ART, AUDIENCES AND DISPLAY;

FRAGMENTS OF MODERNITY IN GLASGOW

ALISON ELDRIDGE

DISSERTATION PRESENTED FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

HISTORY OF ART DEPARTMENT

OCTOBER 2006

ProQuest Number: 10390641

ProQuest 10390641

ART, AUDIENCES AND DISPLAY:

FRAGMENTS OF MODERNITY IN GLASGOW.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CONTENTS

PROLOGUE

At the point of proposal, this dissertation had clear and seemingly attainable aims – to provide an empirical account of the Compass Gallery and to assess its cultural significance against particular theoretical concepts such as those of Pierre Bourdieu. Early promises of access to the gallery's archives could not be met. Under staffed and under funded, the time constraints on the gallery's directors soon began to intervene with my own. It became clear that my initial project had to be re-negotiated in some way. I was reluctant however to give up on the idea that Compass could provide a useful area for study, and had already spent considerable time chasing up information outwith the gallery's own archives – references in catalogues provided the main source alongside newspaper cuttings and reviews. Alongside this, my background reading had followed a fairly wide remit, ranging from larger historical overviews of Scottish art to more specific accounts of Scottish cultural production as well as general sociological writing on both art and Scotland. I had conducted an interview with the art critic and writer Cordelia Oliver. I had also obtained some papers connecting to the New Charing Cross Gallery, a predecessor to the Compass Gallery, from the artist John Taylor. Taylor had been among the initiators of the New Charing Cross Gallery in 1963. Finally, I conducted an interview with Cyril Gerber, the founding director of Compass (1969). The notion of exploring The Compass Gallery as a specific and emergent cultural formation in Glasgow seemed the most practical way forward.

As such, the gallery will be looked at as - to borrow David Frisby's phase - "a fragment of modernity". By keeping this sense of perspective, making any exaggerated claims on behalf of the gallery will hopefully be avoided. At the same time, the social mediation of historical process, the persistence of residual cultural practices in the interplay of the dominant and emergent can be examined.

To this extent, the work of Raymond Williams provides an exemplary analytical framework. Williams writes:

> A cultural phenomenon acquires its full significance only when it is seen
> as a form of (known or knowable) general social process or structure.
> The distinction between process and structure is then crucial. Resemblances
> and analogies between different specific practices are usually relations
> *within* a process, working inwards from a particular form to a general form[1].

In particular, Williams' commitment to both an emancipatory critique and a participatory democracy throughout his work was impressive. In this task, the use of language was always placed under intense scrutiny. In taking account of this, I have also sought to critique some of the contemporary discourse that has contributed to this dissertation in Williams' terms, not simply as an 'aside', but so as to make full use of his intellectual breadth.

Whilst Williams was concerned with the 'individual' this was never at the expense of the social and more pertinently, the idea of 'community'. For Williams, understanding difference could enable communication, and render a knowable community both practical and possible. He was not however, a 'sunshine moralist' to be made happy by a "sturdy little mood of earnest optimism".[2]

Williams could be deeply pessimistic, and at times his struggle to search for what he termed, "Resources of Hope" was underpinned by a very grim optimism indeed. Williams could thus be labelled as a utopian, or as Harris puts it, "It is a late 20th century form of intellectual dreaming".[3] For Williams, there was an important value in the construction of a systematic utopia :

> But what the systematic utopia offers, at its best, is an imaginative reminder
> of the nature of historical change: that major social orders do rise and fall,
> and that new social orders do succeed them It is then mainly a matter of
> the temper of the period whether the new social order is seen as better or worse.
> There can be no idle dreaming either way; the systematic nightmare no more
> no less idle than the rosy fantasy. But the value of the systematic utopia is to
> lift our eyes beyond the short term adjustments and changes which are the
> ordinary material of politics, and thus to insist, as a matter of principle, that
> temporarily and locally incredible changes can and do happen.[4]

Williams thus, deals centrally with the concepts of structure and agency. These concepts and their significance to the democratic process form an underlying and connecting thread throughout this dissertation, in which the Compass Gallery offers a strategic case study.

[1] R.Williams, cited in Paul Jones (2004) Raymond Williams's Sociology of Culture; p81; Palgrave
[2] C.W.Mills; (1959) The Sociological Imagination; p78, Oxford.
[3] J. Harris (2004) Putting the culture into visual culture, in *Visual Culture in Britain*, vol. 5, no 2, 2004, p73.
[4] R. Williams (1985) Towards 2000; p13; Harmondsworth, Penguin.

PART I.
ART, AUDIENCES AND DISPLAY: A DISCUSSION..

This dissertation intends to assess the *cultural significance* of the Compass Gallery, Glasgow. To put this in an appropriate context, I will explore aspects of the development, dissemination and availability of display space for contemporary art in the city of Glasgow.

Before this evaluative task can be undertaken. I want to put down some 'markers' - sign-posts towards some of the key themes that will be addressed throughout this paper. This involves a discussion of the relationship between theory and practice in distinct, but compatible activities; art, the display of art, audiences for art, and the historical and critical discourse surrounding this. These interdependent categories offer an area for analysis in which social and cultural change may be examined in relation to a context of changing political and economic climates.

It is useful, as a starting point, to consider the concept of 'contemporary art', which may at times seem to be problematic. The use of the term 'contemporary' can be seen to share some of the difficulties that are found in the use of the term 'modern'. As Raymond Williams has noted, the earliest uses of 'modern' were nearer to the current use of 'contemporary', "in the sense of something existing now, just now", co-temporary and of the same period. This use however, also included periods in the past, rather than "of our own immediate time". The use of 'modern' as both a comparative and historical term, distinct from 'ancient' and later 'medieval' was common by the 16th century.[1] 'Modernism' 'modernity' and 'modernist' furthered normative ideas of specialist practise, as did 'modernise' and 'modernisation'. To this effect, Williams notes that the term 'modern' has itself come to be distinguished from 'contemporary', shifting its reference from 'now' to 'just now' or even 'then', "and for some time has been a designation always going into the past with which 'contemporary' may be contrasted for its presentness".[2]

The mediation process between the production and consumption of 'contemporary art' – *how and what becomes present, or made visible* - is thus a critical area for study.

Much has been written on the role of the art museum within this process. However, I will explore the complexities of the process by which 'the work of art' enters the art museum, clarifying that art museums' audiences *actively* interpret a museum's

narrative and do not necessarily accept its ideological framework. For this reason, the multiplying narratives contributing to an audience's ability to recognise 'art', and which operate at the interstitial level between museums and audiences, provide fertile territory for art historical enquiry.

In particular, the praxis of the art-for-sale gallery, and the temporary exhibition that is its product has been questioned. Both Neil Mulholland and Suzannah Thompson have suggested that the history of contemporary Scottish art has been recorded via exhibitions, not criticism. Exhibitions have played the 'historicising role' in the construction of schools such as 1990's 'neo-conceptualism' and 1980's New Image painting. According to Thompson, "This is not necessarily a 'good thing' for art writing as it has led to an anecdotal and nostalgic mythmaking in Scotland which has sometimes passed for criticism or art history."[3] This may be so, but does not diminish the historical and cultural value that the exhibition as an entity in itself represents. For Simmel, art exhibitions function as symbolic fragments whose exploration reveals the effects of the totality of metropolitan life. "Modern art exhibitions are a 'characteristic indicator of the modern spirit'."[4] Simmel writes that its features are:

> The specialisation of achievements, the concentration of the most diverse
> forms in the narrowest space, the fleeting haste and excited hunt for
> impressions, the lack of sharply focused personalities, compensated for by
> a great wealth of strivings, tasks, stylistic genre that are carried by whole
> groups.[5]

Art exhibitions "form a miniature image of our intellectual currents; they belong to the symbols of our transitional times."[6] In this sense, the construction of temporary exhibitions is not essentially an uncritical praxis, as Thompson suggests, relying, like all historiography and criticism on the selection, rejection and interpretation of objects and information in order to mediate a particular way of seeing. Thus to see the temporary exhibition as uncritical in its 'historicising role' fails to distinguish between "criticism as (displaced) social distinction and criticism as 'judgement' to declared (social and formal) criteria, where the latter is made "inside the process" rather than "above the process."[7]

What is distinctive about Simmel's analysis is the relationship between the development of the metropolis, the social relationships generated by this and the manner by which these are then represented and exhibited through a culture of 'things' which itself *is* human culture.

Will Bradley writes:

> Since the mid -1960s it's been accepted that the meaning of art, or of most
> things, is a moving target. Everybody knows that an artist can't control the
> way their work is received, that everyone who sees a given artwork will have
> a different experience and will give it a subtly or wildly different meaning
> that will also change from day to month to year. But once a work gets given
> a place in the canon of art history, in the museum or the catalogue, most of
> these unique interpretations are re-framed as wrong, or ill-informed, or just
> no longer relevant. We get the short-cut version. The work becomes the emblem
> of its own significance, and that's the thing that strangles it, traps it in a well
> maintained dead-end.[8]

Bradley's Foucaldian interpretation of the relationship between an object and its
surrounding discourse has become a common theme within contemporary debate.[9] As
Bradley's text makes explicit, the museum, and the discipline of art history are
likened to a specific form of enclosure and confinement, the penitentiary or asylum,
instilling a normalising scrutiny directed at the modification of behaviour. However,
as Marshall Berman points out, Foucault is obsessed with prisons, hospitals, asylums
– resulting in "an excruciating series of variations on the Weberian themes of the iron
cage and the human nullities whose souls are shaped to fit the bars."[10] There is, for
Berman, no freedom in Foucault's world. Any inquiry into the human condition is
merely an addition to "the triumphant discourse of power". Berman writes:

> Any criticism rings hollow, because the critic himself or herself is "in
> the panoptic machine, invested by its effects of power, which we bring
> to ourselves, since we are part of its mechanism."[11]

As a contrast to his perceived notion of a constraining mechanism by which he
characterises art history and the museum, Bradley discusses a fictional museum of the
future, "at the end of human history". This vast museum contains a sub-section for
'art' which includes a 'sub' sub-section for 20th century art. Bradley shares something
with T.J. Clark's "Farewell to an Idea" (1999). Here, Clark sees 'modernism'
unearthed by a future archaeologist in the form of "a handful of disconnected pieces
left over from a holocaust that had utterly wiped out the pieces' context – their
history, the family of languages they belonged to, all traces of built environment."[12]

Clark's and Bradley's conclusions are radically different. Where Clark retains his
commitment to modernism as enlightenment philosophy and its potential for progress

through reason and knowledge, Bradley's vision perhaps confirms Clarke's worst fears. Bradley imagines three 'conflicting' opinions relating to the display of 20th century art. The first wants to exhibit them according to contemporary ideas so that the audience can better understand them. The second group wants to establish the environment in which the objects were made and display the objects so as to reflect the values of the 'ancient world'. Finally, there is a third group, "whose research has led them to believe that the function of the artefacts was never precisely understood or agreed upon even at the time of their creation". This group suggests that in some cases, "even the original makers were reluctant to elaborate their meaning or purpose, and that for every interpretation it is possible to find a refutation or opposite reading". From this last group, Bradley envisages that a few, "may even venture to give this last suggestion the status of a historical law."[13]

While he rightly highlights the contingency of knowledge structures as contested terrain, Bradley's own short-cut here to the logic of post modernism illustrates the contradictions of post modernist theory very well. Freed from modernism's totalising grand narratives, and claims to truth, post modern theory offers a new grand narrative, a new revisionist law, but one in which one concept is as good as another. This, as Eldridge notes, calls the legitimacy of intellectual activity into question. Eldridge writes:

> [...] – after all experts are always disagreeing. They can no longer be taken seriously and should be put out of harm's way and sent into the playground where they can argue about ontologies, epistemologies, and 'forms of life' to their heart's content. Whether they should receive public funding for such indulgence is another matter. Sooner or later it will be raised as a question.[14]

Eldridge recalls Saul Bellow's sardonic comment in *Humboldt's Gift*, "In the past, thoughts were too real to be kept like a cultural portfolio of stocks and bonds. But now, we have mental assets. As many views as you like. Five different epistemologies in an evening. Take your choice. They're all agreeable, and not one is binding or necessary or has true strengths or speaks straight to the soul."[15]

Of course, intellectual differences are to be welcomed and expected through the emergence of alternative and oppositional interpretations and particularly with increased technological advancements. Technology not only facilitates new sources of knowledge and methods of study, but also can facilitate the communication of knowledge. There is, however, a distinction between the questioning and

transformation of orthodoxy and the dismissal of their social construction as subjective fiction.

To this extent, within Bradley's futuristic museum and to his imaginary curators, a fourth group might be added. This group may want to know *why* the function of the artefacts was not agreed upon or fully understood by all in the context of their production. What was the context that shaped the original makers' reluctance to elaborate on meaning and purpose? What selection processes worked to preserve some objects over others? A historical law decreeing the contingency of knowledge is not enough.

The institution of the art museum offers a prime example in which a process of coming to terms with the contingency of knowledge is, quite literally, displayed. Some attention to this is worthwhile in light of Bradley's comments above. Bradley, as already noted, is not alone in his criticism of the museum and art history. Prior notes that a substantial amount of scholarship now focuses on the art museum, witnessed by the growth of 'museum studies' departments in higher education; "courses that pore over the details of museum policy, object relations and social change."[16]

The discipline of museum studies may be new, but as Harris reminds us, "Art history has always acknowledged and given significant weight to the role of public institutions in determining aspects of art production and consumption." Harris points towards scholars such as Hauser, Haskell and Crow, whose work has featured art academies and patronage of varying types – religious, royal, state and bourgeois.[17] More recently, the work of Carol Duncan and Alan Wallach have blended aspects of religious and bourgeois power structures to suggest ways in which the museum performs a ritual and ceremonial function. Duncan writes:

> In referring to museums as ceremonial monuments, my intention is to emphasise the museum experience as a monumental creation in its own right, a cultural artefact that is much more than what we used to understand as 'museum architecture'. Above all, the museum is not the neutral and transparent sheltering space that it is often claimed to be.[18]

While Duncan may be justified to see the museum as a monument, like the metropolis itself in which it finds its form, the dynamic nature of both metropolis and museum are lost in her analysis. The metaphor of the monument here implies a static, fixed, relationship. Walter Benjamin saw the metropolis as a monument to modernity, but

his ideas were centred on modernity's ambiguous qualities of change and flux. In part 3, the social and cultural effects of this in Glasgow will be explored. Berman articulates the nature of this type of modernity with great clarity, and is worth quoting at length.

> There is a mode of vital experience – experience of space and time, of the self and others, of life's possibilities and perils – that is shared by men and women all over the world today. I will call this experience "modernity." To be modern is to find ourselves in an environment that promises adventure, power, joy, growth, transformation of ourselves and the world – and at the same time, that threatens to destroy everything that we have, everything that we know, everything that we are. Modern environments and experiences cut across all boundaries of geography and ethnicity, of class and nationality, of religion and ideology: in this sense modernity can be said to unite all mankind. But it is a paradoxical unity, a unity of disunity: it pours us all into a maelstrom of perpetual disintegration and renewal, of struggle and contradiction, of ambiguity and anguish. To be modern is to be part of a universe in which, as Marx said, "all that is solid melts into air"[19]

In light of Berman's melting description of modernity, the relationship between art historians and the art museum as Duncan describes it, can be seen as highly questionable. For Duncan, the business of art historians is to obligingly supply the 'voracious demand' of the art museum with a continuous production of 'great artists'. Where art history cannot quite come up with the goods, as it were, "a fair or just good Great Artist is still a serviceable item in today's museum business."[20] Ignored in Duncan's perspective, and without reference as to the *exact* nature of the art historian's service to the changing face of the museum, is the historical specificity, and most importantly the contingency of knowledge, in which such social relationships occur. According to Duncan:

> In the museum, art history displaces history, purges it of social and political conflict, and distils it down to a series of triumphs, mostly of individual genius. Of course, what the museum presents as the community's history, beliefs and identity may represent only the interests and self image of certain powers within the community. Such deceit, however, does not necessarily lessen the effectiveness of the monument's ritual structure as such.[21]

Thus, for Duncan, by following a route through a "programmed narrative – in this case one or another version of the history of art" museum visitors are hypodermically injected with the 'official' version of a constructed collective memory. By emphasising the concept of a 'ritual performance' occurring in the museum, Duncan sees the museum site as 'transformative' both in terms of its objects and its audience. Unlike objects however, audiences are not passive. The idea that a collective memory is deceptively transmitted and constructed is difficult to accept. Stanley Cohen asks:

> Can a whole society 'remember' and 'forget' its past in the same way
> individuals do their auto-biographical pasts? Why are private memories
> of public events – a coup, a war, an assassination – different from authorised
> versions? When does an event pass from living memory into history, or
> pre-history? When is collective memory gradually constructed as a shared
> democratic experience; when does it arise from state-organised memory
> work: memorial sites, ceremonies, marches and monuments?[22]

While forms of historicism may be exemplified in the museum, the museum itself does not exist in isolation and neither do its narratives.

Rather than see art history as an integral procedural component within 'history', Duncan maintains an age-old methodological practice. This enterprise, which Duncan is ironically and essentially critical of, separates 'art' from 'life' and as such, maintains the distinction. Her critique of the museum thus suffers from a failure to recognise art, and art history, as practice, and as social process, above art as product. For Duncan, the sum of the total production of art – culminating in its apparently 'unquestioned' reception as such - is a question of power. But, as with Foucault, the nature of that power is left unsaid. Who is empowered, to what extent, and under what circumstances deserves some attention.

In a useful survey entitled 'Art and its Publics'[23], Andrew McClellan brings together a collection of essays which discuss the premise that "museums are where the great majority of people in the West today encounter art". McClellan continues:

> Since their inception two centuries ago, museums have been vested with
> with ever greater responsibility to define what qualifies as art. Art is what
> is shown in museums. Art may also exist outside of museums, of course, but
> its status as such may be questioned in a way it never is inside a museum,
> especially where abstract or conceptual works are concerned. At the same time,
> and in direct proportion, a viewer's confidence in passing aesthetic judgement

decreases beyond a museum's walls. The public's confidence in such matters

is never great, but museums exist to provide essential guidance and reassurance

and, by and large, the public is content to follow the lead of professional

curators and educators. [24]

McClellan, like Duncan, awards the museum a significant degree of social and

cultural power by which the art object is legitimised through a crude base and

superstructure argument. In doing so, the dynamics of the social relationships

involved are subject to inattention. As I will go on to demonstrate by reference to the

Compass Gallery in conjunction with the work of Raymond Williams and briefly,

Pierre Bourdieu, this approach is problematic, and at times, distorting.

The art gallery and museum are certainly powerful signal systems of both occasion

and place. Williams writes:

The case of an art gallery is an especially obvious case. It is a place

specialised and designated for looking at painting or drawing or

sculpture as art. This signal is so established and conventional that it

hardly has to be noticed. Indeed the gallery can be seen as if it were

only (which of course is it also) a mere technical device for the objects

to be displayed. [25]

While it would be foolish to deny any factor of consecration or ideological premise

at work in the public art gallery, precisely because the art gallery is a powerful signal,

the selection of objects as art/non-art and accompanying narratives may be either

accepted or rejected by its audiences. Given that the museum is engaged in a

communicative process between art and its audiences, it is reasonable to make

connections with other areas of communication studies and research.

THE ACTIVE AUDIENCE THEORY AND ITS CRITIQUE.

Audience reception studies have been particularly prevalent within 'media studies' -

for example the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies and the

Glasgow University Media Group. Their attention has turned, amongst other things, to

the role of the mass media – the *effects* of cinema, television, advertising, news

coverage – in shaping the lives, thoughts, and in the case of violence especially, the

actions of those who partake in it. Much of this research can be of value to an

increasingly reflexive art history in which, as Prior reflects, the nominally bounded

disciplines such as sociology, art history, political theory and museum studies can interact, and become meaningless, once a process-account of cultural forms begins.[26]

Specifically, the development of the 'active audience' theory and its critique offers important ways of looking at both the art museum and its public that attempt to preclude Duncan's 'top down' theory of power whilst resisting the reification of subjectivity implied by Bradley.

The 'active audience' theory sets out to illustrate the ways in which people actively engage with the books they read, the films or television programmes they watch and the radio broadcasts they listen to, within the contexts of their own lives. This engagement often prioritises the issue of pleasure and ideas of the variety of uses and gratification extracted from media consumption. As Jenny Kitzinger puts it:

> This work seeks to locate the sources and nature of such delight instead
> of dismissing it as evidence of gullibility or proof of effective media
> manipulation [27]

Kitzinger considers three merits of the active audience theory that are applicable to museum studies. Firstly, a focus on pleasure suggests that "pleasure is not simply determined by identifying with the appropriate characters or messages". Secondly, the idea of a homogeneous viewing/listening public is disrupted through attention to differing readings against issues of class, ethnic identity, gender as well as sexual identity. Thirdly, Kitzinger emphasises the degree by which work with audiences challenges textual determinism:

> It discredits the assumption that the text alone determines audience response.
> It demonstrates that viewers and listeners will not necessarily adopt the
> perspective intended by the film producers, script writers or journalists:
> people do not always take on the subject position, or ideological meaning
> inscribed in the text.[28]

The recognition of the active audience has made a crucial intervention to "uncontested condescending portraits of women (or 'the working class' or any other subordinate group) as 'cultural dupes', victims of the dominant cultural order, swallowing pre-digested tracts which promote ideas and values which are against their own interests."[29]

Yet, at the same time, this research innovation has at times been replaced by "endless banal replication" which may also serve to close down possible areas of investigation. The valorisation of every private act of consumption, which can been

9

seen in Bradley's comments above, can work to suggest that all oppositional readings are somehow liberating through demonstrating the capacity for resistance to particular ideological frameworks. As Kitzinger asserts, and this is an important point, this practice may reveal a great deal about the consumption patterns of audiences, but rather less on 'citizenship'. While many cultural theorists are eager to demonstrate the ways in which ordinary people show the ability to resist and subvert a dominant culture, Todd Gitlin notes the triviality that underpins some of these claims:

> Resistance, meaning all sorts of grumbling, multiple interpretation,
> semiological inversion, pleasure, rage, friction, numbness, what have
> you – 'resistance' is accorded dignity, even glory, by stamping these
> not-so-great refusals with a vocabulary derived from life threatening
> work against fascism – as if the same concept should serve for the Chinese
> student uprising and cable TV grazing. [30]

Thus, resistance may consist of refusing to consume, consuming ironically, or by ironic commentary, "from changing the world to changing the word." [31] However, as I will show in part 2, changing the 'word' can be an important act. For Williams, historical semantic contestation of received terms was a key step in all of his sociological work.

Recognition of an object's possibility for multiple responses and changing interpretations has been central to both art history and the art museum, evidenced by the continuing emergence of new studies exploring new questions to existing discourses. This is an inherent contradiction within Foucaldian metaphors in that they not only describe art history and the art museum as confining, but are in themselves confining strategies with no real relationship between theory and practice. Privileging the polysemic nature of objects undermines the fact that for some artists, there is clearly, in contrast to Bradley's assumption, an intention to control the way in which their work is received, or in other words, an attempt to convey a 'preferred reading'. This is not to argue that the preferred reading will always occur, or that even when it does, as with some advertising, it will guarantee the success of a particular work. Thus, a distinction can be made between 'response' as voluntaristic and a response in which informed contextual understanding takes place without one necessarily subverting the other. At times, polysemy, or the multiple meanings of the object being ultimately conferred by the viewer, may be the artist's intention - but not always. Jonathan Harris notes that a distinctive feature of contemporary art is an 'in-

built' polyvalence. An intention for multiple meanings from the outset, is "a tactic, or condition of practice that continues to undermine established assumptions about the role of criticism itself." However, as he also points out, the relativism of judgement that accompanies and ratifies such work precludes any critical evaluation of its quality.[32]

Furthermore, against Bradley's somewhat arrogant statement, in reality, does *'everybody'* know this? Vera Zolberg writes:

> It is not clear that in a 'post-modern' world, in which aesthetic relativism
> seems to obviate 'standards', it is still valid to think that there is only
> elite culture. The Art Museum, after all, is no stranger to the avant –
> gardes that have tried to overthrow traditional boundaries between
> formerly hierarchicalised genres of fine and low art, academic styles and
> commercial designs, or to promote the co-existence of art styles and
> unconventional forms. If there seems to be an 'anything goes' ethos
> in the world of fine art, however, this does not mean that the tastes cultures
> of all social status groups are valued equally.[33]

Instead, this type of pluralism may represent only the participatory access to an extension of the range of goods in a sufficiently diversified art market.

Since the 1970s, the work of Pierre Bourdieu has provided an important theoretical perspective on the reception practises of art audiences. For Bourdieu, all cultural practise is imbued with systems of domination. While they may not cause or create class divisions or inequalities, "art and cultural consumption are predisposed, consciously and deliberately or not, to fulfil a social function of legitimating social difference."[34] In this way, cultural practises are seen to contribute to the process of social reproduction.

Bourdieu's work will be given more direct attention in the final part of this dissertation. For the moment, however, it is sufficient to recognise, with Bourdieu, that museum and gallery audiences are complex and that reception processes require empirical data, both quantitative and qualitative for any understanding.

As Danielle Rice outlines:

> Many different narratives propose to represent the art museum as
> institution and to characterise the "museum experience". However,
> although the past two decades have seen a substantial increase in
> museological theory, the relationship between theory and practice is

irrelevant to most theorists who see museums primarily as ideological symbols of the power relationships in today's culture.[35]

For Rice, there is a "slippage between theory and practice" resulting in an "illusory museum or a series of illusory museums" which evolves alongside this scholarship.[36] As a museum professional herself, Rice is critical of what she sees as an image created of the museum as a monolithic representative of elite taste and institutional power. She rightly points towards the multiple narratives which shape how museums may come to be represented in contemporary thought, and which are brought in to the reception processes of its visitors. According to Rice:

> The process whereby museums enter and shape the conversation that is called contemporary culture is more complex than much existing literature would have us believe. That is because museums stand at a crossroads between history, high culture and popular culture, and a single discipline, such as art history, is often inadequately narrow for defining this hybrid.[37]

There are two points to be made about Rice's comments here. One is regarding the use of the term 'contemporary' and the second relates to the critical ability of art history as a discipline.

Firstly, in reference to the term 'contemporary' as defining what is present, the enlightening role of the art museum as a tool for the education of desire may become *increasingly more complex* within an advancing capitalist system. As already stated, increased technological developments in (now global) communication media are important for considering how such multiple narratives on the museum evolve. This is recognised early in Benjamin's account of "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction"[38] and the disruption of a concept of 'aura' surrounding the authentic work of art via the advent of the photograph and an increased viewing audience. Yet at the same time, as Allan Sekula notes, the elevation of photography to a 'high art' form has also transformed the photographic print into a privileged commodity through which 'aura' has been restored but now to the mass-communications industry itself[39].

Cheap colour printing, television, now including designated 'art channels' and the internet have all come to contribute to the publicity of art forms in powerful ways. While technology may carry the potential for a more open and democratic society, the ownership of these mass communication systems may also defend itself via the

creation of new technologies, new property rights, including intellectual property rights, and systems of control. This has become an issue particularly in pop music through the practice of 'sampling' and at the same time raises new questions about the artist's role as creator.

As John Berger writes:

> In the cities in which we live, all of us see publicity images every day of our lives. No other kind of image confronts us so frequently. In no other form of society in history has there been such a concentration of images, such a density of visual messages. One may remember or forget these messages but briefly one takes them in, and for a moment they stimulate the imagination by way of either memory or expectation. The publicity image belongs to the moment.[40]

As Berger continues, advertising and art support each other in complex ways, each may make use of the other's properties and techniques. The 'high' or 'fine art' image may suggest cultural authority, dignity and wisdom, and its appearance in publicity images attempts to make the product (and its potential purchaser) credible in these terms. Likewise, the language of mass production has entered 'fine' art – the innovations of Picasso, Braque, and Duchamp have now become the mannerisms for 'Brit Art' and the young British artists (yBa's). Publicity surrounding these artists was deftly manipulated by, amongst others, art impresario and advertising guru, Charles Saatchi. Saatchi, well versed in media theory, and the language of demographic niche marketing, had a professional interest the activities of 'sub-cultures'. Aside from this, he also had an informed interest in free-market policy. That "Labour isn't working" was the Saatchi-coined billboard slogan associated with Thatcherite policy, clearly expressed his own aims, interests and ideas.

Whatever the arguments as to the critical status of Brit Art or the yBas, the artists associated with these headline grabbing and so- called 'movements', provide a useful platform. Here, the relationship between the public and the private, or the corporate intervention towards shaping cultural practice, can continue to be addressed. C-T Wu provides a critical and particularly thorough analysis of Saatchi's networking role in 'hot-housing' and price-fixing certain artists for personal and corporate financial profit.[41] Wu discusses Saatchi's dealings whilst a trustee at the Whitechapel Gallery in London though which he made bulk purchases from two artists prior to major exhibitions of their work. She notes his company to be reported as having made at

least £15 million profit through selling art. Not all of this is redirected to art. Hans Haacke's work "Global Marketing" has detailed Saatchi's involvement, through an affiliate company, with the South African Nationalist Party, helping to promote a change in the country's constitution, which according to Haacke, would buttress apartheid.[42] It is then not simply a question of judging the quality of the art made for and supported by capitalists. Beyond this is the harder reality of the wider cultural processes generated and supported by this system of planned trade in the spectacle.

For some writers, this corporate intervention appears as an unstoppable force. Neil Mulholland's account of recent art in Britain exemplifies this view.[43] Mulholland sets out to address "the indeterminate relationships between institutions and practical/ theoretical shifts in the British art world from 1973 to the end of 2000."[44] Hesitant to make use of what he sees as a 'problematic' narrative tradition which "tends to eliminate contradiction", Mulholland wants to offer a 'non-unified' version of events, hoping to present 'a refracted picture of the period in some of its complexity'.

While it is not my intention to undertake a fully comprehensive literature review here, I do want to take the time to question aspects of his methodology. As Harris comments, "historical and critical analysis means minute attention to the kinds of language – the figures of speech and modes of rhetoric – that necessarily order and articulate writing, bringing a world and subjective identities into existence."[45] By engaging with Mulholland's way of telling, which is, despite his reservations, still a narrative, it can be argued that it is not the narrative form itself that is problematic, however the manner of its construction and the ways in which it used may be. For Williams, the narrative form was a material representation of an underlying stance and approach which offers to show people and their relationships in essentially knowable and communicable ways.[46]

There is no reason why narrative form should "eliminate contradiction", indeed, the method is entirely suitable to accounting for, and in the best examples, explaining some of that contradiction.

Despite Mulholland's impressive grasp of theoretical debate and issues, the introduction, and indeed most of the book, is permeated by the above phrases in which 'indeterminate', 'non-unified' and 'refracted' are the keywords. There is a resignation to the power of capitalist forces rather than any attempt to analyse and critique this complexity – or, more importantly, to suggest ways to turn them back. In a sharp review of the book, Kerstin Mey asserts;

> Saturated with cynical disillusionment he hands out criticism left, right and centre, and demonstrates eagerly that (all) radical and/or subversive approaches and gestures eventually succumb, become complicit with, or are assimilated by, the pre-dominant capitalist culture, testifying to the system's ability to neutralise and 'commodify dissent' successfully. Thus, the author allows no hope for renewal and change.[47]

Although marked by pessimism, and partly because of this, Mulholland's account does do some justice to the complexity of the debates that shape contemporary culture. The book provides a topographical and chronological survey unpacking the theoretical premises of competing art practices. Each theory is in turn, countered by another, thus having the effect of rendering any alternative or oppositional practice as futile. This is in part due to an unchanging dominant concept of 'the art world' as the circulation of commodities which is his standard base for comparison; an insular establishment against which, as well as within which such activity attempts to restructure the current dominant concept. In these terms, any successful restructuring of that establishment is simply the negation of the alternative practice by its assimilation, rather than an expansion of participation within the process of renegotiating that 'establishment'. Williams has outlined that while it is vital to understand how new work can be incorporated, specialised, labelled and displaced by the fact that it becomes known, it is equally vital to recognise areas of genuine reform, and to challenge the idea of an inevitable future.[48] Williams writes;

> It is not some unavoidable real world, with its laws of economy and laws of war, that is now blocking us. It is a set of identifiable processes of *realpolitik* and *force majeure*, of nameable agencies of power and capital, distraction and disinformation, and all these interlocking with the embedded short-term pressures and the interwoven subordinations of an adaptive common-sense. It is not in staring at these blocks that there is any chance of movement past them. They have been named so often that they are not even, for most people, news. The dynamic moment is elsewhere, in the difficult business of gaining confidence in *our own* energies and capacities.[49]

Mulholland's epochal analysis focuses on the IMF crisis of 1976 and attempts to show how art was made a 'scapegoat' by this event. This is primarily illustrated by reference to Carl Andre's "Equivalent VIII", (1969; 120 firebricks, 12.7 x 68.6 x229.2 cm, Tate London). The acquisition of this work and its accompanying (and costly)

restoration after a protest act of vandalism at the tax payers' expense, are posited by Mulholland as focussing the debate on 'cultural authority' within the public domain. This debate, according to Mulholland, was inspired by the criticism that appeared in the Daily Mirror about the Tate's activities.

That a significant part of this debate took place within the more exclusive realm of professional arts journals than in the tabloid press merits greater attention. It is not enough to cite Carl Andre's own testament to the ' critical crisis' (if indeed there was actually a *crisis*) surrounding his work. There are questions that can be raised here about the nature of the 'public' domain. Andre's comments on the reception of his work appeared in the shelter of the first edition of arts journal *Art Monthly*. Andre's acknowledgement that the debate around his sculpture may be more important than the work itself referred to his 'red-top' interlocutors. The suggestion was that through tabloid ridicule in terms of 'the emperor's new clothes', such 'popular' coverage effectively helped to extend the work outside its 'modernist' frame, "dragging contemporary British art along for the ride."[50]

The cultural arena, including the tabloid press, in which arguments for, against and about art were conducted, is represented by, what Mulholland sees, as two opposing camps and the transition from one ideology to the other – "Keynesian culturalism" to "monetarist populism". The polarities assumed by Mulholland are not elaborated on, and thus his perceived transition between one and the other remains vague. The relationship between mass production, 'populism' and popular culture is not straightforward. The mass communications industry, and particularly the tabloid press, can be shown to be both Keynesian, in a narrowly paternalistic sense through their bourgeois mode of production origins, but simultaneously, explicitly monetarist. Monetarist policy is fraught with conflict and Keynesian economics, more so its relationship with 'culturalism' is highly complex. As I will show, these two categories are unstable, and in many ways also subjective. They are not mutually exclusive and as such are simply two sides of the same mode of cultural production. However, the important argument here is that ideologies are never uniform or neatly unified. Although epochal analysis can help to show a characteristic dominant ideology and its appropriate cultural form, it makes little sense unless the complex social structure of Britain at that time is fully understood. Mulholland's study is a 'reflectionist' model in which the art and culture generated is generated by an economic base where art is part of the superstructure. As Wolff notes, an overemphasis on the socio-economic

base (such as the IMF crisis) risks obscuring ideas of cross-cultural influence and cultural development and change which comes, as it were, from outside that base.[51] Where cross-cultural influence is shown in Mulholland's work this is in terms of a London-centric model of the art world, and an apparently contaminating effect on Scottish (or more appropriately, Glasgow) artists whose work is originated *by* the market. While there may be market symmetry in areas of cultural production, the recognition of asymmetry and attention to the less extreme models of cultural commodification provided Williams with contradictions to Adorno's 'Culture Industry' thesis.

In light of the fact that Mulholland's period of political, economic, social and cultural change has implications for my own area of study, some of these issues can be usefully addressed here. A broader historical overview (Part 3) suggests that Mulholland's theoretical model is not altogether appropriate for the development of the increased visibility and diversification of art in Glasgow.

The Keynesian consensus to full employment was an important aspect of nation-state reconstruction after the Second World War. Government intervention could regulate the demand for goods and services in the economy by injecting more demand by public expenditure than it took out by taxation. By increasing the level of economic activity, and boosting the demand for labour this in turn supported reducing unemployment. At the same time, this could be used to prevent inflationary pressures if employment looked like it might become too full or if demand in the economy threatened to exceed supply. Post-war employment figures were impressive and were in stark contrast to the 1920s and 30s. From a norm of anywhere between 1 million and often 3 million unemployed, under Atlee's government, unemployment figures fell to below half a million despite incorporating the millions of service men and women released from their war duties. With the exception of winter 1963, unemployment figures remained low until the end of the 1960s.[52]

Nonetheless, the post war settlement was limited by its lack of commitment to workers' rights *at* work. It was not until the 1970s that a law recognised basic employee rights to job security, discipline and health and safety. Furthermore, democracy within the workforce was limited by issues of gender and ethnicity. Even after acceptance of the principles of equal pay and non-discrimination and the Equal Pay act of 1970 followed by the Sex Discrimination act of 1976, women's hourly earnings increased from 63% of their male counterparts' earnings to only 74% of this.

Full employment, increased welfare services (the administration of which provided an increase in white-collar work) and progressive taxation did not abolish poverty, nor did they herald equality or even equality of opportunity.[53] Thus, an article in *The Economist*, January 1966 concluded:

> About 84% of the wealth seems to be owned by the top 7% of taxpayers....
> And the reason for this extreme concentration is not that a few have such
> vast wealth. It is that so many have virtually no wealth.[54]

One problem with Keynesian economic strategy is reflected by an assumption of a closed economy. A. P. Thirlwall comments that "A Keynesian approach to the functioning of capitalism cannot ignore the balance of payments, or more precisely the export decision relative to the propensity to import". Thirlwall notes a theoretical shift in the approach, which now embraces functioning of the world economy and the mutual interaction between countries:

> What unites Keynesian economists, however, is the facile belief that
> we live in a world in which the functioning of markets guarantees the
> long-run full employment of resources, and even if we did, that it would
> have any relevance.[55]

The rapid expansion of world trade had serious consequences for domestic inflation rates in Britain. British economic growth appeared to lag behind other industrial countries. This relatively low growth "bred a productive system which was un-dynamic, less able to respond to world markets, less able to compete in domestic markets and less able to grow in the future because of the resultant balance of payment constraints. Britain's share of world trade declined steadily".[56]

Government attempts to control the situation oscillated between 'cooling' the economy by restraining demand, and avoiding rising unemployment by doing the opposite. Dissatisfaction with Britain's economic performance during the 1960s began to turn attention to the relationship between trade unions and employers and to changes in the bargaining power of workers who no longer had the threat of high unemployment constraining their demands.

The use of these new bargaining powers by workers could bid up wages faster than production increases, or alternatively restrict production to bargain for wage rises emphasising that the Keynesian strategy of full employment was dangerously inflationary. Higher wage bills' effects on commodity prices were seen to reduce the competitive ability of British production in the world market. By 1976, the British

economy could no longer sustain underwriting full employment, which was itself no longer a reality as manufacturing output had been falling steadily throughout the 70s further compounded by an 'oil shock' which saw the price of imported oil quadrupled. Thus in 1976, the government was forced to secure a loan from the International Monetary Fund (the construction of which it had been a prime instigator) for the sum of £3.5 billion . Labour Party Prime Minister James Callaghan addressed his party's conference that year stating:

> It used to be thought that a nation could just spend its way out of recession and increase employment by cutting taxes and boosting government spending: I tell you in all candour that option no longer exists.[57]

This is not however to confirm Mulholland's account that "Following the International Monetary Fund crisis in the autumn of 1976, policies now characterised as Thatcherite were fully launched by James Callaghan, who reduced public spending by £2 billion in two years."[58] As Eldridge , Cressey and MacInnes point out:

> Whilst it has been suggested that it was the events of 1976 and the attention paid to monetary targets by Labour's chancellor Dennis Healey which launched government economic policy on a monetarist strategy, it would be difficult to argue that it was 1976 rather than 1979 which marked the decisive break in government policy. Unemployment at over 1 million was certainly not 'full' employment, and public expenditure had been cut; but the government still believed it was responsible for the level of employment and could intervene through its macroeconomic strategy and consultation with employers and unions to bring both unemployment and inflation down.[59]

The distinction marking the 'new right' of the 1979 Thatcher government was its role in completely removing the 'restrictions' on the free market in labour, such as union powers and the minimum wage. 1979 marked a major change in government attitude towards the public. As Philo and Miller show, the Thatcher government sought to remove any limits on the processes of accumulation and the power of capital in the market, "and to 'de-regulate' and allow larger units of capital to form, (to increase profitability) and of course to reward the 'wealth makers'". In this aspect, Philo and Miller explain, "the 'new right' looked back to an older society."[60] Another crucial change to patterns of social ownership (and a public service ethos of care and

security) came through the de-nationalisation of industry and the privatisation of public utilities, such as gas, electricity and water. Philo and Miller state;

> What had been seen as public services became merely commodities to be sold. In a free market the social right to have clean water or to be warm could depend on the ability to pay. Policy in this area was no longer to be determined by 'public service' companies, but by private industry whose ownership and shareholders were international.[61]

As Kirsten Mey is right to point out:

> Mulholland has used the IMF crisis as a disputable point of departure for his historical project. Yet, his discussion of the situatedness of emerging politics of representation and their support structures in Britain hardly acknowledges the international and global operations of capitalism, including its cultural industries, nor does it attempt to trace intercultural exchanges and cross-fertilisations.[62]

For Mulholland, the limited economic arena that he offers provides the necessary pre-history to Saatchi's "alleged dominance of the British art scene, charting the 'pedigree' of the yBa's of the 1980s and 90s". According to Mulholland, "Current British art is the legacy of this competition for power over the production and interpretation of art"[63]. This may be so, but such a competition is by itself nothing new.[64] Chin-tao Wu recognises this "persistent battle between various sectors of society that seek to lay claim to a legitimate culture."

> The contest expresses itself, at different historical junctures, in various formulations, sometimes reinstating itself in the elitism/populism divide, sometimes declaring itself in terms of the Establishment and the community, as it did in the 1970s, and at other times transforming itself, as in the debate between the metropolis and the regions in the 1980s. [65]

As Vera Zolberg's earlier quote identified, art museums are not strangers to the display of avant-garde work and its attempts to overthrow traditional boundaries of high and low culture. What is at issue with Saatchi and the yBa's, is the space which free market policy created for increased corporate intervention within cultural production. Equally, the speed by which certain forms of art become made visible, or in other words contemporary, is increased. Robert Hughes notes the necessary relationship between art and money, and suggests that this relationship does not

20

necessarily corrupt "the wells of imagination." His argument is relevant to this discussion:

> The idea that money, patronage and trade automatically corrupt the wells of imagination is a pious fiction, believed by some utopian lefties and a few people of genius such as [William] Blake but flatly contradicted by history itself. The work of Titian and Bernini, Piero della Francesca and Poussin, Reisener and Chippendale would not exist unless someone paid for them, and paid well. Picasso was a millionaire at forty, and that didn't harm him. On the other hand, some painters are millionaires at thirty and that can't help them. Against the art starlet one sees waddling about like a Strasbourg goose, his ego distended to gross proportion by the obsequies of the market, one has to weigh the many artists who have been stifled by indifference and the collapse of confidence it brings. On the whole, money does artists much more good than harm. The idea that one benefits from cold water, crusts and debt collectors is now almost extinct, like belief in the reformatory power of flogging.[66]

Yet, as C.W.Mills has highlighted:

> "You cannot possess art merely by buying it; you cannot support art merely by feeding artists – although that does help. To possess it you must earn it by participating in what it takes to design and create it. To support it, you must catch in your consumption of it something of what is involved in the production of it."[67]

While Mulholland is certainly right to emphasise the role of corporate power and the manner by which certain art forms become visible over others, his dissent is inferred rather than explicit. In the case of the yBas, there is a need to consider why the political ambivalence harboured by an intentional polysemic aesthetic might be attractive to a free-marketeer patron such as Saatchi. C.W.Mills notes the creation of built-in obsolescence and contrived fashion that is a feature of merchandising and publicity:

> "In this vast merchandising mechanism of advertising and design, there is no inherent social purpose to balance its greater social power; there is no built-in responsibility to anybody except the man who makes the profit."[68]

Thus, there is also a need to keep check on the ownership of modes of cultural production and the relations between financial networks, media corporations and political processes. As Mills continues:

"The star system of American culture – along with the commercial hacks – tend to kill off the chance of the cultural workman to be a worthy craftsman. One is a smash hit *or* one is among the failures who are not produced; one is a best seller *or* one is among the hacks and failures; one is either absolutely tops *or* one is just nothing at all."[69]

Contemporary Scottish art has apparently not escaped the corporate process. It is, in Mulholland's view, the product of a process of decentralisation rather than democratisation – a 'cultural devolution' to be "increasingly simulated and recuperated by sizeable institutions such as Baltic, ICA and the Tate Modern".[70] Mulholland's assessment of the current state of contemporary Scottish art is driven by an endless search for theoretically adequate categories of analysis in the manner of post 1970s Cultural Studies and ultimately, is constrained by a historical overview sustained by a commitment to theoretical relativism, and often reductionism.

Thus, for Mulholland, "Cultural parochialisms are discreetly regulated as British subsidiaries precisely as a means of avoiding inflaming the English, Irish, Scottish and Welsh nationalisms characteristic of the art and politics of the 1980s."[71] This is a questionable view that paradoxically maintains a London-centric 'Art World' he seeks to discredit. Hence 'devolution' is given greater weight then 'democratisation'.

To acknowledge any process of democratisation in Scottish art, it is important to consider the development of art in Scotland at its so-called 'parochial' point. This is not as an exercise in civic or national pride, but instead highlights the concept of 'parochialism' itself as difficult to maintain.

Scotland, and particularly Glasgow, has a long history of politically centred artists' groups and artists' initiatives. These were inextricably linked to a sense of place The socialist, communist, and nationalist agendas of the 1930s, emerged in varying formations of these ideologies. and at times are articulated by a culturally diverse milieu including refugees and interned artists during and after the Second World War. However, for many of these groups, the struggle for a socialist and participatory democracy critically informed their practice. Acknowledging this lineage more fully within less visible, but still existing practices of contemporary Scottish art can offer a different model from Mulholland and undermine generalisations on the homogeneous nature of cultural change under late capitalism. This is to see, with Williams, that

> There is more eager and constructive work, more active caring and
> responsibility, than the official forms of culture permit us to recognise.

> It is true that these are shadowed by the most general and active dangers.
> They are shadowed also by the suspicion – which the official culture
> propagates but which also comes in on its own - that as the demonstration
> disperses, as the talk fades, as the book is put down, there is an old hard centre –
> the reproduction of a restricted every day reality – which we have temporarily
> bypassed or ideally superseded but which is there and settled and is what we
> have really to believe.[72]

In Mulholland's refracted record of events, values and views are shown to compete,
conflict and collide. Unfortunately, they remain stranded without reference to
anything beyond themselves. Placing Raymond Williams in the 'Keynesian idealist'
camp of a "culturalist tradition fostered by Matthew Arnold, F.R. Leavis, T.S Eliot
and Richard Hoggart"[73], Mulholland is, at best, short sighted. In a bid to negate the
narrative tradition he is so critical of he is, perhaps, not critical enough.

The assimilation of Hoggart's and Williams' work has been neatly summarised by
Paul Jones in "The Myth Of 'Raymond Hoggart'; On 'Founding Fathers' and Cultural
Policy". The myth of 'Raymond Hoggart' arrived via a newspaper review, referring
seriously to a book entitled "The Uses of Culture" by 'Raymond Hoggart'. Williams
himself was to comment on this, noting that while the two writers were seen as
inseparable at that time, they had in fact never met, and although clear about their
obvious common ground, most importantly, *as writers*, they were also very clear
about their differences.

As Jones states:

> 'Raymond Hoggart' has been a useful construct for some recent attempts
> to set the agenda for self-reflection within the field. The degree of difference
> between Raymond Williams' and Richard Hoggart's positions in the late
> 1950s and early 1960s is underplayed to secure an effective narrative contrast
> with cultural studies post-Althusserian phase. [74]

Jones continues that this practice, which he identifies in Stuart Hall's 1980
paradigmatic contrast between contemporaneously competing 'culturalist' and
'structuralist' paradigms, results in "the containment of even Williams' mature work
within the moment of 'Raymond Hoggart.'"[75] Thus, positions only ever held by
Hoggart are attributed to Williams, including those positions in Hoggart which were
openly criticised by Williams. Williams reserved his harshest criticism for Hoggart's

identification of 'popular culture', (commercial newspapers, magazines, entertainments etc) with 'working class culture'.

Williams writes:

> In fact the main source of this 'popular culture' lies outside the working
> class altogether, for it was instituted, financed and operated by the
> *bourgeoisie*, and remains typically capitalist in its methods of production
> and distribution. That working class people form the majority of the
> consumers of this material, along with considerable sections of other
> classes, does not, as a fact, justify this facile identification. In all of these
> matters, Hoggart's approach needs radical revision.[75]

While Williams was careful to acknowledge a debt to writers such as Arnold, Leavis and Eliot, emphasising what he considered to be their genuinely reforming principles, he was also sharply critical of certain areas of their practice. In particular, Arnold's opposition to the campaign for suffrage was intolerable for Williams. According to Jones, it is Williams' growing hostility towards Arnold that also marks his critique of Hoggart. Hoggart is seen as retaining elements of the idea of a 'cultural clerisy'. Thus, "Arnold becomes the index of the differences between the two. While Hoggart rejects Leavis's 'tetanus team' clerisy, he regularly returns for inspiration to Arnold's more 'disinterested' version."[77] It is worth noting, as Jones does, that throughout his own scrutiny of received formulas, Williams never makes use of a systematic category of 'working class culture'. Jones writes:

> Clearly, for Williams, the critique by 'scrutiny of ideas' of classist
> presumptions within the tradition, one of the central tasks of *Culture*
> *And Society*, is a responsibility the scholarship boy must practice.[78]

In doing so, his transformational cultural materialist project of analysis is laid bare. A detailed treatment of Williams' approach will take place in Chapter 2.

As Mulholland rightly points out, Williams spent three years on the board of the Arts Council of Great Britain. This does not however, as Mulholland asserts, demonstrate any allegiance to a 'Keynesian ideolgy'. As Chin-tao Wu makes clear, "Keynes was not only one of the most influential economists in Britain at the time, who just 'happened' to have an interest in the arts; he was also well connected in the arts world, in particular with the Bloomsbury Group."[79]

Williams saw the particular cultural formation of this group, self-characterised as essentially as a group of friends, but whose friendship was rooted in "the highly

specific and cultural institution which the University of Cambridge was and is."[80] The Bloomsbury group offer an important indicator by which Williams articulates his concept of a class fraction. The group is noted to be genuinely dissident towards the dominant order against militarism, colonialism, unmanaged capitalism, sexual inequalities and indifference to the arts. At the same time as it was based in opposition, this base was paradoxically expressed. This is not only in terms of sexual inequality, and the male dominance of the Bloomsbury set, but also through the group's coherence as and for the notion of free individuals. Bloomsbury are thus seen to belong integrally to the ruling class, serving the dominant order as well as being a coherent division of it, defined by the values of a specific higher education. Their activities, which Williams is careful not to diminish, reflected increasingly specialist rather than collective contributions. In this sense, "They were at once against its [the English Ruling Class] dominant ideas and values and still willingly, in all immediate ways, part of it." Williams writes:

> Thus, the extreme subjectivism of, for example, the novels of Virginia Woolf, belongs in the same formation as the economic interventionism as Keynes, who wanted not only to preserve the economic system by rationalising it, but to do this so that, within achieved stability, the real processes of civilised life could be extended, undisturbed. [81]

As I will go on to demonstrate, the interdependence of communication and a sense of community/collectivity were central to Williams' project.

Appointed a member of the ACGB in 1976 by Hugh Jenkins, the Labour minister then responsible, Williams' main interest in the council, and in contrast to Mulholland's alleged "Keynesian idealist" role on this committee, was predominantly the reform of the council itself. An important aspect of reform was to alter the appointment system for one of election. Within six months, Williams concluded that reform was not, at that present at least, possible. Despite offering his resignation twice, Williams stayed on for the duration of his term in an effort to contribute to public discussion from a critical perspective. This was a direct response against the paternalist principles of a cultural clerisy, which Williams saw in Bloomsbury, and that was still, effectively, dominant.

As O'Connor makes clear, Williams was well aware of the ACGB's internal contradictions stemming from the mandate of its founder, John Maynard Keynes.[82] In a lecture published posthumously, Williams refers to these origins of the council as

25

part of its current problems, noting that from the beginning there were confusions of definition and intentions. Williams notes four definitions and intentions of the council: state patronage of the fine arts; pump priming to the effect that in the long run the arts should be self supporting; as intervention in the market; and lastly, an expanding, serious and popular culture. Williams commented;

> It is evidently possible to hold them all within a single mind, indeed with a notably clean single mind. But as they pass from the level of public remarks and declarations to the level of public policies, first differences of emphasis and problems of priority, then actual contradictions soon emerge.[83]

Of these four areas, Williams' support goes to the last mentioned – that of an expanding, serious and popular culture. As O'Connor notes, the development of this fourth policy of extending access and artistic forms is in practice, not easy.[84] The contested narrative of museum history bares testament to this. Nonetheless, unfailing optimism that it *could* be achieved sustained Williams, theoretically and in practice.

Having explored some of the complexities involved in the discourses surrounding art, audiences and display, I want to return now to the realm of the museum. It may be that some of Duncan's ideas can be justified when only the *imposition* of a national or civic institution for a dominant but minority concept of history (including art's) is seen. Traditional Marxist analysis of the art museum can prove difficult here given that educational and economic structures often correlate in ruling class ideology, its products are seen to be reflective of an imposed ideological order. It is necessary to discriminate however between different modes of social and cultural coercion and consensus; for example between the physical and the symbolic; education and indoctrination; information and propaganda. It is equally necessary to show the variety of ways in which the emergence of the public museum and art gallery occurs within different geographical locations. I will look at this in relation to Glasgow in Part 3.

Duncan is certainly correct to point to "the creation of the museum *experience* as a monumental creation in its own right".[85] As Bennett argues against theories of the museum as a space of confinement, in terms of quantitative access to art objects, the emergence of the public art gallery did open up access to a concept of the 'public sphere'.[86] It can be added that this had specific consequences for women. Although

class differences may have remained relatively unchallenged, the space for female visibility, and thus the gender based experience of modernity, was distinctly altered. It seems strange that Duncan should miss this point. While it can be acknowledged that her thesis refracts the fashionable, and for Duncan, contemporary, aspects of 'Screen' theory, which emphasised the passive reception of textual and ideological compatibility, this should not excuse a lack of historical and sociological thought.

The second point to make against Rice's earlier comments surrounds the possibility for Art History, as a single discipline, to examine the concept of the museum itself. What type of art history is practised deserves attention. In a discussion focussing on 'old' and 'new' world practices of art history, Francoise Foster-Hahn comments on her experience of innovative practise within the discipline:

> For someone who has written a dissertation on caricature in a very trad-
> itional department at a university in the very Catholic Rhineland in
> Adenauer's post-war Germany and never ever felt marginalised, these
> two questions suddenly brought into sharp focus the differences of art
> historical practices and their traditions; the art historian may be constantly
> on the move, but at the same time the practices of our discipline seem to be
> moving apart even though the contemporary art historian spends almost an
> equal amount of time in the air, on the train, or in the car as in the lecture hall,
> library or study.[87]

According to Forster-Hahn, the topic of her dissertation removed her from any danger of "being caught in the narrow boundaries of 'high' art".[88] Nonetheless, access to literature on the subject was often difficult. Eduard Fuch's book on the erotic elements of caricature (1904) could not be found on the open shelves of Bonn University Library. It was stored instead in the library's *Giftschrank*, or 'poison cabinet'.

Forster-Hahn has no doubt that these early volumes reflecting on the social function of the popular arts and their cultural contexts, points to a map of the discipline of art history as inclusive rather than exclusive. However, for Jonathan Harris, this inclusive variety of art history has been displaced by the post 1980s emergence of identity politics which in turn are seen as "inherently partial, subject-position-limited, fragmentary and therefore self limiting".[89] Harris, as does Forster Hahn, discusses an anthology by Robert Nelson and Richard Schiff (*Critical Terms for Art History, 1996*). There are strong echoes of Saul Bellow's remark, quoted earlier. Harris writes:

> The 31 'critical terms' included mostly read like brand identities for 31
> kinds of art history, competing much more than complementing each
> other, and evidencing the beliefs of their editors (I imagine) that 'critical
> art history', to use a term coined by Michael Podro, is now essentially a
> kind of market place that should offer product choice and diversity, but that
> need demonstrate little internal coherence and certainly should not suggest
> a relationship to any collective project of understanding.[90]

This is a significant point about the discipline of art history; how it has functioned in the past, how it can function in the present, and how it may usefully function towards the future. As Tanner explores, early art historical writing had a marked sociological orientation; "Both sociology and art history are rooted in the origins of western modernity, and share certain values and interests which compose the core of western culture, most notable the concern with individual autonomy."[91] Nonetheless, for Tanner, both disciplines have different interpretative methods and aims: "Ideal and material interests shaping sociologists' and art historians' relationship to art lend themselves to mutual caricature and misunderstanding, as each sees the incommensurate truth claims of the other as a threat to their own claims to truth."[92]

It is intriguing to see, that despite the pluralism(s) that post-modernism(s) celebrate, not even those writers who mourn the death of "critical post-modernism" by the MacDonaldisation of post modernist theories apparently brought about by the October School writers, put any store in sociological accounts of artistic practice. Arguments between the disciplines continue. According to Mulholland:

> The working practice and materialisation of contemporary Scottish art
> is performative and highly nuanced, it benefits little from the reiteration
> of flat sociological givens.[93]

What these "flat sociological givens" consist of is left unsaid, and are left to the readers' imagination. However, Robert Venturi's principles advocating 'complexity and contradiction' are seen, by Mulholland, as a more appropriate model for thinking about Scottish art than those models supplied by Pierre Bourdieu. As this dissertation notes, there are other sociological perspectives than those offered by Bourdieu, precisely because his theories are, like Venturi's, both complex and contradictory. As I will demonstrate in the next section by exploring the work of Raymond Williams and his ideas of a historical sociology of culture, there are sociological models that, like the art they discuss, are also highly nuanced. Some sociological perspectives even

dare to point out the fallacies and false dichotomies in the contradictions which Venturi's 'post-modern', vernacular architectural compartmentalisation demonstrates. Perhaps, Mulholland is being ironic?

Bourdieu argues that "Art is the site *par excellence* of the denial of the social world" [ref 1979;596]. Because of this "Sociology and art do not make good bedfellows." Bourdieu criticises what he sees to be two 'received ideas' about the nature of sociology. Firstly, that sociology can give an account of cultural consumption but not production is rejected. Secondly, Bourdieu denies that sociology "belittled, flattens and trivialises artistic creation".[94] Both of these points are agreeable, but as I will go on to explore, without suggesting it to be a "flat sociological given", Bourdieu's 'scientific' analysis of cultural production is open to question.

Prior suggests that there is a particular need for theoretically informed studies, which attempt to think through the "complex interface between cultural forms and the social" or the art-society problematic.[95] As I will show in Part 2, the division of art or culture *and* society was, for Williams, the cause of the problematic.

Contrary to Duncan's over-simplified account of art history as the hand-maiden of the art museum, the personnel required for the total production of art is vast. Howard Becker provides an insightful illustration of this. Becker uses the analogy of the film credit system in order to comment on an extensive division of labour:

> Consider the list of technical credits for the film "Hurricane". The film employed a director of photography, but Sven Nykvist did not actually operate the camera; Edward Lachman did that. Lachman, however did not do al the jobs associated with operating the camera; Dan Myrham loaded it and, when the focus has to be shifted in the course of filming a scene, Lars Karlsson "pulled" the focus. If something went wrong with the camera, camera Mechanic Gerhard Hentschel fixed it.[96]

As Becker continues, the credits still do not give full expression to the fineness of the division of labour involved; "someone must have typed and duplicated copies of the script, someone else copied the parts from Nino Rico's score, and a conductor and musicians, here unnamed, performed that music."[97]

The case of art is no different. For example in painting, which Becker notes is often regarded as a solitary occupation, there may be a dependence on the manufacturers of canvas, stretchers, paint and brushes. Besides this, dealers, collectors, museum curators, exhibition space, and financial support are needed. Critics and aestheticians

may supply the rationale for the painter's activity. Patronage may be provided by the state both directly and indirectly through advantageous tax laws - designed to persuade collectors to make purchases and sometimes to donate them to the public. A public able to respond to the work, emotionally or otherwise is also required. Finally, Becker refers to other painters, "contemporary and past, who created the tradition which makes the backdrop against which their work make sense".[98]

Prior has examined the emergence of the museum and its effects on particular artists. As he notes, Delacroix and Gericault were regular visitors to the Louvre in the 1820s and 1830s, where a significant part of their artistic education was formed. Knowledge of the handling of paint, perspective and draughtsmanship could be gleaned form copying works by Rubens and the Venetian school. However, as Prior also points out, such artists did not visit museums simply to copy and educate themselves, "but to take a critical stance towards the official gloss of the museum and the objects it housed."[99] Prior writes:

> What is important, here, is the explicit position the art museum had reached by mid-century, becoming what modern Romantic artists and, later, avant-garde artists and critics from Baudelaire onwards despised in 'bourgeois' art. In this process of reaction, however, the art museum also provided the well-spring from which modern artists borrowed to push art beyond itself and to attack the institution of art itself. The amassing of works provided the resource for the creative practices of modern artists; the museum in short was the pre-condition for the development of modern art. [100]

While Prior correctly acknowledges the role of the museum as a resource towards changing artistic practices, it is preferable to suggest that the museum was *a part of the preconditions*, rather than *the precondition for* the development of modern art. The development of modern art has also by turn come to redefine the art museum. That the material forms of this process of reaction against the institution of art have come to be charted and represented by that institution is a necessary aspect of an expanding, serious and popular culture.

In the case of art and its display, the historical narratives accompanying art objects are central to the design of this task. They need not, as Duncan states, necessarily "purge history of its social and political conflicts", but instead can make those conflicts accessible. This is to place art fully within the complexities of social life and from this to acknowledge art as an active agent in the production of meaning.

Nonetheless, as I hope this chapter has demonstrated, its agency may be both constrained and enabled by stereotypes of meaning. C. W Mills writes:

> Between the human consciousness and material existence stand communications and designs, patterns and values which influence decisively such consciousness as they have.
>
> The mass arts, the public arts and the design arts are the major vehicles of this consciousness. Between these arts and the everyday life, between their symbols and the level of human sensibility, there is now continual and persistent interplay.[101]

Forster-Hahn considers Humboldt: "The reflective interpretation of world description and world history, and the meaningful ordering of the appearances of nature and of the events of history, being deeply intertwined, eventually lead to clarity and to the laws of science which are the ultimate goal of all human enquiry." [102]

While Humboldt's ideas on the 'laws of science' are doubtless the product of his times, Humboldt's dialectical approach to world description and world history re-emphasises the importance of continual exchange between theory and practice.

Mills has located shared aspects of the artist, the designer and the historical and critical discourse surrounding such activity. All are part of the cultural apparatus. Membership of this apparatus entails acknowledging, and representing "the sensibilities of man [sic] as a maker of material objects, of man as a creature related to nature itself and to changing it by a humanly considered plan."[103]

This demands understanding a sense of relationships, "between people, between people and place, and between people and possibilities."[104] For Williams, the concept of 'the knowable community' became an analytical tool simultaneously expressing as it describes. In the following section, I will outline the central tenets of Williams' approach and suggest that while his work has been neglected in Art History there is a case to be made for his contemporary relevance.

[1] Raymond Williams, (1988) Keywords, pp 208-209, Fontana Press.
[2] Raymond Williams, (1989) The Politics of Modernism, Against the New Conformists, p32, Verso.
[3] Thompson, S. (2005) The Case For Critical Regionalism[...] in Journal for the Scottish Society for Art History, (JSSAH) vol.10, 2005.
[4] Frisby, D. (2001) Cityscapes of Modernity, Polity; p112
[5] Frisby, as note 4, p113.
[6] Frisby, as n.4, p103

[7] Jones, P. (1995) Williams and 'quality': a response to John Corner; in Media, Culture and Society, Vol. 17. (1995) p320. SAGE, London

[8] Will Bradley (2002) My Head is on Fire but my Heart is Full of Love ; p13, Exhibition catalogue, The Modern Institute.

[9] See for example, Crimp (1987) or Duncan (1991,1994)

[10] Marshall Berman, (1982) All That Is Solid Melts Into Air; p34, Simon and Schuster

[11] Ibid.

[12] T.J. Clarke, (1999) Farewell to an Idea; In Art of the 2oth Century (2003) pp539-52, Gaiger, J and Wood, P [eds}, Yale University Press in association with the Open University.

[13] W. Bradley (2002) as above.

[14] J.E.T Eldridge, (2003) Post Modernism and Industrial Relations; in Understanding Work and Employment (2003),p329; Ackers, P and Wilkinson, A [eds];Oxford University Press.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Nick Prior (2002) Museums and Modernity p3; Berg, Oxford and New York

[17] Jonathan Harris. (2004) Art, Money, Parties, p18, Liverpool University Press and Tate Liverpool.

[18] Carol Duncan (1991) Art Museums and the Ritual of Citizenship, p280; in Interpreting Objects and Collections (1994) Susan M.Pearce [ed] Routledge.

[19] Marshall Berman, as above, p15.

[20] Ibid p284

[21] Carol Duncan, as above p 282

[22] Stanley Cohen, in Index for Free Expression, vol. 30 1/2001; issue 198 p40

[23] Andrew McClellan [ed] Art and its Publics (2003) Blackwell

[24] Ibid pxiii

[25] Williams, R. (1981) Culture, p131; Fontana.

[26] Nick Prior, as above. p4.

[27] Jenny Kitzinger (1997) Appropriating Pleasure; in The Mass Media and Power in Modern Britain; (1997) p154. Edridge, J. Kitzinger, J. and Williams, K. Oxford University Press

[28] Ibid p155

[29] Ibid

[30] Philo,G and Miller, D. (2001) Market Killing, p56; Longman.

[31] Ibid, p46.

[32] J.Harris, (2004) Art, Money, Parties; as above p29

[33] Vera Zolberg (1992) Barrier or Leveller? The Case of the Art Museum; in M.Lamont and M. Fournier [eds] Cultivating Difference: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality (1992) University of Chicago Press.

[34] Pierre Bourdieu, (1993) The Field of Cultural Production, p2, Polity Press

[35] Danielle Rice, Museums: Theory, Practice and Illusion; in Art and its Publics, p77 (2003) Andrew McClellan [ed], Blackwell Publishing.

[36] Ibid

[37] Ibid, p78

[38] Benjamin, W. (1936) The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction; in Arendt, H.[ed] (1973) Walter Benjamin, *Illuminations*, London

[39] Allan Sekula; (1979) Dismantling Modernism, Reinventing Documentary (Notes on the Politics of Representation) in Photography/Politics; One; (1979) Photography Workshop.

[40] John Berger, (1972) Ways of Seeing; p129; BBC and Penguin Books.

[41] C-T Wu, (2002) The Privatisation of Culture; p37; Verso

[42] Cook, R. (2000) in Fowler, B. [ed] (2000) Reading Bourdieu on Society and Culture p170;Blackwell

[43] N.Mulholland (2003) The Cultural Devolution : Art in Britain in the Late 20th Century. Ashgate Publishing

[44] As above, p1.

[45] J.Harris, (2004) "Putting the 'culture' into visual culture" in Visual Culture in Britain, Vol. 5 no. 2, 2004; Manchester University Press.

[46] Williams, R. (1973) The Country and the City, p202; Paladin.

[47] Kirsten Mey, book review for the Journal of the Scottish Society for Art History (JSSAH); Vol 9, 2004, pp112-113

[48] R. Williams, (1983) "Resources for a Journey of Hope" in Towards 2000; pp243-269; (1985) Pelican Books.

[49] Ibid p268

[50] as n.43, p35

[51] Wolff, J. (1993) The Social Production of Art [2nd edition], MacMillan Press, London

[52] J. Eldridge, P. Cressey and J. MacInnes; (1991) Industrial Sociology and Economic Crisis; cf pp13-43; Harvester Wheatsheaf

[53] Ibid, p20

[54] "The Indefensible Status Quo", The Economist, January 1966, cited in Eldridge, Cressey and MacInnes, as above, p20.

[55] A. P. Thirlwall, "Keynesian Economics" in The Social Science Encyclopaedia ; (1985) p426; A. Kuper and J. Kuper, [eds] Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, Boston and Henley.

[56] Eldridge, Cressey and MacInnes, as above, p22.

[57] Cited in Eldridge, Cressey and MacInnes, as above p26.

[58] N. Mulholland, as above, p10.

[59] Eldridge, Cressey and MacInnes, as above P 28.

[60] G. Philo and D. Miller, (2001), Market Killing; p7, Longman publishing.

[61] Ibid, p8

[62] Kisten Mey, as above.

[63] N. Mulholland, as above p3

[64] See for example, Henry Moore, UNESCO speech 1952, "The Sculptor in Modern Society" in Art in Theory 1900-1990; pp669-672,C. Harrison and P. Wood [eds] 1992, Blackwell Publishing, or in the same publication, Lawrence Alloway, The Arts and the Mass Media (1958) pp700-703.

[65] C-T Wu, as above, p34

[66] R.Hughes,1990) Nothing If Not Critical; p388; Harvill Press

[67] C.W.Mills (1963) The Man in the Middle; The Designer p386; Oxford University Press

[68] ibid p382

[69] ibid p381

[70] N. Mulholland, as above p153

[71] N Mulholland, as above, p154

[72] R.Williams (1983) 'Resources for a Journey of Hope' in Towards 2000,p267; Penguin Books.

[73] N. Mulholland, as above p14

[74] Paul Jones, (1994) The Myth of Raymond Hoggart; On 'Founding Fathers' and Cultural Policy; Cultural Studies 8 (3), 1994, pp394-416

[75] Ibid

[76] R.Williams, (1970); Practical Critic; Guardian Newspaper, Feb 26th, cited in Paul Jones, as above.

[77] P.Jones, as above, p398.

[78] P.Jones, as above, p399

[79] C-T Wu, (2002) The Privatisation of Culture, p34: Verso

[80] R.Williams, (1980) Problems in Materialism and Culture; The Bloomsbury Faction; p150, Verso.

[81] R. Williams 1981) Culture, p81, Fontana Press

[82] Alan O'Connor; (1989) Raymond Williams, Writing, Culture, Politics; pp27-29; Basil Blackwell Publishing

[83] Raymond Williams, (1981) Politics and Policies. The Case of The Arts Council; in The Politics of Modernism, (1989) pp141-150, Verso.

[84] A. O'Connor, as above, p29.

[85] See note 18 above.

[86] T.Bennett, (1995) The Birth of the Museum, Routledge.

[87] F. Forster-Hahn, Practicing Art History in the Old and New Worlds; in M. Zimmerman [ed] The Art Historian ; p67 (2003) Yale University Press

[88] Ibid p68

[89] J. Harris (2004) Putting the 'Culture' into Visual Culture in Visual Culture in Britain, vol.5, no 2, nov. 2004; p67

[90] Jonathan Harris, (2004); Putting the 'Culture' into Visual Culture, p66 in Visual Culture in Britain, Vol. 5, no. 2, November 2004.

[91] Jeremy Tanner,[ed] (2003) The Sociology of Art, A Reader; p13; Routledge

[92] Ibid p14

[93] N.Mulholland (2002) Learning from Glasvegas: Scottish art after the '90'; in JSSAH, vol. 7, 2002; p65

[94] Pierre Bourdieu, (1993) "But Who Created the Creators?" in Sociology in Question (1993) pp139-48, Sage.

[95] N. Prior, as above, p6.

[96] Howard Becker (1982) Art Worlds, p7, University of California Press.

[97] Ibid

[98] Ibid, p13

[99] N.Prior, as above, p9.

[100] N. Prior, as above, p10.

[101] C.W.Mills (1963) Man In The Middle: The Designer ; in Power, Politics, People; The Collected Essays (1963) p375; Oxford University Press.

[102] As n.85, p71

[103] As n.99, p383

[104] Eldridge, J. and Eldridge, L. (1994) Raymond Williams, Making Connections: p133; Routledge.

PART 2. RAYMOND WILLIAMS: ART HISTORY AND SOCIAL CRITIQUE.

The above title is borrowed from Jonathan Harris's article in *Block* magazine.[1] Here and in later writing, Harris argues for a reconsideration of the work of Raymond Williams. The purpose of Harris's article was to make explicit the manner by which art history could be a powerful vehicle for social critique both inside and outside the discipline. To this extent, Harris considers Williams to be a useful, if not crucial source. Unlike the sociological analysis of Bourdieu, Williams does not attempt to reduce the artist or art to an ideologically bound social construct despite paying critical awareness to the role of ideology. Instead, Williams recognises that art, as a creative practice embedded in every day life processes, is a prerequisite for both communication and experience. For this reason, this chapter will finish by looking at Williams' model of cultural analysis in order to show it at work practically in the next chapter. Before this, I want to explore some of his ideas and demonstrate their use as important for critiquing writing.

There is a certain paradox in the fact that whilst Williams is noted for his ideas on interdisciplinary study and the crossing of boundaries, his contemporary use may be more appropriate towards restoring some aspects of the arts and social sciences to their original purposes. This is to look clearly and responsibly at creative practice and to understand rather than dismiss the real limits and serious pressures in which the actual making of art occurs. For Williams, formalist criticism and its successors often reduced the language of culture to a rationalism, or to purely logical acts.[2]

In Part 1, I explored some of the various ways that aesthetic and art historical discourse have led from art commentary to social commentary, art history to social history and from art criticism to social critique. Embodied to various degrees in this discourse has been an awareness of theory and practice, between the constituted and the constituting.

However, as Eagleton notes, "What has recently grown up, especially in the United States, is a kind of anti-theory." Moreover, this anti-theory, finds the term 'theory' most objectionable.[3] Appropriately, Eagleton notes that this anti-theory is formed in a language of scepticism that is itself theoretically interesting.

Mulholland is a case in point. According to Mulholland, the demystification (unmasking) of particular cultural forms (in this particular case Scottish) is but an

imagined 'overmastering' since "mystification is inevitably entailed by cultural practice."[4] Furthermore, this urge to unmask is also a mask for the urge to partake, "to enjoy the apparent rewards it pretends to despise, by further hypnotising an already bored and hypnotised audience." Being now bored but not quite hypnotised, I wonder if I should save myself some considerable mental labour as attempting to unmask Mulholland's claim would, it seems, be futile. For as he suggests, rather mystifyingly:

> "Whether conscious or not, the objective will always be to preserve a model
> of culture that is never more than the sum of its parts, to accept these rules
> in order to play the militant dilettante." [5]

Cultural practice is nothing more than a struggle to obtain the power and the glory, and often, it seems with eyes on the money. This concept runs through Mulholland's work to various degrees and in different guises through his descriptive vocabulary. Here 'populism' and 'careerism' make for easy criticism that is both formalist and categorical. To know how far an actor's judgements are 'interested', we also need to know how far they are *not* interested. 'Populism' has, since the 1980s been a term of abuse of parts of the Left that has survived, intact, from its other abusive form in cultural criticism of a non-Marxist kind: "[T]hat contempt of people, of their hopelessly corrupted state, of their vulgarity and credulity by comparison with an educated minority." Via the appropriate alterations of vocabulary, this has become one fashionable form of Marxism, "which makes the whole people including the working class, mere carriers of the structures of a corrupt ideology."[6]

To this extent, against Kirsten Mey's summary, Mulholland must in fact be credited with some fairly firm theoretical commitment, albeit one of high post modernism. The bars on Foucault's iron cage are as strong as ever. All mediation, is from Mulholland's perspective, the overlaying of ideologies in which 'masking' or disguised interests of power takes place. In this sense, Mulholland shares a view similar to Bourdieu's perspective, although elsewhere he has denounced Bourdieu's sociological critique. Williams argues that the analysis of ideological masking requires "a process of working back through the mediation to their original forms" [7] and rejects this conception of mediation as being reliant on an *a prioristic* dualism which as such lends itself to a reduction to base and superstructure, or culture *and* society.

Williams writes:

> Cultural history must be more than the sum of particular histories, for it is

35

with the relations between them, the particular forms of the whole organisation, that it is especially concerned. I would then define the theory of culture as the study of characters in a whole way of life. The analysis of culture is the attempt to discover the nature of the organisation which is the complex of these relationships. Analysis of particular works or institutions is in this context, analysis of their essential kind of organisation, the relationships which works or institutions embody as a whole. A keyword in such analysis is pattern: it is with the discovery of patterns of a characteristic kind that any useful cultural analysis begins, and it is with the relationships between these patterns, which sometimes reveal unexpected identities and correspondences in hitherto separately considered activities, sometimes again reveal discontinuities of an unexpected kind, that general cultural analysis is concerned. [8]

In the previous section I paid considerable attention to Mulholland's citing (and situating) of Raymond Williams. It is recognised that Mulholland's work is neither a review of Williams' work nor an attempt to utilise his analytical and theoretical contributions (although there are some aspects of Williams' arguments present). For the most part, I am in agreement with the central theme of Mulholland's argument and share his concerns about the interpenetrating relationship of some aspects of contemporary art practice with corporate finance and the cultural forms generated under high capitalism.

To his credit, Mulholland modestly refers to his own work as a 'rehearsal' of the indeterminate relationship between theory and practice in the period which concerns him, generously allowing for, and prefiguring - perhaps even demanding - more detailed attention to what is very serious and interesting work. It is also important to acknowledge here that I understand and am engaging with Mulholland's current position as one that is temporal rather than reflecting any kind of fixed outlook. There is then, appropriately, a parting of our ways regarding the form of his argument. Mulholland makes substantial use of various conceptual categories - conceptual art, neo-conceptual art, semio-art, neo-expressionist art, neo-situationist art. Nowhere does Mulholland reflect on the manner by which the use of such generalisations, or reifications, themselves may be implicated as closed forms in the process that he aims to challenge.

There may be other scholars more capable of addressing and critiquing the above abstractions of artistic practice. That task is not within the remit of this dissertation.

The work of Raymond Williams, however, is. Language, as an active social process, always required for Williams, a careful examination of the labels that become attached to dramatic forms or other cultural activities in order to provide an examination of ideological processes. Thus "we can go back behind the names, and make our own history, in our own terms."[9]

For my own purposes Mulholland's abstraction of Williams as a 'culturalist' provides a useful illustration of the problems involved in the application of 'received ideas', or stereotypes of meaning that Williams directly contested. At the same time as this excursus provides a point of departure from Mulholland, it offers an opening into exploring Williams critical strengths.

I have already criticised Mulholland's reference to a 'culturalist tradition' that parenthesises Williams' work with that of Arnold, Leavis, and Hoggart, as being in line with an effective narrative contrast with a post-Althussurian phase of Cultural Studies. This is found in Stuart Hall's misleading contrast between competing 'culturalist' and 'structuralist' paradigms. As Paul Jones observes, this narrative has now become consolidated into orthodoxy.[10]

The term 'culturalist', coined by Richard Johnson, was an attempt to distinguish between a 'moment of culture' and a 'moment of theory' as a means to describe the tensions and differences between Marxist intellectuals as outlined in E.P.Thompson's *The Poverty of Theory*. Here, Thompson made a considered and rigorous attack on the ideas of the French philosopher Louis Althusser. Althusser's formative conclusions were that history could not be known, and therefore could not be said to exist. According to Althusser:

> Marxism, as a theoretical and a political practice, gains nothing from its association with historical writing and historical research. The study of history is not only scientifically but also politically valueless.[11]

Clearly, Thompson was not prepared to have his discipline exposed as an illusion, or worse. For Thompson, Althusser's damning critique of humanist scholarship could not be simply accepted as a variant of Marxism, tolerated through a tacit compromise of "we are all Marxists together". Thompson saw Althusser's ideology as politically disrupting the political Left through a position that was explicitly Bourgeois in its elitist division between theory and practice.

In the aforementioned article for Variant magazine, Mulholland expands his views of 'culturalism' which he sees as providing a useful tool through which a post –World War II Labour government was able to assert itself. Mulholland writes:

> Following the Second World War, a newly professionalised culturalist intelligentsia had opted for state education as the mechanism by which its culture might be preserved and extended as the centre of resistance to the driving imperatives of an increasingly materialist civilisation. The ideology and lifestyle of culturalist academics and the 'civilised ruling classes' who were their associates, were central to the post-war Labour government's conception of a new society.[12]

Mulholland goes on to state that "Labour culturalists heralded a society not bound together by economic market contracts, but by citizenship." Alarmingly, Mulholland suggests that this apparently allowed the "ascendancy of the Labour party's vision of democratic socialism", at the same time, " *ensuring* [my emphasis] that existing power structures were left unaltered." [13] This is not just a theoretical error; it is a historical one. It should be recognised that much of post war reconstruction, specifically in education, was done initially with cross party support and was not solely the preserve of Labour policy. The nationalisation of industry, the expansion of the welfare state and education *could not have occurred* without changes to power structures, and indeed, it was the reversal of those changes to power which topped the Conservative Thatcher government's deconstruction agenda in 1979. As discussed in part 1, weakening trade union organisation through the privatisation of public service sectors, including education and the arts ranked highly. The problem was that the Labour government did not alter power structures enough in maintaining a ruling-class attitude of modernisation and organisation rather than socialist values. Changes to power happened all the same, most explicitly for women, but also for other marginalised groups whose increased participation in the culture fashioning institutions brought new, empowering perceptions and articulations of social experience. To ignore these changes is parochial in the extreme.

As O'Connor notes, "An increasingly educated society, with this history of a labour movement to draw upon, was increasingly being blocked by a centralised and manipulative politics which executed its purposes in the name of the labour movement."[14] Yet in Mulholland's account above, there is an inappropriate sense of collusion, between his so-called 'Labour culturalists' and the '"civilised ruling' class

who were their associates". Even if we accept the term "Labour culturalists", this sense of collusion is indefensible given that those intellectuals so labelled both contested and rejected much of the Labour government's rhetoric.

Although these Labour 'culturalists' remain elusively nameless in Mulholland's article, the incorporation of Williams into the 'culturalist tradition' noted above, condemns him to this group by implication. The charge of 'culturalism' was rejected at the time, and this rejection should be *at least* acknowledged as a point of history. Beneath Mulholland's historicist skills, which are salted by Adorno and peppered by Stuart Hall, Richard Johnson's "Moment of Culture" resurfaces - perhaps unwittingly, as no specific reference is made to this. Nor is there any reference made to E. P. Thompson, who forcefully argued that Johnson's charge of 'culturalism' was an invented category that formed a "specious opposition" to a supposedly 'authentic' Marxism. According to Thompson, the category stemmed from a "sloppy and impressionistic history."[15]

The 'moment of culture' expressed by Johnson, refers to a critical moment of academic Marxist critique. At this moment, Marxism struggled with and against Stalinism and a positivist economic history both within and without academic discourse. As Williams recalls, not simply biographically, but to illustrate the extraordinary experience of Cold War politics. "For internal reasons it became very bitter, and there was both intrigue and witch-hunting."[16] This discourse lasted throughout the 1950s and 60s, and in this context publicised disagreement between Marxist academics was strategically weighed up against the Labour government and its policies. Thompson had expressed reluctance to review Williams' newly published *The Long Revolution* due to the sharp theoretical differences he found between them. Expressing them fully might endanger the political relations of the New Left. For Thompson, 'Theoretical opportunism' ranked far beneath engagement in "an active, urgent and fraternal common political movement."[17]

It is worth emphasising that despite his earlier public disagreements with Williams over *The Long Revolution*, which were specifically encouraged through Stuart Hall's editorial position on "New Left Review", Thompson was generous in his defence of Williams, who had also been parenthesised by Johnson's 'Culturalist' label. While Thompson recognised his differences with Williams, he noted their shared discriminations as to 'determinism'. "in its sense of 'setting limits' and 'exerting pressures'."[18]

However, as O'Connor has commented, the temperaments of Williams and Thompson were entirely different: "Whereas Williams is interested in patient descriptions of social structures and cultural forms, Thompson's histories are of people and action."[19] However, neither Williams nor Thompson whilst interested in the value of cultural experience, ever neglected structural analysis.

Mulholland's own theoretical opportunism is well deserving of Thompson's critique of Johnson in that there is a lack of consideration for the difficult politics of this 'moment'. Mulholland abstracts distinct political positions and activities to enhance his idea of an elaborate conspiracy theory without bothering to look behind the labels. Such generalisations are obscurant and potentially dangerous in the manner by which specific historical relations can be misrepresented, and at worst, falsified

In Williams' account, *Britain in the Sixties* (1985), the difficulties and personal struggles are apparent. Williams is, as already mentioned, highly critical of much Labour Party rhetoric. At the same time, he expresses his belief in the foundations of the Labour movement, the trade unions, the co-operatives and the Labour Party, that "were a great creative achievement of the working people and also the right basis for the whole organisation of any good society of the future." [20] Williams writes:

> The main challenge to capitalism was socialism, but this has almost
> wholly lost any contemporary meaning, and it is not surprising that many
> people now see in the Labour Party merely an alternative power-group,
> and in the trade union movement merely a set of men playing the market in
> in very much the terms of the employers they oppose. Any such development
> is generally damaging, for the society is unlikely to grow significantly if it has
> no real alternative patterns as the ground of choice.[21]

As Raphael Samuel noted in a tribute to Williams, "Insofar as he had a settled *persona* – he was uncomfortable with labels, whether academic or political in provenance – it was that of a writer and thinker, offering the fruit of reflection rather than of research."[22] While Williams was a reflective thinker, in that he was not afraid to draw from his own experience, he was in fact a scrupulous researcher. Williams writes:

> It took me thirty years, in a very complex process, to move from that
> received Marxist theory (which in its most general form I began by
> accepting) through various transitional forms of theory and inquiry, to
> the position I now hold, which I define as 'cultural materialism'.[23]

Williams emphasis is always on transition, and on the production, rather than the reproduction, of meanings and values by specific social formations. Language and communication are formative within the complex interaction of institutions and forms and of social relationships and formal conventions. This "may be defined, if anyone wishes, as 'culturalism', and even the crude old (positivist) idealism/materialism may be applied if it helps anyone. What I would now claim to have reached, but not necessarily by this route, is a theory of culture as a (social and material) productive process, and of specific practices, of 'arts', as social uses of material means of production (from language as material 'practical consciousness' to the specific technologies of writing and of forms of writing, through to mechanical and electronic communication systems").[24]

According to Samuel, Williams' strengths lay in his ability to move swiftly from the particular to the general, clarifying, evaluating, refining concepts, and "bringing fissiparous subject matter under a synoptic point of view." Jonathan Harris notes:

> Williams' theory of 'cultural materialism' and his outline of a 'historical
> sociology of culture' both point towards a transformation of traditional
> humanist discourses (including art history) and disciplinary boundaries.[25]

For Harris, writing in 1989, the impact of Williams' work on the discipline of art history since the 1960s "has been piecemeal and particularistic". The issues central to Williams' books - from empirical studies of specific cultural forms, to theoretical studies on the relationship of particular cultural activities with industrialisation and political change – have been only partially absorbed across different academic disciplines. Harris writes:

> Such incorporation actually avoids and negates the radical challenge of
> Williams' work, which over a long period of time, both constitutes itself
> as, and points to, a new field of enquiry and action with a breadth and
> complexity of description, analysis, evaluation and prescription, both inside
> and outside the academy.[26]

It is important to be clear about Williams' notion of interdisciplinary study. In the previous section I referred to Paul Jones' article on the "myth" of 'founding fathers' and Williams' relationship with "Cultural Studies". Williams did not advocate the dissolution of specialised study to be subsequently overridden by a parent discipline of Cultural Studies. As Harris notes, the development of the discipline of Cultural Studies actually worked to reinforce the distinctions between 'high' and 'low' culture,

"leaving safely intact the high ground of English Literature and Art History, not to mention the orthodox methodologies and objects of study of 'serious sociology'."[27] On the other hand, as noted in Part 1, there is also a significant amount of cultural theory that attempts to make all cultural production equivalent, which is also distant to Williams' aims. The discipline of Cultural Studies was in many ways a "concession from the Establishment" as well as an appropriation of the particular methods used by Williams and others teaching in Adult Education and the Workers' Education Association as a means of working through and challenging existing orthodoxy. As I have discussed, Cultural Studies now has its own disciplinary orthodoxy and historical narrative. Williams notes:

> But we are beginning, I am afraid, to see encyclopaedic articles dating the birth of Cultural Studies to this or that book in the late 'fifties. Don't believe a word of it![28]

For Williams and many others involved in the WEA, there was an interest not in a missionary zeal of preaching to the unfortunate, but in building a social consciousness of an adequate kind. In the 1930s there was a strong sense of Adult Education contributing to social change, equipping a social group who had been denied the privilege of higher education to meet new crises of war, unemployment and Fascism. The teaching style could not be about the delivery of a message or to propagandise. The people who entered Adult Education to learn, "didn't want the conclusions of arguments; they wanted to reach their own conclusions." (in Part 3, the role of the WEA and Adult Education towards new cultural formations in art and theatre in Glasgow will be addressed in order to illustrate how power structures did in fact change)

 The specialist knowledge brought about through disciplinary study was however always necessary and vital. As specific forms of cultural production, and thus material culture, disciplinary knowledge itself as practical consciousness offered a powerful indicator of social and cultural change. This change could be understood in reference to economic and political changes but was not necessarily determined by it. Nonetheless, for Williams there was an inherent and pivotal danger in any form of specialisation that could easily lead to theoretical abstraction and alienation. As has been shown with reference to Mulholland's homogeneous misuse of the term 'culturalism', a whole body of complex thought and its political, social, and cultural

potential has been eradicated and alienated from its context and as such, weakens elements of his analytical paradigms.

Williams' concerns lay in a sustained and continual dialogue *between* the disciplines. This is evident in Williams' assessment of the Bloomsbury Group, mentioned in part 1, and their embrace of Freud's psychoanalytic theories through the associations of Karin and Adrian Stephen and James Strachey. Within Williams' self-confessed 'light-hearted' approach to this cultural formation a microcosm of the macro structure is ascertained.

> Thus to the impressive list of Virginia and Morgan for literature,
>
> Roger and Clive and Vanessa and Duncan for art, Leonard for politics
>
> and Maynard for economics, they could so to say, add Sigmund for sex.[29]

Williams himself regarded Freud with some suspicion, and noted the growing influence, and eventual institutionalisation, of his methodological procedure with dismay.

> "For Freudian theory assumes a basic division between the individual and
>
> society, and hence basic division between the individual and such mediating
>
> forces as 'community', or 'class', which are seen simply as social agents which
>
> operate on the individual…Freud's account of the individual and society, is, in
>
> its basic terms, merely an item in an old tradition."[30]

In particular, Williams found Freud's theories on art problematic.

> "The idea that this fundamental human associative activity, which in the course
>
> of human history, represents the result of some crude frustration is not very
>
> serious thinking. The whole conception of the social order as a merely
>
> negative system of constraints and inhibitions belongs to the most classical of
>
> bourgeois theory, to which I am naturally very hostile."[31]

This classical bourgeois theory is, arguably, to be found in areas of Mulholland's writing. If knowledge is power and can be harnessed by power groups, as Mulholland's sad song of the *"Devolution of Culture"* attests, the most powerful propaganda to prevent the desire for knowledge is to demonstrate by carefully selected high theory that creative knowledge is futile. As Bauman writes, "If no critique of ideology is allowed, then the task of social reflection ends once it has been pointed out that ideology is everywhere and everything is ideological. The idea of an active engagement with society loses its justification and urgency." [32]

STRUCTURE OF FEELING

Some of Williams' ideas about art are set out in *Literature and Sociology*, which was simultaneously a tribute to the sociologist Lucien Goldmann and an extension of his theories.

Art is "one of the primary human activities, and that it can succeed in articulating not just the imposed or constituted social or intellectual system, but at once this and an experience of it, its lived consequence, in ways very close to many other kinds of active response, in new kinds of social activity and in what we know as personal life, but of course often more accessibly, just because it is specifically formed and because when it is made it is in its own way complete, even autonomous, and being the kind of work it is can be transmitted and communicated beyond its original situation and circumstances." [33]

In particular, Williams' was impressed with Goldmann's concepts of structure and his distinctions of different kinds of consciousness, noting that "When he [Goldmann] spoke of structures, he was consciously applying a term, and a method which did not so much cross as underlie the apparently separate disciplines".[34] While Williams was referring here to the disciplines of Literature and Sociology, the consciousness to which Williams refers is also applicable to Art History and Sociology. "It is a term and a method of consciousness, and so the relation between literature and sociology is not a relation between, on the one hand, various individual works and on the other hand various empirical facts. The real relation is within a totality of consciousness: a relation that is assumed and then revealed rather than apprehended and then expounded." For Williams, Goldmann's structuralism offered a concern with the analysis of structures alongside an awareness of their historical formation and process, "the ways in which they change as well as the ways in which they are constituted." [35]

From Goldmann, Williams developed the concept of "structure of feeling" which he deployed not only as a descriptive term but also as an analytical tool. Literature and visual art are recognised as a significant human response to an objective situation, a view of the world and thus an organising view. This response is neither individual nor that of an abstract group but refers to individuals in real and collective social relations. "Structure of feeling" is, Jones explains, a notoriously difficult concept which can be consistent with, but often goes beyond ideas of "social character" to provide an account of the 'felt' sense of the quality of life as it is lived and

experienced at a particular place and time. "[..]a sense of the ways in which the particular activities combined into a way of thinking and living."[36]

Engaging with the idea of "structure of feeling" is a deeply reflexive activity which Williams explored in relation to his own writing whether in academic studies or fiction; he did not categorise them but referred to both as *work* and *writing*. While elements can be learned as precipitates, living experience reflects every element in solution, "an inseparable part of a complex whole". This lived experience is for Williams the ephemeral aspect and the most difficult thing to get hold of in studying any past period, being both individual but socially formed. As Eldridge and Eldridge note :

> Thus the concept of 'structure of feeling' is, for Williams, both a practical experience and a theoretical tool. It is a predominant concept throughout all of his work, providing him with a means of examining history not just as product, but as *process*. With this concept, Williams attempts to analyse literary developments in relation to patterns of *social* change, rigid determinism being replaced by interrelationship, itself implicit to the concept of 'structure of feeling'.[37]

As such, both conventions and innovations in art and literature are seen as "inalienable elements of a social material process". These are not necessarily derived from other forms or pre-forms, but are social formations of a specific kind, and articulate ("often the only available articulation") structures of feeling "which as living processes are much more widely experienced."[38]

Nonetheless, there is no logical contradiction for Williams to speak of the 'autonomy' of creative practice within his acknowledgement of socially determined limits and pressures. This autonomy, or freedom lies in the moment of hesitation between the thought and its expression in which the possibility of moving beyond convention may occur and innovation becomes possible. What is important here, is that this autonomy is not confined to the realm of 'Modernism' or 'modernist critique', indeed Williams asks outright "When was Modernism?" in direct defiance to the historical and aesthetic concepts which had become attached to it, and equally rejecting any notion of post-modernism.[39] Critical distance is thus both a trans-historical and universal category but does not, and cannot in either a dominant capitalist culture or a socialist one, depend on a universal or trans-historical stance. This is to argue then for evaluative criteria based on assessing the level, or degree of

autonomy in any cultural practice in relation to the dominant culture, and the limits and pressures which it sets. Harris writes in reference to the availability of space for critique:

> [...] either way, contemporary artists find themselves now within new economic, social and political relations of production and consumption, and have to fashion identities inevitably shaped and limited by these conditions. Any absolutely clear distinctions between 'institution' from above and 'formation' from below become increasingly difficult to make: the contemporary art world is 'corporatist' and *a mechanism of assimilation* now by definition.[40]

This is an emphatic statement on market forces. Nevertheless the distinctions that Harris mentions deserve attention. What needs to be addressed, rather than distinguished is the manner by which the two interact alongside other images and themes in a circular tour, in which, as Burke suggest, what sets out is never the same as that which returns.[41] This is a matter of translation rather than distinction. Williams writes:

> To have a sociology concerned only with abstract groups, and a literary criticism concerned only with separated individuals and works is more than a division of labour; it is a way of avoiding the interpenetration, in a final sense the unity, in the most individual and the most social forms of actual life. [42]

'Structure of feeling' is linked specifically to the role of the arts as crucial aspects of the documentary culture through which the lived experience of the 'whole organisation' of a social order might be accessed. Williams writes:

> It is as firm and definite as 'structure' suggests, yet it is based in the deepest and often least tangible elements of our experience. It is a way of responding to a particular world which in practice is not felt as one way among others – a conscious 'way' – but is, in experience, the only way possible. Its means, its elements, are not propositions or techniques; they are embodied, related feelings. In the same sense, it is accessible to others – not by formal arguments or by professional skills, on their own, but by direct experience – a form, and a meaning, a feeling and a rhythm – in the work of art, the play, as a whole.[43]

This ephemeral quality of 'structure of feeling' has a correspondence with aspects of Duchamp's conceptual notion of 'infra-thin' through its recognition of the condition

of 'liminality'. While this allows for a moment of autonomy there is no neglecting that this is the product of the social and the individual at an exact moment only available to the carriers of a specific culture. Duchamp expresses one illustration of this concept as follows:

> When the tobacco smoke smells also of the mouth which exhales it,
>
> the two odours marry by infra thin (olfactory infra thin).[44]

As with 'infra thin' the very term 'structure of feeling' has the same delicate precision attached to it, "always an adjective, never a noun, so that it can never exist as a thing in its own right."[45] 'Structure of feeling' is that "which attempts to express 'a complex whole', to convey the totality of life as it is lived and experienced, the totality which provides the material for the artist, 'only realisable through the work of art itself'." [46]

The concept of 'structure of feeling' is accompanied by the later idea of the 'knowable community', which also makes reference to and expresses the relation, or distance between the individual and society. However, as O'Connor points out:

> Williams' interest is not in 'knowable man' but 'knowable communities' in
>
> which the connections between persons, collectivities, and underlying
>
> patterns of history are shown.[47]

In making this distinction, O'Connor perhaps loses sight the inextricable connection that is implicit in all of Williams' writing, and the pendulum- like approach between the individual and society, the personal and the social, which necessarily illuminates both. Nonetheless, O'Connor suggests that Williams' observational interests are not to be confused with observation from a distance such as the Mass Observation from the 1930s or fiction that simply observes without involving the writer's intentions. O'Connor also comments: "Nor does Williams have any time for writing which isolates individual persons whether as 'personal' experience or psychological interpretation."[48] However, I think that it should be conceded that Williams would certainly see these literary forms as significant historical and cultural productions.

The 'knowable community' reflects, as Eldridge and Eldridge note, a 'community of sensibility' in which "new ways of thinking about and experiencing the world give rises to changes in this relationship."[49] Williams writes:

> The artist's sensibility – his capacity for experience, his ways of thinking,
>
> feeling and conjunction – will often be finer than that of his audience. But
>
> if his sensibility is at least of the same kind, communication is possible.
>
> Where his sensibility is of the same kind, his language and the language of

his audience will be closely and organically related; the common language will be the expression of the common sensibility.[50]

As I have noted, the complexity and fragility of language was central to Raymond Williams' concerns. Language is identified as "a continuous social production in its most dynamic sense" which like any other social production is the "arena of all sorts of shifts and interests and relations of dominance."[51] With this in mind, Williams chose his own words carefully, artfully and politically. This is evident most specifically in Williams' analysis of the term 'culture'. In opposition to the appropriation of the term culture as an index of aesthetic quality by an educated 'cultural elite', Williams writes: "The working out of the idea of culture is a slow reach again for control"[52].

For Williams, 'culture' was "one of the two or three most complicated words in the English language, which has now come to be used for several important concepts in several distinct intellectual disciplines and in several distinct and incompatible systems of thought."[53] Williams distinguishes between the anthropological, or 'whole way of life' and a set of specific activities corresponding to 'the arts':

> We use the word culture in these two senses: to mean a whole way of life – the common meanings; to mean the arts and learning – the special processes of discovery and creative effort. Some writers reserve the word for one or other of these senses; I insist on both, and the significance of their conjunction. [54]

Culture and Society (1961) was an important contribution to this task. Although Williams later came to distance himself from the book it remains both significant and relevant.[55] Williams takes for his subject, five keywords; industry, class, democracy, art and culture. The words formed a structure for Williams, intellectually and historically. By exploring their historical development, patterns of changing meanings appeared both within and between each word, the modern usage of each coinciding with "the period which we commonly describe as the Industrial Revolution." However, of all the words, the term 'culture' became the most striking, its variable meanings being interpenetrated by and refracted in the other four words as each is transformed from a more general to a more specialised and normative context. From its earliest use as a noun of process indicating 'natural growth' –as in horticulture or agriculture – the term is extended as a metaphor towards human development and subsequently towards the idea of human perfection. From describing the general state of development in society as a whole, 'culture' then becomes

synonymous with the general body of the arts and from this to a whole way of life that is "material, intellectual and spiritual".[56]

'Art' has also developed from a sense of general human skills and attributes, which shared this meaning with industry, and like industry, also has a changed meaning reflecting specialised labour and social organisation. Whereas industry represented a new social order based on organised mechanical production, art designated creative and imaginative production. From art, 'the arts' emerge, grouping together the practices of painting, sculpture, literature and theatre as having something essential in common. These are distinguished from other skills, specifically the mechanical production of industry. Williams notes:

> Further and most significantly, 'art' came to stand for a special kind
> of truth, 'imaginative truth', and *artist* for a special kind of person, as
> the words *artistic* and *artistical*, new in the 1840s show.[57]

From these developments, other special people emerge; aesthetes judging art under the new name of aesthetics, giving rise to concepts of 'genius' which was in turn distinct from 'talent'. Thus, as the objective material forms of art and literature became increasingly seen as market commodities William Blake could write of "the interest of the Monopolising Trader to Manufacture Art by the Hands of Ignorant Journeymen till….he is Created the Greatest Genius who can sell a Good –For-Nothing Commodity for a Great Price". [58]

Williams' five keywords offered him an insight into general changes to characteristic ways of thinking about common life over the period from 1780-1950: "[a]bout our social, political and economic institutions; about the purposes which these institutions are designed to embody; and about the relations to these institutions and purposes of our activities in learning, education and the arts." [59]

Culture and Society offered a new way of approaching the topic of modernity through its compare and contrast analysis of a range of individual thinkers – Arnold, Leavis, Carlyle and Eliot amongst others through which Williams developed his method of cultural materialism. By exploring the uses of the term culture in its documented or recorded state and the historical contexts in which the terms overlap, interact and contradict each other. Williams is led to making the distinctions of Dominant, Residual and Emergent Cultures which are also implicated within any structure of feeling. Williams writes:

> By 'residual' I mean that some experiences, meanings and values, which

cannot be verified or cannot be expressed in terms of the dominant culture, are nevertheless, lived and practised on the basis of the residue – cultural as well as social- of some previous formation.[60]

Of the 'emergent' culture, Williams states:

> By 'emergent', I mean first, that new meanings and values, new significances and experiences, are continually being created.[61]

These new experiences and values may or may not become incorporated into the dominant culture, depending on the selective processes of the dominant culture itself. This interactive, liquid totality is then the lived culture of a society and its 'whole way of life' which in turn has implications for traditional Marxist accounts of base and superstructure. Williams refers to Marx's account of the piano player from the *Grundrisse*. Here Marx had argued that the man who makes the piano is a productive worker but questions whether or not the man who distibutes the piano is also a productive worker.However, given that he contributes to the realisation of surplus value, Marx sees the distributor as also productive. Yet the piano player, whether playing to himself or others, is not seen as productive. Williams writes:

> So piano maker is base, but pianist is superstructure. As a way of considering cultural activity, and incidentally the economics of modern cultural activity, this is clearly a dead-end. But for any theoretical clarification it is crucial to recognise that Marx was there engaged in an analysis of a particular kind of production, that is capitalist commodity production.[62]

For Williams, it was crucial to distinguish in any talk of the base and of primary productive forces whether the reference is being made to primary production in terms of capitalist economic relationships or to the primary production of society itself, "and of men themselves, the material production and reproduction of real life." [63]

Culture is not superstuctural as a product of an economic or political base but is itself productive and the means by which social organistional structures may be maintained, negotiated and changed. This is compatible with the traditional idea of social being determining consciousness, but does not require interpretation through base and superstructure, responding instead to Lukacs's emphasis on a social 'totality'. Williams holds some reservations on this discourse however since it can become empty of any Marxist propositions and simply reflect the complicated combinations and interactions of diverse social practices. While this may be an

accurate description of reality, at aother level, this withdraws from the claim that there is any process of determination. For Williams, the key question towards the concept of the totality revolved around the notion of intention. In Part 3, the question of 'intention' will be raised in relation to accounts of the museum and cultural reproduction.

For Williams, the processes of art and thought could not be located in the superstructure in any formulaic way, which at their most extreme articulation of universally valid laws, ideologies, constitutions and theories effectively ratified the domination of a particular class. Gramsci's concept of 'hegemony' suggested ways of employing the notion of totality without negating dominating elements. O'Connor suggests that:

> Hegemony operates at the same fundamental depth as what Williams
> had indicated by the 'structure of feeling' of a generation. It is a body of
> practices and activities that are deeply part of the every-day [...] The
> hegemonic culture is a process within educational institutions, training in
> the family and at work, and a selective tradition from the past.[64]

Any adequate analysis of culture attempting to identify the 'structure of feeling' in the present or of a previous generation requires consideration of the three general elements of culture. Firstly, there is the social aspect of culture, a way of life that relates to particular traditions and conventions. These might include the organisation of production, the family structure, and the structure of institutions" which express, or govern social relationships, the characteristic forms through which members of a society communicate."[65]

Secondly, there is the 'documentary' culture of intellectual and imaginative work in which human thought and experience are recorded. Finally, 'culture' as 'ideal state' or processes of human perfection in which particular values considered as having a 'timeless order' and selected for 'permanent reference to the human condition' might be identified. These three categories require both independent and interdependent examination in the approach to what Williams termed as a 'common culture'. The construction of this demands equality of access to the mode of production in which the documentary, as a selected record of 'timeless values' is distributed and critiqued, rather than maintained in the form of a tradition. This entailed for Williams, the democratic *construction and distribution* of knowledge. Here, he draws from

Tawney's educational proposal of equality of access, provision and outcome to provide the 'self realisation' of an educated and participatory democracy.

In Williams' work Gramsci's concept of hegemony is then situated to describe a socialist culture, or whole way of life, in which a common culture, culture *held in common*, prevented cultural distinction without implying an indiscriminate equalisation of all artefacts. Terry Eagleton writes:

> Williams' notion of a common culture is thus inseparable from radical socialist change. It requires an ethic of social responsibility, full democratic participation at all levels of social life, including material production, and egalitarian access to the culture-fashioning process.[66]

This common culture requires that "culture is ordinary" and as such cannot be translated to Bourdieu's declaration that "culture is principally a means of social distinction".[67] As Jones comments, the phrase is more appropriately aligned with Gramsci's "All men are intellectuals" by referencing a universal human capacity for creativity.

In "Towards 2000" Williams develops the approach to a common culture, returning to the noun of process:

> In intellectual analysis it is often forgotten that the most widespread and most practical thinking about the future is rooted in human and local communities. We can feel the continuity of life to a child or a grandchild. We can care for land, or plant trees, in ways that both assure and depend on an expectation of future fertility. We can build them in ways that are meant to last for coming lives to be lived in them.[68]

It was then necessary to look beyond short- term plans and solutions, epitomised by what Williams termed 'Plan X' schemes. 'Plan X' people do not believe that any dangerous elements – such as the role of commercial revenue in public communications and institutions - can be halted or turned back. Williams regards this as more dangerous than 'mere conspiracy theory':

> On the contrary, it is as its emergence as the open common sense of high-level politics which is really serious. As distinct from mere greedy muddle, and shuffling day to day management, it is a way – a limited but powerful way – of grasping and attempting to control the future.[69]

Williams' structure of feeling was for the conjuncture of the learned and the popular, the expansion of the arts and learning as part of everyday practice, a counter-

hegemonic in negotiating the balance between theory and practice, structure and agency. To mistake the extraordinary culture that 'culture is ordinary' offers as utopian idealism is to miss its challenge. While Mulholland may speak in damnation of 'cultural devolution', Williams can provide a sharp rebuke:

> What has really to be said, as a way of defining important elements of both the residual and the emergent, and as a way of understanding the character of the dominant, is that no mode of production and therefore no dominant social order and therefore no dominant culture ever in reality includes or exhausts all human practice, human energy, and human intention.[70]

---

[1] J.Harris, (1989) Raymond Williams: Art History and Social Critique; BLOCK 15 , 1989,1.;Middlesex Polytechnic.

[2] R.Williams (1989) The Politics of Modernism: Against the New Conformists. P168; Verso

[3] T. Eagleton (2003) After Theory. P54. Allen Lane.

[4] N.Mulholland (2002) Why Is There Only One Monopolies Commission? In Variant, issue 4; www,variant.org.uk p5 of 6.

[5] Ibid.

[6] R. Williams (1980) Problems in Materialism and Culture, p241, Verso.

[7] R.Williams (1977) Marxism and Literature; p98; Oxford University Press.

[8] R.Williams (1965) The Long Revolution; p63; Harmondsworth

[9] J.Eldridge and L.Eldridge, (1994) Raymond Williams: Making Connections, p120.

[10] P.Jones (2004) Raymond Williams's Sociology of Culture: A critical Reconstruction. P14. SAGE

[11] cited in Thompson, E.P. (1978) The Poverty of Theory p202. Merlin Press, London

[12] N.Mulholland as n.4 , p1 of 6

[13] ibid

[14] A. O'Connor (1989) Raymond Williams: Writing, Culture, Politics; p23; Basil Blackwell.

[15] E.P.Thompson (1979) The Politics Of Theory; in Samuel, R. [ed] (1979)People's History and Socialist Theory p397; History Workshop Series, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

[16] R.Williams, as n.2 p242.

[17] E.P. Thompson, as n.15, p398

[18] ibid, p405.

[19] A.O'Connor, as n 14, p105

[20] R.Wiliams, (1985) Towards 2000; p33, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

[21] Ibid.

[22] R. Samuel, (1989) 'Philosophy Teaching by Example' in History Workshop Journal,Issue 27, Spring 1989. P141

[23] R.Williams as n.6, p243.

[24] Ibid pp243-4

[25] J.Harris, as n.1 p21

[26] Ibid.

[27] ibid p24

[28] R. Williams (1990) What I Came to Say... p162; Radius, London.

[29] R. Williams as n.6 p166.

[30] R.Williams cited in Harris, J. as n.1. p26

[31] ibid.

[32] Z. Bauman (2001) The Individualised Society, p195. Polity Press.

[33] R.Williams as n.6 p25.

[34] Ibid p22

[35] ibid p23

[36] P .Jones as n.10 p20.

[37] J .Eldridge and L Eldridge as n.9, p112.

[38] R. Williams (1977) Marxism and Literature p133, Oxford University Press.

[39] R. Williams, (1989) When was Modernism? In The politics of Modernism, as n.2

[40] J. Harris, [ed] (2004) Art, Money, Parties[..] p20 ; Liverpool University Press.

[41] P. Burke (1997) Varieties of Cultural History; p135. Polity Press.

[42] R. Williams, as n.6, p29.

[43] R. Williams as n.8, p65.

[44] D.Ades, Cox, N. and Hopkins, D. (1999) Marcel Duchamp; p183; Thames and Hudson.

[45] Ibid.

[46] J.Eldridge and L. Eldridge as n.9. p120.

[47] A .O'Connor, as n.14, p72.

[48] Ibid.

[49] J.Eldridge and L.Eldridge as n.9 p120.

[50] R. Williams (1964) Drama from Ibsen to Brecht; p31, cited in n.9, p120.

[51] R .Williams (1981) Politics and Letters p 176

[52] R. Williams (1961) Culture and Society (1988) p285

[53] R. Williams (1983) Keywords p87

[54] R. Williams (1989) Resources of Hope; p4 ; Verso.

[55] R. Williams, (1981) Politics and Letters, p100; Verso.

[56] R. Williams (1983) Keywords; p13, Fontana Press, Glasgow.

[57] R.Williams [1961] (1988) Culture and Society, p15, Harmondsworth, Penguin

[58] Cited in Eldridge and Eldridge, as n.9, pp48-9.

[59] R. Williams, as n.57, p13.

[60] R. Williams, as n.6 p40

[61] Ibid, p42.

[62] Ibid, p35.

[63] Ibid.

[64] A.O'Connor as n.14, pp107-7

[65] R.Williams, as n.52, p42.

[66] T. Eagleton (2000) The Idea of Culture, p119; Blackwell Publishers.

[67] P .Jones (1995) Williams and 'Quality': A response to John Corner. In Media, Culture and Society, vol.17,p319. Sage.

[68] R. Williams as n.20, p5.

[69] R. Williams as n.20, p 244.

[70] R. Williams as n.6 p177.

PART 3; HISTORICAL OVERVIEW....(LIVES TOLD)

As noted in Part 1, Glasgow has a long history of politically motivated artists' groups
and initiatives, which were aligned with varying commitment to socialist, communist
and nationalist agendas. In this chapter, an historical overview is offered which, in
taking account of some of these cultural formations may provoke some hesitation
concerning Pierre Bourdieu's generalisations on cultural reproduction. At the same
time, the emergence of the Compass Gallery as a specific, and significant, cultural
formation in its own right can be placed in a relevant perspective.

In 1990, as Glasgow celebrated the official status of "European Capital of Culture",
the Compass Gallery celebrated its 21st anniversary. The occasion was marked with
an impressive exhibition, "The Compass Contribution" (10th of May –24th June 1990).
Far exceeding the spatial capacity of the gallery's own premises, the exhibition was
held at a brand new space for both the display of art and theatre performance – 'The
Tramway', Albert Drive, Glasgow. This venue had been developed specifically to
cater for the city's celebrations. The Tramway had originally been home to the
Glasgow Corporation's tram depot prior to a refurbishment when it became the city's
Museum of Transport.

'The Compass Contribution' exhibition chronicled an extensive range of artists
whose works had, in a variety of forms, been displayed at Compass since its inception
at 178 West Regent Street in 1969. In an introductory essay to the accompanying
catalogue, the late playwright and critic, W. Gordon Smith noted:

> The creation of Compass, and Gerber's dedicated involvement
> with contemporary art, was no dilettantish or commercial accident.
> At least some of its pedigree goes back as far as the 40s, to No. 358
> Sauchiehall Street, where that loose assembly of Glasgow Unity
> Artists – J.D. Fergusson, Josef Herman, Helen Biggar, Tom MacDonald,
> Bet Low, Millie Frood and others, including many European refugees,
> celebrated the freedom of creative spirits and inspired some of Cyril Gerber's
> ambitions.[1]

The Glasgow Unity Artists were indeed a 'loose assembly'. Activities and
participants were many and varied. As such, they cannot be described as a movement
in any formal sense of style and medium – expressionism, social realism, and

surrealism have all been used to assess their works – however adherence to a shared cultural and political outlook is evident.

Williams notes that the sociology of such loose groups, as the Glasgow Unity Artists were, is already complex and more so if no fixed constitution, or lesser formality of organisation is present. Williams writes that the looser form of group association, "primarily defined by shared theory and practice, and its immediate social relations are often not easy to distinguish from those of a group of friends who share common interests."[2] Williams comments further:

> The sociology of such groups, internally considered, is then obviously
> difficult, in any orthodox terms. Yet a general sociology of the phase in
> which the formation of such groups can be seen as culturally distinctive,
> alongside more formal and established organisations, is at once necessary,
> and fascinating.[3]

This chapter sets out to examine the 'pedigree' to which Gordon Smith refers, and to explore the emergence of the Compass Gallery in relation to this as well as existing institutions for art in Glasgow; educational activity, trade organisations and the spaces made available for the public display of art. The interrelation of the role of theatre, masques and pageants also makes an important contribution that will be addressed. In particular, the development of Glasgow's civic collection and the institution of an annual exhibition for living artists will be explored.

While the bourgeois origins of these early spaces for the public display of art can, and must be made clear, this is not to confirm Carol Duncan's account of the art museum and to see it as 'deceptively' fixed within these boundaries. Instead, this identification, with all its contradictions, ambivalence and absences, serves as a basis for opening rather than closure, and for understanding and identifying social and cultural change. This leads back to the questions about structure and agency and leads out to the broader question of the autonomy of art.

Harris comments:

> Yet if 'art institutions' in the more or less traditional sense of important
> buildings housing great collections; the relations between royalty and painters
> trained in a state academy to produce official portraits or commemorations of
> historic battles; the direct employment of 'war artists' by British and US
> governments in two world wars – have been recognised as active and influential
> in the development of art and artists, then far less attention has been paid to the

ways in which artists organise themselves (in the later 19th and 20th centuries often *against* such official institutions) in what may be called their own *formations.*[4]

The idea of the cultural formation is a central aspect of Williams' analysis which following Goldmann, suggested a typology for his sociology of self-organised aesthetico-intellectual groupings, or cultural producers outwith, but also including traditional notions of schools or movements.

 As I discussed in Part 1, against Prior's assessment of the museum as "the precondition for modern art", the museum can be seen as one of the preconditions for changing artistic practices but it cannot be isolated as a determining factor within this process. By the same token, the role of the art historian as outlined by Duncan cannot be sustained as the sole provider of the museum's content. Mulholland, as discussed in part 1, has sought to establish an economic basis for the art (and culture) of the late 20th century using the IMF crisis of 1976 as his point of departure. While each of these specifically structural conjectures may have great merit as possible components towards the social production of art, there is a problem of ascertaining the degree of emphasis to be placed on any of these particular themes. Williams was clearly alert to the role of economic change, and its shaping influence as "Culture and Society" established; "But the difficulty lies in estimating the importance of a factor, which never, in practice, appears in isolation." [5]

 As Williams' writes:

> However difficult it may be in particular practice, we have to try and see
> the process as a whole, and to relate our particular studies, if not explicitly
> at least by ultimate reference, to the actual and complex organisation.[6]

Thus, to situate Compass Gallery appropriately, it is necessary to examine its emergence not only against existing institutions for art, but also in reference to a wider social context. Within this context, new political, economic and cultural experiences shaped the everyday lives, thoughts, and feelings of 'ordinary' people, motivating them, rather than determining them, to create extraordinary things.

 Bill Williamson has commented on the insensitivity of both social science and history as a failure to grasp the "extent and pace of change which has overtaken us". [7] Social science, although there are exceptions to this, is often too preoccupied with "ideas and structures and groups to understand the potency of feelings, relationships and personal change".[8] Similarly historians have been concerned with public lives,

issues and movements. Williamson acknowledges Theodore Zeldin, who organised his history of 19th century France around six passions: ambition, love, anger, pride, taste and anxiety with the individual Frenchman as his starting point. For Zeldin, private lives, and the emotions of the individual have been left to the novelist. Zeldin's concern, as Williamson notes, was to focus on how people feel about themselves, "without taking it for granted that their behaviour is determined principally by their economic situation". Williamson writes:

> This is an argument for taking seriously how people respond
> emotionally to experience, for trying to see how feelings are part
> of how people think and act.[9]

It is an argument also which supports the continued relevance of studying the interdependence of structure and agency, biography and history, the macro and the micro and to understand the relationship between the two.

As Zygmunt Bauman has expressed, "The battle between 'background' and 'action' ('structure' and 'agency') is, arguably the, the most hotly contested of the boundaries which give shape to the *Lebenswelt* map and so, obliquely, to the trajectories of life courses."[10] Bauman suggests that this boundary is the site of "frenzied ideological struggles." However, the act of questioning this boundary, as Williams did, is the most effective form of contest. Bauman acknowledges Lawrence Grossman's concept of 'articulation' as best describing the struggles conducted on this boundary. This is "the process of forging connections between practices and effects, as well as enabling practices to have different, often unpredicted outcomes." Bauman comments that:

> All articulations open up certain possibilities and close down some others.
> The distinctive feature of the stories told in our times is that they articulate
> individual lives in a way that excludes or suppresses (prevents from articulation)
> the possibility of tracking down the links connecting individual fate to the ways
> and means by which society as a whole operates; more to the point, it precludes
> the questioning of such ways and means by regulating them to the unexamined
> background of individual life pursuits and casting them as 'brute facts' which
> the story tellers can neither challenge or negotiate, whether singly, severally or
> collectively.[11]

For Bauman, "articulation of life stories is the activity through which meaning and purpose are inserted into life." Bauman's use of the term 'articulation' has much in common with Williams' 'knowable community'. In both cases, the narrative form has

historical and cultural value within the descriptive terms that are made use of and applied. As Bauman makes clear, there are not only more ways of telling a story than can be dreamt of in our daily story telling, there are also more ways of living than may be suggested by these stories. [12]

To this extent, this chapter will examine public lives, issues and movements alongside structures, ideas and groups. This will be followed by exploring the 'potency of feelings, relationships and personal change' to which Williamson refers. In their totality, it is hoped that the emergence of the Compass Gallery can be appropriately situated.

The following section aims to outline the flow of economic and cultural history in Glasgow and to give some indication of the cityscape itself. This provides the opportunity to show the inter-relations between urban landscape and class divisions. At the same time, the significance of education as a tool that has effectively weakened and contested elitist versions of knowledge and culture associated with class structure can be recognised as active within a growing interest in art and culture. To understand the social construction of cultural production is at the same time to recognise that this can be socially altered.

CONDITIONS ENCOUNTERED FROM THE PAST.....

> *Men make their own history, but they do not*
> *do so under circumstances chosen by themselves,*
> *but under circumstances directly encountered,*
> *given, and transmitted from the past.*
>
> *Marx; 18th Brumaire[13]*

Prior to the First World War, trade and industry prospered in Glasgow. In the early 1900s, Glasgow had developed into a highly successful commercial centre. As Juliet Kinchen writes:

> By 1900, Glasgow was one of the richest cities in the world, the
> 'second city' of the British Empire, with a population of around
> three quarters of a million people. It had become the successful
> commercial, social and service centre for a huge hinterland and

through its advantageous coastal location, commanded a vast
international market. All the components of industrial pre-eminence
were at hand: a ready supply of skilled, cheap labour and technological
expertise: a great river for steam power and transportation: easy access
to both raw materials and imports.[14]

In this context, as Cordelia Oliver notes, trade in art enjoyed considerable buoyancy:

In its heyday at the turn of the century, Glasgow could boast more than
thirty art galleries, while the new building to house the municipal art
collection could be seen rising in all its pink sandstone splendour at
Kelvingrove Park.[15]

Art, industry, business, power and money were closely entwined. Great collections
were built, emphasising and celebrating social prestige. The collection to be housed at
the municipal building at Kelvingrove Park was comprised initially from the
bequeathed estate of Archibald McLellan. This collection had previously been housed
in purpose built salons (now the McLellan Galleries) on Sauchiehall Street.

McLellan was a civic colleague of Lord Provost Andrew Orr, who in a stated aim to
make Glasgow "a model municipality", advocated the acquisition of a civic art
collection in 1856. This venture was suggested to place Glasgow on a par with
"almost any other city of importance on the continent".[16] Urban regeneration was, as
Maver suggests, a vital component of civic rhetoric:

In the heart of the old city living conditions had deteriorated drastically
as slum-dwellers continued to cluster in the warren of wynds and closes
that had long been identified as a serious hazard to public health. It came
to be realised that a co-ordinated solution under municipal control was the
most practical means of reversing further decline. Making a virtue out of
social necessity, plans for city improvement were depicted as progressive
and life-enhancing.[17]

In particular, Glasgow's civic leaders looked to Paris. There is nothing accidental or
purely aesthetic about this particular adoption of urban planning. As Williams' work
has discussed, ideas of representational democracy were introduced throughout
Britain as a defence mechanism by the bourgeoisie against a popular (which in this
context articulated ideas of 'mass' or 'mob' and thus seemingly unruly) democracy
that the French revolution of 1848 had clearly illustrated. Anxiety over potential
political upheaval was differently expressed by John Ruskin's "Seven Lamps of

Architecture" (1849). As Boyer notes, Ruskin's treatise set out to establish the manner wherein architecture expressed its meaning and moral atmosphere, and to demonstrate how architecture could become an instrument of social stability.[18] Ruskin was a staunch opponent of 'modernist' architecture, which in his eyes, the Crystal Palace epitomised, upholding the Gothic style as the greatest testament to craftsmanship.

In Glasgow however, the work of Georges Haussmann, architect of Emperor Napolean III provided an influential resource and was advocated by the Lord Provost John Blackie, who headed a civic delegation to the French capital in June 1866.[19] In Paris, Haussmann had cleared slum areas and introduced the construction of the boulevards, establishing parks and open spaces. Such spaces were seen in direct contrast to the closes and wynds of Glasgow. More explicitly, those people who were visible in such spaces were compared; "Neatness and self-respect" was deemed to typify Parisians against "those loathsome types of utterly degenerate human nature that abound to such an appalling extent in our own closes and wynds."[20]

At the same time, city restructuring brought untold investment opportunities and real estate speculation for Glasgow's bourgeoisie

The French example of urban design was translated to Glasgow through the city architect John Carrick, who laid out wide, straight thoroughfares. As Frisby has highlighted in his discussion of "Straight or Crooked Streets":

> The broad, straight avenue might also have a political significance as
> potential barrier to insurrection as Walter Benjamin and others argued
> for Haussmann's *grand boulevards*.[21]

Susan Buck-Morss points out in relation to this, that "Haussmann's slum 'clearance' simply broke up working-class neighbourhoods and moved the eyesores and health hazards out of central Paris and into the suburbs". While the arrangement of buildings and streets could be altered, as "objects in space", Buck- Morss notes that social relationships were left intact, "class antagonisms were thereby covered up, not eliminated".[22]

The ambiguities of this context of 'progress' are made available through Baudelaire's "Paris Spleen", and "The Eyes of the Poor". Two lovers sit in a new café that formed the corner to a new boulevard, still littered with the rubble that underpinned its construction. Surrounded by mirrors, gold and the opulence of artificial light, the lovers find themselves confronted by a "family of eyes" dressed in rags. Baudelaire's description of the fascination of this displaced and impoverished

family group, as Marshall Berman comments, is not hostile. "Their vision of the gulf between the two worlds is sorrowful, not militant, not resentful but resigned."[23] As Berman continues, the 'creative demolition' of Haussmann's Paris, which drove the poor out of sight, now brings them back into a new line of vision:

> Haussmann, in tearing down the old medieval slums, inadvertently broke
> down the self-enclosed and hermetically sealed world of traditional urban
> poverty. The Boulevards, blasting great holes through the poorest neighbour-
> hoods, enabled the poor to walk through the holes and out of their ravaged
> neighbourhoods, to discover for the first time what the rest of their city and
> the rest of life is like. And as they see, they are seen: the vision, the epiphany
> flows both ways.[24]

Eileen Hooper-Greenhill has used the concept of seeing and being seen in relation to the emergence of the public museum arguing that it "exposed both the decadence and tyranny of the old forms of control, the *ancien regime*, and the democracy and the utility of the new, the Republic."[25]

In Glasgow, industrial expansion spurred the city's architectural transformations and contributed to changing patterns of spatial utility and symbolism. In particular, educational activity shifts away from an increasingly industrialised and commercialised East End. The most decisive break with Glasgow's old town being illustrated by the demolition of the 17th century College buildings on High Street. In their place, a central railway terminus and goods depot, alongside the new straight streets, heralded an uninhibited flow of trade and commerce. While this relates to the slum clearances around High Street, and the 1866 Act, the idea of relocation had surfaced earlier in the 19th century.

The early decades of the 19th century were ravaged with smallpox ('the poor man's friend') and four major cholera outbreaks forced attention to sanitation and water supplies and the increasingly pressing need to tackle housing problems which were by now infamous in the East End. Cholera epidemics were democratic in their reach, spreading fear among all social classes. According to one doctor writing in the Glasgow Herald, "the cholera has been permitted by our Creator for no other object than that of enforcing upon the rich and intelligent the amendment of the habitations of the poor."[26] As Devine notes, cholera was not so much an act of God as compelling evidence that the slums had to be cleansed. Physical well-being and a pure environment were, as Wohl states, the essential foundations for all areas of social

progress. Physical improvement was necessary before any moral, religious or intellectual improvement could occur.[27]

However, as Spring writes:

> These plans were predicated by the benevolence of Victorian philanthropists, but were due, in no small part, to commercial concerns – with the increasing demand for city centre space and rented housing, especially with the development of the railway centred around the top of the High Street.[28]

Alex Matheson provides a survey of the University's history in *Glasgow's Other River* (2000).[29] In 1845, the Glasgow, Airdie and Monklands Railway offered a tempting deal. In exchange for the site at High Street, the railway company would build a new university in the West End of the city. The university gained the necessary sanction from Parliament to relocate, and the railway company then purchased the estate of Woodlands. By 1847, architect John Baird had been commissioned to provide plans. The University Senate, on the advice of William Lyon Playfair and Augustus Welby Pugin rejected three successive proposals from Baird. Hoping for a more financially viable scheme, the Senate turned to Edward Blore. Unfortunately, by the time a suitable design was drawn up, in 1849, the railway company had its own financial difficulties and could no longer afford to honour the offer.

As Matheson notes, the relocation scheme had its critics. Arguments were made against the Professors "selling their souls to the railways", advocating that their attention should instead be turned to resolving the housing problems around the site and restoring what then constituted the foremost group of 17th century edifices in Glasgow.[30] Nonetheless, a new offer came from the City of Glasgow Union Railway in 1863 proposing to buy the East End site for £100,000. The university agreed, and having again obtained sanction from Parliament, turned its attention to searching for alternative premises. The site at Woodlands was no longer available.

The university's new location at Gilmorehill, purchased in July the following year, lay between the exclusive Park District and what was then the growing suburb of Hillhead. Against the wishes of his peers, Professor Allan Thompson, Convenor of the Senate's Removal Committee, secured plans from the London architect James Gilbert Scott and against some heated discussion, ignored local architects such as Alexander 'Greek' Thomson. Matheson writes:

> Scott had made his name as an ecclesiastical architect and his design for

the university was strongly influenced by this. Perhaps that was what swayed the Senate in his favour, for the monastic quadrangles must have suggested the Auld Pedagogy to them. Whereas 'Greek' Thomson was a committed classicist, Scott was a disciple of the Gothic revival which was all the rage in the 1860s. [31]

Construction began in 1866. The last classes in the old university were dismissed on 29th July 1870, and the doors opened at Gilmorehill in November that same year. The relocation of the University not only consolidated the material and geographical expansion of 'Greater Glasgow', but also was symbolically seen as "altogether more appropriate terrain for educating the aspiring doctors, lawyers and clergymen of Glasgow."[32] In the more affluent West End setting, students housed in local lodgings would be spared the increasingly reported attention of muggers and prostitutes that proliferated as print communication industries expanded.

New forms of domestic commerce, for example the growth of department stores that replaced the old arcades were also instrumental towards changing the face of the city. Numerous retail outlets along Argyll Street, Buchannan Street and Sauchiehall Street testified to a new mass consumerism among the middle and artisan classes. [33]

In 1853, McLellan began to erect buildings on Sauchiehall Street. The buildings contained shops and houses as well as the three exhibition galleries anticipated for the public display of his collection. In many senses, this configuration replicated the earlier moments of the Glasgow Dilettanti Society (1825 – 1838) whose initial attempts to found an annual exhibition space for living artists (1828) were similarly located within developing commercial areas. Until the 1830s, Sauchiehall Street's surrounding area of Blytheswood had been a developed residential district for Glasgow's wealthier citizens, escaping the industrialised East End. Unsurprisingly, as expanding domestic commerce and the demands of business spread westwards, Maver notes that "the middle classes fled even further to the fringes of the city." [34]

The 'donation' of McLellan's art collection and its purpose built salons on Sauchiehall Street, bequeathed to the citizens of Glasgow while building was still in progress (1853), was not however a straightforward matter. McLellan was a coach - builder and Deacon-Convener of the Trades House. Coach building in 19th century Scotland generally became a particularly profitable business as road construction improved with the advent of 'Tarmacadam' surfaces. Interestingly, it was also among the first trades to adopt component production. This economic organisation was both

cause and consequence of social inequality reflecting a functionalist world view, where 'survival of the fittest' permeated all areas of social life. Despite this, MacLellan had in fact died insolvent. The acquisition of his collection was dependent on the agreement of the Corporation of Glasgow to pay his creditors. Amidst all the civic rhetoric, there was also significant public unease about the £44,500 needed for the acquisition of McLellan's collection. However, this unease was ultimately overridden by an argument proposing 'community prestige' through promoting the "instruction and gratification of the people". [35]

McLennan's art collection was finally purchased for £15,000. and the building for £29,500. Public funds, under the pretext of an articulated policy on the benefits of the general public's exposure to art, are clearly shown to be underwriting private, corporate debt. Nonetheless, the introduction to the 1906 catalogue of Kelvingrove, celebrates both the Glasgow philanthropist, Archibald McLellan who graciously left his private art collection to the people, as much as the city Corporation's own benevolence. His testimony, quoted in the 1906 catalogue was as follows:

> I, Archibald McLellan, coach builder in Glasgow, considering that I have
> for thirty years, spent much of my spare time in making a Collection of
> Pictures, illustrative of the characteristics and progress of the various
> schools of painting in Italy, Germany, Spain, the Low Countries, and
> France, sine the revival of art in the fifteenth century; and believing that,
> imperfect as any such Collection by a private individual must necessarily be,
> it still may be of some use to those who are desirous of studying the progress
> of Art; and also believing that it may be made to form the foundation for
> a more extensive and complete Collection, through contributions from those
> who have more means and better judgement to select fine examples of the
> respective schools; and being impressed with the belief that the study of what
> are called the 'Fine Arts' is eminently conducive to the elevation and refinement
> of all classes, as well as intimately connected with the manufacturing and
> mercantile prosperity of the community — from these various motives, and on
> account of my connection with Glasgow and its various public bodies, and as a
> humble testimony of my attachment to its citizens, and my desire for their wel-
> fare and elevation, so far as it is in my power to aid in the promotion of these, I
> have resolved to donate my said Collection to public use and exhibition, and to
> make the same over, for that purpose, to Trustees, who shall have the sole con-

trol and management thereof.[36]

McLellan's testament articulates a 'knowable community' (a conception of self and others) through the narrow terms of his own bourgeois class identity. Economic means are aligned with 'better judgement' through educational attainment. Economic capital and cultural capital are here considered as mutually reinforcing. This particular 'cultural clerisy' saw as its task the 'elevation' and 'refinement' of "all classes" via the prosperity of the mercantile and manufacturing community. This prosperity was in turn, to be made visible through the conspicuous demonstration of public access to a civic art collection. Nonetheless, the fact that "*all classes*" are seen capable of 'refinement' and 'elevation' is notable for its egalitarian concerns even if some classes were seen as in need of more refinement than others.

Prior refers to Bauman's emphasis on Darwin's *Origin of the Species* and its role towards a changing conception of social hierarchy. No longer fixed in divine feudal relationships, the human species was capable of adaptation and transformation via external forces. These ideas were manifest not only in the social role of the public museum and art gallery itself but equally found resonance in its display methods. Education was crucial within this process and Scotland's education system, albeit one of enormous variety in its provision before 1872, was a source of national pride. Devine notes that:

> The Scottish system was believed to be both meritocratic and democratic, resting on a ladder of opportunity which ascended from the parish and burgh schools through to the universities, allowing able boys from the most humble background to rise to eminence simply on the basis of their own talent.[37]

Nonetheless, as McCrone points out, this view of egalitarianism was 'old' in that it was premised upon the existence of a hierarchical order, not a classless society. [38] The meritocratic concept became prevalent in Victorian Scotland and its cultural form was articulated by the "lad o' pairts", and the Kailyard literary tradition from the 1880s. 'The lad o' pairts' personified the virtues of the Scottish education system. A 'talented youth', this figure was often the son of a crofter or peasant who had the ability but not the economic means to benefit from education. The merits and influences of the Kailyard tradition are subject to some debate. McCrone offers a summary of two competing views. Tom Nairn argues that Kailyardism laid down "a distorting image of Scotland replete with pawky simplicities".

On the other hand, Willie Donaldson suggests that this tradition was by no means dominant in late 19th century Scotland, taking second place to a more popular genre of writing in newspapers. The Kailyard, he argues, was designed for export by the London based book trade whereas the Scottish press was owned, written and circulated within Scotland. [39]

As McCrone comments, the egalitarian element of the "lad o' pairts" has a precise meaning and a specific sociological significance, which is explained by Allan McLaren:

> The egalitarianism so often portrayed is not that emerging from an economic, social or even political equality; it is equality of *opportunity* which is exemplified. All men are not equal. What is implied is that all men are given the opportunity to be equal. Whatever the values attached to such a belief, if expressed today, it would be termed elitist not egalitarian. [40]

The 'lad o' pairts' was not simply a literary construction, as McCrone has shown through his examination of educational statistics in Scottish universities and patterns of social mobility. Nonetheless, *he* (for there was no equivalent lass o' pairts) was more likely to be an urban rather than the rural figure that Kailyard literature fictionalised. By the third quarter of the 19th century, 23% of the students could be described as "working class". In the main, these students were the sons of skilled artisans – carpenters, joiners, masons or shoemakers – only a tiny minority being the sons of crofters, fishermen or labourers. According to Devine:

> The lad o' pairts clearly existed, but they were few and far between. Above all, students of working class origin came to university as adults, often on a part time basis, rather than directly from the celebrated parish schools. [41]

The concept was also close to the hearts of Scottish Industrialists and reflected something of their own experience of social mobility. As Fowle has noted; "Scots industrialists were anxious to achieve social status, furnishing their homes and lining their walls with the trappings of wealth. Some sought to emulate the aristocratic collectors of the 18th century, who acquired their pictures and their works of art on the Grand Tour." Old Masters and established British painters such as Gainsburgh, Constable or Turner were standard investments. Scottish art was also important, and to a large extent, the choice here reflected their self-image. [42]

Fowle suggests that the Protestant Work Ethic is historically an important feature of Scottish identity. The concept was rigorously studied by the sociologist Max Weber who singled out the doctrine of predestination for special attention, "that only some individuals are chosen to be saved from damnation, the choice being predetermined by God."[43] The extreme inhumanity of this view could only result in one consequence for those who surrendered to it - "A feeling of unprecedented inner loneliness."[44] From this, Weber argued, the capitalist spirit was born.

Giddens points out two developments from this; the obligation to regard oneself as chosen as any lack of certainty indicated insufficient faith. The performance of 'good works' in worldly activity thus became the medium whereby surety of faith was demonstrated. "Hence success in a calling became a 'sign' - never a means- of being one of the elect." [45]

While McLennan's articulation of the 'knowable community' might be deservedly critiqued, it is difficult to make the case, as Duncan would, that there is any 'deception' at work here - 'deceit' implies intention, and as mentioned in part 2, reflects a 'totalitarian' ideology. As Fowle has demonstrated with reference to art collectors in Dundee, their own humble beginnings were a critical factor in the belief that art could have a positive and salutary effect on the working classes. Thus a collector like William Robertson "truly believed that the minds and hearts of the working classes could be improved and uplifted through art, thereby encouraging them to take a pride in their work and perhaps even increase trade and productivity."[46] The connection being made between art and work is interesting in that it suggests that for industrial patrons, the hierarchical separation of 'art' from 'craft' was not yet complete and that a shared sensibility anchored in the idea of skilled labour and good craftsmanship persisted.

However, E. P. Thompson's reference to Wordsworth's polemic against "the wardens of our faculties" can be noted. Thompson writes:

> For there is no such thing as economic growth which is not at the same
> time, growth or change of culture; and the growth of social consciousness,
> like the growth of a poets mind, can never, in the last analysis, be planned.[47]

As Maver's account shows, the purchase of McLellan's collection was contested from the start. While moments of domination are critical to examine, there is no moment of power that does not simultaneously contain a moment of resistance.

Williams and Garnham point out that within any process of reproduction, it is also necessary to distinguish between 'replication' and 'reformation':

> Reformation points us towards the spaces that are opened up in conjunctural situations in which the dominant class is effectively weakened and which thus offers for real innovation in the social structure, for shifts in the structure of power in the field of class relations which, while falling short of 'revolution' in the classical sense, are nonetheless of real and substantial historical importance and are objectively 'revolutionary' within a longer historical rhythm.[48]

It is clear that Glasgow's acquisition of a civic art collection was a component in aspects of social control and urban regeneration that were a response to the visible effects of Bourgeois exploitation of the labour force. However, we have also to see that exploitation as being at least in part, understood and in turn, challenged by critical responses, and alternative cultural formations. Glasgow's civic collection did have an educational intention (as the references to 'schools' of painting and the 'progress of art' suggest) albeit one that cannot be easily separated from ideas of improving the spiritual welfare, consumption patterns and thus the productivity of the labour force. Williams might describe this as " the irresolvable choice between a necessary materialism and a necessary humanity".[49]

The ambivalence surrounding the imposition of the civic art collection has to emphasised. As Hooper-Greenhill has argued, from the very beginning, the public museum was a form of political, economic and cultural apparatus with two deeply contradictory functions; "that of an elite temple for the arts, and that of a utilitarian instrument for democratic education." [50]

As this chapter highlights, the emergence of both Glasgow's civic art collection and later the Kelvingrove Art Gallery and Museum are part of much wider reformist activity, including sanitation measures, schools and hospitals, in which direct planning as much contingency strategies against historical accident occur. The release of private goods to civic ownership and public display does, as Hooper-Greenhill suggested in the French example, comment on both an older class relationship against a new citizenship. Reformation did not just occur for the working classes, but significantly reordered the Bourgeoisie itself as a new industrial class rose and an indigenous landed aristocracy weakened.

In light of this, can Duncan's accusation of the museum's 'deceit' be demonstrated as viable either in theory or in practice? Some distinctions are necessary between the expansion of education in an empirical sense, and the contribution which education makes within the experience of cultural expansion.

Clearly, McLellan's testament supports a civic art gallery as being provided by the city's wealthiest (in his terms from above) in an attempt to 'refine' even the poorest (below). Given that prosperity and abject poverty, were the two polarities of the lived reality of the *whole* community's identity, the historically and culturally specific emergence of Glasgow's civic art collection, does paradoxically represent that history and identity, when the historical role of labour is brought into the account. The labour force in Glasgow represented the majority, and as any self-respecting industrialist knew, this majority carried great power to create pressure and provided an ever-present potential threat to minority wealth.

Duncan's assessment that the museum reflects only "the interests and self image of certain powers within the community" is in its way, an honourable argument by which to expose unequal distributions of economic, social and cultural power. Nonetheless, in some ways, this argument loses its potentially radical edge because Duncan upholds the museum, despite changes to its narratives, contents and layout, as successfully maintaining/reproducing *only* that dominant power. Missing from her argument is any consideration of the struggle *between* labour and capital that has historically renegotiated the limits of the dominant power. As Williams articulates, "Where only one class is seen, no classes are seen." [51]

In particular through Duncan's degrading use of the term 'deceit', all challenges to the contingent structures of knowledge displayed by the museum or art gallery are implicated as testifying to the success of the museum's 'ritual structure'. Now, given that Duncan accuses art history of displacing and purging history of social and political conflict, and distilling history down to a series of triumphs, how does her own assessment of the (triumphant, bourgeois) museum stand up to this criticism?

To see the museum as a one-sided, 'deceptive' affair, shares with aspects of Bourdieu's theories, and specifically with his ideas of 'mis-recognition' and 'symbolic violence'. As with Bourdieu, Duncan exhibits an extreme scepticism about the structures of formal democracy. These are seen, as Bruce Robbins notes in a recent commentary on Bourdieu, to function so as to "disguise the hereditary transmission of privilege, allowing the success of some and the failure of the rest to

appear as an innocent process of selection on merit."[52] Such theoretical constructions preclude progressive political interventions as doomed to recuperation and futility.

As Williams has asked, "[...] can we raise again the question whether showing the exploited as degraded does not simply prolong the lease of the exploiter?" [53]

The citizens of Glasgow can be said to have paid for their heritage twice and not only through their hard labour which created Glasgow's economic prosperity. McLellan's wealth, which enabled the development of his personal art collection, had at times a particularly unpalatable source. As already noted, MacLellan enjoyed a privileged and high profile civic career, and according to the campaigning Reformist journalist Peter Mackenzie's "Reminiscences of Glasgow" (The Astonishing Increase Of The Poor's Rates In Glasgow,1865, Glasgow), was not only 'an ace away from becoming Lord Provost' but was also the 'despot of the times' via his role as Chairman of the City Parochial Board in raising income tax, or "Poor Rates" in the city. [54]

As an assessor of taxes, McLellan and his board were on a commission of 1.5%, and it was thus in their personal interests to adjust the tax returns in their favour. Between 1837 and 1848, the "Poor Rates" in the city rose from £10,241. to "the prodigious amount of £70,000 sterling."[55] According to MacKenzie, this rise was not necessarily symptomatic of an increased charitable sensitivity. Relating to an Act of Parliament passed in 1846, the Poor Law Amendment Act, three new modes for assessing tax were devised. The first was aimed at rental, with landlord and tenant each paying half. The second idea was to share the assessment between those proprietors of heritable property and the whole inhabitants according to means and substance. The third mode was that assessment should be made via the estimated annual income of all city inhabitants according to their means and substance.

It cannot be overemphasised that the majority of the city inhabitants, living in inferior rented accommodation, had precious little means in comparison to either landlords or property heirs. With this in mind, the first mode of assessment would have seriously damaged the profits of the landlords whilst lessening the financial burden to the tenant. The second mode offered similar properties towards the redistribution of social wealth. The wealthiest 'citizens', including landlords and property heirs themselves, often lived without the taxable territory then designated as Glasgow. McLellan was lucky enough to enjoy two residencies; No.3 Dalhousie Street for superior urban dwelling and Mugdock Castle for the country life.

Maureen Park also makes comment on the 'Poor Rates' affair, although her interpretation of it differs from my own.[56] Park cites the recollections of James Hedderwick, (*Backward Glances*, 1891) of a dinner party that he attended with McLellan to celebrate the election of Lord Provost Stewart, who had narrowly defeated McLellan. "On hearing a rumour that a wealthy business might move out of the city to avoid payment, McLellan reacted with characteristic fervour." According to Hedderwick, McLellan was enraged by "the meanness of men whom Providence had so largely favoured, plotting for the sake of a few coppers to escape their just obligation to the poorly born and unfortunate." Nonetheless, apparently in a bid to return the party to its relaxed atmosphere, McLellan followed his outburst by putting his thumb to his nose, spreading out his fingers and twirling them 'to comic effect', uttering "Pass the bottles, Provost!" [57]

While Park is keen to read this gesture as symptomatic of McLellan's charitable regard for the "poorly born and unfortunate", his involvement with the Poor Rate was not wholly honourable and as such, suggests there were limits to his philanthropic 'good works in worldly activity.'

The 'means and substance' tax of all citizens of Glasgow was eventually carried out under McLellan's board. While MacKenzie notes the administrative nightmare involved in the task, he also points out that few of these schedules were faithfully returned within the ten days specified. Whether or not this was a strategy in protest against the form of the assessment tax or if this represented the scale of inadequate numerate and literacy skills is not, in MacKenzie's account made clear. While Scotland's education facilities were held in esteem, as already noted, both access and provision varied. Glasgow did not have a co-ordinated schooling system until 1872. Either way, the board, and their assessors had the power to amend the schedules in any way they saw fit, and if required, could grant warrant for its recovery by poinding or otherwise. MacKenzie describes McLellan in a colourful account:

> Mr McLellan was the despot of the day in that affair. He literally
> ruled the city with a rod of iron in all matters connected to the poor
> law. We say this from no disrespect to his memory. We ever and anon
> esteem his great talents; he was within an ace, at one time of being Lord
> Provost of the city. He judged, we daresay, honestly and fairly on
> public grounds, that he was in the right, and that all others who differed
> from him in opinion, were wrong. He clung to the "means and substance

assessment" with the most desperate fidelity; and if he had the power, as he had the inclination, we are not sure but he would have put many of the citizens to the sword if he could have done so with impunity, just because they were becoming irritated and protesting loudly and deep against his favourite mode of assessment. He had tools of his own to work it exactly as he pleased.[58]

Not only was this financial scandal exposed, matters were further seen as reprehensible due to the manner by which the sums of money "squeezed by them by foul means or fair from the citizens of Glasgow" were disposed of. The taste for luxury is evident. MacKenzie's account records 400 gallons of whiskey, besides rum, brandy, sherries and port, ales, tobacco and snuff. These were in addition to "other luxuries never intended nor fit for paupers, [that] were charged in the course of that year to the Hospital, where hot dinners, in splendid style were frequently prepared for the clique of directors themselves!" [59]

The following year, 1847, saw an election designed to overthrow the existing board of directors. 15,089 votes were cast in favour of reforming the system against 4701 in favour of its continuance. Although McLellan maintained a position on the board, he was no longer Chairman. (NB:Park's dates do not confer with MacKenzie's ; Park's account suggests that McLellan was still Chairman of the board in 1851 while Mackenzie notes his demotion in 1847.[60])

McLellan's art collection was certainly impressive, particularly in terms of paintings from the Italian, Dutch and Flemish Schools. He was much admired by his contemporaries as an art connoisseur, and, according to Park, was a frequent host to artistic and literary friends at both of his homes. These included David Wilkie, Francis Chantrey and John Graham Gilbert.

In particular David Wilkie is renowned for his depictions of Scottish rural life. These sought to explore social and societal relations with specific reference to the poetry of Robert Burns. "The Rent Day" (1807) and "Distraining for Rent" (1815) were not well received. Of "Distraining for Rent", Wilkie's friend Haydon commented, "the aristocracy evidently thought it an attack on their rights." [61]

'The Rent Day', (1807) became the source for a play by Douglas Jerrold in 1832 which, alongside 'The Factory Girl' was an open attempt to dramatise a new social consciousness. The opening tableau directly reproduced Wilkie's painting, offering a domestic drama showing a farm tenant suffering at the hands of an absentee landlord

73

and a cheating steward. Williams notes that this depiction is in one sense radical, but yet, simultaneously is assimilated to an older kind of consciousness and an older kind of play. From the 1820s onwards, the melodrama of spectacle rather than sustained dialogue now became a vehicle for new content [62] :

> "The absentee landlord, initially taken as the representative figure gambling away his rents, has returned in disguise to see what is happening; he exposes the dishonest steward. Thus the actual tension, which was especially acute in the period when the play was written, is at once displaced – the agent substituting the landlord as villain – and sensationalised, in that through the magic of disguised and providential authority a happy ending to what in fact had no ending, was contrived." [63]

While the rural oppression did not offend the (English) play's audiences, urban industrial workers drew less sympathy. 'The Factory Girl' was taken off after two nights. The play was never printed and so is only known by report. For Williams, this represents a significant moment in 19th century culture. The contrived happy ending was a standard device of the time, but Jerrold's own reasons for the plays unpopularity referred to the new theme of the victimised industrial worker. Jerrold wrote:

> "The subject of the piece 'was low, distressing'. The truth is, it was not then *la mode* to affect an interest for the 'coarse and vulgar' details of human life, and the author suffered because he was two or three years before the fashion."[64]

This is noteworthy in light of McLellan's urban activities with the Poor Law tax, and helps to mark the coexistence of egalitarian beliefs and socially created inequality appearing simultaneously without any sense of contradiction in both English and Scottish society. This is not then a feature simply representing two 'ideologically opposed groups' wherein "The conservative may use it to justify the social order; the radical may seek to rectify the anomaly in political and economical ways."[65] Both systems of thought appear to coexist in McLellan's own structure of feeling. Dominant, residual and emergent cultures interpenetrate each other. This reinforces the claim, as noted in Part 1, that ideologies are never fixed or unified.

Prior to his project for a permanent public collection, McLellan, along with Graham Gilbert, had been involved in earlier attempts to promote trade in the arts in Glasgow. The new corporation premises on Sauchiehall Street were soon to become the home

for another of Glasgow's art establishments; The Royal Glasgow Institute for the Fine Arts (1861).

While Glasgow could now boast a civic art collection, which did in fact contain work by Scottish and English living artists, there was as yet, no annual exhibition for the display of new works by living artists, local or otherwise. The 'annual exhibition' is a feature emerging from the establishment of the Academy. The institution of the Academy itself marked a secular emphasis on the didactic possibilities for art as Church patronage in this area declined. Begun in Paris in 1667, the 'annual exhibition' was widely imitated in Europe. Academy exhibitions promoted artists' careers and offered introductions to prospective patrons

Attempts to found a permanent exhibiting society in Glasgow had been made since the latter part of the 18th century. Duncan MacMillan notes that the most long lasting of these were the Glasgow Dilettanti Society (1828-1838) and later The West of Scotland Academy which ran from 1841 – 1853 under the presidency of John Graham Gilbert (1794-1866). [66]

The Glasgow Dilettanti Society was founded in 1825, with the aim to "improve the taste for, and advance the knowledge of the Fine Arts". As Fairfull Smith records, membership was limited to 'Painters, Sculptors, Architects, Engravers and Etchers, or men possessing taste and critical knowledge in one or other of those branches of art." [67]

McLellan was a member from the society's inception, gaining the opportunity to partake in monthly meetings where he and his fellow art lovers could display aspects of their collections to mutual admiration and discussion. The society also formed a library of books and exhibition catalogues for their own private study. Aside from this, the society also included a "Committee of Taste" in order to comment on the standard and design of new buildings in the city.

By 1828, the society began to consider the benefit of an annual public exhibition for the works of living artists. Well before Fra Newbery's engagement with the relationship between art, design and industry, at the Glasgow School of Art, the Glasgow Dilettanti Society were advocating the rewards to be gained from an improved public taste, and the advantages of this in assisting manufacturing with its dependence on the arts of design. In particular, the activities of the Royal Institution and the Scottish Academy in Edinburgh were influential. The Dilettanti Society

sought guidance from William Nicholson (1781-1844), a founder member of and secretary to the Scottish Academy.

Exhibition rooms were found above Buchannan Street's Argyll Arcade, (a precursor to the department store) and on 16th September, 1828, the West of Scotland Exhibition for the Works of Living Artists displayed over 300 exhibits from more than 123 contributors. According to Fairfull Smith, the public response was encouraging. 510 season tickets and 1000 catalogues were sold, and 36 works of art were purchased amounting to over £200. The second year of exhibiting doubled that figure with sales in art exceeding £500.[68]

MacMillan credits Graham Gilbert for putting painting in Glasgow on to a professional footing. Trained at the Royal Academy, Graham Gilbert was awarded the Gold Medal for "The Prodigal Son" (1821) as "the best historical painting in oil".[69] After extensive travels in Italy, he returned to Scotland staying for a time in Edinburgh, before finally settling in Glasgow in 1834. Graham Gilbert was a prolific portrait painter, who embodied professional academicism, depicting several of Glasgow's wealthier civic community, including portraits of both Archibald McLellan and his father. These naturally became part of the civic collection after McLellan's death, although Graham Gilbert's portrait of Archibald McLellan exists through a copy by Graham Cree Crawford, purchased in 1906. Several portraits by Graham Gilbert entered the civic collection, as further bequests from some of Glasgow's more prominent citizens were added. Some of these bequests were conditional only on the Corporation's acquisition of McLellan's collection.

Artistic and social prestige can be shown to overlap in complex ways here. This is not in a dissimilar fashion to the technique of the high art image in advertising as expressed in chapter 1, by John Berger. A particular style of painting (academic), the artist and the patron combine as subject and object of display, all three supporting the idea of an educated cultural authority, and reinforcing mutual reputation and honour.

By 1906, no less than twenty of Graham Gilbert's works are listed in the collection's catalogue, four of which are commissioned portraits donated by relatives of the sitters. The remaining works attributed to Graham Gilbert were part of a substantial bequest made in 1877 by the artist's widow. This included 27 copyist paintings that are catalogued under the names of those artists copied. Thus under 'Titian' a number of works can be found which were copied by Graham Gilbert. These are secondarily attributed to him, demonstrating both the museum's and the academic painter's shared

emphasis on an art education gleaned from the study of the 'Old Masters' and the value of the continuity of tradition.

Graham Gilbert was also an enthusiastic art collector. His widow's bequest not only demonstrates his artistic judgement, but also his financial position that was enhanced considerably through marriage. The 70 paintings from the Dutch and Italian schools donated included Rembrandt's "Man in Armour" (1655, oil on canvas, Kelvingrove Art Gallery and Museum.) The incorporation of Graham Gilbert's work - and of course a great deal of work by other living artists with academic credentials - into the civic collection reflects the dominant forms of trade in art. Some cross-referencing between the 1906 catalogue of Kelvingrove Art Gallery and Museum against RGI archive material substantiates this claim. For the most part, the living artists in the civic collection are legitimised by the credentials of the RSA, and where these letters do not apply, those names can be found as early exhibitors at the Glasgow Institute for the Fine Arts.

Prior to the 20th century, with the exception of a small number of exhibits purchased from the Great Exhibition of 1988, the civic arts collection was wholly dependent on bequests and did not make purchases on its own behalf. As such, the living artists in the civic collection are an adequate demonstration of the artistic taste of Glasgow's art buying bourgeoisie in which the role of the dealer was crucial.

Examining the emergence of the civic collection in Glasgow makes it difficult to agree with either Carol Duncan's suggestion, that it is the art historian who supplies the museum with "a continuous production of great artists", or with McClellan's proposal that the museum increasingly defines what qualifies as 'art'. Of course there is art historical knowledge involved but not in the direct sense that Duncan implies. In the case of Glasgow's civic collection, the contents have already been socially defined as art through educational and economic structures in which and from which the art museum emerged.

McLellan's own collection of paintings from the "Schools of Italy, Germany, Spain, the Low Countries and France" corresponds with the development of the Scottish Enlightenment and its European connections. In the late 16th and 17th centuries, scholars and students from Scotland went to and from universities in the Low Countries, France and Germany for training and teaching in divinity and law. The study of medicine found a European centre of excellence at Leyden in the Low

Countries and painters and architects flocked to Rome where a large community of expatriate Scottish artists became established during the 18th century.[70]

Both Duncan's and MacLennan's arguments ignore the social relations of exchange between the producer and the market, and the different phases of commodity production which are involved.

Graham Gilbert was instrumental in the establishment of The Glasgow Institute for the Fine Arts. This was a private exhibiting society founded in 1861, with "the avowed intention of bringing the best of modern painting to Glasgow no matter whence its origins." It remained a dominant force as an 'establishment' of artistic practise for much of the twentieth century. The Glasgow Institute was primarily a trade organisation with a symbiotic relationship to the civic collection.

The creation of the civic art collection was an effective intervention in the art market whilst at the same time creating an expanded audience, and potentially, an increased trade for art. Goods that had previously been bought and sold for private individual reasons, taste or personal and idiosyncratic collecting habits, including those entwined with status and investment, were in most cases now bound to the museum and its audiences by the conditions pertaining to their donation.

This included conditions of how the work should be displayed, and who, between artist and patron should be primarily acknowledged. For example, in the case of the bequest made by the five sons of James Reid (Hydepark Locomotive Works, Glasgow) it was stipulated that ;

> The ten pictures should be hung together in a prominent position in one of the large rooms, or in a special room set apart for them in the galleries, and that they should be arranged and catalogued in such a manner as would make it evident that the works were presented in memory of Mr. Reid."[71]

In this case, the acknowledgement of the donor appears at least as important as the pictures themselves. The civic art collection, despite demonstrating enlightened civic leadership via a manifesto of democratic access to an educating and elevating environment, could thus still be used as a vehicle for emphasising social status as well as cultural prestige. At the same time, this necessarily helped to demonstrate the ideals of meritocracy.

As such, the Corporation's Galleries were an appropriate home for the new exhibiting society. According to Simmel, "the aesthetic output of the exhibition principle is not merely in the housing of the world of things, but also within their

outer casing in the visual stimuli and modes of representation of the commodity. The aesthetic veil of the commodity, this 'shop window quality of things' in the exhibition has its origins in the need for commodities to circulate.'[72]

The Corporation agreed to hire out the premises, and the Institute with a budget of £500 set about arranging its inaugural exhibition. In the event, so many works were submitted that costs doubled, and the eventual profits were minimal. However, Billcliffe notes the exhibition to have been well received by the artistic community and an 'enormous public success' attracting 39,099 visitors, a large proportion of whom were purchasers of 'Working Men's Tickets.' [73]

A formal Council and Constitution were voted in, and plans for the next exhibition took shape. Subsequent exhibitions followed with equal success and increasing visitor numbers. According to Billcliffe, the success of the Institute lay in the relative difficulty artists in the West of Scotland encountered in their attempts to get work accepted by the Royal Scottish Academy in Edinburgh. As the quantity of entrants to the Glasgow Institute grew, so too did the administration tasks and costs. More staff as well as more of the gallery's space was required. This strained the relationship between the Institute and the Corporation Galleries, who were required to pack up and store the existing collection of Old Masters for up to five months of the year. [74]

Boyer has commented on the pervasive sense of flux and uncertainty that permeated the 19th century city. The emergence of permanent collections, such as the civic art museum, sought both stabilising roots and values in rare and treasured works of art.[75] If the permanent collection represented stability then the temporary exhibition was the antithesis of these aims by its essentially transient nature.

The civic collection had also been growing thanks to further bequests from some of Glasgow's magnates. Concerns for both the safety of the works alongside misgivings on the validity of displaying contemporary art provoked tensions regarding the Institute's continued use of the Corporation Galleries. The expansion of both forms of exhibition, permanent and temporary required the RGI to find alternative premises. In 1879, the financial viability of the annual exhibition was firmly established and the Glasgow Institute for Fine Arts opened its own gallery, but stayed in close proximity, relocating further along Sauchiehall Street. The area was now home to a number of private dealers. In the 1870s, Alexander Reid, persuaded his father to allow him to show prints in a room at the family firm of carvers and gilders at 50 Wellington

Street. As Fowle notes, this was a natural step from carving and gilding picture frames which was part of the business. By 1877, this trade had expanded to paintings. Alongside Reid, and other dealers such as Thomas Lawrie and Son, Craibe Angus and Son were operating providing a hub of activity in the city's commercial centre.[76]

In the meantime, the Institute's council had come to the decision that its exhibitions should incorporate works from further afield rather than simply concentrate on local artists. This was also to include works from personal collections, and was not confined to living artists. Graham Gilbert lent paintings by Turner and Constable. Other prominent collectors followed suit, with French painters becoming more visible alongside some of the more famous English artists – Albert Moore, Millais and Holman Hunt. Billcliffe notes the recruitment of agents in London specifically employed to seek out work for the Institute and pre-empting criticisms of parochialism in art.[77]

Thus the nature of the exhibitions, and the Institute itself, can be seen to undergo a profound change. No longer merely an intermediary vehicle for local artists, the Glasgow Institute was now also a vehicle for dealers to trade, as well as a display space for those collectors wishing to show off important paintings from their collections. The Institute was not just a sales exhibition facility. It also purchased work - the re-sale of these investments contributed to funds for the new gallery space. The Institute can be seen to operate as a microcosm of the 'art world'. Previously dispersed relations of production and consumption are now compressed and mutually supportive and marking a new development in patronage.

A 'totality of cultural production' appears on a modest scale. Artisanal and post artisanal relations with the market appear simultaneously. Artisanal markets, such as portrait commissions, are wholly dependent on the immediate market with the producer (the artist) maintaining direct control of the work and in this sense, the artist can still be characterised as 'independent'. Collectors could make contact directly with artists as names and addresses were provided in the accompanying catalogues The post-artisanal market differs from this in that the artist sells indirectly through a distributive and productive intermediary, such as the dealer, wherein typically capitalist relations are activated. When the intermediary invests in the purchase of work for the purposes of a profit, it is now *his* relations with the market which are now direct.[78]

By 1880, the Institute had become attached to the Annual Exhibition circuit, joining London, Edinburgh, the West of England, Manchester and Liverpool, where "the latest fashions and the latest productions of the great names were revealed every year."[79] The RGI, like the civic collection, also represented the city's image of itself, and visitors to the exhibition participated in the consumption of these images. However, the economic patterns of consumption generated by exhibition sales were not enough to support the higher running costs of the RGI, despite intermittent displays of members' works between the annual exhibitions.

The monopoly on art trading was not the preserve of the RGI. Local dealers were highly influential. In particular, Alexander Reid is credited with "effecting a revolution in taste from the darker tones of the Barbizon and Hague School painting to the luminosity and lighter touch of Impressionism."[80] Reid's influence on the taste of Glasgow's art buying community is now well documented alongside his notorious connections in Paris with Theo and Vincent Van Gogh. Suffice to say, through a net-worked society, by the beginning of the 20th century, French art was clearly identified with modernity.[81] He did not ignore local artists, and was a regular patron of the Glasgow Boys, themselves highly influenced by French painting, and in particular, Bastien- Lepage.

Having now outgrown its original premises, now also deemed to be a fire risk, the civic art collection was to be re-housed. Plans for a new art gallery and museum and an anticipated integrated art school forged ahead. The first of Glasgow's Great Exhibitions took place in 1888, with parts of the proceeds designated towards the cost of the new display site. In 1901, Kelvingrove Art Gallery and Museum was open to the public, and its launch marked with the second of the World Trade Fairs. In the event, this did not include an art school.

Glasgow School of Art, originally a Government School of Design from its inception n 1840 later came under the auspices of South Kensington Science and Art Department in London in 1852. First housed in Ingram Street, it moved to the city's Corporation Galleries on Sauchiehall Street before finally gaining its own premises. Designed by Charles Rennie Mackintosh, the school opened in two stages, 1899 and 1909. In 1885, Frances (Fra) Newbery was appointed headmaster. Under his authority, the School's visibility in the city reached new heights. While art trade and art education remained in a now established district of activity, the permanent collection was no longer enmeshed in the centre of commerce.

The RGI, having conceded financial defeat, returned as an annual exhibition to its original setting in the McLellan Galleries on Sauchiehall Street. It did not, however lose its status of 'authority'.

Venda Pollock has written of the RGI's dominant position in relation to artistic production in Glasgow, seeing this as a prime factor in Glasgow's "lack of an urban modernism that it could call its own".

> When Glasgow seemingly presented all the city-features the avant-garde
> required and was an artistic centre in its own right, it is slightly paradoxical
> that it did not produce its own dialogue with the urban.[82]

Pollock argues that Glasgow did not produce equivalent urban aesthetics to those of the German Expressionists or the Italian Futurists, noting the unfavourable press reception to the latter's display at the RGI, 1913. Both Pollock and Normand have noted the experimental work of Stanley Cursiter in Edinburgh. Cursiter's awareness of the Italian Futurists is explicit in a number of large canvases in which urban scenes are depicted in fragmented style. "Sensation of Crossing the Street – West End, Edinburgh" (1913) has the surface effect of Futurist painting, yet retains a naturalistic face amongst the sharply deconstructed background. Normand and Pollock both see this as a conservative attempt in which style took precedence over the theoretical dimensions of this aesthetic form.[83] Nonetheless, the enigmatic naturalistic face perhaps reflects a deeper engagement with and ultimate rejection of that theory than first recognised. At the last count, not everything is reduced to component form. Human identity is not yet lost in the matrix of the modern world.

While this aesthetic form may have been absent, there is still evidence to suggest that Glasgow artists were nonetheless commenting significantly on the experience of metropolitan modernity.

The Glasgow Boys although noted as defining art on a national and international level, are not seen by Pollock to operate in modernist terms. This is, I think, to underestimate the variety of structures of feeling that modernity in the city and the country engendered and also a difficulty in the use of 'modernism' as a comparative term. This use fails to recognise 'modernism' as the conjuncture of philosophical, experiential and aesthetic elements that are spatially as well as temporally situated. That modernism is, in this sense, never a homogeneous practice, casts a problematic shadow on ideas of 'post-modernism'.

Rural life was far from being undisturbed by industrial modernity, to the extent that many traditional elements were fast disappearing. The Fife countryside, for example, was ravaged by a series of new collieries, attracting workers from other parts of Scotland and Ireland, trebling the local parish population between 1891 and 1910 to a staggering 17,547 in number. [84]

Pollock suggests that the work of the Glasgow Boys is a form of compensatory 'escape' via its focus on scenes outside the city. In Pollock's reading, it is a legible depiction of the Ruskinian value of the dignity of manual labour and timeless innocence that the modern city lacked. "In other words, the landscape began to function as the wish fulfilment of urban dwellers." [85]

I have commented on Wilkie's rural scenes, and his early attempts to confront the social dislocation brought about through agricultural revolution on which the industrial revolution was founded.[86] MacMillan notes the influence of Wilkie alongside Courbet particularly in the work of James Guthrie. The elimination of sentimentality marks Guthrie's "A Funeral Service in the Highlands". [87]

While Pollock is right to note Williams' identification of changing ideas about country and city life, the term country continued to reference the country as a whole. Landscape, as Tom Normand notes carries many connotations – land elides into country, and country is identified with homeland defined by ownership and often 'race', expressed in a shared history.[88] In documenting rural scenes, the Glasgow Boys were simultaneously recording a vanishing way of life and the shared history of modernity's change and flux for both city and countryside. The past, rather than any idealised present is the compensatory aspect.

Such nostalgia in art may not necessarily promote 'escape' from the realities of modern life. At a time when Liberal crusades against rapacious landlordism in the Highlands were adopted by the Independent Labour Party in Glasgow against urban landlords, such images might also be uncomfortable. Nonetheless, their ambiguous subject matter was certainly less confrontational than the aesthetics of the European avant-garde that was associated with the irrational and radical behaviour. Such attributes were not conducive to the political climate of Scotland at that time.

Scottish interest in Home Rule had emerged in the 1880s, partly through fears that the Irish were receiving preferential constitutional treatment, but also because of concerns for administrative reforms which would make the union with England function more efficiently.[89] By 1885, the office of the Secretary of Scotland was

revived, the Scottish Offices established in London and a Scottish Standing Committee was set up in 1894 to consider all Scottish legislation. The Scottish Home Rule Association was also founded, campaigning for a parliament in Edinburgh. Devine notes seven Home Rule motions presented to parliament between 1886 and 1900. However, he questions the depth of this commitment to Home Rule, noting an unenthusiastic Liberal leadership and significant numbers in the Scottish Party who did not support it.

By 1910, this position had radically altered. For Young Scots, Home Rule was regarded as the road to social reform. "The new impetus for constitutional change came within an ace of success when a Home Rule Bill passed its second reading in the House of Commons in May 1914. Unfortunately the chances of its reaching the statute book were killed off when war broke out in 1914." [90]

An emergent cultural dialogue with urban modernity was taking place elsewhere in the city, beyond the spaces of Glasgow's art trading establishment. While Pollock argues that the Glasgow School of Art, under Fra Newbery's auspices was a potential locus from which an urban modernism might have emerged, she also states that this was a principle reason why it did not. A traditional academic teaching regime coupled with "a suspicion of modern art", provide the reasons by which Pollock supports her thesis.[91] Newbery was however, highly committed to a policy of social reform through cultural expansion, and the conjunction between the arts and learning with everyday life. This becomes apparent via his involvement with pageants. As Kinchen observes:

> Indeed the medium attracted many of the most progressive artists, critics
> and designers of the day, providing a vehicle for their aesthetic and political
> idealism. There was an international vogue, with comparable events being
> staged in artistic centres throughout Europe and America. [92]

Patrick Geddes had directed and scenographically composed 'The Masque of Learning' in Edinburgh, 1913, performed by 500 masquers, and replayed in London the following year with more than double the original cast number.[93]

Kinchen comments on the propensity for the pageant to be seen as negatively amateurish, ignoring their serious side and marginalising their aesthetic and educational input. For Geddes, the pageant was a force for collective participation in art, history, education and citizenship and thus, collective health. Rather than dispensing 'facts' about great heroes, royalty and wars, Geddes was interested in

visualising important events from past ages; poets, inventors, discoverers and students of nature. Boyer notes:

> Friar Bacon in his cell, Columbus pleading for money to support his
> voyages, composers from Burns to Beethoven, all gave visual witness
> to the evolution of human knowledge and to the sacrifices made for the
> sake of its advancement.[94]

This concept of participation became central to the ideas on collective memory set forth by Maurice Halbwachs. Halbwachs was a pupil of French sociologist, Emile Durkheim. (1858-1917) Durkheim's views were widely discussed, and in 1903, sociological teaching was begun at the University of London by Geddes, Edward Westermark, A.C. Haddon and L.T. Hobhouse. [95]

"The Elementary Forms of Religious Life" appeared in 1912. Here Durkheim explored the concept of the *conscience collective* by analysis of religions in their 'elementary states' and argued that all forms of religion have their origins in totemistic beliefs. Clan membership was fundamental to the whole way in which people lived their lives. Central to this was the development of collective representations, which included shared images and ideas about the moral obligations that people understand as binding them together as members of a society. These representations become so fundamental to social relations that they take on a sacred character. Thus religion for Durkheim was a way of representing, or expressing social realities. Lukes writes:

> Thus, 'the totem is the flag of the clan', constituting its 'rallying sign'
> by which its members 'mutually show one another that they are all
> members of the same moral community and they become conscious
> of the kinship uniting them'.[96]

Representative and commemorative rites functioned to imprint the past more deeply in the mind, and aimed to attach the past to the present and the individual to the collectivity. Durkheim relates this to art and dramatic representation. Following on from Durkheim, Halbwachs sought to understand the social framework of memory, exploring the social determinants of differential living standards, variable definitions of needs in relation to class, budgets and consumption patterns.[97] For Halbwachs, collective memory was generated by participation in company with others. Memories and views shared in common operated as 'cues' which later helped to recall and stay in contact with those memories. Where tradition ended, history began. Boyer writes:

> As long as memory stays alive within a group's collective experience
> he argued, there is no necessity to write it down or to fix it as the official
> story of events.[98]

Like Geddes, Newberry was interested in bringing art out of the art school, the art gallery and the commercial context of the dealer's showroom.[99] Through the pageant, 'art' and 'life' could be reintegrated. Kinchen writes:

> There was room for specialists of every kind. For Geddes, pageants
> were to be nothing less than a resuscitation of the past in which all
> schools of scientific and philosophical history could be joined. He felt the
> process of collaboration would help to reunite the fragmentary nature of
> contemporary knowledge, and to heal the perceived split between thought
> and skill in industrialised society.[...] Spectators could learn from witnessing
> the unity of the endeavour and the synthesis of knowledge being acted out.[100]

Pageants were not the only form of collective representation in Glasgow prior to the First World War. As I have shown, Glasgow's labour force had a militant reputation. The early years of the 20th century brought more frequent periods of unemployment as increased labour-saving machinery threatened to dilute skills. In the engineering workshops on Clydeside, artisans became restless. By 1907, unemployment in the Second City saw 7000 skilled workers dependent on a special relief fund. As Devine notes, "at the same time, socialist ideas were being promoted more vigorously through lectures, the newspaper *Forward*, socialist Sunday schools and the evening classes of the Workers' Educational Association." [101]

The WEA was set up in 1903 and its 'practical creed' of idealism remained pervasive through the First World War and the inter-war years within the voluntary sector. As McArthur points out:

> "It was the dominant ethos in the influential 1919 Report on Adult Education,
> in the formation of the National Council of Social Service (also in 1919) in the
> British Institute of Adult Education when it was established in 1921 and was
> still present in the foundation of the Committee (later Council) for the
> Encouragement of Music and the Arts." [102]

Through institutes such as the WEA and the Miner's Welfare Institute, new directions in cultural production took place. Despite educational reforms, remaining at school past the age of fourteen was a luxury that few could afford. The voluntary sector offered the opportunity to resume education in later life providing classes,

libraries and reading rooms. As Williams points out, Adult Education has two relationships with social change. Most obviously, adult education was instituted, developed and altered by social change in the wider movements of society. But less obviously, for Williams, is the inner history, in that adult education offered to be, and at times was, part of the process of social change itself.[103] (In Part 2, I commented on the teaching style adopted for adult education and its appropriation into Cultural Studies.) The skills learnt in the WEA gave new opportunities of expression, particularly in creative writing and theatre. Masques and pageants were developed in which the traditions of the 'penny-geggie' and the music hall were blended. Glasgow's earliest amateur drama clubs were formed via such institutions. Linda McKenny refers to the Parkhurst and Paisley Socialist Sunday Schools, active in 1908 and 1909, and the Glasgow Clarion League Comedy Club in 1911.[104] The groups offered political and moral values alongside entertainment. While theatrical activity in the inter-war years took on a vibrant lease of life amongst the generation born into these troubled times, the First World War brought these activities, temporarily, to a halt.

Whilst Glasgow's economy had improved with wartime production on the Clyde, this was followed by a dramatic recession as global demand for shipping declined bringing unprecedented levels of unemployment. The deterioration lasted through to the 1930s. The coal industry was especially hard hit, the Fife coalfields suffered extreme economic and social strife and the experience of the depression here was especially acute. As MacKenny notes, "such conditions inevitably bred a high level of political awareness and unrest, areas like Fife and Glasgow supporting a wide range of socialist parties and other social organisations, which were well known for their militancy. They were also well known for their interest in international events – the rise of Fascism in Europe, the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War and later the Second World War."[105]

While calls for Home Rule had become more forceful, the Labour Movement was making itself heard on an unprecedented scale. The Independent Labour Party (ILP) and the Socialist Labour Party (SLP) grew in number and in an emergent Socialist culture, the Scottish Left built up its martyrs. The Marxist John MacLean was appointed Bolshevik Consul in Glasgow and honorary president of the First All-Russian Congress of Scotland. Twice arrested for sedition and twice imprisoned,

MacLean served harsh sentences in Edinburgh's Calton Gaol. However, the majority of socialists were reformers rather than revolutionaries.

The political mood in Scotland changed utterly and Liberal Scotland slowly lost its foothold. During the war, Scottish socialists had been occupied more with social questions than constitutional ones – de-skilling, racketeering and housing issues were foremost. Yet, as elsewhere in Europe, the end of the war brought a new tide of nationalism. Many small countries were formed, and for some Scots, as Marr notes the idea of Britishness was completely untenable. Scotland became pregnant with modern nationalism.[106] Other Scots simply moved away. Between 1921 and 1931 eighty out of every thousand emigrated compared to five in every hundred in England. Population declined for the first time since records began. Against the call for home rule, socialist Tom Johnston enquired:

> What purport would there be in getting a Scots Parliament in Edinburgh
>
> if it has to administer an emigration system, a Poor Law and a graveyard?[107]

For all the activity and unrest, the prevailing spirit was one of bleak despair and a seeping away of confidence. Against that background, the Nationalists and the Scottish Renaissance writers made their presence felt. The metropolis was of course a vital element in this. As shown, Glasgow had confidently represented itself on the international stage. Here "Futurists, Imagists, Surrealists, Cubists, Vorticists, Formalists and Constructivists all variously announced their arrival with a passionate and scornful vision of the new, and as quickly became fissiparous, friendships breaking across the heresies required in order to prevent the innovations from becoming orthodoxies."[108] As Williams notes, such formations were defensive cultural groupings, which rapidly, if partially, became competitively self promoting.

The giant of the Scottish Literary Renaissance was the poet Hugh MacDiarmid (Christopher Grieve) who had been a founder member of the Scottish National Party in 1928. His politics were extreme as both a nationalist and a communist, and briefly a proto-fascist. To this extent, he was a member of both parties and also expelled from both parties; nationalism did not tolerate his communism in 1934 and communism would not tolerate his nationalism in 1938. Patrick Geddes' 'renascence' ideas of synergy, modernity and a national art were of particular importance to MacDiarmid's project.

Other writers associated with this were Lewis Grassic Gibbon, Edwin Muir, Neil Gunn and Noami Mitchison. Also included, however, were the poets Helen

B.Cruikshank and William Soutar, the playwright James Bridie, composer Francis George Scott and the folklorist F. Marian Mitchell. For each of them, the relationship between a regenerated Scottish culture and an energetic political system was both necessary and vital. While the idea of a 'renaissance' was itself a highly constructed and complex measure of self organisation, this in itself marked a new social and cultural consciousness. To this extent, the ideas of the European avant-garde movements, practically, theoretically and aesthetically were both absorbed and manipulated to cater for the Scottish cultural experience.

Where Liberal Unionism had dominated the 19th century, the First World War exploded any sense of complacency. Scotland's death toll was markedly higher than anywhere else in the United Kingdom; a stark testament to Geddes' fears on the outcome of the imbalance between the human sciences and technology.

While Glasgow artists did not produce a simultaneous equivalent to the aesthetic challenges of the Italian Futurist artists, an emergent cultural formation was beginning the search for a visual dialogue with their own precarious modern times. Normand writes:

> In fact, it was the narrative tradition itself which provided the soil for Scottish modernism and the struggle with modernity. From an established concern with profoundly humanist values, located in a visual tradition which was figurative, narrative, and tied to the ethics of Enlightenment, the best of Scottish modernism looked to articulate the contest between the individual and the developing social world.[109]

Normand sees the two polar points of this formation as represented by artists William McCance and John Duncan Fergusson. Both artists had their own structures of feeling surrounding nationalism; McCance explored the experience of modernity through an adaptation of Wyndam Lewis's vorticist approach and a machine aesthetic whilst Fergusson looked back to a 'golden age' of pagan sensibility.

As Normand makes very clear, the range of artistic activity in between these figures was diverse. The levels of engagement with nationalism were arrived at by differing routes and to various depths to the extent that 'nationalism', as MacDiarmid embraced it, should not be said to stand as any overriding manifesto. McCance is of special interest, offering a structure of feeling that is, despite the difference of the years and no evidence of any mutual knowledge between them, very close on a practical level to the ideas that Williams expressed later.

McCance (1894-1970) had left Glasgow for London in 1919 after studying at Glasgow School of Art where he married fellow student, the artist Agnes Miller Parker (1895-1980). Under Newbery, his training was based around figure drawing and early paintings followed a bold, 'post-impressionist' style. As a conscientious objector, he was debarred from teaching. His war was spent in an English prison. An unremitting humanism places his nationalism in an entirely different framework from that of MacDiarmid. MacDiarmid made appeals to an essential and distinct 'Scottish Psyche' that was often expressed as an anti- English hostility.

Nationalism was not McCance's primary concern, and it seems that he was 'claimed' for the movement by MacDiarmid who published a piece on the couple in *The Scottish Educational Journal* (1925) although he had not yet seen their work in anything other than photographs.[110] McCance was however, receptive. He had already entered into correspondence with Naomi Mitchison and, while disbarred from mainstream teaching, had found work with A.S.Neill at the experimental school, Summerhill. McCance was a socialist above all else, well read and familiar with the current, competing theoretical debates in art particularly those of Bloomsbury's Roger Fry and Clive Bell. 'Significant form' was deemed as the essential quality of a work:

> Significant form stands charged with the power to provoke aesthetic
> emotion in anyone capable of feeling it. The ideas of men go buzz and
> die like gnats; men change their institutions and their customs as they
> change their coats; the intellectual triumphs of one age are the follies of
> another; only great art remains stable and unobscure. [111]

While McCance accepted aspects of their theories, he seems to remain in a border country between Fry and Bell's ideas and those of Wyndam Lewis which were set to challenge "the more comfortable abstractions of the Bloomsbury set" and as such, could be equally vitriolic about Bloomsbury and Lewis.[112] The ideas he was to eventually formulate are, as mentioned, remarkably close to Williams. Art, above all, was communication. "The artist paints because he has something to say which is more or less inexplicable."[113] The concept of structure of feeling is raised here.

For McCance, the construction of an indigenous art was to displace received ideas about Scottish culture. As noted, the Kailyardism designed for export was seen as sentimental idealism. In particular, J.M. Barrie's *A Window in Thrums* was subject to a hard critique. While the novel was unusual in that it was peopled by an increasingly

industrialised rural poor, the traditions of virtuous provincialism, family, church and community morality are still evident.

As Normand notes, when it was first published in 1889, the community it examined had long ceased to be central to Scottish life. As viewed by the intellectuals of the renaissance movement, the novel was deemed to be patronising. "It presented an image of Scotland that was provincial, primitive and naïve." [114]

MacDiarmid and McCance both used this 'cultural stereotype' of countryside fantasy as an effective creative source. McDiarmid's poem *Frae Another Window in Thrums*, and McCance's painting *From Another Window in Thrums* (oil on canvas,1928) both reacted against this tradition offering an alternative vision through the Thrums window; "calculated to give Sir J.M. Barrie a succession of shivers down his spine. It is a very different Window in Thrums, indeed, and symbolises a Kirriemuir that has not only ceased to be Kailyardy and Kirky, [but has] become thoroughly conscious of the machine age." [115]

McCance's painting is constructed from a variety of sources, not least a close reading of Wyndam Lewis's experiments after the First World War contributing the darker and more sinister qualities of the work. Juxtaposed images of disconcerting sexuality undermine the morality of the Kailyard tradition. The dominant relationship of city as base and country as superstructural leisure culture is emphatically denied. Nonetheless, the link to the city is made and a new rural mode defined that is still a cultural superstructure whose base is the profits of the industrial metropolis. A linear logic of development, where all the country becomes city, a developing scale of human societies culminating in a universal industrialisation along which degrees of development can be marked. [116] "Harmlessness," writes Normand, "has been replaced by neurotic repression." [117] The residual image of a 'backward countryside' and a dominant corrupting modernity are however still evident in this emerging aesthetic.

The machine aesthetic that MacDiarmid praised in McCance's work tallied with the poet's ideas on a new social organisation of production in which the artist and the engineer were equal through a shared sense of skilled craftsmanship. The figure of the engineer was already appearing in McCance's work. *The Engineer, his wife and their Family* (linocut, 1925) is an ambiguous piece that addresses ideas of social functionalism, component production and the absorption of man by machine.

For Simmel, the key site of modernity was the metropolis, and it is characterised by the mature money economy, not capitalism. The processes of monetary exchange

empty social relations of their subjective character, facilitating the increased tempo of modern life. Money is the manifestation of reason and rationality and as such, is described as a pure form. The perceived freedom which money can bring thus becomes the motive for its accumulation; a paradoxical freedom, as obtaining it requires duty. Simmel writes:

> The individual has become the mere cog in an enormous organisation of
> things and powers that tear from his hands all progress, spirituality and
> value in order to transform them from their subjective form into the form
> of a purely objective life.[118]

Yet, as with Cursitor's enigmatic face that emerges from its fractured background, McCance draws attention to a raised hand as a potent symbol of human creativity. All is not yet lost. Creativity, for McCance was a solution, and the source to a democratic culture. The sensibility that McCance shares with Williams stems from a reading of Marx's *The German Ideology*, and a resistance to the idea of alienated labour. While Williams would not condone the term 'mass' – "There are no masses, only ways of seeing people as masses." – the structure of feeling that posits social change in democratic participation is evident. McCance wrote;

> The Mass I consider to be the real evolutionary force. The Mass has
> preserved the non-specialised mould of the species.[119]

Although differently expressed, McCance against the elitism of specialisation in which knowledge was power harnessed by a dangerous (Fascist) intelligentsia and Williams calling for increased access to knowledge as an (extra)ordinary culture, there is a common goal. As with Williams, McCance understood the liberating potential of technology, which arrived with, as Marx understood, the power to potentially fructify and shorten the working day.[120] In this surplus of leisure time, the human capacity for creativity could be recovered. As Normand points out, McCance, despite his usage of the term 'mass', advocated the diversification of human talents within the individual, stating:

> It is only in an order of society which approaches nearest to a true
> democracy that this essential freedom of selectivity can be left to
> the mass. Any order, which does not allow the mass to perform this
> act of evolutionary growth, organically, and with freedom, must perish.
> Society must be organic, and not mechanistic, if man has to survive or
> reach a fuller state of life and mental growth. [121]

As with Williams, McCance sees creativity as a fundamental and 'ordinary' capacity of the human species, an endemic resource of 'ordinary man' and therefore the potential salvation of mankind.[122]

Like McCance, J.D. Fergusson also connected the artist and the engineer. Fergusson was an autodidact whose initial influence came from the Impressionist painters and a perceived spontaneity of approach. Having spent the first decade of the 20th century in Paris, Fergusson had direct contact with artists such as Renoir and Monet . His close friend from Edinburgh was S.J. Peploe, who joined Fergusson in Paris each summer before moving there himself in 1910.

As the First World War broke out, Fergusson returned to London, where he had enjoyed limited recognition through a one man show at the Baillie Gallery in 1905. In London, now with his wife, the artist and dancer Margaret Morris, Fergusson socialised with Charles Rennie Mackintosh and Margaret MacDonald before taking work as a war artist in 1918. After the war, Fergusson and Morris returned to Paris exhibiting in Antibes as well as Glasgow and Edinburgh. As the Second World War approached, Fergusson settled in Glasgow, and began to ally himself with the intellectual group including the poet MacDiarmid and the publisher William MacLellan,

MacLellan was an important supporter of artists and poets in the 1940s, responsible for a host of left wing and nationalist publications, including the journal *Million* and Fergusson's own treatise on *Modern Scottish Painting* (1943) The treatise included a chapter on 'Art and Engineering'. Fergusson wrote;

> Young people are impressed by the dignity, the wonder of machinery and engineering achievement. In the windows of the motor shops we see engines wonderfully lit, compared with which *most* sculpture, especially the not modern, is merely stupid and boring.[123]

Normand points to the echoes of MacDiarmid's homage to the engineer, but at the same time, MacMillan acknowledges that Fergusson had explored his own machine imagery as a war artist, through works such as *Damaged Destroyer* (1918). In the same chapter, Fergusson comments that he returned to Glasgow because, "Glasgow creates things and not imitations of things, but ships like the *Queen Elizabeth* and yachts like the *Britannia.*"

Fergusson, despite partaking in several collaborations with MacDiarmid, did not share the poet's political position in the aim for a free and independent art in Scotland.

Independent art for Fergusson lay in the independence of the artist her/himself and the autonomy of expression. The influences of Margaret Morris were instrumental to this. The Celtic Ballet established by Morris issued its first circular in August 1940. Favouring naturalistic movement, as opposed to classical ballet, the guiding principles supported the therapeutic value of music and rhythm. Dancing followed Geddes' concepts of the pageant and the visualisation of ideas rather than hard, technical facts. Fergusson acted as artistic director and the enterprise as a whole involved a number of visual artists. Located in the city's heart of artistic activity, the headquarters were at 299 West Regent Street.

Fergusson's own brain child was The New Art Club (1940), providing an alternative centre to the existing Glasgow Art Club, which was a conservative and exclusive set up, charging eight guineas for an annual subscription. In contrast, the New Art Club charged one pound, which could be paid in quarterly instalments. The club held bi-weekly meetings and planned monthly exhibitions, for which a hanging fee of one shilling per picture was charged. Modelled on the Salon des Independents in Paris, the exhibition system followed a no-jury policy, was run on democratic lines and with a minimum of formality. The artist Josef Herman recalls the meetings and Fergusson's talks there on the aesthetics underpinning his work:

> Naturally, most so in his talks about Cezanne. He would talk without
>
> plan, without order, without a definite point, as the words came to his mind.[124]

It was, said Herman, "a guided tour through Cezanne's workshop or perhaps J.D's workshop. After all, J.D. was Scotland's leading Cezannist. Who can tell how much self-revelation lay in such talk?" [125]

There was certainly self-revelation in MacDiarmid's talk. The idea of 'Scottish Renaissance' and a nation born again through adoption and use of the old Scot's tongue, whilst grounded in an inherited past, was his personal perception of the nation's sorry state. Yet, it commanded a knowable community, willing and able to contribute in various ways and at different levels of commitment. Whilst the writer Lewis Grassic Gibbon certainly fulfilled MacDiarmid's vernacular ideals, here too lay sharp conflicts.

James Huntington Whyte was the wealthy American founder and editor of the influential magazine *The Modern Scot* as well as being an important figure in the development of contemporary art. Whyte arrived in St. Andrews in 1930. St Andrews itself was geographically and culturally significant to Scottish history since the saint

was pressed into service as Scotland's national patron in the 13th Century, signifying papal approval on the authority of the state. The key aim of this had been to prove that Scotland was an older Christian nation than England.[126] The town fabric had undergone significant architectural development through the partnership of James, Gillespie and Scott, which John Frew describes as 'suburban free-stylism'. A hostile reaction from Arts and Crafts circles to Scott's villas, earned them the local title of the 'tartan villas'. In St Andrews, Whyte established a small gallery in North Street to promote the more experimental artists. In 1935, an exhibition included Hunter, Peploe, Fergusson, Cowie and Mactaggart amongst others with established reputations. The gallery provided an annex to the discussions held in the *Modern Scot*. Here, questionnaires were sent out to practising artists requesting their responses to state of Scottish art, past and present. Among the respondents were McCance, William Johnstone and Hugh Adam Crawford, who at this time was head of painting at Glasgow School of Art. Crawford replied, "The youth are beginning to have more national and self-respect."[127] As the journal grew in stature, MacDiarmid was regularly published (often not using his pseudonym), alongside Edwin Muir and the conservative Compton Mackenzie.

For Grassic Gibbon, the journal was something of an affront. Gibbon was a communist at its most communitarian level. Glasgow defied personification in his eyes. As he surveyed the industrial and commercial expansion of the metropolis, he noted;

> One cannot watch and hear the long beat of traffic down Sauchiehall Street, or see its eddy and spume where St. Vincent Street and Renfield Street cross, without realising what excellent grounds the old-fashioned anthropologist appeared to have had for believing that man was by nature a brutish savage, a herd-beast delighting in vocal discordance and orgiastic aural abandon.[128]

The middle classes of the city, whilst appalled by the continuing housing crises – "They live five or six to a single room." – could at least escape to the shores of Loch Lomond, to rest on its banks, "seated on the plump modernity of *The Modern Scot*". Gibbon saw the journal as serving up "culture at three removes – castrated, disembowelled, and genteelly vulgarised." Its subscribers, he thought did not admire sunrises, but instead, at the Kelvingrove Galleries, preferred to see the "half starved at sunset" as portrayed by Josef Israel's *Frugal Meal*.[129] Whilst renowned for the trilogy *A Scots Quair* which moves trough the classic historical process from country to city,

using an Anglo-Scots dialect, his view on the vernacular was less extreme than McDiarmid's.

Unlike McCance who thought democracy more likely to flourish in a small nation, Gibbon thought small nations were a curse. His nationalism preferred to be "an expatriate writing novels in Persian on the Cape of Good Hope than a member of a homogeneous literary cultus." To this extent, Braid Scots could shed "lovely light and shadows not only on the English language but on the perfected speech of cosmopolitan man."[130]

What became of these modernisms? Williams writes;

> The isolated, estranged images of alienation and loss, the narrative
> discontinuities, have become the easy iconography of the commercials,
> and the lonely, bitter, sardonic and sceptical hero takes his ready-made
> place as the star of the thriller.[...] If we are to break out of the non-
> historical fixity of *post* modernism, then we must search out and counter-
> pose an alternative tradition taken from the neglected works left in the wide
> margin of the century, a tradition which may address itself not to this by
> now exploitable because quite inhuman rewriting of the past, but for all
> our sakes, to see a modern *future* in which community may be imagined
> again.[131]

Devine notes that the Scottish Renaissance was undeniably distinguished but that much of it had little impact on the popular consciousness, and failed to inspire any broader flowering of Scottish culture in the inter-war years.[132] There is perhaps more that can be added to the story and further fragments to be pieced in.

[1] W. Gordon Smith (1990) The Compass Contribution, exhibition catalogue; Compass Gallery

[2] Williams, R. (1981) Culture, pp65 – 66 ; Fontana

[3] ibid.

[4] Harris, J (2004) Art, Money, Parties; New Institutions in the Political Economy of Power p18, Liverpool University Press.

[5] Williams, R (1961) The Long Revolution (p273) Harmondsworth, Penguin.

[6] Williams, R, (1961)

[7] Williamson, Bill, (1990) The Temper of the Times, p16; Basil Blackwell

[8] Ibid

[9] Ibid

[10] Bauman, Z. (2001) The Individualised Society, p8; Polity Press

[11] ibid p9

[12] ibid p12

[13] Marx, K.[1851] (1978) The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte; p595; W.W. Norton and Co.

[14] Kinchen, J (1990) in Burkhouser, J. [ed] (1990) Glasgow Girls; Canongate.

[15] Oliver, C. (1990) 'Compass Gallery Comes of Age' in The Compass Contribution, exhibition catalogue, pvii.

[16] Maver, I. (2000) Glasgow, p79, Edinburgh University Press.

[17] Ibid, p170.

[18] Boyer, C. (2001) The City of Collective Memory; p225; MIT Press.

[19] Maver, I as note 15, p73.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Frisby, D. (2003) Straight or Crooked Street? In Boyd White, I. [ed] (2003) Modernism and the Spirit of the City; p77; Routledge.

[22] Buck-Morss, S. (1993) The Dialectics of Seeing; p89; The MIT Press.

[23] Berman, M. (1983) All That is Solid Melts into Air; p149; Verso.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Cited in Bennett, T, (1995) The Birth of the Museum; chapter 3; Routledge.

[26] Devine, T. (1999) The Scottish Nation 1700 – 2000; p337; The Penguin Press.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Spring, I. (1990) Phantom Village, p15; Polygon.

[29] Matheson, S. (2000) Glasgow's Other River; Fort Publishing

[30] Ibid, p159.

[31] Ibid..

[32] Ibid.p178

[33] Devine, as n.25, p331

[34] Maver, as n.15 p94

[35] Ibid.

[36] Paton, J. in the Introduction to the catalogue of Kelvingrove Picture Collection, 1906.

[37] Devine, as n..25, p389

[38] McCrone, D. (1992) Understanding Scotland: The Sociology of a Stateless Nation;p99;Routledge.

[39] Ibid.p97

[40] Ibid.

[41] Devine as n.25 p409

[42] Fowle, F. (2005) Scottish Collectors of the 19th Century; in Cullen, F. and Morrison, J. [eds.] (2005); A Shared Legacy; p173; Ashgate Publishing

[43] Giddens, A. Introduction to Weber, M. [1930] (1992) The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism; pxii; Routledge.

[44] Ibid, pxiii.

[45] Giddens, A. (1992) Introduction to n.42, pxii.

[46] Fowle, as n. 41, p175

[47] Thompson, E. P. (1991) Time, Work, Discipline; in Customs in Common; Merlin Press, London

[48] Garnham, N. and Williams, R. in Collins ,R. et al (1986) Media, Culture and Society; Sage.

[49] Williams, R. (1973) The Country and the City; p353; Paladin.

[50] Cited in Bennett, as n. 24.

[51] Cited in Eldridge, J. and Eldridge L. (1994) Raymond Williams: Making Connections; p187; Routledge.

[52] Robbins, B. (2006) Martial Art; in The London Review of Books, April, 2006 p18-19.

[53] Williams. R; (1989) The Politics of Modernism;p175, Verso.

[54] Mackenzie, P. (1865) Reminiscences of Glasgow; St. Enoch's Square, Glasgow

[55] Ibid; p 600

[56] Park, M.(1990) The McLellan Bequest; Scottish Art Review, vol.xvii p22

[57] Ibid, p23

[58] As .n.51; P603

[59] Ibid, p606

[60] cf Mackenzie, as n. 54.

[61] MacMillan, D. (1990) Scottish Art 1460 – 1990; p174; Mainstream .

[62] Williams, R (1980) Problems in Materialism and Culture; p133; Verso

[63] Ibid.

[64] Cited in n.58 p136.

[65] McCrone as n.37 p92.

[66] MacMillan, as n. 57, p256

[67] Fairfull Smith, G. (1998) The Glasgow Dilettanti Society; in JSSAH, vol. 3 ,1998, p9.

[68] Ibid. p11

[69] Paton, J as n35, p76

[70] Devine, as n 25, p71

[71] Paton, as n 35 pvii

[72] Frisby, D. (2001) Cityscapes of Modernity; p111; Polity.

[73] Billcliffe, R; (1990) Introduction to RGI Catalogue of Exhibitors, Vol.1 - IV

[74] Ibid.

[75] Boyer, C. (2001) The City of Collective Memory; p131; the MIT Press.

[76] Fowle, F. (1997) Alexander reid: The Influential Dealer; in JSSAH, vol.2 1997; p25

[77] Billcliffe, as n. 69 p11

[78] See Williams, R. (1981) Culture ; Fontana; for this discussion of market relations,pp44 –56.

[79] Billcliffe, as n.69, p12

[80] Fowle, as n.72, p25.

[81] Fowle, as n.41, p181.

[82] Pollock, V; (2004) Second City or Absent City? Futurism and Glasgow's Lack of an Urban Modernism; JSSAH vol.9 2004. P87

[83] Pollock, as n.78 and Normand, T; (2000) The Modern Scot[..], Ashgate.

[84] McKenny, L. (2000) The Activities of Popular Dramatists in Scotland 1900 – 1952; p256; Edwin Mellin Press.

[85] Pollock, as n.78, p89.

[86] MacMillan, as n.57, p174.

[87] Ibid, p258.

[88] Normand, T. in Cullen and Morrison, as n.41, p133.

[89] Devine as n.25, p307

[90] ibid, p308.

[91] Pollock, as n. 78, p91.

[92] Kinchen, J. (1997) Art and History into Life[..];JSSAH, vol2. 1997, p43.

[93] Boyer, C. as n.71, p219.

[94] Ibid.

[95] Lukes, S. (1973) Emile Durkheim; p399;Penguin Books.

[96] Ibid, p419.

[97] Ibid. p401.

[98] Boyer, C as n.71, p133

[99] Kinchen, J. as n. 88, p49.

[100] Ibid.

[101] Devine, as n.25, p306

[102] McArthur, E.(2005) as n.41

[103] Williams, R. (1990) What I Came To Say; p157; Hutchinson Radius.

[104] McKenny,L. as n. 80; p115.

[105] Ibid. p7

[106] Marr, A.(1992) Battle for Scotland; p50; Penguin Books.

[107] Ibid, p56.

[108] Williams, R. (1989) When was Modernism? In The Politics of Modernism, as n.52, p33

[109] Normand, T. (2000) The Modern Scot, p5; Ashgate.

[110] Ibid. p68

[111] Bell, C; (1914) The Aesthetic Hypothesis; in Harrison, C and Wood, P (1992) Art In Theory; p116; Blackwell.

[112] Normand as n.104, p71.

[113] Ibid.

[114] Ibid. p10.

[115] Hugh MacDiarmid cited in Normand, as above, p13.

[116] Williams, R. as n.40; p340.

[117] Normand, as n.104, p92

[118] Simmel, G. (1978) The Philosophy of Money, p283, translated by Bottomore, T. and Frisby, D. Routledge and Keagan Paul, London.

[119] Normand, as n.104, p90.

[120] For Marx's full discussion on the production of surplus labour and the impact of capitalism on the length of the working day cf Marx, [1867] (1999) Capital; Oxford University Press. Also , E.P Thompson, as n.47.

[121] Normand, as n104, p91

[122] Ibid, p92.

[123] Ibid, p124.

[124] Herman, J. (1975) Related Twilights; p73; Robson Books.

[125] Ibid, p74.

[126] McCrone, as n37, p19

[127] Normand, as n104, p54

[128] Grassic Gibbon, L.; Glasgow; in McLay [ed] (1988) Workers' City, p 56 ;Clydeside Publishing.

[129] Ibid

[130] Ibid, p63.

[131] Williams, R. (1989) The Politics of Modernism; p35; Verso.

[132] Devine, as n. 25. p320

PART 4.......STORIES LIVED

Like many of his generation, Cyril Gerber (b1917) took an early interest and involvement with the Communist Party. Through his political activities, he met Glasgow artist Tom MacDonald (1914 –1985). Gerber's recollections of MacDonald go back before the Second World War. The Left Book Club, engineered by Victor Gollancz was influential at that time, providing a nation-wide forum for the discussion of international affairs. Gerber was a member from the start. The club offered a monthly choice of left wing literature otherwise unavailable in mainstream bookshops and set up local meeting groups. Here, the growing threat of Fascism, the policy of Appeasement and the Spanish Civil War provoked vigorous argument. Gerber writes:

> All of us who were then young and politically conscious believed – correctly
> as it turned out – that we were witnessing the beginning of a Second World
> War. It was a time of great activity. Debate, frequent large scale demonstrations
> and 'poster parades'. And among the political theorists, orators, and campaign-
> ers, there were a few people who could paint banners and posters. Tom was one
> such person, and I remember seeing him working at them in an old building in
> the Townhead district where he lived. He could convey a political message with
> equal fervour and realism, whether on a crumpled cloth or a piece of poster
> paper.[1]

MacDonald became a significant influence for Gerber. Trained as a marine engineer, (1930-1935) in Elderslie Dockyard, Scotstoun, MacDonald completed his apprenticeship before leaving to go to sea, sailing mainly to and from North Africa. The arrival of Franco's troops in Spain caused the emergency departure of his ship from its port in the south of Spain. After this, MacDonald left the Merchant Navy. Whilst at sea, he had occupied his time making sketches and drawings of Old Masters, and on his return for 1937-8, he enrolled for one session at the Glasgow School of Art.

To this extent, MacDonald was the archetype of the 'engineer- artist' idealised by McCance and Fergusson, and soon he would also become involved in the activities of the New Art Club. Prior to this, MacDonald, was designing stage sets for the Glasgow Workers Theatre Group (1937–40) as well as Avron Greenbaum's 'Jewish Institute Players' (established in 1936).

During the 1920s, 30s and 40s, Glasgow had become an important locus for dramatic activity supported by a massive working class population. By the late 1920s there were several socialist organisations in Glasgow – innumerable branches of the Labour Party and the Independent Labour Party, an active Communist Party and the Young Communists' League. The Glasgow Labour College, founded by John McLean in 1915, Socialist Sunday Schools and trade union clubs were all a means of political organisation, alongside education and entertainment.[2] Masques and pageants provided a ready and accessible vehicle for their expressions.

As Cordelia Oliver notes, during the Second World War, Glasgow was a lively centre for the arts. Alongside Fergusson's New Art Club, another focus was David Archer's "The Centre" at 7 Scott Street (1941), located close to the Art School and the old Corporation Galleries on Sauchiehall Street.[3] However, Oliver is critical of the idea that the activities of such places were alone responsible for a thriving arts community. While she acknowledges the influences of Polish artists Josef Herman and Jankel Adler on artists in Glasgow, this may be overstated. Oliver refers to an important exhibition of German Expressionism, in the McLellan Galleries in 1938 as having a great impact. Glasgow School of Art's Head of Sculpture, Benno Schotz played a part in this. In his autobiography, Schotz writes:

> In 1938, an exhibition was arranged in London of 'decadent' German art, under the title '20th Century German Art'. A selected portion of it was going to be sent over to the United States. Milly and I decided that this section would have to be brought to Glasgow for the Scottish people to see it before it left for the States. As a Jew, and a hater of Hitler, I did not want my name to appear as the one who had brought it to Glasgow, as it would lose its impact.[4]

Schotz approached the Saltire Society, a group founded in 1935 to promote Scottish cultural interests. Milly Schotz had been a founder member of the society, and another close friend, Fred Nettler, a furrier by trade, offered to underwrite the financial costs of the exhibition. The exhibition was highly successful, and helped by a sympathetic press, attracted visitors from all over Scotland. Profits from the ticket sales were donated to the Refugee Artists' Fund.

The response to the 'Decadent German Art' exhibition in London was less favourable. Janet Wolff quotes the art critic for the New Statesman and Nation who wrote:

> Because Hitler has condemned the works as degenerate, one is tempted to

acclaim them with enthusiasm. But it is the critic's first duty…to resist such
temptations….People who go to see the exhibition are only too likely to say:
If Hitler doesn't like these pictures, it's the best thing I've heard about Hitler.
For the general impression made by the show upon the ordinary public must
one of extreme ugliness.[5]

Wolff is interested in the difficult experiences of refugee artists particularly in
England due to an English resistance to Modernism during the inter-war years and
beyond, and suggests that the Scottish experience was different. Refugee artists such
as Schwitters, Meidner, Kokoschka and Heartfield who had careers and reputations in
Germany and central Europe, did not thrive in England. While there may have been
less resistance to Expressionism in Scotland, the *indirect* ways by which continental
influences infiltrated Scottish visual culture are, as discussed in Part 3, important to
note in this respect. The ideas surrounding 'Scottish Literary Renaissance' were in
their various forms, actively seeking a distinctly internationalist perspective that was
shared by artists like Crosbie, Gear, Fergusson and McCance. Herman and Adler were
both warmly received in Glasgow, both artists exhibiting separately at Annan's
Gallery, and both actively participated in the emergent cultural formations appearing
in art and theatre across the city. Whilst Adler is mostly noted for his influence on the
works of Robert Colquhoun and Robert MacBryde, Tom MacDonald found
inspiration from Herman. This was not only a matter of style and technique, but also
Herman's structure of feeling and attitude towards painting was impressive to
MacDonald. After Herman left Glasgow, MacDonald took over his studio.

'The Centre' at Scott Street was, however, a short-lived affair. It was described on a
membership card as a 'Gallery, Bookshop and Coffee Room' and many of its
members were also active in the New Art Club. The Centre had two floors, the upper
level decorated by the Polish artist Josef Herman and the lower by his fellow
countryman Jankel Adler. Both artists were to have one-man exhibitions there along
with William Crosbie and Andrew Taylor Elder.

Crosbie attended the Glasgow School of Art, and assisted by travelling scholarships
he continued studies at *Les Beaux Arts*, Paris under Ferdinand Leger and the French
Sculptor Aristide Maillol. He also attended the Sorbonne University to study art
history and travelled extensively around Europe. Crosbie was an extremely versatile
artist, bringing a powerful intellect to Scottish painting and a receptive mind to
Continental influences. His murals were included in the Empire Exhibition of 1938

and the Festival of Britain in 1950. During the 1940s he had seven shows with Annan's Gallery, on Sauchiehall Street Glasgow. In the main, however, younger artists had great difficulty finding local dealers to take their work.

'The Centre' also organised poetry readings and made some attempts at publishing, including Dylan Thomas and David Gascoyne. Archer made his personal collection of books available by way of providing a library. Dennis Farr notes:

> Unfortunately, the organisation of The Centre was so anarchic that the books gradually 'disappeared', until such as remained were given away by Archer to his friends. The Centre was probably more *avant-garde* than the New Art Club, but was in no way antagonistic to it, and seems to have been an attempt at an Institute of Contemporary Art. Robert Frame and Benjamin Crème took over management of The Centre before it finally collapsed after some eighteen months precarious existence.[6]

When "The Centre" finally closed, the premises were taken over by the Glasgow Unity Theatre Club. The Unity Theatre marks the high point of dramatic development in the first half of the 20th Century and was very much a product of its time and place. It was an amalgam of three local workers' theatre companies; The Glasgow Workers' Theatre Group, The Glasgow Corporation Transport Players, and The Jewish Institute Players. Amateur theatre groups, which had flourished in the 1930s, fell short of members during the Second World War and through National Service.

Its roots, as with its predecessor the GWTG, lay in the anti-fascist feeling of the 1930s and with the Communist Party's Seventh International call for a 'united' or 'popular' front against Fascism. The group was also linked to the Left Book Club who established both theatre and film (Kino) workshops throughout Britain, and by extension, the WEA. Many of the writers engaged with community drama had learnt their skills at evening classes, where they were also introduced to plays and literature which at that time were not necessarily included in the university curriculum. Given that most Unity members combined their theatrical activities with their day-to-day jobs, word of mouth brought in newcomers from all walks of life.

Glasgow Unity's repertoire was impressive; Clifford Odet's *Awake and Sing*, Sean O'Casey's *Juno and the Paycock*, Maxim Gorki's *The Lower Depths*, Henrik Ibsen's *Ghosts* were performed alongside local playwrights including Ena Lamont Stewart, Robert McLeish, Joe Corrie and John Kincaid. In particular, Stewart's *And Men Should Weep* offered an emergent feminist perspective of Glasgow's working life.

Glasgow Unity Theatre also made significant use of Masques and Pageants, such as 'We Are This Land' (1942) with a set designed by Herman as well as introducing the overtly agitational concept of the 'Living Newspaper'.

John Kincaid was also a poet, and a member of *The Clyde Group of Artists and Writers* with Tom MacDonald and Hugh MacDiarmid. In September 1948, the group put on a Festival and exhibition at the MacLellan Galleries, entitled *Art and Peace*. It was widely publicised in colleges, university unions, in libraries and, through the Corporation Education Department, to all schools, attracting large numbers of visitors. The exhibition was dominated by MacDonald's painting *The Trial of John McLean*. Bet Low and Nancy Irvine showed drawings and paintings of Glasgow back-streets, parks, canals, shipyards and the people who inhabited them. Fergusson gave a public lecture, MacDiarmid gave poetry readings and William Noble gave a recital of songs written by the composer Francis George Scott. Readings were given of work by Gorki, Mayakovsky, Grassic Gibbon, Jack London, whilst John Kincaid and friends organised further poetry sessions.[7]

The Clyde Group suggest another departure that might be situated within the broader framework of MacDiarmid's ideas on a 'Scottish Literary Renaissance', but again the idea of nationalism as MacDiarmid preached it, did not sit comfortably with all members of the group. Tom MacDonald and his fellow Unity set designer, the sculptor Helen Biggar were committed to the Communist Party, and as such, regarded nationalism with a great deal of suspicion.[8] Biggar was also connected to the activities of James Whyte in St. Andrews. She worked mainly in cast concrete and was interested in 'primitivism' and during the 1930s, produced a set of commissioned sculptures for James Whyte's gallery in St. Andrews.

Helen Biggar was the daughter of the Independent Labour Party's Lord Provost Hugh Biggar and her political outlook found creative expression in the Kino Film Group. Biggar supplied the Workers' Film and Photo League (FPL), although it had no official Scottish branch, with footage of the 1936 Scottish Hunger Marches for the FPL's compilation *March Against Starvation.*

With Norman McLaren, she undertook photographic experiments at Glasgow School of Art from which emerged their Kino Films, like *Hell Unlimited* (1936), *The Cost of 1914-1918* (no date) and *Stop It!* (no date). *Hell Unlimited* was made as a protest against profits in armaments during the period when Fascism was growing throughout Europe. Extremely political and highly experimental, the film mixed animation, acted

footage, archival footage and titles, all edited at rapid speed. It was not structured as a narrative but rather, as a sequence of images, each relating to a political theme announced by a title, and reading like a political broadcast. The film countered the government's claims to have reduced spending on weapons of destruction, comparing the rise there with a reduction of finance in health and education. This is linked back to the First World war and archival footage from this is juxtaposed with government rhetoric about a 'safer world for democracy', condemning the government's commitment to further warfare.[9]

As committed internationalists, Biggar and MacDonald were not only highly sceptical of nationalism, seeing this as the root cause of Nazi Fascism and anti-semitism, they were also beginning to move away from the associations of Celtic mythology and Scots Language. These ideas were now felt to be irrelevant to the welfare of modern Scotland in the grip of the Second World War.[10]

During the war, Gerber lost contact with MacDonald;

> When the war did come we all went, or were sent, on our separate ways. And, when it ended, those of us who were lucky enough to be around, and in one piece, started reconstructing our peacetime lives, raising families, and taking on what now seem like infinitessimal mortgages. One night, my wife Betty came home from a local Townswomen's Guild gathering and said, "Guess who was the speaker there tonight?" It was Tom MacDonald, giving a talk and a demonstration on make-up, based on his practical theatrical experience![11]

From then on, Gerber and MacDonald struck up a long friendship that lasted until Tom's death in 1985.

In an interview recorded with Gerber, I asked him about his involvement with the arts in Glasgow.[12] Like many artists living and working in Glasgow, the influence of French painting was inescapable. Gerber's involvement began at the level of the Impressionists, but a more acute awareness came through Gauguin and Van Gogh:

> "It was the *human* side of the thing, I was very struck by the fact that quite a lot of famous artists had quite a struggle to reach their fame. And yet they had that skill in them, and they had to express it, but there wasn't the means to express it and there wasn't the publicity for what they were doing or art in general [...] and it made me think, that if that could happen to somebody who later became a world famous artist, then it could quite easily be happening on our own doorstep. And how do we know it's not.... And how,

then do you unravel that?"

Aside from The New Art Club, the younger generation of artists emerging in Glasgow had significant difficulties finding galleries to show their work. Establishments such as the RGI were still locked into academic styles and continuing the tradition of isolating any more adventurous work from the main areas of exhibition.[13] Exhibition space was hard to come by and artists would seek out anything available. The artist John Taylor recalls having taken part in a three man show in the late 1950s, at an "upmarket painters and decorators on Blytheswood Square", who would allow artists to make use of a front room, which the exhibitors had to invigilate.[14]

The newly established Citizens Theatre offered display space in its foyer, as did the Cosmo Cinema on Rose Street, one of the few cinemas where European avant-garde films could be seen. While Annans and McClure's on Sauchiehall Street would occasionally give up wall space (depending at times on the artist providing a guarantor) Glasgow had no gallery devoted to displaying work by living artists.

Glasgow artists such as MacDonald and Bet Low, were regularly hanging work on the railings of the Botanic Gardens during the 1950s. Nonetheless, by the late 50s Edinburgh had more provision than Glasgow, with the New 57 Gallery (1957) offering some respite. While artists from Glasgow did exhibit there, the tendency leaned towards East Coast artists.[15] It was not until 1963 that a similar venture became established in Glasgow.

The New Charing Cross Gallery was founded by Bet Low and John Taylor, who invited Gerber to join them. While MacDonald (Low's husband) was not officially a director he played a vital role in the project.

The gallery was situated up a steep flight of stairs in a disused attic above a print shop, Duthie's, on Sauchiehall Street. After much hard work, the gallery opened its doors receiving welcome, and some less welcome reviews from the press. "Miss Low works with Scrubbing Brush – to open new art gallery" remarked the Glasgow Evening Citizen, (07/12/1963)[16] a headline which Taylor remembers as infuriating Low. The first exhibition included works by Low, Taylor, MacDonald, Douglas Abercrombie and Carole Gibbons.

Again, a new meeting place had been established. The gallery was host to book launches, for writers such as Archie Hind and Alan Sharp[17] and organised travelling exhibitions that demonstrated the breadth of its interests. In 1967, in conjunction with the Goethe Institute, Glasgow, the New Charing Cross Gallery brought a series of 78

etchings and colour lithographs by Lovis Corinth (b.1858) to Glasgow. Little known in Scotland at that time, Corinth was linked to German Expressionist work and was a close friend of the playwright Gerard Hauptmann, through whom Corinth was introduced to Kaethe Kollwitz. Both artists were to produce work from Hauptmann's play "The Weavers" (1898) charting the defeat of the Silesian weavers.

In a review of the exhibition, Martin Baillie pondered over the contrast between Van Gogh's fame against Corinth's relative obscurity, suggesting that there was a reluctance in Glasgow to show anything outside of post-impressionism. "Today the graphic works of Corinth's last years. Tomorrow, one hopes, a comprehensive exhibition which will enable us to follow his development".[18] The exhibition toured to Belfast's Arts Council Gallery.

Other artists such as J.D. Fergusson, Joan Eardley, Benno Schotz, Scotty Wilson, Philip Reeves, and William Crozier can all be counted in the gallery's exhibition history.

Paying no rent to Duthie, except for a small commission from any sales, the gallery was run on a volunteer basis. Profits were minimal, despite a sell out exhibition of Joan Eardley that kept the gallery afloat for nearly 18 months. The surviving pages of the account books testify to fairly healthy trade. Purchasers included T.J. Honeyman, (director of Kelvingrove Art Gallery and noted for crowd pulling exhibitions such as Van Gogh and Picasso and Matisse during the late 1940s and early 50s) Glasgow University Fine Art Department, and importantly, the Scottish Arts Council. The SAC purchased work from over fourteen artists and gave occasional assistance with transport and insurance costs. Emilio Coia also notes the Scottish National Gallery of Modern Art, Vincent Price Collection USA, Abbot Hall Art Gallery in Kendal, Scottish Television, National Gallery of Malaysia, Dumbartonshire Educational Committee and finally, Argyll Education Committee.[19]

Alongside these purchases intermittent donations came from the public including the refugee architect Fred Selby. Selby was "the embodiment of a left-wing Jewish Intellectual, an active communist who counted Walter Ubricht amongst his associates"[20] and who taught at both Glasgow School of Art and Strathclyde University.[21]

Gerber commented on the difficulties involved in getting the gallery started, due in no small part to its "off the beaten track" location. The university was actively courted in a bid to allow the venture to grow through educational channels and to develop

organically. It seems, given the above patrons, that this was a successful task. However, from the late 1950s Tom MacDonald had himself become involved with Glasgow University's extra-mural department and adult education classes. While the university had well-attended courses in the social sciences - economics, politics and trade union studies – there was little provision for the arts.

In 1954, Martin Baillie was appointed as a lecturer in art extending his teaching into extra-mural work. Responses to the courses were immediate and impressive. Whilst MacDonald had no 'formal' qualifications, Baillie recommended him to the department to help cater for the growing demand. The courses were often captioned as 'art appreciation', although in practice study combined art history and importantly, understanding the wider social framework of art.

In 1968, after almost five years and over 45 exhibitions, the gallery was forced to close. Mr. Duthie had become seriously ill and had to sell the premises. For Gerber, this was an extremely serious thing. The New Charing Cross Gallery had become an important outlet for artists who could not gain entry into the RGI or the RSA. as well as offering the opportunity to view more experimental work which other, more commercially minded sales galleries would not entertain. It became increasingly urgent for a new venue to be found. In the meantime, the gallery continued a limited function by holding exhibitions in the Cosmo Cinema foyer.

In 1969, new premises were at last found in a basement at 178 West Regent Street, close to the new Scottish Arts Council Gallery in Blytheswood Square, the Blytheswood Gallery, Annans and Armstrongs. These latter galleries had little or no interest in contemporary art however. Gerber canvassed a wide range of people to gain financial assistance for the project and eventually a group of Trustees purchased the premises under an agreement to rent them to the gallery for £1.00 per year for all time. The gallery would be responsible for any debts incurred, and the trustees were to have no say in the running of the venue. Gerber commented:

> Its remarkable that such people were found, and something like £3,200
> was contributed – most of it by people who asked us to accept their
> contribution as an outright donation and some by people who wished to
> put it towards the cost of the property. An interesting point is that quite a
> number of folk who helped in this way are completely unknown to me, but
> I hope to meet them in time. Certain painters, whose work I recently happened
> to sell, generously declined payment and asked me to accept it on behalf of the

can't, so that made it clear what the purpose was, and that's why we started it like that.[24]

Gerber consulted a lawyer and soon after, opened the gallery doors to the public. In contrast to the New Charing Cross gallery, Compass had a prime site with street access. In its day, it was designed to fit the requirements of 1960's chic. Stark white walls were applauded and its lighting and continental rod-hanging system regarded as 'state of the arts'. Even the convenience of a public toilet was deemed worthy of comment as a modern facility.

Aside from showing the works of lesser known younger artists, Compass gave the first Scottish exhibitions to artists such as Adrian Heath (1981), Roger Hilton (1973) Anthony Caro (1980), Craigie Aitchison (1970) Terry Frost (1978) and Keith Vaughan (1976).

The Compass enjoyed support form the Scottish Arts Council, which increased as both the SAC and the gallery grew in stature. As discussed in Part 1, the 1980s proved to bleak times for the arts. By 1984, SAC reports were announcing cutbacks. Compass Gallery in Glasgow, Demarco's Gallery and the Fruitmarket Gallery in Edinburgh were all marked out for reductions to their grant aid over a three year period and were asked to prove themselves as more financially viable, and ultimately to be self-sustaining.[25] By 1988, Compass Gallery was no longer on an Arts Council 'client'. The announcement came through a telephone call, and an hour later, both the Glasgow Herald and The Scotsman Newspaper were picking up the story. A number of damning reports appeared in the press over the consecutive weeks and months. No faults were found with either the artistic policy or conflict of interest with Gerber's own gallery (Cyril Gerber Fine Art), which he had set up privately in the 1980s.

Lindsay Gordon, art director of the SAC was reported to state that the gallery did not exploit itself enough and thought that a committee should be put in place with a full time director. Press reports were generous towards the gallery, which by this time was no longer a lone establishment for contemporary art in Glasgow. Gerber resisted the changes and subsequently lost the funding.

It is tempting to place Compass in a political light. However, Gerber insists that there was nothing political about the scheme, despite his own political history. There was no manifesto and no fixed constitution. There is nonetheless a social consciousness present in which art is an important aspect of the culture of the city:

No, it was nothing political…the left book club, yes…. No, I just felt…

I came to the conclusion that art was a very important thing in life, for me and could be for people in general and it was a good thing that should be encouraged and to do everything you could to get people to look at it and deal with it, because it opens people's minds. It helps you to see how other people think. So it had a kind of political background you know, in a way, a kind of social responsibility thing. You don't just go about blind and close your eyes your eyes to issues. [....] It's a lot to do, in a way, with basic democracy in its broadest sense of understanding how other people think and not disrespecting them because they're different.....not throwing away a piece of art because you can't understand it...try and understand it, try and understand what motivated it....things like that.[26]

As I have explored, this social consciousness belongs to the specific emergent cultural formations that developed in Glasgow after the First World War in response to the experience and conditions of modernity in the metropolis.

The history of change and flux which this dissertation has charted permeates Gerber's structure of feeling. At the age of 89, he still runs Compass Gallery, now with his daughters Jill and Sue Gerber, on the same ethos as it began with in 1969. By exploring the emergence of the Compass Gallery, history as social process is made explicit: through politics, economics, education as lived social relationships and the interplay occurring between them. Cultural history becomes more than the sum of its separate parts. It is lived at the every day level and at times, extraordinarily so. That is the cultural significance of the Compass Gallery.

[1] Gerber, Cyril (1986); 'An Appreciation'; in Tom Macdonald (1914-1985) A Memorial Exhibition of Paintings and Drawings selected by Cordelia Oliver in association with Bet Low; P39; (exhibition catalogue); Third Eye Centre, Glasgow.

[2] McKenny, Linda; (2000) The Activities of Popular Dramatists and Drama Groups in Scotland 1900-1952; p112; The Edwin Mellin Press; Lewiston, Queenston, Lampeter.

[3] Oliver, Cordelia (1985) Wartime Glasgow: The 'Alternative Arts Scene' ; in Josef Herman, "Memory of Memories" The Glasgow Drawings 1940- 43; Exhibition Catalogue,Third Eye Centre, Glasgow

[4] Schotz, B. (1981) Bronze In My Blood p126.

[5] Wolff, J. (2003) 'Degenerate Art' in Britain: Refugees, Internees and Visual Culture; in Visual Culture in Britain, vol,4, no.2, (2003) p43

[6] Farr, Dennis (1968) New Painting in Glasgow,1940 – 46; Exhibition catalogue, p5, The Scottish Arts Council.

[7] Taylor, W. as n.1 ; p31

[8] Helen Biggar is only one of a growing number of women artists who emerged from Glasgow School of Art. During WWI, the art school was staffed almost entirely by women. The contribution made by these early feminists cannot unfortunately be addressed here, but would be an interesting follow up study. Biggar is commemorated by a bust by Benno Schotz, bronze, whereabouts unknown.

[9] www. screenonline; British Film Institute, 2006.

[10] McKenny, L. as n.2; p154.

[11] Gerber, as n. 1, p39

[12] Private interview.

[13] See, for example, Emilio Coia's reviews in Scottish Field, 1968, and William Eadie, (1990), Movements of Modernity; Routledge

[14] John Taylor, "An Artist Remembers", as n.1, p43.

[15] John Taylor, Tom MacDonald and Bet Low all showed there.

[16] Papers of John Taylor

[17] Invitation card to Bet Low, to launch *A Green Tree in Geddes*, Friday 19th March, cocktails 6pm-8pm, from the directors of Michael Joseph Ltd, 16 Bloomsbury St, London.

[18] Glasgow Herald, 16/11/1967; papers of John Taylor.

[19] Coia, E; in Scottish Field, July 1968.

[20] Thompson, S. in Art Booms With The Guns; exhibition catalogue, Glasgow School of Art, provides a fuller account of Selby's life and work.

[21] Papers of John Taylor

[22] Interview with Coia, E; Scottish Field, April 1969.

[23] Scotsman newspaper, March 15th 1969

[24] Private interview.

[25] SAC Annual Report; The Next Five Years; (1984)

[26] Private interview.

EPILOGUE.....THE LOVE OF ART

Norbert Elias writes:

> Among the most interesting unanswered questions of our time is that
> of the structural characteristics on the basis of which the products of a
> particular person survive the selection process of a series of generations,
> and are gradually absorbed into the canon of socially accepted works of art,
> while those of other people lapse into the shadowy world of forgotten works. [1]

This question was central to Raymond Williams' concerns. The selection processes
by which documentary culture is both produced and sustained provided an ongoing
and changing area of analysis that underpinned his work. The central aspect of this
was not only the constantly changing cultural patterns by which such selection
processes were articulated, but equally how they shaped and were shaped by the
interplay of individuals and their social relationships. In this way, the idea of process
informed his approach in order to highlight innovation, and reformation against direct
reproduction. Williams writes:

> It is important to try to understand the operation of a selective tradition.
> [...] In society as a whole, and in all its particular activities, the cultural
> tradition can be seen as a continual selection and re-selection of ancestors.
> Particular lines will be drawn, often for as long as a century, and then suddenly
> with some new stage in growth these will be cancelled or weakened, and new
> lines drawn. In the analysis of contemporary culture, the existing state of the
> selective tradition is of vital importance, for it is often true that some change
> in this tradition – establishing new lines with the past, breaking or re-drawing
> existing lines – is a radical contemporary change. [2]

For Williams, the significance of an activity must be sought in terms of the whole
organisation and that this is always more then the sum of its separable parts. In this
sense, every element under analysis should remain active. The selective tradition and
its interpretations of past works provide the connection between the lived culture and
the period culture. "The significance of documentary culture," said Williams, "is that,
more clearly than anything else, it expresses that life to us in direct terms, when the
living witnesses are silent." [3] For Williams, this was never simply a matter of
returning a work to its period. Cultural analysis was a means of making our

interpretations conscious, and to confront us with the real nature of the choices we make, and to take responsibility for them:

> The more actively all cultural work can be related, either to the whole
> organisation within which it was expressed, or to the contemporary
> organisation within which it is used, the more clearly shall we see its
> true values.[...] In describing these relations, the real cultural process
> will emerge.[4]

To this extent, the work of Pierre Bourdieu, whilst offering significant insight for the sociology of art, was overtly structural in its analytic and methodological procedures, and through the suggestion that all cultural production produced cultural distinctions and divisions. As Williams' work aimed to illustrate, through its construction of a systematic Utopia, there was at least the possibility of developing a culture held in common in which difference could be maintained and encouraged but without the distinctions of class culture, mass culture, or elite culture. For Williams, art was a fundamental human activity and it could not be understood by any reference to any 'grand theoretical' claims. C. W. Mills was highly critical of grand theory, with all its opacity of language, normative structures and master symbols of legitimisation, which did not necessarily bear relation to 'real life'.[5] Mills writes:

> The basic cause of Grand Theory is the initial choice of a level of
> thinking so general that its practitioners cannot logically get down to
> observation. They never, as grand theorists, get down from the higher
> generalities to problems in their own historical and structural contexts.[6]

For Mills, there was a dearth of empirical research and a preoccupation with theoretical abstraction. This form of methodology was divorced from practice resulting in an inability to write in accessible language and a retreat into impenetrable private debates. However, while his theoretical position, and his language is certainly complex, there is still a great deal of value to be found in Bourdieu's analysis, most clearly in his observations which correlated educational and cultural capital and exposed areas of inequality in access, provision and outcome. At the same time, Bourdieu offered serious methodological procedures by which empirical work in this area might be conducted. Yet, underpinning Bourdieu's theories, Williams observed a dependence on a base and superstructure relationship, which as I have shown, was too mechanistic to explain the way that social and cultural change happens, both at a micro and a macro level.

By exploring the emergence of the Compass Gallery, which as a registered charity falls into the space in between the private dealer, the public art gallery and the artists' co-operative, it is possible to show, at a very local level, an historical alternative to ideas of the devolution of culture. As a pocket of resistance to the ways in which capitalism operates at a macro level, the Compass Gallery offers a resource of hope. It seems clear that during the arts funding upheavals under the Thatcher government, Gerber attempted to follow his own path between laissez-faire capitalism and becoming a hand-maiden of the Scottish Arts Council policy of the time; or as Mulholland might describe it, between 'monetarist populism' and 'Keynesian Culturalism'. For the sculptor Henry Moore (1898 – 1986), this path was not easy. Speaking to the UNESCO conference of artists at the Venice Biennale in 1952, Moore addressed the difficulty:

> [...] I do not think we should despise the private collector or the dealer who serves him; their attitude to the work of art, though it may include in the one case an element of possessiveness or even selfishness and in the other case an element of profit making, of parasitism, nevertheless, such people circulate works of art in natural channels, and in the early stages of an artist's career they are the only ones willing to take a risk, to back a young artist with their personal judgement and faith. The State patronage of art is rarely given to young and unknown artists, and I cannot conceive of any scheme, outside the complete communisation of the art profession such as exists in Russia, which will support the artist in his early career.[7]

Historically, the correlation of educational and economic capital has permeated the role of the private collector and the dealer, and by extension, the emergence of civic art collections has its roots in this relationship. While this has often delineated limits and pressures, it is not necessarily true to suggest that this has been an entirely exclusive relationship. However, the growth of an educated and participatory democracy was as important for Moore as it was for Williams in that it could be a tool by which such social and cultural relationships might be critiqued and prevented from becoming a monolithic block. In a democratic society, Moore argued that:

> Isn't there a primary duty in such a society to make sure that the people have the interest and the eagerness that demand the best art just as surely as they demand the best education or the best housing?[8]

Moore, in his UNESCO address called for the "renewal of the sources of artistic inspiration among the people at large."[9] In other words, Moore advocated the regeneration of a love of art. Pierre Bourdieu was critical of the 'love of art':

> Is it legitimate to invoke the experience of the lover, to make of love, as an astonished abandon to the work in its inexpressible singularity, the only form of understanding which accords with the work of art?[10]

The experience of love is not, by definition, "astonished abandon". Zygmunt Bauman provides an astute articulation of the variable conditions in which love is experienced entitled "Falling in and out of Love"[11]. Love is fragile, and is more often than not, a struggle. As this dissertation has explored, the love of art is not, and has never been a singular quality based on the idea of 'disinterestedness'. Across the different historical actors I have looked at, the love of art has found complex and diverse manifestations. Bauman suggests:

> Love fears reason; reason fears love. Each tries hard to do without the other, but whenever they do, trouble is in store. This is, in its briefest rendition possible, the quandary of love. And of reason.[12]

After a long discussion on whether or not love needs reason, Bauman concludes that the answer is; yes, love needs reason; but it needs it as an instrument, not as an excuse.

Art, audiences and display are linked yet separate. They can hardly exist without each other, and yet the discourses that surround them are often spent in an ongoing war of independence. Out of that war, however, a commitment to the love of art, in the end is found as much in Bourdieu as with Williams, McCance or Gerber. Art is activity rather than object, and in its active process lies the space for evaluation.

---

[1] Elias, N. Craftsman's Art and Artists' Art; in Tanner, Sociology of Art, A Reader, 2003 p136
[2] Williams, R. [1961] The Analysis of Culture; from The Long Revolution; in Harrison, C. and Woods, P. [eds] (1992) Art in Theory 1900-1990; p716
[3] Ibid
[4] Ibid p717.
[5] Mills, C.W. (1959) The Sociological Imagination;pp25 –49.;Oxford.
[6] Ibid. p33
[7] Moore, H. (1952) The Sculptor in Modern Society: in Harrison and Woods, as above, p671.
[8] Ibid.
[9] ibid.
[10] Bourdieu, P; (1996) The Rules of Art; pxv; Polity Press
[11] Bauman, Z. (2003) Liquid Love; pp1-37, Polity Press, London.

[12] Bauman, N. (2001) The Individualised Society ; p162; Polity Press.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ades, D. Cox, N. and Hopkins, D. (1999) *Marcel Duchamp* ; Thames and Hudson, London.

2. Bauman, Z. (2001) *The Individualised Society* ; Polity Press, Cambridge in association with Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

3. Bauman, Z. (2003) *Liquid Love* ; Polity Press, Cambridge in association with Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

4. Becker, H. (1982) *Art Worlds* ; University Of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London.

5. Bennet, T. (1995) *The Birth of the Museum*; Routledge, London and New York

6. Berger, J. (1972) *Ways of Seeing* ; British Broadcasting Corporation and Penguin Books, London.

7. Berman, M. (1983) *All That is Solid Melts into Air*; Verso, London.

8. Billcliffe, R. (1990) *The Royal Glasgow Institute of the Fine Arts; A brief History;* in Vol. 1, Royal Glasgow Institute Catalogue of Exhibitors, Vols. I-IV.

9. Bold, A. (1990) *Hugh MacDiarmid* ; Paladin Grafton Books, a subsidiary of the Collins Publishing Group, London, Glasgow, Toronto, Sydney, Auckland.

10. Bourdieu, P. (1979) *Distinction; A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* ; Published in English 1984 by Routledge and Kegan Paul, reprinted 1989, 1992 by Routledge, London.

11. Bourdieu, P. (1993) *The Field of Cultural Production* ; Polity Press, Cambridge in association with Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

12. Bourdieu, P. (1996) *The Rules of Art*, Polity Press, Cambridge in association with Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

13. Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (1992) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*; Polity Press , Cambridge in association with Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

14. Bourdieu, P. (1993) *Sociology in Question* ; Sage Publications, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi.

15. Bourdieu, P. (1968) *Outline of a Sociological Theory of Art Perception* in Tanner, J. (2003) *The Sociology of Art, A Reader* ; Routledge, London and New York.

16. Boyd -White, I; [ed] (2003) *Modernism and the Spirit of the City;* Routledge, London and New York.

17. Boyer, C. (2001) *The City of Collective Memory* ; The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England.

18. Bradley, W. (2002) *Exploits* in Bradley, W. Bretton-Meyer, H. and Webster, T. [eds] *My Head is on Fire but my Heart is Full of Love*; Exhibition Catalogue (8 May – 9 June 2002) ; Charlottenborg Udstillingsbygning, Copenhagen.

19. Buck-Morss, S. (1993) *The Dialectics of Seeing* ; The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England.

20. Burgin, V. (1986) *The End of Art Theory* ; MacMillan Education Ltd. London

21. Burke, K. (2003) *The British Isles Since 1945* ; Oxford University Press.

22. Burke, P. (1997) *Varieties of Cultural History* ; Polity Press, Cambridge in association with Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

23. Burkhauser, J. [ed.] (1990) *Glasgow Girls; Women in Art and Design 1880 - 1920;* Canongate, Edinburgh.

24. Calhoun, C., Lipuma, E., and Postone, M. [eds.] (1993) *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives* ; Polity Press, Cambridge in association with Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.

25. Callinicos, A. (1999) *Social Theory*; Polity Press

26. Caunce, S. (1994) *Oral History and the Local Historian* ; Longman, London and New York.

27. Clark, T.J. (1999) *Farewell to an Idea* in Gaiger, J. and Wood, P. [eds.] (2003) *Art of the Twentieth Century; A Reader;* Yale University Press in association with The Open University.

28. Cohen, S. (2001) in *Index for Free Expression;* vol,30 1/2001; issue 198.

29. Collins, R., Curran, J., Garnham, N., Scannell, P., Schlesenger, P., and Sparks, C. [eds] (1986) *Media, Culture and Society* ; Sage publications, London.

30. Crane, D. [ed] (1994) *The Sociology of Culture* ; Blackwell, Oxford, UK and Cambridge USA.

31. Cullen, F. and Morrison, J. [eds] (2005) *A Shared Legacy* ; Ashgate Publishing, Hants. England.

32. Damer, S. (1990) *Glasgow; Going For A Song*; Lawrence and Wishart, London.

33. Devine, T. (1999) *The Scottish Nation 1700 – 2000* ; Allen Lane, The Penguin Press.

34. Duncan, C. (1994) *Art Museums and the Ritual of Citizenship* in Pearce, S.M. [ed] (1994) *Interpreting Objects and Collections* ; Routledge, London and New York

35. Duncan, C. (1995) *The Art Museum as Ritual* in Preziosi, D. [ed] (1998) *The Art of Art History*; Oxford University Press, Oxford.

36. During, S. [ed] (1993) *The Cultural Studies Reader* ; Routledge, London and New York.

37. Eadie, W. (1990) *Movements of Modernity*; Routledge, London and New York.

38. Eagleton, T. (2000) *The Idea of Culture*; Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

39. Eagleton, T. (2003) *After Theory*; Allen Lane, an imprint of Penguin Books, London.

40. Eagleton, T. (1990) *The Ideology of the Aesthetic*; Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

41. Eldridge, J. (2003) *Post Modernism and Industrial Relations* in Ackers, P. and Wilkinson, A. [eds.] (2003) *Understanding Work and Unemployment*; Oxford University Press.

42. Eldridge, J. and Eldridge, L. (1994) *Raymond Williams, Making Connections*; Routledge, London and New York

43. Eldridge, J., Kitzinger, J., and Williams, K. (1997) *The Mass Media and Power in Modern Britain*; Oxford University Press.

44. Eldridge, J., Cressey, P., and MacInnes, J. (1991) *Industrial Sociology and Economic Crisis*; Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hertfordshire; a division of Simon and Schuster International Group.

45. Elias, N. (2003) *Craftsmen's Art and Artist's Art*; in Tanner, J. [ed] (2003) *The Sociology of Art, a Reader*; Routledge, London and New York.

46. Fairfull Smith, G. (1998) *The Glasgow Dilettanti Society*; in *Journal of the Scottish Society for Art History: Vol. 3 (1998)*

47. Farr, D. (1968) *New Painting In Glasgow 1940 – 1946*; Exhibition Catalogue, Scottish National Gallery of Modern Art, Edinburgh, 6 July – 4 August 1968. Scottish Arts Council, Edinburgh.

48. Fernie, E. [ed] (1995) *Art History and its Methods*; Phaidon Press, London.

49. Fowle, F. (1997) *Alexander Reid: The Influential Dealer*; in *Journal of the Scottish Society for Art History, Vol.2, 1997.*

50. Fowle, F. (2005) *Scottish Collectors of the 19th Century* in Cullen, F. and Morrison, J. [eds] (2005) *A Shared Legacy*; Ashgate Publishing, Hants. England

51. Fowler, B. [ed] (2000) *Reading Bourdieu on Society and Culture*; Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

52. Frascina, F. and Harris, J. [eds] (1992) *Art in Modern Culture*; The Open
    University, Phaidon Press, London.

53. Frisby, D.(1985) *Fragments of Modernity*; Polity, Cambridge.

54. Frisby, D. (2001) *Cityscapes of Modernity*; Polity, Cambridge

55. Forster-Hahn, F. (2003) *Moving Apart: Practicing Art History in the Old and New
    Worlds*; in Zimmermann, M. [ed] (2003) *The Art Historian*; Sterling and Francine
    Clark Institute, Massachusetts.

56. Gaiger, J. and Wood, P. [eds] (2003) *Art of the Twentieth Century; A Reader*;
    Yale University Press, New Haven and London, in association with The Open
    University.

57. Gerber, C. (1986) *An Appreciation;* in *Tom MacDonald (1914 – 1985): A
    memorial Exhibition of Paintings and Drawings;* Third Eye Centre, Glasgow.

58. Gerber, C. (1990) [ed] *The Compass Comtribution; 21 Years of Contemporary
    Art, 1969 –1990;* Exhibition catalogue, The Compass Gallery, Glasgow.

59. Gold, J. and Gold, M. (2005) *Cities of Culture; Staging International Festivals
    and the Urban Agenda 1851 –2000*; Ashgate Publishing, Hants. England.

60. Grassic Gibbon, L. (no date supplied) *Glasgow*; in McClay, F. [ed] (1988)
    Workers City; Clydeside Press, High Street, Glasgow.

61. Harris, J. [ed] (2004) *Art, Money, Parties: New Institutions in the Political
    Economy of Art*; Liverpool University Press.

62. Harris, J. (1989) *Raymond Williams: Art History and Social Critique* in *BLOCK
    15, 1989, 1.* Middlesex Polytechnic

63. Harris, J. (2004) *Putting the 'Culture' into Visual Culture*; in *Visual Culture in
    Britain, vol.5 number 2. 2004*; Manchester University Press.

64. Harrison, C and Wood, P. [eds.] (1992) *Art in Theory 1900 – 1990*; Blackwell
    Publishers, Oxford.

65. Harvey, D. (1990) *The Condition of Postmodernity*; Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

66. Herman, J. (1975) *Related Twilights*; Robson Books, London.

67. Herman, J. (1985) *Memory of Memories; The Glasgow Drawings 1940 -1943*;
    Exhibition Catalogue, 1985, 3rd Eye Centre, Glasgow

68. Hobsbawm, E. (1997) *On History*; Abacus, an imprint of Time Warner Books
    UK.

69. Hughes, R. (1990) *Nothing If Not Critical*; The Harvill Press, London

70. Hutton, P.H. (1993) *History as an Art of Memory*; University Press of New England, Hanover and London.

71. Jenkins, H. (1979) *The Culture Gap*; Marion Boyars, London, Boston.

72. Jenks, C. (1993) *Culture, Key Ideas*; Routledge, London and New York.

73. Jones, P. (2004) *Raymond Williams's Sociology of Culture: A Critical Reconstruction*; Palgrave MacMillan, New York.

74. Jones, P. (1995) *Williams and 'quality': a response to John Corner*; in *Media, Culture and Society, Vol. 17 (1995) pp317-322;* SAGE, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi.

75. Jones, P. (1994) *The Myth of 'Raymond Hoggart': On 'Founding Fathers' and Cultural Policy*; in *Cultural Studies 8 (3) (1994) pp394-416.*

76. Kinchen, J. and Kinchen, P. (1988) *Glasgow's Great Exhibitions*; White Cockade Publishing, Bicester, Oxon.

77. Kinchen, J. (1990) *Second City of the Empire* in Burkhauser, J. [ed] (1990) *Glasgow Girls, Women in Art and Design 1880-1920*; Canongate Publishing, Edinburgh.

78. Kinchen, J. (1997) *Art and History into Life: Pageantry Revived in Scotland* in *Journal for the Scottish Society of Art History, Vol.2, 1997*

79. Lukes, S. (1973) *Emile Durkheim, A Historical and Critical Study*; Penguin Books, London.

80. MacDonald, M. (2005) Scottish *Art and Identity: A Unique Diversity* in *Journal for the Scottish Society for Art History, Vol. 10, 2005*

81. MacMillan, D. (1994) *Scottish Art in the 20th Century*; Mainstream Publishing, Edinburgh and London.

82. MacMillan, D. (1990) *Scottish Art 1460 – 1990*; Mainstream Publishing, Edinburgh and London.

83. Marr, A. (1992) *Battle For Scotland*; Penguin Books, London

84. Matheson, A. (2000) *Glasgow's Other River; Exploring The Kelvin*; Fort Publishing, Ayr,

85. Maver, I. (2000) *Glasgow*; Edinburgh University Press.

86. Marwick, A. (1990) *The Arts, Literature and Society*; Routledge, London and New York.

87. Marx, K. [1851] (1978) *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*; in Tucker, R. [ed] (1978) The Marx-Engels Reader; W.W.Norton and Company, London an New York.

88. McClellan, A. [ed] (2003) *Art and its Publics*; Blackwell Publishing, Oxford

89. McCorquodale, D., Siderfin, N. and Stallabrass, J. [eds.] (1998) *Occupational Hazzard*; Black Dog Publishing, London.

90. McCrone, D. (1992) *Understanding Scotland; The Sociology of a Stateless Nation*; Routledge, London and New York.

91. McKenny, L. (2000) *The Activities of Popular Dramatists and Drama Groups in Scotland, 1900 –1952*; The Edwin Mellen Press Ltd. Lampeter, Wales.

92. McLay, F. (1988) *Workers' City*; Clydeside Publishing, High Street, Glasgow.

93. Mey, K. (2004) Book Review of Mulholland, N; *The Cultural Devolution* (see number 99 below) in *Journal for the Scottish Society for Art History, vol. 9, 2004* pp111-112.

94. Meyerscough, J. (1990) *Monitoring Glasgow 1990*; report prepared for Glasgow City Council, Strathclyde Regional Council and Scottish Enterprise.

95. Meyerscough, J. (1984) *Funding The Arts In Europe*; Policy Studies Institute

96. Mills, C.W. (1959) *The Sociological Imagination*; Oxford University Press, Oxford, London, New York.

97. Mills, C.W. (1963) *Man In The Middle: The Designer* in C.W. Mills, *The Collected Essays; Power, Politics and People*; Oxford University Press.

98. Morrison, J. (2005) *Nation and Identity* in *Journal for the Scottish Society for Art History, Vol.10, 2005.*

99. Mulholland, N. (2003) *The Cultural Devolution: Art in Britain in the Late Twentieth Century*; Ashgate Publishing, London

100.   Mulholland, N. (2002) *Learning from Glasvegas: Scottish Art after the '90'* in *Journal for the Scottish Society for Art History, vol. 7*, 2002 pp69-76.

101.   Mulholland, N. (No date supplied) *Why Is There Only One Monopolies Commission?* In *Variant, Issue 4*; www.variant.org.uk varianmag@btinternet.com

102.   Mulholland, N. (No date supplied) *It could be an eye…* ; in *Variant, Issue 10*, web details s above.

103.   Normand, T. (2000) *The Modern Scot: Modernism and Nationalism in Scottish Art 1928 - 1955*; Ashgate Publishing, London

104.   O'Connor, A. (1989) *Raymond Williams: Writing, Culture, Politics*; Basil Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.

105.   Oliver, C. (1990) *Compass Gallery Comes Of Age* in Gerber, C. [ed] *The Compass Contribution*, Exhibition Catalogue, 10 May – 24 June 1990, Tramway, Glasgow. Published by Compass Gallery, Glasgow.

106.   Oliver, C. (1999) *Magic in the Gorbals*; Northern Books, from Famedram.

107.   Oliver, C. *A History of the Third Eye Centre* in Variant Magazine, undated Photocopy.

108.   Park, M. (1990) *The McLellan Bequest*; in *Scottish art Review*, vol XVII, pp22-25.

109.   Philo, G. and Miller, D. (2001) *Market Killing*; Longman Publishing, an imprint of Pearson Education, Essex, England.

110.   Pinkney, T. (1991) *Raymond Williams: Border Lines*; Seren Books, an imprint of Poetry Wales Ltd. Mid Glamorgan.

111.   Pollock, V. L. (2004) *Second City or Absent City? Futurism and Glasgow's Lack of an Urban Modernism*; in *Journal for the Scottish Society for Art History*, vol.9 2004.

112.   Prior, N. (2002) *Museums and Modernity*; Berg, Oxford and New York.

113.   Samuel, R. (1989) *'Philosophy Teaching By Example': Past and Present in Raymond Williams* in *History Workshop Journal*, Issue 27, Spring 1989.

114.   Samuel, R. [ed] (1981) *People's History and Socialist Theory*; History Workshop Series, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, Boston, Hemley.

115.   Thompson, E. P. (1978) *The Poverty of Theory and Other Essays*; Merlin Press, London.

116.   Thompson, E. P. (1979) *The Politics of Theory* in Samuel, R. [ed} (1981) as number 106, see above.

117.   Thompson, E.P. (1991) *Customs in Common*; Merlin Press, London.

118.   Thompson, S. *"A Living Link to Modernism"* in *Art Booms With The Guns*; Exhibition catalogue; Glasgow School of Art.

119.   Thompson, S. (2005) *The Case for Critical Regionalism in Recent Scottish art Criticism* in *Journal for the Scottish Society for Art History*, vol.10, 2005.

120.   Turkell, S. (1970) *Hard Times; An Oral History of The Great Depression*; (1986) The New Press, New York and London.

121. Weber, M. [1930] (1992) *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism;* Routledge, London and New York.

122. Williams, R. [1961] (1988) *Culture and Society 1780 – 1950;* Harmondsworth, Penguin.

123. Williams, R. [1961] (1965) *The Long Revolution;* Harmondsworth, Penguin.

124. Williams, R. (1973) *The Country and the City;* Paladin, Chatto and Windus Ltd. London

125. Williams, R. (1980) *Problems in Materialism and Culture;* Verso, London.

126. Williams, R. (1981) *Culture;* Fontana Press, Glasgow.

127. Williams, R. [1976] (1983) *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society;* Fontana Press, Glasgow.

128. Williams, R. [1983] (1985) *Towards 2000;* Harmondsworth, Penguin.

129. Williams, R. (1989) *Resources of Hope: Culture, Democracy and Socialism;* Verso, London.

130. Williams, R. (1990) *What I Came To Say* ; edited by Belton, N., Mulhern, F. and Taylor, J. Hutchinson Radius, London.

131. Williams, R. (1989) *The Politics of Modernism : Against the New conformists* edited by Pinkney, T.; Verso, London and New York.

132. Williamson, B. (1990) *The Temper of the Times: British Society since World War II;* Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

133. Wolff, J. [1981] (1993) *The Social Production of Art;* 2nd edition; MacMillan Press, London.

134. Wolff, J. (2003) *'Degenerate Art' in Britain: Refugees, Internees and Visual Culture.;* in *Visual Culture in Britain,* vol.4 no.2, 2003.

135. Wu, C-T, (2002) *Privatising Culture: Corporate Art Intervention Since The 1980s* ; Verso, London and New York.

136. Zimmerman, M. [ed.] (2003) *The Art Historian: National Traditions and Institutional Practices* ; Yale University Press

137. Zolberg, V. (1992) *Barrier or Leveller? The Case of the Art Museum;* in Lamont, m. and Fournier, M. [eds] *Cultivating Difference: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality.* (1999) University of Chicago Press.