubt that the economic impacts have often been exaggerated. The fault lies in having looked at consumption, employment and tax revenues as gross quantities instead of investigating whether the arts have generated new consumption or new jobs… In other words, it is necessary to determine the extent to which the cultural activities and the subsidisation of the arts are helping to create *economic growth*. (italics in original, 1995, p. 310)

---

¹³⁸ See also Pick, 1989.
In the second place, Hansen argues that ‘it is not enough to show that the arts generate income, employment and tax revenues, for all economic activity does that… It is therefore necessary to investigate whether the arts stimulate economic development more than would be the case if the subsidies had been used for alternative purposes’ (italics in original, 1995, p. 310-11). Thus, arguments which justify subsidy of the arts sector on the basis of its profit value to the community are basically flawed. Furthermore:

The purpose of the arts is not to attract tourists and companies and create jobs. These economic impacts are ‘extra gains’, not the real aim of the exercise. The arts are subsidised mainly for cultural or social reasons… If one wants to evaluate the economic value of the arts, one cannot simply use an economic standard analysis which does not take account of the special purposes of the activity. (Hansen 1995, p. 315)

In the next chapter and by way of conclusion to this thesis we will discuss further ‘economic rationalist’ arguments as they have been applied to the arts in the last few years. For now it is enough to note two main points to conclude this section. First, we have argued that there was an increasing predominance of arguments based on statistical research which demonstrated that the arts had an economic value. However, while ‘arts industry’ rhetoric began to predominate in the 1980s as we will see in the next chapter it was not until the 1990s that the arts come to be strategically positioned as part of the ‘cultural industries’. The second main point we can make here relates to the role of statistics as a productive technology in a neo-liberal governmental rationality. We have argued that the increasing focus of the Australia Council on research into the arts sector produced an ever increasing body of statistical data. This data allowed the arts to become more open to calculation and therefore management, all at ‘arm’s length’ from government.

ii. The McLeay Report and Cultural Rights

The House of Representatives Standing Committee on Expenditure was charged with examining-the procedures for the allocation and distribution of funds to the arts; the impact of the present level and allocation of expenditure and other means of support such as taxation expenditures; current
issues and concerns in the arts industry; and the Commonwealth’s role in arts funding. Although the Report did not receive the same kind of reception as the IAC Report its recommendations were by no means universally popular. The Committee agreed to some extent with the approach of the IAC Commissioners and ‘fully endorsed the basic philosophy of their report; that the direction of assistance to the arts should be predicated on the nature and extent of the community benefits that the assistance provides’ (1986, p. 20). However, the McLeay Committee was less rigorous in its assessment of what counted as public benefit and concluded that ‘it would be foolish to forgo the additional public benefits from the arts that government support can provide merely because we cannot agree on their precise nature or on the best way to maximise them’ (1986, p. 37). The McLeay Committee’s understanding of the basic principles for government art subvention are summarily expressed in the following quote where they argued that:

The Committee sees the broad objective of government arts assistance as increasing cultural democracy. We define this not as wider access to the so-called high arts, but rather as access by the community to a diversity of cultural experiences from which individuals may choose for themselves the cultural activities of most benefit to themselves at any time. (italics added, in Parsons 1987, p. 27)

Thus, access to art was defined as the provision of access to a wide range of cultural experiences which ‘individual’ arts consumers could pick and choose from as they wished. Before engaging in a more detailed description of what is involved in the new more pluralised conception of the arts audience we must note the essential difference in the relations between art, citizenship and government implied here. We have argued that in the 1970s the relations between art, citizenship and government were dominated by a conception of the government’s role in the provision of ‘excellent’ art which would be representative of the best of the Australian nation. In relation to this understanding access and participation was conceived in terms of a ‘disadvantage’ model which provided access to ‘excellent’ art to communities which for some reason did not have ease of access. By the mid 1980s, as we will see, the arts audience was beginning to be understood in terms of individual arts consumers who required access to a plurality of cultural resources. In relation to this, debate on the findings of the McLeay Committee polarised around the opposition of
community cultural rights to artist’s rights. However, on a more detailed analysis the Committee’s cultural democratic rhetoric did not translate extensively into its policy recommendations.

The majority of the McLeay Report focused on the Australia Council. The Committee’s three main recommendations which involved the Australia Council were also the Committee’s most controversial. They were to stream-line the Council, with fewer staff, Boards, and functions, to be achieved, in part, by the devolution of small grants to State and local organisations equipped to make decisions about such grants. Second, the position of the Minister would be formalised in relation to the Australia Council by changing the Australia Council Act to allow the Minister the legislative ability to give direct policy directions to the Council (but not on specific grants). The Committee specifically rejected what it took to be the Australia Council’s position that ‘an arts council ought to be free to ignore the policy priorities of an elected government’ (1986, p. 57). And, finally, to reduce the amount of artists involved in the peer review procedure, the Committee asserted that ‘the position of artists and artworkers in the Council was not originally intended to be so dominant’ (1986, p. 81). These three recommendations combined meant a reduction in the Council’s responsibility. This was justified by the fact that the Committee felt that the Council had become ‘a captive of its clients’. Phillip Parsons in the introduction to *Shooting the Pianist*, a collection of papers given at a one day seminar held to discuss the McLeay Report, described the Committee’s depiction of the arts community in these terms- ‘the McLeay Report had managed to produce a report which not only ignores the contribution of the artists… but represents them in passing as power-hungry, self-seeking and unrealistic’ (1987, p. 13). Nevertheless, for all the Report’s anti-elitist opposition to vested interest and ‘high’ culture, it was the major performing arts companies and not programmes focused on improving access and participation which gained as a result of its recommendations.
While the McLeay Committee stated that the basis of its support for government arts assistance was to ensure increased access to a plurality of cultural resources, the Report can be read as doing the opposite. Rowse criticised the Report’s quarantine of the major performing arts companies from normal budgetary fortunes by the recommendation that these companies be placed in a separate unit within the Australia Council with guaranteed triennial funding, that is, even though the Australia Council itself was not to receive such funding (1986, p. 4). Rowse further argued that the McLeay Report ‘fails to develop any policy proposals to increase “access” or promote “democracy”’ (ibid.). Although support for the major companies was guaranteed there was no such support for the smaller companies. The difference between the Report’s attitude to the major companies and other arts interests is highlighted in the tone of this paragraph on decentralisation:

The Committee is not aware, nor is it concerned, as to whether its recommendations on decentralisation extend so far as to provoke uproar… We see no compulsion on any of these groups to accept government assistance and believe that those not prepared to recognise the primacy of public benefit in the assistance system are free to withdraw from it. The Committee does not believe that it would be difficult to replace any such withdrawals. (1986, p. 91)

As a result of the McLeay Committee’s emphasis on decentralisation the Community Arts Board was downgraded to the Community Cultural Development Committee. Hawkins argues that we can read the McLeay Report’s recommendations for a restructured Australia Council not simply as an exercise in administrative efficiency but, despite the rhetoric, as evidence of a dismissal of access. One of the McLeay recommendations was a reduction in the Board’s role in the formulation of policy. The Community Arts Board had been particularly influential in this area. We described earlier Hawkins argument as to the productive nature of the Community Arts Board in constituting ‘community’ as a category of government arts funding and in extending Australia Council policy definitions of quality and excellent art. Hawkins argues that the Community Arts Board

… had played a major role in the production of innovative policies and had also devised a wide range of strategies for reaching new constituencies. By the mid-1980s the impacts of the Community Arts Program, were evident across the Council. The rhetoric of cultural diversity and cultural rights was no longer exclusive to community arts. It was also becoming central to mainstream arguments for the arts. For some in the arts community these changes in philosophy were disturbing.
Reasserting the power of the Council and the Minister was represented as the best way to contain the threat of recalcitrant Boards. The McLeay Report’s recommendations endorsed this belief. (1993, p. 80)

It is clear that the McLeay Report did not represent any radical departure from the dominant modes of understanding government arts assistance, framed in terms of excellence and nation. Nevertheless, as Hawkins argues by the mid 1980s the importance of the rhetoric of cultural diversity and cultural rights was shaping Australia Council policy and Australia Council advocacy of support for the arts.

A number of initiatives were begun in the early 1980s which were both reflective of and operated to further challenge the still dominant understanding of government funding of the arts as being to support ‘excellence’. There are two main strategies that are worth noting here by way of illustrating the initiation of a more pluralist understanding of government arts funding. The first of these, and possibly the most influential, was advocacy for more pluralist Australia Council policies which would take account of the increasing emphasis on multicultural policies being developed in other areas of government. The Galbally Report: A Review of Post-Arrival Programs and Services for Migrants (1978) recommended that the ‘Australia Council develop closer links with ethnic communities and that it reassess its budgetary allocation in order to ensure that ethnic arts received a more equitable amount’ (in Blonski 1992, p. 6). In 1982 it was found in an evaluation of the implementation of the Report’s recommendations that the Australia Council’s response had been inadequate (Blonski 1992, p. 6). There was rapid change in the years between 1982 and 1985, by 1985 a Multicultural Arts Committee was established.139

---

139 However, this Committee only lasted a year, holding its last meeting in 1986. The position of multicultural project manager was moved to the new Community Cultural Development Committee during the AC restructuring. The Multicultural Arts Committee was re-established in 1990 and developed a programme for the Council titled ‘Arts for a Multicultural Australia’ (Blonski 1992, p. 37-38). For a more contemporary statement of the objectives of this programme see National Working Party on Arts for a Multicultural Australia, 1993.
Challenges to the dominant discursive conjunction of professional-excellent-national also came from the Art and Working Life Programme established in 1982. This programme, which was a collaboration between the Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU) and the Australia Council, sought ‘to encourage art practice and policy which is informed by the concerns and issues affecting workers own lives and acknowledges working class cultural traditions and the multicultural nature of those traditions’ (Australia Council 1992b, p. 3). Through this collaboration the ACTU hoped to pluralise public perceptions of the union movement as representing more than the blue collar male worker in a ‘jackie-howe’ singlet. This aim was particularly in view of the union movement’s failure to make significant inroads into the service sector, which was one of the biggest employment sectors and also predominantly staffed by women, young people and part-time workers, all categories of worker who traditionally were not unionised. Deborah Mills, Director of the Community Cultural Development Unit, argued at a Art and Working Life conference that many ‘Art and Working Life projects have been outstandingly successful in working with just these groups’ (in Australia Council 1991, p. 6). She stated that the programme also benefited the Australia Council at it was ‘looking for a way to respond to the cultural diversity of Australian society. It needed to come up with polices and programmes which at least recognised different cultural perspectives based on ethnicity, race, class and gender’ (in Australia Council 1991, p. 5). By the later 1980s the promotion of cultural pluralism and cultural identity was a dominant policy objective within the Council, we will further discuss the importance of notions of cultural identity in the next chapter. First, it is important to examine the notion of cultural rights which became a dominant advocacy discourse at this time.

Part-time Chairperson of the Australia Council from 1985 to 1991, Donald Horne, was a staunch opponent of the McLeay Committee’s recommendations. In Horne, for the first time, the Australia Council had a public head who was just that- very public. Not only did Horne have a
significant public profile which he used to vigorously advocate on behalf of the Australia Council and its programmes but he had very definite philosophies about the relationships between art, citizenship and government. Some of these ideas were reformulations of pre-existing rhetorics, such as his cultural rights arguments. Nevertheless, it attests to Horne’s energy that his advocacy of cultural rights and cultural pluralism arguably helped to concretise the significance of the more pluralist versions of access which were promoted in the Council initially by the Community Arts Board.

Horne’s inaugural address and inaugural essays, published in *Artforce*, summarise his principles for government support of the arts. Horne argued that the function of government support for the arts should be to ensure cultural rights: ‘Just as we speak of political rights, civil rights and economic rights, in modern industrial societies we should perhaps learn to speak of “cultural rights”’ (1985b, p. 10). Horne defined this notion most succintly in a lecture given a couple of years after his inauguration: ‘These cultural rights, which are a legitimate concern of the state, consist of a right of access to our common cultural heritage and to use it as we wish, a right to new art and a right for citizens to participate in their own art making’ (1988, p. 5). There are two main arguments which underpin this position. First, Horne argued that there was no necessary division between excellence and access: ““Excellence” is, of course, the motherhood word of arts-support policy. Everyone is for “excellence”. No-one says: “What I stand for is determined mediocrity”’ (1985a, p. 7). Thus, Horne argued that excellence was a concept which was just as applicable to community access programmes as it was to the ‘flagship’ companies. Second, and as a logical result of his cultural rights position, Horne advocated cultural pluralism. However, unlike many from the community arts movement, he did not advocate pluralism at the expense of the more traditional ‘Arts’. Rather, he advocated increased access to the ‘high’ arts, which could be achieved by art books, prints, radio,
television, and video (1985b, p. 10). He also argued that cultural pluralism was necessary in a
democratic society where citizens have a right to a choice of leisure opportunities. This choice was
particularly important because the

arts are one of the ways in which, through continuing social criticism, general
reactions to change and, indeed, change itself can be organised within a society…
With the kinds of standardisation that are provided by the mass culture industries, one
of the more efficient uses of public money can consist in the sponsorship of
alternative and diverse, including minority, cultural pursuits… By intervention of this
kind, there can be an offset to the *bullying monopoly of the public culture.* (italics
added, 1988, p. 4)

It is at this point that we can pick up on an important contradiction in Horne’s argument. While
much of Horne’s rhetoric was socially democratic and argued in favour of access to a diversity of
cultures and for the dissemination of culture through communication media, he is less happy with
the dissemination of what he calls ‘bullying public culture’. This ‘public culture’ refers to, among
other things, mainstream television programming. Indeed Horne argues that the cultural hegemony
which exists in Australian society is not the cultural pursuits of ‘high’ culture but ‘mass-produced’
culture: ‘if you want to see ruling-class culture in operation, you should stay at home and watch
television rather than go to the opera’ (1991, p. 127). Despite Horne’s social democratic position he
fails to encompass a broad definition of cultural activity into his arguments.142

Rowse has criticised Horne’s charter as lacking programmatic content. For example, Rowse writes
that Horne has ‘very little to say about other cultural institutions, such as, the electronic media and
schools, and how they might need to change to afford [cultural] rights’ (1988, p. 22). Hawkins on
the other hand, while allowing that Horne has a tendency to be romantic at times, cites his work
actively advocating the Community Cultural Development Committee as an example of ‘one place

---

141 The IAC in 1976 had argued for more creative solutions to the goal of increased access possibly through the use of
communications technology. Unfortunately, as we have seen, this report was buried.
142 Even though mainstream T.V. watching (for example) is considered by Horne in negative terms this does not stop
him from making the usual move of quoting profits from these industries to establish the profit making ability of ‘the
arts’ (1988, p. 5).
143 See also Rowse 1989 for a criticism of Horne which compares Horne’s perspective on cultural rights to Rowse’s own
arguments.
where concrete strategies were developed to address the cultural rights of particular constituencies’ (1993, p. 83). Nonetheless, it is clear that Horne’s charter failed to come to terms with what may provide the basis of a cultural policy whose philosophical precepts cover all cultural activity and not simply ‘the arts’. Like earlier Australia Council policy and advocacy of government involvement with the arts, Horne’s notion of ‘cultural rights’ was not able to account for or provide a way in which the Australia Council might be involved in ‘entertainment’ industry activities. It was not until the mid 1990s that the Australia Council began to account for and develop strategies which involved activities traditionally defined as ‘entertainment’. Discussion of the shift in discourse framing government involvement in the arts which both induced and enabled the Australia Council to position itself in a way that it could take account of ‘entertainment’ industry activities forms the subject of the next chapter.

Conclusion

In this chapter we have traced, through the example of the Australia Council from 1968 to the late 1980s, a process of the governmentalisation of the arts. This has involved the increasing professionalisation, bureaucratisation and politicisation of the arts. We have traced how, for instance, the development of specialist knowledges, such as survey techniques for measuring public attitudes to the arts, have resulted in the arts being ever more amenable to calculation and management. In tracing the development of governmental technologies for the management of art, we have traced the strategic deployment of the arts to construct, for instance, ‘community’ and multicultural constituencies, as well as ‘national’ audiences and products. At the beginning of this chapter and in the previous chapter we noted that a primary rhetoric in the constitution of the ‘arts

144 In a seminar on extending access to cultural institutions Horne described how this notion of cultural rights might be applied to the development of programmes which would further access to cultural institutions. He suggested, for instance, changing methods of display away from the ‘chronological hang’ towards a hang which did not require ‘art to speak for itself’ and also the provision of written explanations of particular works to increase public access. Above all Horne argued that ‘any art museum that depends largely on public money for its survival should be required to explain to the funding authorities what methods it is adopting to assist intellectual access among its visitors’ (1990, p. 4) In other words, it is not enough for cultural institutions to measure access by ‘bodies through doors’ (1990, p. 5).
council’ model of government is its ability to manage the arts at ‘arm’s length’ from government. In this chapter we have made two main points about the conjunction of culture and government through the specific example of the Australia Council. We have argued that this history demonstrates that the relations between culture and government, far from bring constitutively oppositional, are positive and productive. For instance, the establishment of the Australia Council resulted in a direct boost to Australian cultural producers, the IAC Report resulted in the multiplication of knowledges about cultural production and consumption which have been used to advocate for further government funding for the arts, the establishment of the Community Arts Board involved a process whereby community art and its attendant more culturally pluralist notions became an object of government, and so on. In our discussion of the Australia Council we have not traced a history where ‘a central state extended its tentacles throughout society’ (Rose 1993, p. 285). Rather, we have traced a history whereby involvement in art through the technology of ‘arm’s length’ government has constructed certain norms and objectives of government which enabled the arts to be constituted as a field open to management by technologies of government.
CHAPTER SIX:
Conclusion: The Arts as Industry
Nowadays… ‘culture’ attracts the attention of men of politics: not that politicians are always ‘men of culture’, but that ‘culture’ is recognised both as an instrument of policy, and as something socially desirable which it is the business of the State to promote. (T.S. Eliot 1948, in Bennett, O. 1995, p. 212)

There is a discursive division in contemporary arts policy between the notion of art as the moral and spiritual storehouse of the nation, and the notion of art as profitable, marketable and its benefits as calculable. This split results in a set of recurrent oppositions. As we have seen much discussion of arts policy attempts to negotiate between the humanistic objectives of providing access to art to ‘everyone’ and the ‘economic’ objectives of marketing the arts, sponsoring the arts, and so forth. One of the objectives of this thesis has been to provide a historicisation of these rationalities for art administration. This historicisation may provide us with an approach through which we might understand these seemingly irreconcilable policy discourses. In order to examine some of the main issues in present day arts policy it will be helpful to briefly recap the main historical and theoretical arguments of the thesis.

Chapter one provided a brief analysis of the relations between art, citizenship and government in France during the history of the Salon and then during the history of the Louvre art gallery during and immediately after the Revolution. These two moments are important in the history of the relations between art and government. The example of the Salon allowed discussion of the strategic use of art in absolutist regimes prior to the Revolution. While the Salon may have been open and free to the public, most of the public were excluded from its message. In this milieu art was used strategically to communicate the splendour of the King to his own and foreign Courts. After the Revolution it was claimed that art was the property of all the people and further that it was representative of, and of educational benefit to, the French citizenry. Analysis of these moments allowed discussion of the debates about the concepts of public and citizen in pre-Revolutionary and Revolutionary France. This discussion was organised around a discussion of Habermas’s theory of the bourgeois public sphere. The
focus of this was to describe the fundamental re-orientation of the relationship between individuals and
government which took place after the Revolution and resulted in a recognisably modern conception of
the relation between citizen and nation. In regards to the history of cultural institutions this chapter
allowed us to trace the way in which the conception of art shifted from playing a strategic role in
relation to King and Court to a relation which constructed it as representative of and as imbued with a
capacity to educate the citizens of the new French Republic.

Chapter two established the thesis’s theoretical framework with a discussion of conceptions of power.
This discussion argued that a Foucaultian conception of power, which saw power as diffuse and as
implicated in all relations, was a productive way of analysing cultural institutions. It was argued that
such a conception allowed us to address the ‘micropolitics of power’ rather than analysing cultural
practices and institutions as either designed to secure consent to existing social arrangements or as
instances of opposition to hegemonic arrangements. In order to analyse the relations of power and
knowledge operating in the various conjunctions of art, citizenship and government Foucault’s concept
of governmentality was used. This allowed the thesis to argue that the field of culture is best analysed
as a field which has been progressively governmentalised and its institutions deployed strategically
alongside and along with other institutions involved in ‘governing the social’. For Foucaultians,
institutions involved in ‘governing the social’ are those concerned with the distribution and utilisation
of resources in the task of shaping a citizenry to be self regulating in various particular ways. The
increase in the perception that art might be useful to the training of ‘good’ citizens can be seen in
relation to a general shift towards a multiplication of strategies for the management of ‘the social’,
which can be traced from the early nineteenth century in, for example, museum policy. As a way of
illustrating and comparing the theoretical application of a Foucaultian notion of power and
governmentality, chapter two briefly discussed the history of cultural institutions in nineteenth-century
Britain. Analysis focused on a set of shifts which occurred during the course of the nineteenth century which meant that by its end the relations between art, government and citizenship were constructed in a way that could be thought of as distinctive in terms of the way in which art was used strategically as a means to equip a citizenry with certain capacities which would render them self governing.

Chapters one and two established the methodological underpinnings of the thesis. These chapters also allowed us to trace some of the historical pre-conditions for our discussion of the relations between art, citizenship and government. In section two of the thesis we argued that this relation was best characterised by the ways in which different strategies, for the management of populations through encouraging a citizenry to be self regulating in various ways, have been organised and deployed. Thus, section two can best be described as being to do with an analysis of cultural institutions in terms of the way in which they have been strategically deployed to govern ‘the social’. In the second section of the thesis we argued that there is no single logic to conjunctions of art, citizenship and government, rather, we emphasised the complex and contradictory nature of government rationalities of arts administration. As in section one, it was not possible to offer an exhaustive historical account of these moments. Rather, the purpose was to explore some of the framing discourses for the conjunction of art, citizenship and government in these milieux.

Chapter three began with an examination of art programmes under the ‘New Deal’ in America in the 1930s; the second part of chapter four discussed some of the British institutions which administered art during WWII, particularly focusing on the Arts Council of Great Britain. The period of the 1930s and 1940s is especially significant for the ways in which government arts funding came to be institutionalised in the post-war world. During the 1930s and 1940s there was a significant shift in the
degree to which government administered the arts. This had two direct outcomes. First, there was an increased political expectation that it was a responsibility of government to fund and administer art. This meant that in a time of dire economic and political circumstance, due first to the Depression and then to WWII, there were multiple initiatives for administering the arts with the aim of extending access and participation more generally throughout the nation. Second, linked to this shift in arts management, there was a shift in the way ‘the people’ were constructed in relation to art. Far from being thought of as the property of the few or the elite, the definitive art programmes of the 1930s and early 1940s were titled ‘Art for the People’ and proudly proclaimed that art was the property of ‘Everyman’. The 1930s and 1940s are significant for the way in which cultural policy sought to act on the citizen ‘from a distance’, that is, these strategies hoped to produce and encourage citizens capable of self regulation in a way that would ensure their active and productive contribution to the nation. An integral part of these various constructions of collectivity was the shaping of a citizen who would participate constructively in her or his working, political, and social life.

In chapter four we described some similar relations in the context of Australia during post-WWII reconstruction. This chapter began the exploration of Australian arts administration which was the subject of the rest of the thesis. Its aim was to describe some of the conditions of emergence of cultural policy in Australia. It was not a genealogy of either Commonwealth or State funding of the arts in Australia but described the dominant discourses which framed the administration of visual art in the years immediately following WWII. Reconstruction in Australia was influenced in important ways by economic, social and political debates occurring in America and Britain. Thus, post-WWII reconstruction was characterised by a belief that Keynesian economics and governmental planning could stave off the horrors of the Depression, which was seen to be a result of laissez faire economics and an overly individualist conception of the relation between state and citizen. The lessons of the war
taught government that an educated citizenry was more likely to participate productively in the running of the nation. Also, it was believed that an educated citizenry was less likely to fall victim to the seduction of totalitarian politics. Thus, the conception of the relationship between government and population shifted. This shift in understanding was reflected in the field of arts administration. This shift was reflected in the fact that it was in post-war reconstruction that government arts funding and thereby increased access to the arts began to be seen in terms of what would later be framed as a ‘right’ of citizenship, although at this stage it is better and more modestly put as an ‘expectation’ of government.

Chapter five discussed the history of the Australia Council from its establishment in 1968 to the period of Donald Horne’s Chairmanship in the late 1980s. This chapter explored some of the framing discourses for government arts subvention particularly focusing on discussion around the two main government inquiries of the period- the 1976 IAC report and the 1986 McLeay Report. Analysis tracked two main sets of discursive co-ordinates which have informed Commonwealth government arts policy. One of these focused on a description of the division in policy goals between the production of excellence, on the one hand, and the facilitation of access and participation on the other. We described the way that this division was not fixed but had been understood and deployed in a number of differing ways. The other main dichotomy traced was one we have termed the ‘cultural rights’ versus ‘art as industry’ polarity. Chapter five brought us to the end of Horne’s Chairmanship in 1991. In the space that remains we shall examine how the competing discourses, ‘cultural rights’ v ‘the arts industry’, have been constructed in contemporary arts policy. This will allow us, by way of conclusion, to consider whether it might be possible to negotiate a way through the seemingly irreconcilable stand off posed by dichotomising the relation between industry and humanistic rationalities for arts funding.
The Arts Industry\textsuperscript{145}

In the last ten years the status of the Australia Council as sole advisor to government on arts policy and administrator of Federal arts funding has diminished considerably. Over the same time frame the status of arts and cultural policy has increased significantly with the construction in 1993 of the Department of Communications and the Arts- the first Commonwealth ministry to bring the arts and communications sectors together in one portfolio- and the launch in 1994 of, \textit{Creative Nation}, the first Commonwealth cultural policy, which gave the Australia Council triennial funding and an increase in base funding of $18 million over four years (Artforce 1994, p. 3). It is significant that while these changes occurred under a Labor government, the Coalition government, while slashing funding to most sectors in its first budget in 1996, continued the Australia Council’s level of funding and even allocated $14 million in new funds to be spent specifically on regional arts development, emerging artists, contemporary music export, and major festivals (Artforce 1996, p. 12).\textsuperscript{146} Peter Collins, ex-NSW Leader of the Labor Opposition and Shadow Minister of the Arts, commented that the bipartisan support of the arts in the 1996 Federal election campaign ‘demonstrates a new awareness of political strength by a politically empowered cultural industry… No Australian politician will dare dismiss the importance of the Arts again’ (1996, p. 106). With this increase in political status there has been a significant change in the rhetoric used to justify government arts funding. In chapter five we traced the development of the ‘arts industry discourse’ from its first public airing in the 1976 IAC report. Now, as then, there is a tension between this economically framed set of arts funding rationalities and what might loosely be termed a ‘humanistic’ set of arts funding rationalities.\textsuperscript{147}

\textsuperscript{145} For a discussion of definitions of the arts and the cultural industries in relation to Australian Council publications see Anderson 1990/1991.

\textsuperscript{146} Subsequent budgets have reduced funding to the Australia Council, furthermore, certain factions in the current political climate demonstrate an adversity to government funded arts, constructed negatively as ‘intellectual’ or ‘ethnic’. However, it is too early to tell what real or lasting effects this will have on the relatively bi-partisan support for the arts. The general governmental shift away from public provision remains the more pressing threat to government arts subvention.

\textsuperscript{147} Peter Brokensha has characterised this division in terms of policy outcomes which are quantifiable and those which have general societal outcomes which are indirect (1986, p. 3).
In 1992 the Department of the Arts, Sports, the Environment and Territories (DASET) released *The Role of the Commonwealth in Australia’s Cultural Development: A Discussion Paper*. This discussion paper represented the first step in the Commonwealth’s formulation of a cultural policy. The discussion paper also represented some significant shifts in the discursive framing of culture and its relations to government. The foreword of the paper is illustrative of the kinds of tensions which characterise contemporary Australian cultural policy, it says:

In the past, the Commonwealth has been reluctant to formulate an explicit policy goal in the cultural arena, believing firmly that the paths followed by authentic cultural development can never be predetermined. The Government’s view on this fundamental point remains unchanged. Given the level of Commonwealth activity in the cultural field, however, and the mounting evidence of the importance of cultural issues within the Australian community, it now seems timely to develop a clear statement of the Commonwealth’s policy objectives and implementation strategies. (1992, p. i)

While on the one hand the Commonwealth is signifying here a shift to much more governmentalised strategies of cultural administration, at the beginning of this highly rationalised policy document there is still a perceived need to flag that the government is aware of the ‘larger spiritual’ and more ‘authentic’ importance of a culture which government can never control nor administer. We have noted this perceived dichotomous relation between culture and administration. This set of tensions still operates in the midst of a highly rationalised policy discussion which seeks to frame culture as a resource to be managed like other resources.

In the DASET paper culture is defined in this way:

The Government encourages and supports culture in its more specific sense (the practice and appreciation of music, the visual arts, literature, theatre, cinema, the preservation of our history and heritage) because of its fundamental importance to culture in a broader sense- that is, because of its importance to our whole way of life. (1992, p. 1)
This definition is significantly different from earlier governmental definitions of ‘the arts’ which were much more limited in the conceptions of production and value they could encompass. In the Institute for Cultural Policy Studies’s (ICPS) response to DASET’s discussion paper it was argued that the Commonwealth needed to be more specific about what constituted culture and why. It argued that the ‘phrase “because of its fundamental importance” obscures more than it reveals and provides a blanket argument for the support of arts activity narrowly defined’ (1994, p. 3). While on the one hand the DASET discussion paper tended to use vague justifications of why culture was important it was much more concrete about the possibility of the importance of culture as an industry. The DASET paper indicated that the Commonwealth would be increasingly drawn to industry policies which encouraged self-reliance, commercial viability and employment generation. At the same time though it argued that:

There is… a perception that too much discussion of ‘an industry’ might detract from the cultural arguments on which government involvement is predicated, that the economic imperative might take over from the cultural one. If that occurred government might well assist cultural development merely because or insofar as it provided economic benefit. Such a rationale for government involvement in the cultural area is quite different from that put forward in this paper. Yet, while pursuing an essentially cultural objective, it might become increasingly necessary to take an industry perspective if the consequences of dependency are to be avoided and greater self-reliance is to be achieved. (1992, p. 29)

It was this balance between cultural and economic interests that the Commonwealth sought to achieve in its arts ministry.

In 1993 DOCA was established, taking on responsibility for those ‘arts’ bodies previously administered by DASET, including the Australia Council and Artbank, but also, as its title suggests, taking on responsibility for the communications sector including Telstra, the ABC and the SBS. The creation of this ‘super’ Ministry received a mixed response. On the one hand, it was supported because it allowed an appropriate broadening of the definition of culture. As the ICPS discussion paper pointed out, the

---

This shift to a more inclusive governmental definition of ‘culture’ was due to mounting pressure from many sources during the late eighties. In chapter five we have briefly mentioned the importance of the Community Arts Board and
Australia Council could never encompass such an expanded policy role (1994, p. 15). The Ministry was seen as positive because it bridged the traditional gap between ‘the arts’ and entertainment. Deputy Secretary of DOCA, Cathy Santamaria, made just this point:

If cultural industries are to be treated from an industry perspective as well as a cultural one, this does mean an evolution in the manner in which the Government intervenes and taking a whole view of particular sectors which make up the industry instead of a partial one.
It means being concerned with the unsubsidised and the subsidised sector, distribution and production, as well as the jobs that flow from creativity. (in DOCA 1994, p. 39)

On the other hand, there were also perceived negatives to the creation of a ‘super’ Ministry. Stuart Cunningham, arguing against the construction of a ‘super’ Ministry, argued that there were significant tensions between the rationales for support in the communications and arts sectors. He commented that when advocating greater links between culture and communications we need to be mindful

… that the arguments supporting cultural development in Australia are diverse and don’t always mesh perfectly. On the one hand,… economists like David Throsby and Glen Withers have underpinned the notion of the arts as an industry… On the other, there are the established industries like broadcasting being treated as major vehicles of culture. These two kinds of arguments are both appropriate and timely, but they mark out very different logics of support. (1992, p. 11-12)

For Cunningham, Australia’s history in relation to its ‘long tradition of importing its popular culture’ is a pressing reason why it ‘needs a street smart sense of nationalism’ and to this end ‘the present role of the Commonwealth must not be diminished’ (1992, p. 4). The argument that the Commonwealth needs to maintain funding levels has become a mantra in the last few years as the impetus for an industry focused cultural policy has increased to the detriment of ‘public good’ arguments for cultural funding. We will discuss this set of current policy arguments further in section two. For now we will explore further the development of an industry focus in recent cultural policy.
The push for a strategic industry approach to cultural administration originated in the Cultural Minister’s Council\(^{149}\) which, via its Statistical Advisory Group,\(^{150}\) began to collect data on industry aspects of the arts. This initiative was furthered by DOCA which created a programme which was specifically responsible for advocating links between the cultural, business and private sectors. The Cultural Industry Development Program was established in 1993; its aims are stated in DOCA’s 1994-95 Annual Report:\(^{151}\)

> It aims to increase the commercial performance of cultural industries through improving access to existing industry and export assistance programs, developing industry-targeted export market development strategies, and increasing cultural industries’ knowledge and understanding of their industries, and domestic and international market environments. (1995, p. 10)

In 1994 the Cultural Industry Development Program launched a range of programmes and initiatives to educate the sector and the community generally about the government’s more strategically focused industry approach.\(^{152}\) The *Smart Tactics* programme was the first to be launched. This programme consisted of the *Smart Tactics* directory and the *Smarts* newsletter.\(^{153}\) The directory was an annual directory of business programmes for the cultural industries, it defined cultural industries broadly as

\(^{149}\) ‘The Cultural Ministers’ Council was established in 1985 to provide a ministerial forum for the exchange of views on issues affecting cultural activities in Australia. It currently comprises Australian Commonwealth, State and Territory Government and New Zealand Ministers responsible for arts and cultural heritage. The corresponding Minister from Papua New Guinea is invited to participate with observer status’ (Statistical Advisory Group 1991, p. 1).

\(^{150}\) In 1996 this Group became the Cultural Industries Statistics Working Group before changing its name again in 1997 to the Statistics Working Group.

\(^{151}\) The Cultural Industry Development Program received funding of $10 million over four years beginning in 1993-94. At the end of 1996 DOCA commissioned a review of the Cultural Industry Development Program. This review demonstrated the ‘value of the program in raising awareness within industry portfolios, of the scope and potential of cultural industries. It demonstrated the leverage provided by Commonwealth leadership and funding in establishing effective publishing, heritage and cultural tourism initiatives in developing export markets, while acknowledging a two to three year period is generally required to demonstrate measurable commercial results’ (DOCA 1997, p. 39).

\(^{152}\) Indeed the following are not the only programs which acted to encourage less dependence on the government for funding, in recent years the Australian Foundation for Culture and the Humanities was established with a brief to develop private sponsorship of the arts. As well the Major Organisations Board was established which, via its triennial funding, is more able to focus on marketing and fund raising activities. In 1995 another program was launched titled *Mapping Culture*, this took the form of a manual detailing in practical terms how to establish and carry out a cultural mapping exercise. This manual advocated that cultural mapping could ‘...help identify and develop new enterprises for areas of high unemployment. It could also result in a clearer understanding of cultural diversity which can help in the reconciliation process, [and] equity issues...’ (1995, p. 2).

\(^{153}\) This newsletter has a focus on business opportunities for the arts and show-cases cultural businesses who have marketed themselves well and so forth.
including libraries, newspaper printing, individual artists and so forth. The *Smart Tactics* programme posed its aim in this way: ‘We are committed to helping the pool of talented and enterprising creative workers fulfil their potential through strengthening the marketing and distribution strategies of cultural businesses, improving access to export and development programmes, and building links into other industries’ (1994b, p. 4). In 1994 the Cultural Industry Development Program also organised the *Creating Culture* conference which aimed to increase information to the cultural industries on industry assistance programmes and business opportunities. This conference was held before the release of the Commonwealth’s cultural policy *Creative Nation*. In his opening address the Minister for Communications and the Arts, Michael Lee, foreshadowed *Creative Nation’s* dual emphasis on culture as important to the construction of national identity and as important economically (in DOCA 1994, p. 9-10). Hilary McPhee, the Chair of the Australia Council, responded to this duality in a way that has become familiar. By pointing to the success of the Australia Council in terms of the increase in cultural production and consumption in Australia over the past twenty years of government funding, McPhee argued (like Cunningham above) for the necessity of government funding particularly as Australian content would suffer without it (McPhee 1994, p. 22). Furthermore, anticipating the current emphasis on arts organisations generating their own funds, she argued that most arts organisations do not have the funds to spend on campaigns to generate more funds from sources other than government (McPhee 1994, p. 21).

In October 1994 the Commonwealth released its first cultural policy statement, *Creative Nation*. *Creative Nation* defined culture above all as concerning identity- ‘the identity of the nation, communities and individuals’ (1994, p. 5). Furthermore, it stated that ‘this cultural policy pursues the

154 This strategy was replaced in 1997 by the *Artsinfo* information phone line and web site which provides access to a broad range of information about the cultural industries- everything from where to access funding, to legal firms specialising in intellectual property.
twin goals of democracy and excellence’ (ibid). The two major organising discourses in this policy are
directed clearly at the end of the introduction. On the one hand:

The ultimate aim of this cultural policy is to increase the comfort and enjoyment of
Australian life. It is to heighten experience and add to our security and well-being. In
that it pursues similar ends to any social policy. By shoring up our heritage in new or
expanded national institutions and adapting technology to its preservation and
dissemination, by creating new avenues for artistic and intellectual growth and
expression and by supporting our artists and writers, we enable ourselves to ride the
wave of global change in a way that safeguards and promotes our national culture.
(italics added, 1994, p. 7)

On the other hand, written almost twenty years after the IAC report, this policy firmly defined the arts
as a profitable industry:

This cultural policy is also an economic policy. Culture creates wealth….Culture
employs….Culture adds value, it makes an essential contribution to innovation,
marketing and design. It is a badge of our industry. The level of our creativity
substantially determines our ability to adapt to new economic imperatives. It is a
valuable export in itself and an essential accompaniment to the export of other
commodities. It attracts tourists and students. It is essential to our economic success.
(italics added, ibid)

In chapter five we described how in 1976 the IAC’s recommendation that the benefits of culture might
be measurable in quantitative terms met with a horrified response. At that time, in Prime Minister
Fraser’s memorable words ‘art [was]… not something which can be judged merely by harsh economic
criteria’ (in Anderson 1990, p.133). Ten years later the McLeay Report, while arguing in favour of an
industry oriented approach to the arts sector; nevertheless, argued that ‘it would be foolish to forgo the
additional public benefits from the arts that government support can provide merely because we cannot
agree on their precise nature or on the best way to maximise them’ (1986, p. 37). Creative Nation
framed culture as a set of resources to be managed so that the Australian nation could reach its full
potential, economically and socially. In Creative Nation humanistic and industry rationales of support
were placed together unproblematically. However, as we have already indicated, these rationales of
support are based on very different logics which must be negotiated in relation to specific aspects of
each sector of the industry. It is fitting to illustrate our point here with a brief discussion of some aspects of the present day policy concerns of the Australia Council, particularly in relation to the current ‘enthusiasm’ for ‘marketing the arts’.

‘Marketing the Arts’

One of the significant emphases of *Creative Nation* was its claim that the Australia Council ‘has to turn its attention away from the “supply” side of the arts equation to the creation of a higher level of demand from arts consumers’ (1994, p. 13). The Australia Council established its Audience Development and Advocacy Division in 1996. In current discussions of audience development, arts marketing is seen as the primary means whereby arts organisations and the arts generally can encourage their core audiences to remain loyal and as a way of generating new audiences. In the Australia Council’s 1996-1999 corporate plan there is a redefinition of what direct support for artists entails:

> Direct support for artists is the cornerstone of the Council’s activities. Its support for the creation and presentation of the arts, however, will be complemented increasingly by an emphasis on creating demand from arts consumers, both in Australia and overseas. The Council has responsibilities in the areas of audience development and marketing, meeting the challenge of new technologies, and further developing export markets for Australian artists and arts products. (1996, p. 5-6)

This new emphasis redefines ‘direct support for artists’, which is one of the Council’s statutory obligations, to include audience development and marketing. The Australia Council emphasised its commitment to arts marketing when it commissioned the report *Marketing the Arts* which was released earlier this year.

The then Director of the Audience Development and Advocacy Division, Sue-Ann Wallace, put the policy shift this way: ‘Council actually serves the people of Australia, and it serves them by supporting Australian arts. This is… a shift, from thinking that the end product is the artist’s development, into
thinking of the audience’ (in Charlton 1996, p. 3). One of the crucial factors in this shift is that it frames individual arts organisations as responsible for the development of their audiences and generating funds. In *Arts Management. A Practical Guide* Jennifer Radbourne and Margaret Fraser have argued that the ‘contemporary focus is not so much that the government is restricting subvention, but that the arts organisation is abdicating its responsibility if it is not actively and successfully seeking … sponsorship’ (italics added, 1996, p. 66). There is no doubt that the encouragement of a more proactive attitude amongst individual arts organisations towards the generation of broader audiences for the arts and alternative sources of funding is a proper emphasis in these days of dwindling government resources. However, there are some questions which need to be asked before advocating a policy which puts too much emphasis on the responsibility of individual arts organisations for the successful attraction of new audiences and the generation of sponsorship.

There are two main points or questions to pose about this current turn to audience development through arts marketing techniques. The first relates to the findings of sociological studies of audience demographics at cultural events which show clearly that attendance at arts events is closely linked to the individual’s level of education. This indicates that the constitution of arts audiences is not simply a matter of the right ‘marketing mix’ but rather that it is closely linked to a range of other factors. Tony Bennett and John Frow in *Art Galleries Who Goes?* and the *Australian Cultural Consumption Project* have shown that in Australia audiences at cultural events typically defined as ‘high’ have comparatively high levels of education. Following the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, Bennett and Frow have argued that this has to do with the utility of cultural forms to practices of social distinction. Bourdieu draws on statistical evidence to argue that, practices of distinction, especially those displayed
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155 See also Radbourne 1993 in which she argues that even though the Australia Council has been restructured, arts bodies are still ‘clinging to government agendas’ and that ‘accountability to the government or statutory funding’ limits their ‘management and production processes’ (1993, p. 53).
by ‘preferences in literature, painting or music, are closely linked to educational level and secondarily to social origin’ (Bourdieu 1994, p. 1). Moreover, there is an uneven and inequitable distribution of the capacities necessary to engage with such cultural forms. Bennett has argued that a focus on audience development strategies to the detriment of access policies may ‘serve only to accentuate existing inequalities in the social patterns of access to, and use of, Australia’s cultural and artistic resources’ (Bennett 1997, p. 89). This is particularly because, as Justin Lewis points out, while there are two main approaches to marketing in the arts- ‘the saturation approach’ and audience development- it is ‘the saturation approach’ which is the most common. This approach ‘is based, primarily, on the economic motive: to maximise audiences (and therefore income) at the lowest possible cost’ (Lewis 1990, p. 148). Thus, ‘the saturation approach’ recognises that the audience for subsidised art is middle-class and thus ‘saturates’ this market. As Lewis argues, ‘this will necessarily reinforce existing patterns of cultural consumption’ (1990, p. 149). On the other hand, the audience development approach, according to Lewis, ‘focuses upon the needs of people as consumers, and translates these back into the production process in order to meet those needs’ (1990, p. 149). For Bennett, audience development, as well as addressing the consumer’s needs and wants, can also address the consumers capacity to engage with different cultural forms. Thus,

... access and audience development policies might productively interact with one another... Effective access policies and the development of new audiences both require, through whatever means, ways of culturally resourcing those who, at the moment, fall outside the sphere of restricted culture in order that they might become culturally effective consumers within it. (Bennett 1997, p. 105)

While practising our ‘marketing mix’ we need to be clear about our aims- selling more tickets to established audiences and/or developing new audiences. If the second aim is a priority we may need to retain an emphasis on other strategies for the extension of access and participation. To this end we

156 This project is still underway. For preliminary reports on its findings see Bennett (1997) and Frow (1997).
might revisit discussions to do with intellectual access, the role of art in public places, techniques for the display of work, and so forth.

The second point to pose about this current turn to audience development through arts marketing techniques concerns the emphasis on making individual arts organisations more independent in raising their own funds and more proactive in generating their own audiences through strategies of arts marketing. The report *Marketing the Arts* has shown that to some extent most arts organisations practice some form of marketing no matter how basic. The report also found that some of the more expensive marketing tools, such as market research, were not undertaken by most organisations (Australia Council 1997, p. 89). Given the limited financial funds available and the small administrative nature of most arts organisations this is not surprising. In *Marketing the Arts* two hundred and seven out of the two hundred and fifty organisations surveyed had less than six full-time staff (1997, p. 7). This reflects the diverse components of the arts sector which ranges, for example, from the large performing arts bodies to small community arts organisations. These small organisations are the clear majority. Jennifer Craik and Robin Trotter make a similar point in relation to museums and ‘their ability to attract the big tourist dollar’ (1997, p. 46). Craik and Trotter’s pilot study of cultural tourism in Queensland has shown that most museums are ‘highly localised in content and patronage’ (1997, p. 45). They argue that it may not be economically viable for most museums to outlay investment by marketing and repackaging their attractions (1997, p. 46). Craik and Trotter conclude that with ‘these issues in mind, our analysis indicates that most museums would be advised to re-visit their community remit- and attempt to do that better- than to chase an elusive rainbow’ (ibid.). In light of such factors we must be cautious about the degree of the shift we make towards a policy emphasising the *responsibility* of individual cultural organisations for the size and diversity of their audiences.
Hilary McPhee has recently commented that ‘attempts to persuade governments and taxpayers of the importance of support for the arts in the language of the marketplace, that culture *sells*, that it attracts tourists, that it employs a lot of people, might be to miss the point’ (italics in original, 1997, p. 14). On the other hand, Radbourne and Fraser have written that:

> The arts manager in the 1990s practices in a highly competitive and complex environment… most particularly the elevation in the status of arts and cultural development in government planning and policy in response to economic impact studies and statistics that creates a rationale for investment that is *more than ‘welfare’* and the ‘*public good’*. (italics added, 1996, p. 246)

There is a broad mix of policy objectives which frame government subvention of the arts through the Australia Council. *Creative Nation*, while exhorting the Australia Council to focus more on demand than on supply, also claimed that one of the most important functions of culture and therefore the reason why government had a responsibility to fund it was in relation to its ‘social value’. Gillian Swanson has neatly summarised the implications of this:

> Social value, as it has been defined in the Australian cultural policy context, includes the cultivation of a sense of national identity and the communication of distinctive cultural content; the generation of community development and a sense of belonging, place and cultural stewardship. It also includes the recognition of the value of communities which are under-represented in other sectors; the promotion of diversity; and the development of skills and competencies which cultivate active and participating citizens. The *social value of culture is about more than economic regeneration; it is about developing sustainable communities as much as it is about developing sustainable cultural industries*. (italics added, 1997, p. 41)

The relation of culture to ‘the social’ is in terms of the construction of various kinds of identity. If one of the functions of government art subvention is in relation to the construction of particular kinds of identity, then Radbourne and Fraser’s claim that ‘the gradual release of organisational, financial and philosophical ties with government’ is possible through ‘effective marketing practice’ (1996, p. 84) may not be desirable because as yet there is no evidence to show that ‘effective marketing practice’ will allow us to retain a broad mix of cultural organisations and representations. In fact there is much to suggest that the opposite is true. For example, Director of Arts Victoria, Lesley Alway, has argued that
marketing strategies must target those audience segments which have already proven a strong interest in attendance. She writes, regarding the third phase of Arts Victoria’s marketing and audience development strategy, that: ‘Over the next twelve months, Arts Victoria will implement… a major umbrella marketing campaign and co-operative marketing project targeted at three distinct audience segments which have demonstrated strong growth potential in the arts’ (italics added, 1997, p. 11).

Construction of the arts as part of an industry has clearly been useful in the way it has foregrounded some of the arts’ more instrumental components, such as, the working conditions of artists, tax questions, intellectual property, and so forth. However, it seems that replacing the ‘old enthusiasm’ for aesthetic rationalities for arts funding is an equally blinkered ‘new enthusiasm’ for the brash new world of an economically rational culture and leisure industry in which the dictates of the market are the primary concern. The problem with the ‘new enthusiasts’ is that, like Radbourne, Fraser and Alway, they tend to forget the significantly different components which make up the ‘cultural industry’. Craik argues that ‘the three spheres of cultural industries- fine arts, commercial arts and amateur arts- although interrelated and interdependent, have very different requirements in terms of government policy, funding support schemes and accountability measurements’ (1996, p. 186). As well as this the ‘new enthusiasts’ tend to understand the concept ‘cultural industry’ in primarily economic terms and in distinct opposition to ‘welfare’ or considerations of ‘public good’. It is not clear that the economic rationalities for arts funding will address some of the most pressing problems of the sector. For example, in relation to the problem of unemployment and rates of pay in the arts sector Craik points out that ‘the gap between the better off and the struggling artists may widen as commercially viable types of cultural practice develop an industry focus’ (1996, p. 191). This is despite the Australia Council’s claim in its corporate plan that audience development and marketing strategies are of clear benefit to producers. Paul du Gay has argued that the proponents of entrepreneurial governance, while admitting
that ‘bureaucratic norms and techniques have proved efficient and effective in certain circumstances, clearly believe that such circumstances are no longer to be found’ (1996, p. 158). For du Gay the problem with this is that ‘it neglects the fact that the generalisation of an enterprise form to all forms of conduct may not of itself serve to incapacitate an organisation’s ability to pursue its preferred projects by redefining its identity and hence what the nature of its project actually is’ (1996, p. 158). Thus, as we have argued in relation to marketing the arts, du Gay argues more generally that there ‘is a clear danger here that the introduction of entrepreneurial principles into the public sector organisations might undermine basic principles of public provision’ (1996, p. 159).

**Conclusion**

How do we negotiate our way through these recurrent oppositions? Swanson, drawing on Macdonnell (1989), argues that a ‘processual’ rather than an economic definition of the cultural industry may be a way in which we can include the diverse logics of support which are implied by the different cultural sectors. She defines this ‘processual’ model of cultural industry as:

… using the concept of industry to bring into view the whole range of activities involved in all stages of cultural production and consumption, as well as including as industries those commercial, public and informal enterprises which make up the complex of cultural activities which we have an involvement in as producers and users. (1997, p. 41).

Clearly we need a way of thinking of the economic and the cultural as part of one system. Indeed these systems have always been interconnected in concrete ways. Kay Daniels argues that:

Most government cultural policy has an economic dimension ... There has, however, been a tendency to see industry-focused policy as economic and policy which focuses on ‘excellence’ and ‘access’ as primarily cultural in intent. There is also a tendency to see industry-focused objectives as in conflict with more traditional cultural objectives. I think that view is simplistic and believe that the failure to take an industry-focused approach to culture deprives policy development of its most useful tool. (1997, p. 5)
The economist David Throsby argues that cultural policy cannot be separated from fiscal policy even though the impact of cultural policy on economic policy is hard to measure. Instead Throsby proposes a theory of ‘culturally sustainable development’ which understands culture in terms of a set of resources with certain measurable effects which are both economic and ‘public good’ benefits (1997, p. 33).

The majority of this thesis has discussed cultural policy at the centralised and national level. In Australia, as we have seen in this chapter, a national cultural policy is a new thing; however, there are strong indications that cultural policy rationales are shifting to strategically target the local and community as a field of action. Such rationales have in the last few years typically taken the form of urban and regional planning frameworks. It is typically claimed (see Bianchini 1993, 1996; Hawkins 1993b; Swanson 1997; and Worpole 1992) that such a locally-based focus for cultural policy can ‘resituate the consumer- or the audience, or the user- in a cultural industry model grounded in ordinary ways of everyday living, … this may give us a different purchase on definitions of culture which are more malleable to diverse constituencies’ (Swanson 1997, p. 48). If this were true it may indeed be possible to tie the policy goals of fostering diversity in cultural production and consumption to the policy goals implied by taking a more economically oriented approach to cultural policy. Such a blend of specifically targeted ‘processual’ cultural and economic goals may be able to retain a more complex mix of policy objectives while also making use of the ‘new enthusiasm’ for marketing techniques. It is the importance of the continuation of this mix that we hope to emphasise in the contemporary construction of the relations between art, government and citizenship. A mix which would seek to
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157 Tony Bennett has argued that public good is measurable if its assessment is tied directly to the policy goals of the institution or program in question, see Bennett, 1989.

158 See for example Bianchini and Bloomfield (1996), Bianchini (1993), and Worpole (1992) for discussion of these programs in the UK. See for example Hawkins (1993), Mercer (1991), Mercer (1993), and Mercer (1994) for discussion of such programs in the Australian context.
explore how arts marketing strategies might combine with other important policy goals such as cultural pluralism, access, and research and development.
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