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Abstract

Intrinsic and instrumental cultural values have represented core rationales for public cultural policies in the UK. However, the increasing dominance of neoliberal logic in recent decades has increased the tension between these policy rationales, making the question of how to negotiate and define intrinsic cultural values a key concern for cultural practitioners.

This thesis investigates the intellectual, historical and sociological basis of intrinsic and instrumental cultural values, encompassing the times of classical Greece to the present day. The role of cultural values in the emergence of UK post-war cultural policy is explored. This aims to reconnect implicit cultural policy assumptions with their conceptual roots, and offer a theoretical perspective from which to appraise contemporary cultural policy developments. The analysis of liberal humanist ideas is complemented with an assessment of the network of discourses informing instrumental policies, in particular, social inclusion and urban regeneration.

The thesis suggests that the contemporary instrumental cultural policy approach represents a misappropriation of the liberal humanist cultural discourse. In the neoliberal policy framework cultural and social concerns are usurped by entrepreneurial, managerial and consumerist imperatives, as cultural policies become a social and economic panacea. The neoliberal instrumental framework undermines key principles of public provision, with detrimental effects on social equality, local communities and cultural programming.

The theoretical part of this project is complemented by qualitative field research, which is based on semi-structured interviews with 25 cultural managers from across the UK cultural sector. The key finding of this study suggests that cultural managers deflect the tension between intrinsic and instrumental policy rationales by proposing a synthesis between intrinsic and social instrumental cultural values. This recognition allows cultural managers to incorporate competing cultural policy assumptions into a broad cultural political framework. Cultural managers justified cultural policy making by resorting to enlightenment reasoning, public responsibility, cultural democracy and funder’s demands. The critique of instrumentalism was deflected in to an opposition to impact-driven and commercial values.
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Introduction

Government rationales for the public provision of arts have become the focus of considerable debate amongst cultural practitioners and researchers over recent decades. Underlying what many commentators deemed an ‘impasse’ in public cultural provision, were general shifts in the philosophy and practice of public service policies over the last three decades. There has been a consensus that the global drive to reform and modernisation across the public sector has made neoliberal principles the overriding organisational basis of public governance. This tendency has been organised around the centrality of managerial and entrepreneurial approaches to decision making, the primacy of needs tested conceptions of service provision, and the dominance of private, market-driven and competitive forms of public institutions. The transformation of public sector management has been informed by the contention that public services have had to respond to an increasingly competitive, diverse and individualised set of needs. These challenges required transparent evidence and robust testing for operational effectiveness, impacts and ‘fitness for purpose’. As a result it has become a key requirement across public sectors to justify expenditure in terms of explicit economic and social impacts. After the election of New Labour in 1997, social inclusion and regeneration were declared key political agenda. It is in the course of these developments that the public cultural sector began to be justified on the basis of social and economic instrumental policy rationales. This has been associated with the emergence of evidence-based policy making in the cultural sector.

The emergence of instrumentalism in public policy has raised widespread concern amongst members of the cultural constituency (Belfiore and Bennett 2008; Gray 2007; McGuigan 2005). The critique of instrumental cultural policies has aimed at methodological and theoretical shortcomings of culture-led instrumental policies, which enrolled culture in the fight against low educational achievements, crime and unemployment. A number of commentators challenged the effectiveness and appropriateness of culture-led instrumental policies. Not only was culture’s social instrumental role questioned as replacing much needed structural social policy intervention. Scepticism was raised against the methodological basis of instrumental policy making. Evidence-testing and auditing often pertained to a mere advocational
and legitimising role, rather than a means to assess and re-evaluate policy programming. However, the main point of contention concerned the relevance of intrinsic, art-specific values and meaning, as the traditional *raison d'être* of art production. To many, the social instrumental approach failed to take account of principles of art for art's sake (Tusa 2002; Lewis in McGuigan 1996: 71). The question of how to negotiate and define intrinsic cultural values within an instrumental policy framework has therefore become a source of debate.

The tension between intrinsic and instrumental cultural values has represented a historically long enduring conflict. Cultural values and their role in society have been subject to ongoing debate, representing a history of complex and competing discourses around cultural reasoning. In order to engage in a discussion on cultural values and their relation to cultural policies in the contemporary context, this thesis suggests that an understanding of the conceptual and historical foundation of cultural values is needed. The intellectual origins of contemporary claims of the arts can be traced to philosophical, literary and cultural sources from the times of Classical Greece to the present day. In the course of this cultural history, intrinsic and instrumental cultural values developed in separate theoretical strands. Whereas the instrumental role of culture and the arts has been debated throughout Western cultural history, it is only until the 19th century that the foundation for intrinsic cultural values was solidified. In the wake of the modern industrial society, French and English art for art's sake proponents established a canon of art separatist claims that were based on 'disinterestedness' from political, economic, social and moral pressures.

Although intrinsic reasoning gave impetus for the foundation of public cultural provision in the UK, its role was constantly challenged. A significant theoretical counterpart to intrinsic reasoning has been represented by so-called social and economic instrumental arguments. In fact, it is generally agreed that instrumental cultural rationales have pervaded, if not dominated, the cultural political discourse. Their significance in the public policy arena came to the fore in the Victorian discourse of 'social control', which evolved around policies for the management of working-class upheaval and secure, civilised and moral conduct. In this context, cultural institutions became explicitly enrolled in the 'social control' agenda, a role that was promoted by enlightenment reformers. Until today, enlightenment reasoning of
culture has pervaded the public cultural policy discourse. The contemporary emphasis on social instrumental justifications of culture, for instance, has been frequently justified and linked to culture's historically defined instrumental role in public governance. Given the historical genealogy of cultural values in the history of public cultural policy, the question of why intrinsic cultural values have taken centre stage, and what conceptual and political meaning they pertain to in the public debate is subject to debate.

It is a main contention of this thesis, that whilst the conflict between intrinsic and instrumental values has historical precedence, the context, in which the tension is set, has changed considerably. As pointed out above, a significant departure from liberal humanist roots has represented the alignment of contemporary cultural policies with advanced neoliberal forms of governance. The instrumental approach has increasingly drawn upon a joined approach to cultural policy, mainstream social policy goals and economic market-driven agenda. What the upsurge of intrinsic cultural arguments indicates, is that despite the focus on instrumentalism, the public cultural policy debate continues to draw on complex and competing cultural political arguments, which contests and negotiates the effects of neoliberalism. The aim of this thesis is to provide a discussion on the tension between cultural, social and economic values, and the cultural-historical and political context of this debate. The account seeks to explore the implications of this debate for key aspects of public cultural provision and public governance.

However, the negotiation of cultural values in the cultural sector has not only been subject to the emergence of neoliberal forms of instrumentalism. Part of the reconstruction of cultural values has also been the result of changing terms of cultural theory. The emergence of postmodern discourses, such as poststructuralist, postcolonial and feminist theory, has challenged foundational assumptions, on which the liberal humanist discourse of culture has rested. The postmodern discourse has questioned key notions underlying cultural theory, such as cultural excellence, universality and access. One of the main effects has been increasing expectations on cultural organisation to adopt more democratic, inclusive and participatory roles, and to thereby challenge idealist and elitist assumptions. An impetus for the negotiation of cultural values therefore is not only provided by neoliberal policies, but also changing
terms of cultural theory itself. The thesis will consider the question of how to reconcile a commitment to intrinsic cultural values with a concern for cultural democracy.

This thesis seeks to firstly clarify the complex and competing meanings evolving around intrinsic and instrumental cultural values. This is done by tracing a historical genealogy of cultural values. The aim is to put the discussion on contemporary cultural policies into an intellectual and historical perspective, reconnecting implicit assumptions with their conceptual roots. To this end, philosophical and theoretical sources from European intellectual history are presented that form the conceptual foundation for intrinsic and instrumental cultural values. In order to understand their influence on the formation of cultural policies, their role in the emergence of UK cultural policy is discussed.

Having provided for an intellectual history of cultural values, the thesis assesses the contemporary relevance of cultural values for principles of public provision. The thesis first discusses the theoretical challenges to intrinsic cultural values that have emerged in postmodern theory. This thesis complements the intellectual history of cultural values with a sociological analysis, which provides for a sociohistorical context and materialist critique. Such an analysis will highlight the social and economic embeddedness of culture in cultural production and consumption conditions, raising awareness of issues of social inequality, cultural democracy and participation.

Having established the conceptual basis for liberal humanist assumptions of culture and its critique, this is contrasted with a discussion on contemporary instrumental policies. Instrumental cultural policies are analysed in terms of the emergence of neoliberal principles of public governance, and their effects on liberal democratic principles of public provision, citizenship and culture. It is a central aim of this thesis to critically analyse the competing underpinnings underlying the cultural policy debate, as they represent the points of conjuncture, where notions of cultural value, public provision and the role of the public are defined. The way the term 'culture' is defined by competing discourses will be discussed in the context of social and economic instrumental policies, such as social inclusion and urban regeneration.

The conceptual part of the discussion on cultural values is complemented and developed by field research into the practices and beliefs of cultural managers. A key
concern of this study is the assessment of the way cultural managers make sense of and negotiate the tension between intrinsic and instrumental cultural policy rationales in their everyday professional lives. To this end, semi-structured interviews with 25 cultural managers from across the UK cultural sector were conducted.

**Thesis Organisation**

This research project is structured in three parts across six chapters. The first chapter explores the much evoked tension between intrinsic and instrumental values within the contemporary UK cultural policy sector. It lays out the theoretical assumptions that underpin the conflict between cultural, social and economic policy rationales. Based on the analysis of policy documents, public statements and academic research, the account discusses the intertextuality of the cultural value debate, which juxtaposes liberal humanist and postmodern cultural discourse, and competing principles of liberal democratic and neoliberal governance. The chapter aims to highlight the competing discursive strands underlying the cultural values debate, and their relation to changing forms of governance. The last third of the first chapter is dedicated to the representation of the methodological approach.

Chapter Two focuses on Bourdieu and Gans' materialist and sociological critique of liberal humanist assumptions on intrinsic cultural values. The aim is to provide an analysis of the historical, ideological and contingent nature of much of cultural values and its implications for taken for granted assumptions of the 'transhistorical', universal and essentialist nature of cultural values. The sociological analysis of liberal humanist assumptions comments on the socially stratified nature of cultural production and consumption, in particular with relation to class. Bourdieu's theory of the unequal distribution of cultural capital as a means of class distinction and social stratification will be discussed. According to Bourdieu lifestyle patterns and art practices are products of education and socialisation, rather than inherent taste, talent or ability. The implications of his account for key principles of public cultural provision, such as cultural excellence, autonomy, education and democracy are assessed. Subsequently, the account considers the validity of the sociological critique for different cultural and social national context. The discourse highlights patterns of cultural convergence and omnivorousness, the role of popular culture,
ethnicity and gender gain significance. This is done by presenting the sociological analysis of culture in the North American context by Herbert Gans. The primary goal of Chapter Two represents a critique of intrinsic cultural values, raising the question as to how to reconcile a notion of autonomy with its sociological analysis.

Section Two traces the historical and philosophical genealogy of contemporary cultural policy rationales to an ideal typical mapping in art for art's sake and enlightenment thought. Although there are conceptual overlaps and divergences within the intellectual history of intrinsic and instrumental cultural reasoning, it is a contention that these two traditions have provided the theoretical foundation for contemporary cultural policy. The intellectual history aims to reconnect contemporary cultural assumptions and cultural policy rationales to their historically specific, conceptual origins. In Chapter Three, key tenets of cultural autonomy will be discussed in the context of German, French and English cultural history. This account avoids a purely conceptual discussion of key ideas. It seeks, rather, to understand their emergence in the intersection with social, economic, political, and cultural conditions. Having discussed the theoretical proposition of key figures of the movement such as Gautier, Baudelaire, Walter Pater and Roger Fry, the influence of art for art's sake on the development of post-war public cultural policy is assessed. The implementation of ideas of art for art's sake in the British funding system will be traced to the relation between the founder of the Arts Council movement, Maynard Keynes, and members of the Bloomsbury group. The account will illustrate how Keynes' political vision of state cultural provision drew on close philosophical parallels with the formalist assumptions of Roger Fry and Clive Bell. The account subsequently assesses the influence of the movement on the development of British post-war arts policies. The chapter explores the minor role of intrinsic cultural values, which was superseded by instrumental political, economic and social interests.

The fourth chapter concerns the historical genealogy of instrumental rationales. This account focuses on the development of instrumentalism through the specific conjuncture of culture, governments and citizens in 19th century England. The crucial role that cultural instrumental arguments played for the emergence of cultural policy will be discussed within the sociohistoric context of the Victorian era. The account explores the appropriation of culture and the arts for the service of social control and management within the rapidly industrialising and democratising society. The
theoretical basis that establishes the enhancing and civilising role of culture and its role as a remedy against civil unrest, political upheaval and moral disintegration is presented. Victorian reformers, Ruskin and Arnold, will be discussed, who were key progenitors of the view that culture pertained civilising, educative and moral functions. To them, culture represented a means to counter the corruptive and immoral influences of the commercial and secularising modern society. Subsequently, conceptual parallels between historical and present instrumental cultural policy rationales of culture-led social inclusion and regeneration are assessed. The account will consider how today's impact-driven instrumental agenda with its neoliberal undertones represents an ideological departure from historical instrumental notions. Chapter Four, in this way, provides a theoretical context for the discussion of contemporary instrumentalism, which follows in Chapter Six.

In Part Three of this thesis, the conceptual debate on cultural values will be further explored and developed by an empirical enquiry into the values, beliefs and practices of cultural managers. The field research represents the analysis of interviews with 25 cultural managers from across the UK cultural sector. The main objective of the field research has been to find out how cultural managers define and negotiate cultural values in a neoliberal policy climate. The enquiry questioned how instrumental policy expectations, and financial and ideological pressures are reconciled with artistic practice. The field research assumes an interpretative qualitative research approach, which emphasises logical and in-depth analysis and rich description in theory development and research design.

Chapter Six concludes the enquiry by investigating the emergence and practice of the contemporary instrumental cultural policy approach. It represents a conceptual counterpoise to the discussion on intrinsic cultural values in Chapter One. The account commences by tracing the conceptual roots of instrumentalism to the political framework of New Labour and previous governments. The increasing reliance on impact and evidence driven policies is linked to the broad philosophical changes in welfare policy and public sector reform. Particular attention will be paid to the mounting role of culture within New Labour's Third Way manifesto. The account discusses the emergence of cultural instrumentalism as a result of New Labour's joined approach towards mainstream economic, social and cultural agenda. Instrumental cultural policies will be assessed in terms of a complex and competing
discourse, which juxtaposes principles of social justice, fairness and citizenship with entrepreneurial and managerial assumptions. Instrumental policies such as social inclusion, urban regeneration and ‘public value’ are assessed in terms of their implications for notions of liberal democratic public provision, public governance and citizenship.
SECTION I

CHAPTER ONE:

Intrinsic Cultural Values
Chapter One: Intrinsic Cultural Values

1.1 Introduction

This chapter will begin with an enquiry into the complex and competing discourse, underpinning intrinsic value arguments in the UK cultural policy sector. Intrinsic cultural values are discussed in terms of four broad argumentative strands: Firstly, the chapter will describe the upsurge of intrinsic cultural value arguments, which emerged as part of a critique of instrumental cultural policies. It will be argued that the dissatisfaction with instrumental practices has resulted in a reformulation of traditional liberal humanist ideas and practices. The opposition to instrumentalism is partly described as a historically derived cultural idealism that sets apart autonomous artistic discipline from extant concerns.

Secondly, the account critically assesses the resurgence of cultural idealism and the retrograde invocation of intrinsic cultural values as threatening to neglect postcolonial, postmodern and feminist critique of liberal humanism. These highlighted the need to reformulate cultural values in terms of principles of public provision, democracy, accountability and citizenship. The implications of postmodern cultural theory for a reformulation of intrinsic cultural values are discussed. The question is raised how to reconcile the postmodern critique of cultural values with a commitment to normative, artistic assumptions.

Thirdly, having highlighted the need to critically reflect upon the sociological implications of intrinsic cultural value claims attempts to reformulate intrinsic cultural values are assessed. It is suggested that the contemporary debate on cultural values has evolved around a discursive network, which has been informed by circulating notions of sovereign consumerism, postmodern theory and social democratic principles of public provision. The account argues that attempts to redefine intrinsic cultural values have been based on decidedly market-driven, consumerist terms. This chapter will assess the implications of this discourse for cultural provision, principles of public governance and citizenship.
Finally, this account will comment on the role of social instrumental values within the discourse on intrinsic cultural values. The social instrumental agenda will be discussed in terms of its dual determination by a long-running intellectual, cultural history, and on the other hand, neoliberal developments in the public sector and the cultural industries. It is suggested that historically derived meanings of social instrumentalism are misappropriated by contemporary neoliberal developments in the cultural sector. Their conceptual embeddedness in the instrumental cultural policy framework is therefore questioned. In the final part of this chapter the broad methodological approach and fieldwork project will be laid out.

1.2 The Indictment of Impact-driven Cultural Policy

The question of how public cultural provision achieves legitimacy in a democratic society has been subject to an ongoing historical debate. Although this debate is not new, its terminology has undergone significant change. Throughout cultural history, intrinsic and instrumental cultural rationales represented intellectual counterweights. However, it has been the latter that delivered most of the fundamental raison d'être for government involvement in the arts and culture. Public cultural intervention has been constitutionally instrumental being driven by a succession of political ideas such as social control, economic expansion, national prestige and access. Despite these developments, intrinsic cultural values have taken centre stage in the contemporary public cultural policy debate involving key players of the cultural sector across many countries.

The timeliness of the upsurge of cultural value arguments is a reflection on the shifting social and economic relations, in which public cultural provision are set. These shifts have been characterised in terms of advanced or neoliberal forms of government and public policy, which had profound effects on principles of post-war cultural provision. Key concepts underlying neoliberal economic thought have rested on the regulation and limitation of government activity through a reign of open, competitive and unregulated market economic principles. Over the last decades, developments within government reform and modernisation have adopted managerialism and entrepreneurialism as governing principles of public policy. These
developments, which will be discussed in more detail in the last chapter, have been paralleled by changes in public cultural provision that have been broadly characterised as instrumental, impact-driven or evidence-based. The instrumental cultural policy approach can be described in two ways: On the one hand, legitimacy for public cultural intervention is principally drawn from culture’s contribution to social and economic mainstream political agenda, such as social inclusion, regeneration and economic expansion. On the other hand, these goals are reinforced through the introduction of all-pervading guidance systems for performance measurement and operational effectiveness in meeting policy objectives.

The so-called ‘instrumentalisation’ of culture has been met with widespread and severe criticism from within the cultural constituency. To its opponents, instrumental policies have represented an unprecedented historical shift of *raison d’etre* within the cultural sector. Contemporary policies of instrumentalisation have been berated as a ‘threat’, as ‘policies of extinction’ and as unsustainable in terms of long-term planning. The critique dismissed conceptual and methodological shortcomings of instrumentalism ultimately evoking the importance and recognition of intrinsic cultural values.

Centre stage in this debate took Tessa Jowell, the former culture secretary, who presented a critique of instrumental policies in an essay called ‘Government and the Value of Culture’, delivered at the *Cultural Value* conference in 2003. The speech in many respects represents the complex and often confounded nature of the present cultural debate that intertwines competing theoretical propositions of liberal humanist culture, social instrumentalism and neoliberal market assumptions. Jowell’s speech seemed to amount to an indictment of instrumental policy rationales, and a defence of intrinsic cultural values. Despite having developed much of the instrumental policy approach under her own tenure, Jowell pointed out the importance of culture in terms of ‘what it does in and of itself’. Jowell opposed the pervasive sway of impact-driven policies, conceding how intrinsic cultural values had under the instrumental approach too often been dismissed in favour of measurable criteria and quantitative evidence. In a much cited paragraph Jowell suggested:

Too often, politicians have been forced to debate culture in terms of only its instrumental benefits to other agendas…We have avoided the more difficult
approach of investigating, questioning and celebrating what culture actually does in and of itself (Jowell 2004: 8).

Jowell suggested how the concern for the 'utilitarian agenda and the measures of instrumentality' had displaced a concern for intrinsic cultural values. Jowell underscored the importance of intrinsic cultural values, such as personal and emotional enrichment, quality of life and experience. These values amounted to intangible measures that reached beyond measurable outcomes. They amounted to individual and private resources, ‘a personal heartland’ and ‘a lifelong enrichment’ people could source from. Jowell argued:

Complex cultural activity...is at the heart of what it means to be a fully developed human being...Engagement with culture can offer us more-an understanding of, an engagement with and the satisfaction of the deepest of human needs (Jowell 2004: 15; italics added).

Jowell's account seemed to represent a critical reflection on the developments cultural policy had undergone over recent decades. As a matter of fact, it implied a significant departure from her own commitment to instrumental reasoning. After all, under her tenure, Jowell had frequently boosted social and economic justifications for culture (see for instance Jowell 2006).

In many respects unsurprisingly, as a close assessment shows, her discussion of intrinsic cultural values in fact continued to represent a differentiated, and at times incoherent, ensemble of arguments, which juxtaposed intrinsic cultural values with residual instrumental assumptions. Jowell in fact defined the intrinsic value of culture in close range to social instrumental policy goals. In many ways, her opening paragraph set the tone for the speech to follow:

Sixty years ago Beveridge set this country a challenge: slaying the five giants of physical poverty – want, disease, ignorance, squalor and idleness. At the beginning of this century... it is time to slay a sixth giant – the poverty of aspiration which compromises all our attempts to lift people out of physical poverty. Engagement with culture can help alleviate this poverty of aspiration... (2003: 3; italics added).

In this paragraph, Jowell evokes the founding father of 'Old Labour' 'classic welfare theory' in an attempt to establish conceptual links with New Labour's modernised
Jowell's speech represents the complex and confounded nature of the present cultural debate by intertwining competing theoretical propositions evolving around culture and social policy provision. However, although in this way – hardly an indictment of instrumentalism – her speech nevertheless captured the attention of the cultural constituency as it overtly represented much of the widespread discontent with the instrumental cultural policy approach.

Although the contemporary opposition to instrumental arguments has severed as the result of developments specific to public policy reform and modernisation, which began in the 1980s, it can be argued that the conflict between intrinsic and instrumental rationales has drawn on philosophical and historical roots deeply imbued within cultural history. Based on their conceptual genealogy intrinsic and instrumental cultural reasoning in many ways have come to represent binary opposites, whose formulaic and largely theoretical nature has been agreed upon.

---

1 As the discussion in Chapter Six will show, critics of New Labour's Third Way objected to the juxtaposition of neoliberal and 'Old Labour' socialist principles as an incoherent if not cynical move (see for instance Powell 1999). Third Way policies represented an ideological departure from socialist principles, which New Labour rhetoric attempted to mask.

2 Orr (2008: 309) for instance suggested:

These dictionary definitions help to define the terminology for the purposes of this piece; in reality separating the intrinsic value of culture from the instrumental value is almost impossible at a practical level. The instrumental and the intrinsic are used broadly to describe two different approaches to cultural policy, with intrinsic assuming the value of culture as “inherent” and instrumental as demonstrating the value of culture with measurable outcomes.
(see for instance Orr 2008; Levitt 2008; Eikhoff 2007). The duality of these cultural values has been described by Eikhoff (2007), who distinguished between artistic and economic logics of cultural practice. According to this distinction, artistic criteria resist 'comparison' and measurement demanded by economic reasoning. They reject quantifiable, objectifying market and monetary values. In this context, principles of market competition are found to oppose the often vaguely defined, interpretative processes of arts production, which are founded on a heterogeneous and subjective understanding of cultural quality and content. Intrinsic cultural values are often referred to as art for art's sake ideas, according to which aesthetic form and style lack external legitimisation. Based on this opposition, cultural and artistic values have been described as intangible and immeasurable.

The distinction between intrinsic and instrumental cultural values as being driven by subjective, intangible and discretionary criteria on the one hand, and evidence-based, statistical ones on the other have been also drawn by participants of the field research. Many cultural managers suggested how artistic activities were difficult to assess in terms of predetermined social and economic outcomes, as they were subject to an open-ended artistic production process, as well as individual experience. The artistic director of a London based theatre company for instance suggested how artistic experience opposed quantifiable assessment criteria:

I think that the art that interest me does change things and the people that come. It is an intervention into social space and it is at its best empowering and challenging, and part of a cultural and vital conversation. It does these things in a secuitous and hard to map way. I think pure work intervenes in a way that is... It is open and we are confident that audiences will answer questions...or not that is fine too. What worries me in instrumentalism that it seems to want to pin down art and its effects. I don't think that is how art works and artists work... they can't be quantified and objectified.

Henry drew a distinction between artistic processes and instrumental policy criteria by suggesting how artistic activities were undetermined, spontaneous and evasive of concrete measures. He underscored their opposition to impact-driven assessment criteria by suggesting that artistic outcomes did not have to be fully understood by audiences. A similar observation was made by a Warwickshire artistic director. Sam argued:

Often with measurement in quantitative terms in order to justify public money it's not possible to be authoritative. If you set out to harness culture to produce
a particular result, you are unlikely to prove that because there are no measurements for that. This doesn't mean though that the impact is nil. It just means that you don't know.

Sam suggested how artistic outcomes were difficult to measure in terms of instrumental impacts, as they remained largely evasive to concrete assessment methods. By arguing how instrumentalism is this way failed to capture artistic impacts he underscored the opposition between intrinsic and instrumental cultural values.

To many commentators (Belfiore 2006; Gray 2007) intrinsic cultural values have represented the legitimising power and raison d'être of cultural activities. In the absence of intrinsic reasoning instrumental rationales perpetuated the endemic weakness of the cultural sector, and its susceptibility to economic and political purpose. The impact-driven approach resulted in a 'policy of extinction', where culture was justified on purely economic or social grounds (Belfiore 2006; Gray 2007). Such an argument can be illustrated on the example of the debate on the London 2012 Olympic Games, which has increased the economic pressure and competition on the art sector. The government's decision to divert £675m from the National Lottery to fund 'the hardware of the Olympics' to many observers demonstrated the susceptibility of art funding to competing political causes. The diversion of public money to fund the epic £9.35bn Olympics, most of which has been allocated to the construction of the Olympic Park (Kelso 2008), to many members of the arts constituency resulted in funding cuts, which had detrimental effects on the quality of art provision, grass root activity and development (Gardner 2007; Brown 2007). These developments fuelled the argument that the lack of recognition of intrinsic cultural values stripped the sector of its raison d'être. It thereby increased the dominance of instrumental reasoning and competition for public funding.

1.3 'From Measurement to Judgement'

The dissatisfaction with the impact-driven approach has ultimately resulted in a debate as to how to formulate and discuss cultural policies in 'non-instrumental' ways. The demand for the reformulation of intrinsic cultural values in the face of their displacement by instrumentalism has been a widespread concern. Voicing
dissatisfaction with the instrumental approach, Belfiore, for instance, suggested that without a ‘debate about culture within democratic society, arts evaluation is little more than an extension of private sector managerialism to a public service’ (cited in Mirza 2006: 34). Assessment criteria were needed that accounted for culture’s intangible effects. The terms of cultural subsidy needed to be debated in alternative ways, as this opened the opportunity to:

…being finally able to talk meaningfully about all that performance indicators fail to access. The area of debate this exercise would ultimately free up might turn out to be the very essence of what the arts ‘do’ to people (in Mirza 2006: 36).

Claims like these have fronted the demand for a ‘new language’, in which to discuss intrinsic cultural values (see also Morris 2003 in Belfiore 2008; Holden 2007). The central significance of this demand is reflected by the issuing of the *McMaster Report: Supporting Excellence in the Arts: From Measurement to Judgement* by the DCMS (2008). The report presented the results of a national review on performance criteria for artistic excellence, which has since its publication been deemed a catalogue of substantial guidelines for a less instrumentalist public cultural policy approach. In its foreword, the Culture Secretary Purnell suggested that the report represented ‘a real shift in how we view and talk about culture in this country’ (Smith 2008). The Arts Council of England illustrated its significance for cultural policy making by stating to have based its recent funding round on the review. The report has been dedicated to an in-depth enquiry into the processes cultural quality evaluation, which was based on a consultation with 140 members of the arts community. The primary aim of the report was to move away from impact-driven evaluations, and to formulate intrinsic cultural values. It argued that:

Targets have led arts organisations to take decisions based on meeting quantifiable targets (such as filling seats) at the expense of less easily measurable but equally important outcomes such as excellence, innovation and risk-taking (2008: 21).

The *McMaster Report* defined intrinsic values in terms of three key words: ‘excellence’, ‘risk taking’ and ‘innovation’. These were based on ‘non-bureaucratic methods to judge the quality of art’, self-assessment, peer review and the removal of top-down targets. The report emphasised the importance of internal and discretionary quality assessment methods, which were ‘inherent to any genuine artistic process’.
The report defined artistic excellence as freedom of expression and complexity. Artistic values were based on subjective, experiential and introspective meaning. The *McMaster Report* stressed ‘innovation’ and ‘risk taking’ as means to define artistic form and content, and to explore new artistic language. The intangible and indeterminate nature of artistic practice and values were highlighted as key aspects of cultural production. In many respects, the report represented an unapologetic return to aesthetic idealism and fine art criteria.

The field research thereby showed how many participants in this study praised the emphasis on qualitative, artistic criteria the *McMaster Report* suggested. In many ways, the report was regarded as a return to intrinsic cultural values that resulted partly as a critique of instrumentalism. Alan, the director of a Birmingham dance company for instance argued:

> One thing is defining what works for the audience or population today, but what this conversation is more about, is what the *McMaster Report* talks a lot about: No matter what you do, remember that your core values are about something that is extremely good… It's extremely hard. It’s very subjective. It's like in the *McMaster Report*, it says, you can go to a performance and know it’s perfectly fine, and good and valuable. But you can also go somewhere, where you really think it hit home, it had a quality, it spoke. It had an emotional impact.

To Alan the *McMaster Report* gave a definition of artistic core values that recognised the intangible and indeterminate qualities of art. He implied how this represented a counterweight to instrumental assessment criteria, such as audience numbers. The significance of the report for the debate on intrinsic cultural values was also discussed by Mark, the director of an art centre for film in Sheffield. Mark argued how the report offered alternative assessment methods, based for instance on peer review, that took account of artistic values, such as risk and failure:

> Failure can be a significant part of the creative process, a productive thing to do. But in terms of public investment it is not about risk. And what the *McMaster Report* has done is open up a debate about the idea of excellence. In order to get excellence you need some degree of risk and that is the task of the public funding sector… What the *McMaster Report* suggests is that you need professionals within to be part of that measurement process, and there is an issue of leadership.
Mark suggested that the *McMaster Report* offered an alternative approach towards the evaluation of cultural values that contemporary public funding policies did not take account of. He argued that the report’s emphasis on risk and failure ultimately offered a basis, from which to renegotiate cultural values in less instrumental terms.

### 1.4 Critiquing Cultural Values

Although the report has been met with a positive response, to some critics (Gardner 2008; Gibson 2008), however, it represented a retrograde return to overcome and outmoded notions of culture, long dismissed. Gardner, for instance, argued that the *McMaster Report's* endorsements of 'internal assessment methods' such as peer-led review and self assessment attracted decade old pitfalls of cronyism and elitism that had plagued art funding since its post-war conception. That a short-sighted critique of instrumentalism may ultimately result in a return to elitist and exclusionary policy approaches has been pointed out by Gibson, who stressed the need to take account of democratic and accountable terms of public cultural provision.

The critique of elitism has reflected upon an endemic problem of public arts provision. The questions of how to reconcile a conviction in the intrinsic merits of art with a recognition of cultural democracy has been a long enduring concern within public cultural policy. The critique of the liberal humanist focus of public cultural policy gained strength in the 1960s and 70s, when left wing political critique, community and grassroot arts practitioners began to challenge key assumptions of UK Arts Council policies. Opponents questioned the 'consensus' ideology and the biased commitment of public funding bodies towards established fine art genres, high art institutions, urban settings and middle-class audiences. Their core theoretical assumptions were informed by the emergence of postmodern, poststructuralist and feminist discourses. These facilitated a social-democratic discourse on access and participation demanding 'radical plurality, participatory democracy and egalitarianism' (McGuigan 1996; Braden 1978). The opposition pointed out the unrepresentative constitution of Arts Council structures, opaque decision making processes and rigid bureaucracy. The critique questioned the ideological foundation of official cultural discourse, which focused on a selective canon of European, high art genres and
prestige projects. This resulted in the demand for the recognition of grassroots and community arts, and anthropological cultural approaches. Despite the early onset of the critical debate on official cultural policies, which in fact resulted in the Arts Council's increasing openness to broader notions of cultural practices, there arguably has remained an enduring commitment to traditional idealist notions of art and culture.

Many participants of the field research voiced similar concerns with Arts Council policies. In particular managers from community art centres and smaller organisations argued how core funding policies remained biased towards established art forms and elitist quality criteria. Policies that stressed traditional measures for excellence and access thereby merely perpetuated traditional art programming, rather than offering opportunities for a more democratic implementation of cultural values. Jane, the artistic director of a London based gallery made this point very clear. She questioned core cultural artistic forms and funding as exclusionary and too traditional:

I mean there is a problem with the whole issues of art subsidy and impact... (It is based on) historical subsets that define what art should be subsidised and what is happening when people take part in the arts... But there is no theorisation going on there on why one art form is within this public policy definition of art, and the other isn't... It is a complex picture, and yet what is happening is a reinforcement of the same, that is to reinforce the picture that a particular definition of the art is making people better.

Jane stressed how official funding policies had become too narrowly defined in terms of traditional and historically defined aesthetic criteria, thereby largely excluding local and more holistic definitions. She suggested that the limited focus on specific art forms left unaccounted local, alternative and creative art forms that were practiced at her gallery:

What I find on the ground that local funders have an elitist definition of the arts, and tend not to fund certain things. And if you can break down barriers and define art as creative practices, that usually, but not always involves artistic practices, such as music, drama and so on- you are more likely to get in people and support it. The word art has a real problem in it because people see it as an elite thing... But in terms of a policy level I think the word art has been essentialised and become specific, and not as wide as it is on the ground.
Jane went on to suggest that as a result of the narrow Arts Council approach audiences were excluded that did not take part in core cultural activities:

When you look at the *Taking Part in the Arts* survey by the DCMS and their definition of the arts, it is not surprising that you get a particular social group partaking in the arts, because they don't ask people about the cultural and historical traditions of other groups. So…it is part of the mainstream artistic culture… which aren't included in that survey. So, unless people want to partake in the traditional set of arts they are actually not counted as partaking in culture, which is not true.

As these excerpts from the interviews show, the postmodern critique of cultural idealism has not lost significance for the contemporary debate on cultural provision. As the following discussion will, however, show the debate on the democratic and inclusive basis of cultural provision has in the contemporary context often been appropriated by consumerist strands of the cultural policy debate. The facile alignment of democratic cultural provision with capitalist consumerism, however, bears questionable implications for principles of public service provision and the relativisation of normative, professional cultural judgement.

A good example for the introduction of the postmodern critique into the debate on cultural values has represented the extensive publications by the think-tank Demos. Although most of the pamphlets on this subject remain short of theoretical depth and sufficient clarity, they represent a distinctive discursive trend towards the political and ideological reformulation of intrinsic cultural values in terms of market-driven logic. In the DEMOS publications *Capturing Cultural Values* (2004) and *Cultural Value and the Crisis of Legitimacy* (2006) John Holden addresses the deconstruction of traditional modes of intrinsic values by reference to the general theoretical implications of postmodernism. In a facile treatment of the postmodern cultural critique, he argued that 'postmodern questioning of concepts such as beauty, truth, delight, transcendence...made using them in debate an embarrassment... All judgements have become relative' (2004: 23). Holden further suggested how the concept of 'culture' had become 'tainted', as it assumed old fashioned universalist and transcendental implications. He dismissed idealist intrinsic cultural values as having been relativised by the postmodern critique. Holden attributed the loss of culture’s essentialist foundation to changes of cultural consumption pattern. He
argued how cultural experience and production had become increasingly diverse, subjective and intangible. Intrinsic cultural values had therefore lost their relevance. He argued how audiences, rather than experts, represented now the main arbiters of cultural values. Moreover, culture needed to represent a diversity of needs and demands, as ‘Everyone is now in a minority group.’ (2004: 22). Holden regarded the final consequences of the postmodern critique of cultural idealism as a relativisation and dissolution of intrinsic cultural values.

Holden’s account of the postmodern critique leaves unaccounted a complex and balanced discussion of the postmodern critique of cultural distinctions. Before continuing the discussion on its implications, a brief comment on the postmodern discourse and its role for the contemporary debate is therefore deemed necessary. The various strands of postmodern discourse have represented a significant part of the contemporary cultural debate as they question modernist notions of art and culture and their claims on transcendence and universality. The implications of postmodernism, in general the questioning of hierarchical cultural distinctions and processes of social de-differentiation, have been widely regarded as a critique of European cultural canon. Whereas in some ways, relativisation has been proposed, there have, however, been substantial propositions of a more balanced nature. Foster, who surveyed the many strands of postmodern critique and their implications, concluded how a ‘responsive’ postmodernism was concerned with a ‘critical reconstruction of tradition’ and ‘a critique of origin’ that asks not whether representation is possible, but what can and cannot be represented (1983: 57). Postmodernism resulted in this way in a more self-conscious and reflexive approach to cultural and social history, marginalised groups and repressed content. He consequently dismissed the relativisation of cultural order. In an equally cautious vein, Featherstone (1988) argued that postmodern epistemology taught attention to hidden assumptions and social processes, upon which cultural theory and representation are built, questioning dominant discursive authority. Demanding a more detailed attention to social conditions, as well as the political economy of cultural production and consumption, he argued that the postmodern discourse needed to look beyond an opposition between single epistemology and plural ontology, foundationalism and relativism (1988: 205). The significance of postmodernism lay in the way progenitors like Lyotard and Baudrillard effected a
critique of the symbolic and aesthetic power of language and signs, raising critical awareness to the social and political conditions of production and interpretation.

The relativising implications reached by some strands of the postmodern discourse have not only been dismissed by cultural theorists. They have also been critically assessed in terms of their effects on foundational assumptions of cultural policy (McGuigan 1996: 30; Bennett 2006; Connor 1992). McGuigan, for instance, raised the question whether cultural policy rationales could exist without normative cultural prescriptions, respective of their definition. In a similar way, has Connor defended the sphere of cultural policy as based on normative resistance. In many ways, Holden's account of the postmodern critique, however unsubstantial, needs to be re-evaluated in this light. Postmodern cultural theory has encouraged a reflection on European cultural canon in terms of excluded and disenfranchised social groups, and the status of anthropological cultural theory. Such an approach calls for a balanced approach to the postmodern critique of cultural values that forestalls an uncritical cultural idealism, as well as a radical evacuation of cultural order.

1.5 'Restating' or 'Redefining' Cultural Values?

The discussion so far has illustrated how the discourse on intrinsic cultural values has been informed by assumptions of changing pattern of cultural and social participation, which pose increasingly individualised, diverse and competitive demands on public cultural provision. As Holden argued, cultural organisations and public institutions are to respond to these challenges by offering more democratic, diverse and transparent services. In his discussion he described changing social and economic developments, such as individualisation, differentiation and globalised, competitive economic market conditions as causes for changing cultural consumption and production pattern. Holden suggests how these shifts ultimately required a different approach to cultural policy thinking:

...We are entering a time when the role of culture in society is undergoing a fundamental shift...Throughout the twentieth century... culture was a reassurance and a decoration. In the twenty-first century all that has changed... Our nation states are far from homogeneous; every citizen is now part of a minority; and we no longer define ourselves through work... In these
circumstances we, the public, need culture...to make sense out of our lives... in a globalised world with access to multiple, diverse and interwoven cultures (2006: 23).

Here, Holden describes the emergence of new social, 'economic and demographic trends' that require changing conceptual approaches to cultural consumption. According to him, cultural activities ceased to represent stable and consistent meanings, as they gave way to individual and subjective processes of meaning creation. Holden attributes the transformation of cultural values mainly to the emergence of 'cultural consumerism\(^3\), according to which cultural consumption attained significance as tools for identification in the absence of other collective reference points, such as work (see for instance Ransome 2005). Cultural users became in effect 'sovereign consumers', who demanded individual choice, flexibility and accountability. As a consequence cultural provision needed to cater for private, affective, subjective and intangible cultural needs, and 'multiple', fluent and 'sophisticated consumers'. In this way normative notions of intrinsic cultural values became outmoded. Holden describes the value of culture as follows: 'People have less time and more money..., they are increasingly looking for 'perfect moments' – low risks but high quality and exciting experiences'. Instead of being based on essentialist qualities and expert opinion, Holden suggests how intrinsic cultural values were increasingly defined directly by the 'consumer'. According to Holden, the 'public' had become less interested in enlightenment or education, less driven by distinctions between lay and professional criteria, and showed a disregard for political and social instrumental concerns. In this way, cultural values amounted to 'what the public wants'.

Based on these assumptions, Holden suggests how public cultural provision should be based not on essentialist values, but on what has become known as 'public value'. The 'public value' framework stipulated how choice, transparency and competitive services represent key aspects of changing modes of cultural service provision. According to Holden, 'public value' provided the conceptual basis for individualised services, and egalitarian and democratic principles of production and dissemination. These processes enabled individuals to participate and hold a greater share in

---

3 Keat (1991: Ch. 10) defined the shift from a capitalist to 'consumerist societies' as an advancement ‘in which affluence on a mass scale is the dominant force in the marketplace’. Consumerism represents an advanced form of capitalism, which increasingly relies on socially constructed criteria, such as fashion and social prestige value, to define commodities.
artistic processes. ‘Public value’ was a means to overcome hierarchical and elitist modes of cultural production as it promoted collective values, community-led participation, ‘citizenship’, ‘diversity’, ‘inclusion’ and ‘well-being’ (2004: 10).

Holden’s account of ‘public value’ as a theoretical framework for public cultural provision has been in line with a general discursive shift in public sector management. Public services across the board have advocated ‘public value’ as a commitment towards more individualised, equitable and transparent services. This conceptualisation has been based on the assumption that ‘public’ needs and interests reflected a plurality and diversity, public services needed to serve. The best response to diversity and individual demands could be provided by offering ‘choice’ and consumer sovereignty. This meant that ‘choice’ and ‘user want’ should be regarded as organising principles for public service provision.

The discourse of ‘public value’, however, in many ways bears deep philosophical and conceptual contradictions not easily reconciled. A number of critics highlighted the broad conceptual and ideological shifts that followed respective changes to public sector management. Clarke and Newman, chief critics of New Labour’s Third Way policies, identified the shift towards consumer sovereignty as part of an economically inflected rhetoric of public governance, characteristic of New Labour’s reform policies (2007; see also Newman 2007). Clarke and Newman discussed reform and modernisation as having resulted in broad conceptual and philosophical shifts of key values, underlying liberal democratic principles of citizenship and public governance. Based on these concepts, the distinction between ‘public’ and ‘consumer’ bore crucial importance, and opposed a facile juxtaposition. They suggested how, in the political context of public sector modernisation and welfare reform, notions of the ‘public’, public goods and citizenship have increasingly drawn on binary political and philosophical opposites, not to be reconciled. According to Clarke and Newman, the ongoing project of modernisation resulted in a transformed understanding of liberal public values inscribed in the public sector domain that a continued circulation of competing conceptual clusters of neoliberalism masked. Liberal democratic definitions of public good, the ‘public’ and ‘citizen’, as defined by modern Western nations, traditionally opposed interference by state control and neoliberal market influence. Public values represented an adherence to ‘[a] social of collective identifications and citizenship rights’. They were defined in terms of the formal
equality in the formulation of shared notions of the common good, culture, faith and identity. In principle, these public values functioned to insulate public institutions and professional ethics from power relations attached to political and economic interests and personal profit. In this way, they represented a key requirement for fostering trust in public actors and institutions (see also Peterson [1999] for a discussion on citizenship in the context of neoliberalism).

To Clarke and Newman it is the circulation of competing discursive meanings of liberal democratic and neoliberal consumerist notions of citizenship and public governance, however, that threatened the usurpation of the former. Market-driven approaches to public service provision and citizenship undermined democratic participation and equitable share in public goods and services, and disrupted processes of public deliberation. The oscillation of competing meanings that resulted from the citizen/consumer pairing is critically assessed as a 'perfect example of New Labour's transformative dominant politics holding both terms in play while subordinating the former...to its neoliberal imaginary' (Clarke 2007: 742).

The significance of the public sphere as a platform for democratic and inclusive deliberation on public goods, ethics and cultural practices has a long discursive history. McGuigan, referring to the conditions of a Habermasian public sphere, suggested that the 'public will', respective of its construction, represented a constituent part of cultural policy within liberal-democratic societies. It was through the facilitation of a democratic basis for public conversation on the conditions of culture and society that the 'cultural' is expressed. Culture is here referred to as language, knowledge and beliefs. The democratic determination of the cultural conversation ultimately was contingent upon citizenship rights (in Lewis & Miller 2002: Ch. 2). To McGuigan, the public sphere functioned as an arena for public cultural debate and critique, and therefore represented an institutional requirement for cultural policy practice. He suggests:

Without provision for public accountability and control, and without some attempt to foster alternatives to an overbearing state and untrammelled market forces, the prospects for democratic debate and cultural experience would be curtailed and, indeed, imperilled (2002: 35).
The conceptual underpinnings, on which liberal democratic public spheres rest, and the contention of the 'ideal' and historically unrealised nature of the Habermasian rational-critical debate, have been often criticised. However, McGuigan insists on the residual validity of key principles of the public sphere in the context of instrumentalism, as being 'open to further development and radicalization'.

As Clarke and Newman have suggested, according to liberal definitions of the public sphere, public values ultimately define a distinctive set of principles that are based on philosophical and theoretical distinctions between 'public/private', 'citizen/consumer', 'collective/individual' and 'de-commodified/commodified' (Clarke 2007). In many ways, it is the constitutional neglect of these oppositions, through which the neoliberal renegotiation of cultural values in the current policy climate can be understood. In the course of reform, public sector administration has displayed susceptibility to ideas of consumerism and neoliberal managerialism that have resulted in substantial conceptual shifts of notions of public good, citizens and consumers. Holden’s attempt to reformulate principles of public cultural provision in terms of ‘public values’ and consumerist notions represents a good example for this.

As briefly noted, this is not to leave unrecognised the critique of liberal democratic principles of the public sphere. The critique of the self-understanding of the liberal public sphere as insufficiently facilitating 'openness', 'cultural universalism', 'rationality' and 'transparency', is not to be dismissed in the debate on public sector policies. Civil rights and social movements have challenged the ability of liberal public constitutions to achieve the norms of impartiality, shared interests and equality inscribed in them. The critique represents the claims of those originally excluded from post-war formulations of the public sphere such as women, ethnic minorities, disabled and homosexuals.

Whereas these claims remain salient problems in contemporary public administration however, a critical approach to neoliberal challenges of public-private boundaries is needed that problematises the domination of private political and economic interests in the formulation of public and cultural values. As critics of the recent trends in public sector reform have argued (see also Powell 1999; Le Grand 2006; Leahy 2007), one of the main challenges for the negotiation of public values has been the modernising
reform movement and its instalment of neoliberal discourses. This account argues that Holden's discourse represents an example for this.

The discussion has shown how, by drawing on competing conceptual notions of culture and consumerism, an economically inflected discourse on intrinsic cultural values is forged, which draws on a close alignment with principles of neoliberal economic logic. As the account has further argued this conjuncture undermines conceptual and philosophical distinctions deeply imbued in liberal democratic principles of public governance, citizenship and the public good. What is at threat is an insulation of public institutions, ethics and trust. By undermining them, the foundation for democratic participation, equitable share in public goods and processes of public deliberation, which include cultural goods and services, are endangered.

1.6 Social Instrumental Values

So far, this discussion has attempted to illustrate the discursive complexity evolving around the upsurge of intrinsic cultural value arguments. The debate has attempted to reflect the philosophical and conceptual implications that the general shifts in public provision towards reform and modernisation had on the cultural debate. It has been a general contention that the difficulty of defining intrinsic cultural values has been severed through the increasing significance of instrumentalism. Social instrumentalism has represented a significant new development in the contemporary cultural policy debate. Although social instrumental policy rationales have been often dismissed as extant concerns, a clear distinction between intrinsic cultural and social instrumental values has remained difficult to define. In the following discussion, the emergence of the social instrumental agenda will be discussed as having represented a key justification for public cultural subsidy in recent decades. Whilst having been presented in an often dismissive way, as a new development fully entrenched in the instrumental approach of more recent history, its embeddedness in European cultural history will be highlighted. Considering its intellectual history, its easy dismissal as part of the impact-driven policy approach is questioned.
Social instrumental rationales emerged in the public policy arena with the rise of New Labour and the much theorised 'Third Way'. A significant part of the new political programme has represented a transformed commitment to public services and welfare, resulting in an emphasis on broadly cultural and social rationales, such as quality of life and social justice (Newman 2007). Instead of focusing on merely economic measures, the discourse adopted 'soft edged' measures such as 'aspiration', 'self-esteem', community cohesion and identity. New Labour's response to structural economic and social deficits shifted from hitherto economic rationalisation to broadly cultural and social criteria. Culture's contribution to social instrumental aims has rested on the suggestion of the 'transforming', educational and socially enhancing role. In its Ambitions for the Arts 2003-2006 the ACE, for instance, stressed the 'power (of the arts) to transform lives and communities' acting as a 'life source' for individuals and the society (ACE 2003). In a similar way, the DCMS emphasised the role of culture in 'neighbourhood renewal' and 'sustainable communities' (DCMS 2009).

As has been argued above, instrumental cultural policy rationales have been met with scepticism, and dismissed as attempts to reposition the cultural sector within mainstream politics and neoliberal governance. However, the easy rejection of social instrumental policies as 'policies of extinction' has been forestalled by the recognition of the long running intellectual and cultural history of social instrumental ideas (Belfiore and Bennett 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009; Mason 2004; Gibson 2008). As a matter of fact, Belfiore and Bennett argued how the extensive cultural and intellectual history of instrumental rationales has been at the forefront of Western cultural history and policy. Belfiore and Bennett, albeit dismissing contemporary instrumental policy practice, for instance suggested how 'there has never been a time... when discussion of the role of the arts in society and their effects... have not been at the centre of heated debates' (2007: 148; see also 2009). This sort of argument has been supported by the art historian Stolnitz, who cemented the significance of instrumental cultural assumptions:

Throughout all history and up to the present day, art has been explained and valued in non-aesthetic terms. It has been esteemed for its social utility, or because it inculcates religious beliefs, or because it makes men more moral, or because it is a source of knowledge. In all these cases, you see, art is
Recognising the extensive intellectual history attached to current social instrumental rationales, Belfiore and Bennett concluded how there was a 'divide' between the intellectual history and contemporary discussion of social instrumental arguments. In the recent cultural policy debate, references to the long-standing history had become increasingly frail. In many ways, this line of argument challenges the easy dismissal of social instrumental ideas as extant economic and political calculus. In the cultural historical account, Belfiore and Bennett stressed their significance as part of the intellectual cultural discourse. They argued how a close examination of the cultural history of cultural policy ideas revealed a complex assembly of civilising, humanising, healing and educational claims, whose detail and relevance were left unrecognised in the present debate.

In fact, by tracing the intellectual trajectory of social instrumental arguments within the broader context of the humanities, a re-thinking of the hitherto facile dichotomy between intrinsic, or 'not-socially instrumental', and instrumental cultural notions is encouraged. It is the rich intellectual heritage and the fundamental role of social instrumental values in the history of ideas that makes its dismissal as 'extant' or 'unprecedented' unfounded. Section Two will further explore the historical genealogy of art separatist and enlightenment arguments. The discussion shows, that the emergence of intrinsic cultural values in fact represented a relatively recent development of 19th century cultural history. In this way, an easy dismissal of instrumental claims may be deemed a lack of historical awareness of their prevalent role.

The above discussion has attempted to illustrate how a debate on the role and function of intrinsic and instrumental cultural values is rooted in a conceptual genealogy, which the critique of instrumentalism needs to address. The debate thereby implied that the public discussion on cultural values lacks a consensus on the defining characteristics of the dichotomy between the intrinsic and instrumental. This conceptual division has been tellingly illustrated by Gibson (2008), who compared the various definitory approaches by Hewison and Holden (2004) and...
Gray (2008), amongst others. Her discussion shows that there is by far no consensus on what establishes either cultural category. Based on her arguments above, Gibson warned against the easy dismissal of instrumental policy rationales, if this implied ignorance of the 'longer histories of its formation' (Bennett 2007 in Gibson 2008: 250). To Gibson, it is the 'constitutively instrumental' within the history of cultural policy that put the recent indictment of the 'instrumentalism per se' as a threat, into perspective. The recognition of the instrumental nature of cultural policy linked to principles of public accountability and egalitarianism in public provision. If these principles were ignored, a return to separatist and exclusionist accounts, presented for instance by the McMaster Report, could result. As Gibson suggests, a critical analysis on social instrumental claims was needed that 'engage(s) with the detailed specifics of the institution, policy or programme in question', and pay attention to particular context (2008: 253).

A rethinking of the dichotomy between intrinsic and instrumental values was also supported by the cultural managers interviewed for this study. As the discussion in Chapter Five will show, cultural managers suggested that there was an overlap between intrinsic and social cultural values. On a frequent basis, the idealist opposition between intrinsic and social instrumental values was dismissed. The arts were seen to facilitate 'communication' and 'interpretation', which required the recognition of social and cultural context. A curator from London for instance emphasised how his organisation not only pertained a public remit, which committed him to engage actively with audiences. He also suggested how artistic work was instrumental in forging communication and active participation.

...Visitors will always bring a whole load of cultural and social values to their experience. So I think it is important that there are other elements, which you might call instrumentalisation... At the most basic level, the social function of the arts is to build on the way it brings together people and communication between them. You can say getting a gathering of people is instrumentalising people, it is creating a social situation. You know reading a novel and things like that, as long as there is communication you can always make an argument for a social function.

Anton suggested in this excerpt how the arts had a social instrumental function by building on the social and cultural backgrounds of audience, as well as facilitating interaction between audiences and artists. However Anton highlighted how
instrumentalism needed to be balanced with other organisational goals, as they should not become overriding concerns for artistic production:

I think (fulfilling a social function) is part of the challenge and that is where creativity comes from, it is working within a framework. But obviously if something is overly instrumentalised than it can suffocate things. If the intention is too clearly detailed, than it can be suffocating… I think the social function is inevitably part of the social process, no matter how explicit it is. If it becomes the driving purpose, then it can overshadow other aspects.

Many cultural managers suggested that the arts had a 'social responsibility' and needed to be accountable and more transparent. Anton for instance suggested that his public remit consisted of delivering evidence based criteria, but also facilitating access:

I mean we do lots of auditing and surveying. But it is not the main work for me. I mean there are a lots of expectations and there is heavy responsibility to working in a public organisation. And my role is to facilitate not only art organisation but also access to art experience and ideas.

In line with this, it is suggested that a formal definition of the meaning and content of intrinsic or instrumental values may remain theoretically blinding. The discussion on cultural values needs to consider the historical, political and economic underpinnings and context governing cultural policy programming. Cultural values have been informed by a complex and competing intellectual history, and have influenced historically specific conjunctures of cultural policy. Only a historical and conceptual analysis of policy rationales may therefore yield a better understanding of the theoretical implications of cultural values. A more detailed discussion is needed that assesses the emergence of intrinsic and instrumental cultural policy rationales within their social, political and economic context.
1.7 Methodological Approach

1.71 Research Questions

This study is concerned with the question of how to define and negotiate intrinsic cultural values in a climate of instrumentalism. It endeavours to analyse the complex and competing historical, theoretical and philosophical underpinnings of cultural values and cultural policy rationales, and the political and ideological consequences and conflicts these bear for cultural production, governance and citizenship. The objectives for this research project are:

I. To engage in a philosophical, historical and sociological enquiry into the conceptual underpinnings of contemporary intrinsic and instrumental values and policies.

II. To investigate instrumental cultural policy developments and their relation to notions of liberal humanism, cultural democracy, social policy and neoliberalism.

III. To discuss the political and ideological implications of cultural policy practices in terms of the relation between governance, citizenship and culture.

Central research questions are:

I. What are the historical and philosophical genealogies of intrinsic and instrumental cultural policy rationales and their relation to the development of UK cultural policy?

II. How do cultural values, that is liberal humanist and democratic, relate to current policies of instrumentalism?

III. What are the conceptual underpinnings of 'instrumentalism', and how does it relate to cultural, social and economic objectives?

IV. What is the role of class and socio-economic conditions for historical and contemporary developments of cultural state provision?
V. How are intrinsic cultural values negotiated in the contemporary climate of instrumentalism?

1.72 Policy-Oriented Cultural Studies

The locus of this study is embedded in the broad remit of cultural policy studies. This area of research has traditionally lacked institutional denomination, forming an interdisciplinary arena for cultural studies, art history, sociology and economics. According to Scullion (2002) cultural policy studies sources from a multi-disciplinary approach encompassing social research qualifying the socio-economic role of the arts, historiographic description of cultural genealogy and cultural studies, the analysis of culture as texts, signs and representation, as invested by power relations. Contrasting early locutions of cultural policy that have aimed at a professional discourse of art management, which is mainly concerned with operational and administrative practices, this study is dedicated to a policy-oriented perspective of cultural studies. This approach combines textual analysis with an assessment of the theoretical, philosophical and socio-political underpinnings of the production and dissemination of text and ideas. This approach shows awareness of the critical assessment of the consumerist turn that cultural studies has undergone (Stanbridge 2002). It assumes a balanced focus on the material and discursive determinants of the production and consumption of culture (McGuigan 2001 in Lewis & Miller). An explicitly multidisciplinary approach is proposed that derives its justification not only from the broad methodological remit of cultural policy studies, but also from research dedicated to discourse analysis, historisation and genealogy of cultural meanings.

---

4 The consumerist strand of cultural studies describes the alignment of popular cultural theory and consumption with principles of neoliberal consumer capitalism (see for instance Stanbridge 2002). This relation can be described in terms of two principles: The isolated focus on cultural consumption at the expense of production that regards moments of cultural consumption as resistance and empowerment; and affinity between cultural consumption and notion of consumer sovereignty. (McGuigan 2006: 149).
1.73 History of Ideas

As the discussion so far has illustrated, the enquiry into the meaning and function of competing cultural rationales requires a historical genealogy of the main theoretical and philosophical underpinnings of cultural policy programmes and cultural values. In this discussion, historisation has the aim of explicating the emergence and development of accepted and implicit rationales evolving around intrinsic and instrumental cultural policies. A basic precept of historical research is regarded in its endeavour to recapture 'ideas of the past that have influenced and shaped the present... [and] to increase appreciation and understanding of contemporary issues... of social, political and spiritual realms' (Berg 1998: Ch. 9).

The methodological approach and subject matter of the history of ideas does not represent a uniform basis. Intellectual history has undergone constant upheaval and changes (Grafton 2006; McCullagh 1997). Although it is not within the scope of this research to discern a detailed theoretical discussion, a brief outline of the principles and methodological problems of the history of ideas in terms of their relevance for this project will be given. Grafton defined the history of ideas as 'a study of texts, images and theories that seeks to balance responsibility and precision in the formal treatment and analysis of its object with an... effort to connect them to a particular historical world' (Grafton 2006: 30). According to Grafton, the founding idea of the history of ideas assumed a unified picture of intellectual traditions and common world views, best exemplified by A.O. Lovejoy's mapping of a formal system of 'unit ideas'. Lovejoy argued how uniform 'ideas' underlie all cultural, scientific and philosophical traditions. This was part of a progressive, teleological approach to modern history and society that assumed that political and social order were shaped by a logical succession of ideas.

However, the linear model of intellectual history has largely been reversed following the wide spread impact of postmodern theory, which aimed at the critical deconstruction of intellectual 'histories' in terms of formerly excluded subjects. Its principle goals were the expansion of the canon of Western thought. The methodological approach and subject matter of intellectual history hence changed according to the principles of 'contextualism'. This school of thought stressed the formal analysis of text and ideas in terms of their intersection with social, political and
economic context. This shift reflected on the central concern of the history of ideas, as of historical science in more general, for establishing the relationship between ideas and their social context and theory. This is based on the well-rehearsed opposition between structure and agency (see for instance Kelley 2002; Grafton 2006; Tosh 2000: Ch. 8). This study is not concerned with rehashing arguments of this debate, only to opt for a middle range position that recognises the intersection between historically specific social, economic and political conjunctures of theory development, and ideas (Tosh: 158). As Grafton suggests, intellectual history method amounts to 'formal analysis of language and tradition and the intersection of linguistic fields, larger contexts, and particular individual intentions'. In line with this, this study adopts a contextualised approach to the history of ideas that recognises the historically specific nature of cultural traditions, and their social embeddedness. This reiterates Bell-Villada's 'integrated history' approach, which aims to take account of the 'concrete social, economic, political, and cultural reasons for the emergence, growth and diffusion' (1996) of cultural schools recognising their 'ideological' nature.

The conceptual genealogies within this study aim at four paradigmatic or ideal typical discourses that underpin cultural policy rationales: the liberal humanist traditions of aesthetic separatism and enlightenment culture; social theory of relationalism and neoliberal economic market theories and practices. These four discourses have informed the emergence of key cultural policy rationales evolving around intrinsic cultural values and instrumentalism. This study seeks to establish their core principles and ideas, whilst relating them to historically and nationally specific social, economic and political contexts of emergence.

1.74 Field Research

The theoretical part of this study will be supplemented and developed by qualitative field research into the beliefs, values and practice of cultural managers from across the UK cultural sector. Using semi-structured interview technique, 25 cultural managers from different artistic disciplines, institutions and professional positions

---

5 Ideology here may refers to a more general definition of a particular world view, rather than the definition derived from CDA, which will be used later in this study.
have been interviewed. The aim of the empirical research is to juxtapose a theoretical and philosophical enquiry into cultural values with evidence from everyday professional practice in natural settings. This aims at the refinement and advancement of issues and concerns discussed in the theoretical part of this thesis. The main aim of this is to facilitate insight into the theoretical discussion by drawing on the personal experience and practice of art managers. Based on an interpretive approach, the empirical research focuses on the individual and idiosyncratic nature of cultural management practices and artistic programming. This had the purpose of reaching beyond a theoretical, generic debate and to pursue conceptual pathways as they occur.

1.8 Personal Background

Adopting an interpretative sociological approach to this study that regards the personal background and motivation of the researcher as an integral part of the research approach, a few words will be added on my interest in exploring the debate on intrinsic and instrumental cultural values and policy. The endeavour for this research project emerged whilst studying for an MA in European Cultural Policy and Management. Whilst having embarked on my studies based on a broad interest in 'working in the cultural sector', it was here that I was made aware of the complexity of the word 'culture' and national cultural policy and identity. What drew me further to this subject was my interest in the philosophical and historical development of cultural definitions, and their relation to contemporary socio-economic conditions and cultural political developments.

Whilst exploring UK cultural history and policy, I was forced to become aware of my own assumptions on culture, which are a reflection of my year-long classical music education, playing the piano and violin, as well as a humanist school education in Germany. This certainly cemented my belief in the merits of art and culture as great enjoyment, sociability and skill. Cultural activities have, to me, been associated with traditional German enlightenment notion of 'Bildung', which defined 'Kultur' as a source of education, social and personal enhancement, and moral instruction, rather than elitist pastime activity. In many ways, despite their mostly experiential and
'idealistic' nature, these cultural beliefs served ultimately as a comparative perspective from which to perceive the cultural assumptions and concepts within the UK context.

1.9 Conclusion

In this chapter, the contemporary debate on intrinsic cultural values has been discussed in the context of the social, political and economic conditions of their emergence. The resurgence of intrinsic cultural values has been described in terms of an idealist binary opposition between cultural values, and political and economic interference by governments, the market and society at large. This opposition defined cultural values as intangible, subjective and interpretative values that stand in stark contrast to the evidence-based and impact-driven criteria underlying contemporary cultural instrumentalism. This formulation of cultural values has, however, been problematised in terms of historical implications of elitism and patricianism, and the changing nature of the public sphere and citizenship rights. It has been suggested that the public remit of cultural policy highlights the need to place cultural provision on egalitarian, democratic and accountable grounds. The debate on cultural values needs to be discerned in terms of the changing nature of public sector administration, and notions of the public and governance. The debate on the competing conceptual underpinnings of these terms has been mediated through the new concept of 'public values' and its relation to liberal notions of the public sphere and neoliberal capitalist consumerism.

Since the rise of the New Labour administration, a central plank of its cultural policy strategy has represented the social instrumental role of culture and its benefits in areas of social regeneration, education, health and social cohesion. The prominence of the social instrumental agenda justified an investigation of its relation to cultural values, which stressed the historical and intellectual prevalence of social instrumental ideas in cultural history. In this way, an easy dismissal of the social instrumental agenda as part of the contemporary neoliberal sway of public administration has been problematised. Instead, it has been suggested that a contextualised, critical
debate is needed in order to discern intrinsic and instrumental elements within the cultural policy discourse.

Finally, this chapter has drawn on the methodological approach taken by this study that aims at a historical, philosophical and critical analysis of cultural values in the context of neoliberal public sector administration and the cultural industry. This study relies on the interdisciplinary and interpretative approaches endogenous to policy-oriented cultural studies, intellectual history and CDA. A short description of the basic precepts of the qualitative field research into the practice and beliefs of cultural managers has been given.
CHAPTER TWO:

Relationalism
Chapter II: Relationalism

2.1 Introduction

The previous chapter outlined the resurgence of intrinsic cultural value arguments in the context of the contemporary UK cultural policy sector that has been increasingly defined by the externalities of public sector and welfare reform. It has been argued that intrinsic cultural values represent complex and competing conceptual propositions that may, on the one hand, be understood in terms of a traditional idealist opposition to political and economic pressures, but in a more critical way, in terms of changing relations between public sector governance and cultural citizenship.

In the following chapter the discussion of intrinsic cultural value claims will be met with a socio-historical response that assesses the conceptual underpinnings of aesthetic order and taste. It primarily aims to show the historical, ideological and contingent nature of cultural values, and to thereby challenge taken for granted assumptions of their 'transhistorical' and essentialist nature. A number of sociologists such as Wolff (1992) and Harrington (2004) have pointed out the mounting significance of critical and social-historical approaches to liberal humanist cultural theory, which has resulted from the increasing visibility of post-colonial, postmodern and feminist criticism. Although there have been numerous accounts of sociologies of art, according to Wolff, key points of enquiry have largely remained unchanged. Socio-historical accounts challenge central tenets of cultural autonomy and hegemonic order posing the questions of 'What constitutes art specific values and objects?', 'Who defines these values?' and 'How are they disseminated?’. Socio-historical enquiries represent tools to assess these questions, as they assume the dependence of aesthetics on the prior constitution of self-contained artistic discourse and disciplines. They thereby challenge the validity of artistic canon and hierarchies as impartial by pointing out their historically specific production and their embeddedness in social relations and economic co-ordinates (Wolff 1992: 15). Socio-historical accounts will question the 'innocent' nature of art that claim timeless and pure qualities to be preserved from extant interests. In line with this, Harrington
argued that the sociological analysis of cultural values rests on the assumption that a comprehensive account of aesthetic and cultural values must take into account the social and economic conditions of culture that facilitate an ‘evaluative engagement with the normative contents of its subjects’ and the ‘experienced value qualities’ of culture (Harrington 2004: 53).

The relevance of a social-critical discussion for this project is, in this way, is seen in its initiation of a discussion on the status of cultural claims by addressing the ideological and socially embedded nature of culture. This chapter aims at two points: firstly, to bring about a better understanding of the analysis of the historical, ideological and contingent nature of intrinsic cultural values; secondly, to discuss the implications of such accounts for the contemporary cultural policy context.

The following account presents two key authors of the sociological analysis of cultural production and consumption, Pierre Bourdieu and Herbert Gans. Bourdieu’s sociological account represents an attack on the notion of cultural ‘taste’. It suggests how cultural distinctions emerged from historical genealogy, acting as a tool for the reproduction of social order. It will be illustrated how his socio-historical critique challenges prevalent contentions of cultural excellence, access, popular culture and democracy. The theory of class distinction will then serve as a basis for the discussion of a wider body of research investigating the ideological and social nature of cultural production and consumption.

2.2 Taste Acquisition as Social Distinction

The discussion will commence with the presentation of Bourdieu’s relational analysis of the dialectic of cultural appreciation and social, cultural and economic processes of stratification. Bourdieu’s sociological stance on cultural production and consumption stemmed from his early anthropological enquiries into the relation between kinship system, education and lifestyle patterns, such as eating, dressing and artistic taste, in 1960s Algeria. It is here where he laid the theoretical foundation that asserted the power of social structures, such as families, to determine cultural conventions and lifestyle patterns. Much of the groundwork for his main empirical and theoretical oeuvre, however, was established by his enquiry into the education system in the
1960s and 1970s France (Bourdieu and Passeron 1964; 1970 in Sulkunen 2000). In *Reproduction in Society Education and Culture* Bourdieu and Passeron suggested how the tradition of the comprehensive state school system in 1960s France reflected a system of certification that recognised and perpetuated class specific performance criteria and knowledge. School curricula assessed cultural contents that required extended prior acquisition, socialisation and the accumulation of so called 'cultural capital' through early familiarisation or schooling. School curricula for instance favoured high cultural contents, such as opera or impressionist art, generally pursued by the upper-classes and those most rich in educational and economic capital. Bourdieu argued that school award systems represented a significant tool in value inculcation and social stratification, in that they endowed upper and middle-class cultural contents with legitimacy and *noblesse*. Academic certifications conferred symbolic power by designating the cultural and social élite. Bourdieu argued that they eventually became essentialised representations of cultural and social status unwittingly affecting mechanisms of social distinction, aspiration and career development. In line with this theory, Murdock (in Robbins 2000) argued how school diplomas and university degrees functioned as outward signs of ability and achievement. They, however, merely confirmed what was already attained by social origin and birth. Cultural and educational certificates were therefore not a necessary guarantor for social mobility by those without social capital. School systems in fact merely reproduced class division.

Bourdieu suggested how the presentation of scholastic training as egalitarian and democratic distorted the socially selective basis of cultural and educational policies. By claiming how schools offered equal opportunities to prove talent, innate giftedness and effort, unequal relations of class and power were tacitly consecrated through and within the education system. Bourdieu criticised official cultural programming as the mainstay of symbolic violence, the arbitrary imposition of legitimate culture.

The theoretical propositions linking class structure, cultural acquisition, processes of legitimisation and taste were later extended on a more profound level in *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* (1979, henceforth *Distinction*), a comprehensive study of cultural consumptive pattern of French society in the 1960s and 1970s. In *Distinction* Bourdieu suggested how cultural participation and lifestyle ultimately reflected and perpetuated socioeconomic status and scholastic education.
In this comprehensive sociological study Bourdieu suggested that taste and cultural choices of the arts and lifestyle depended on the acquisition of cultural skills through education and social origin. Not only ostensible visits to high art venues, but more so the subtle differences in cultural knowledge, manners and lifestyle depended upon class specific socialisation, education and aspiration. Bourdieu suggested how lifestyle practices such as dressing, dieting or decorating required specific and often subtle knowledge of cultural classifications and protocol that were not universally accessible. He used the concept of 'habitus' to suggest that cultural choices depended on competence and 'capital' that was acquired through school education, and in a more comprehensive way through family life and early socialisation. 'Habitus' was the expression of the largely unconscious and collective mediation of cultural preferences. Cultural choices depended on learnt patterns of perception and activities and class specific social environments.

Bourdieu found that amongst the infinite array of artistic genres and classifications collective, class specific cultural consumption pattern could be discerned. He suggested that taste and appreciation of 'legitimate culture' was highest amongst the French upper-classes, where cultural knowledge corresponded most with educational qualification. Combining cultural knowledge and economic capital, upper-class taste was characterised by expensive and elaborate types of cultural activities, such as opera visits and expensive restaurants. In the struggle for social distinction upper-classes could often rely on their elevated socioeconomic position, which ultimately diminished the significance of cultural capital as tools of distinction. Lack of cultural knowledge was compensated by an air of self-assurance, naturalness and indifference towards intellectual and high art practices.

Cultural capital, on the other hand, was most significant for the aspiring middle-classes or nouvelle petite bourgeoisie, who strove for social and economic standing. Symbolic capital served as a means for social upward mobility. Aspiring to improve their social standing, cultural knowledge and legitimate cultural practices often showed signs of autodidactive, highly scholastic and ascetic acquisition. This type of cultural capital was most prevalent in the intellectual, technocratic and highly

---

6 Bourdieu stressed the unconscious and inevitable character of cultural distinction by suggesting that: 'All consumption and, more generally, all practice, is conspicuous, visible, whether or not it was performed in order to be seen...every practice is bound to function as a distinctive sign...' (1991 in Mattick 2003: 175).
educated fraction of the growing middle-classes. Descending towards the working-classes, where educational and cultural capital was lowest, cultural consumption was primarily defined in defiance of upper-class culture, driven by practical rather aesthetic concerns. As the discussion will show, the strict hierarchical correspondence between class and taste cultures has been widely questioned as ethnicity. This critique and the way 'taste' has been assessed in culturally and socially diverse societies will be discussed later.

2.3 The Critique of Humanist Essentialism

Bourdieu’s critique of taste posed ultimately an attack on key ideas underlying the humanist foundation of European cultural policy. His attack addressed claims of universal transcendentalism and the essential nature of aesthetic categories, which form key ideas of central cultural policy ideas, such as cultural excellence and access. Bourdieu’s scepticism against central tenets of cultural policy was ultimately founded on a rejection of Kant’s aesthetic philosophy, which provided a philosophical, disciplinary foundation for the separatist aesthetic discourse.

According to Kant’s *Critique of Aesthetic Judgement* taste was founded on universal mental faculties for aesthetic categories. Although in many ways cultural distinctions remained subjective, Kant suggested how taste ultimately amounted to objective and essential judgements.

According to Bourdieu, Kant’s transcendentalism provided socially acquired distinctions with a philosophical and intrinsic cultural justification. Bourdieu's class-based account disputed essential cultural qualities, and deemed cultural distinctions arbitrary and socially determined. Rather than corresponding to essential aesthetic qualities, taste was the result of extended training in historically perpetuated cultural classifications and practices. Answering the pivotal question as to why cultural and aesthetic qualities differed in fundamental ways, Bourdieu suggested how economic and practical necessity and functionality represented key criteria for cultural expression. He argued how most legitimate culture corresponded to a break with ordinary, mostly functional approaches to culture. High culture made cultural competence and detachment from everyday functionality a necessary condition of
participation. To Bourdieu, classical music, for instance, represented the best qualifier of social distinction as it was the most abstract and least accessible without prior knowledge. Similarly, post-impressionist, abstract painting represented the least decipherable visual art school as it stressed artistic proficiency by privileging form over content, modes of expression over representation, innovation over tradition.

Bourdieu’s main critique, however, aimed at the ideological representation of cultural order. Cultural essentialism attributed aesthetic order and taste to innate qualities and dispositions. Intrinsic cultural values were asserted through the simultaneous neutralisation of its social and historical determinedness, and the denial of a collective and individual genesis necessary for cultural participation. This resulted in the ‘misrecognition’ of the objective value of culture. The defence of intrinsic cultural values in this way represented ideological and political vested claims by those with exclusive cultural access.

Bourdieu’s critique of essentialist presentation of intrinsic cultural values, which were often removed from unequal social and economic production and consumption conditions, could be frequently observed within conversations with cultural managers. A managing director of a large gallery in London for instance underlined the intrinsic value of art that was essentially removed from extrinsic concerns. Anton argued:

(A painting) exists for itself. You might employ all sorts of value to it, positively or negatively, but actually it just is. And in that respect, what is healthy about that is that you don’t have to get into arguments about what is the worth of it? Is the social worth? So it puts you in quite a different position. The function is …to investigate what happens if you encounter things that have no extrinsic functions, that aren’t there for any other reason apart from us to experience them.

By suggesting how arts participation was based on experience alone, Anton somehow dismissed the extensive educational and social requirements needed by audiences to partake in cultural activities. According to Bourdieu, not only economic and social barriers to museums and galleries were ‘rare’ and class-based, more importantly, however, it was the unequal distribution of cultural and educational capital that ultimately prevented meaningful cultural inclusion of the disenfranchised. Contrary to the social critique like Bourdieu’s, Anton, like many participants in this study, suggested how the separation of arts production and consumption from extant concerns represented in fact a unique quality of the arts. Anton proceeded to explain
the intrinsic function of art as removed from social and historical consumption conditions further by making a distinction between artistic works and artistic institutions. Based on this difference he highlighted the subjective and socially removed nature of the arts:

I think institutions have a moral responsibility to fulfil a social function. Arts themselves have no particular obligation. I think it would be difficult to assume what function an abstract painter would have? … The work is the work! The second thing is: it is not so much that art *per se*, or artistic endeavour needs to or doesn’t need to have a social function. In fact one of the things this is important is what surrounds that work. It’s actually the artistic institution that surrounds that work that needs to have a social function. To me that is the distinction.

The curator suggested how art works assumed an intrinsic value, which should not be compromised by extrinsic, instrumental concerns. He emphasised this point by suggesting how it was the task of art institutions to mediate a social function, and to thereby protect the unique function of the arts. As will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Five, Anton went to assume art for art’s sake ideals in many ways underscoring adherence to the humanist foundation of art management. Ultimately artistic activities remained separate from educational and social production and consumption conditions.

Similar assumptions on the strict separation between the sociohistorical account of artistic production and consumption, and artistic value were voiced by a managing director of a large arts centre in the West Midlands. Sam highlighted the ‘universal’ and transcendental value of key artists throughout history and thereby assumed an ahistorical notion of their intrinsic cultural value. He argued:

If I were in South-Korea I could find those artists who have survived throughout history. I think these are archetypal cultural thinkers who determine our reactions to the world in different cultures. I think we have the notion of quality and contemporary value (for them).

By pointing out how some artists transcended their cultural and historical context, and thereby assumed a contemporary, ‘archetypal’ value Sam implied their independence from specific cultural and educational requirements for art participation. Sam underscored this position by pointing out primarily traditional measures for cultural evaluation, such as peer review, provenance and school, which
largely remained unaffected by the cultural and social conditions of acquisition. Sam pointed out:

Quality is used as a measure... They might have worked with the greatest. Or violinist may have played there and went to this school. So, another aspect would be contemporeinity. ... I would say I interpret what I see in relation of my experience and my colleague's programmers experience of many years of assessing and experiencing arts.

The adherence to intrinsic and ahistorically defined cultural measures that many cultural managers in this study demonstrated can be regarded as a reflection on the continued significance of the humanist tradition that starkly contrasts its social critique. Many participants pointed out the intrinsic nature of cultural activities, which remained largely disinterested from historical and socioeconomic production and consumption conditions. They thereby suggested that intrinsic cultural values and activities represented the *raison d'être* of cultural management. Although social instrumentalism and public responsibility were assumed, their interference with artistic goals was questioned as undermining artistic values. It is the lack of critical awareness of the socio-historical critique of the idealist foundation of art separatist ideas that underscores Bourdieu’s contemporary relevance for the debate on intrinsic cultural evaluation.

### 2.4 Access Policies: Cultural Democracy or Elitism?

Having highlighted the relational and politically obscured conditions of high culture, Bourdieu looked at the consequences of unequal production and consumption conditions for cultural programming. Bourdieu’s social critique of humanist cultural policy ideas resulted not only in a critical reflection on the ideological presentation of core cultural contents as unique and transcendental, it also questioned access policies as perpetuating class induced inequality. Bourdieu’s assessment of cultural policies represented a reflection on the possibilities of diversification of core cultural contents, and on the other hand, compensatory education. He, however, remained sceptical of efforts as to both cultural diversification, that is the inclusion of popular culture, but also affirmative access policies.
Bourdieu remained concerned with working-class culture as being largely excluded from official cultural curricula. On the one hand, he feared how the working classes remained determined by a 'dominated' position, and a limited and restrained nature of cultural consumption. He argued how working class culture was mainly driven by a lack of aspiration, immediate use value and easily recognisable meanings. It remained bounded by limited social considerations, such as moral assurance, economic efficiency, time constraint and practical usefulness. Bourdieu therefore distanced himself from the inclusion of popular culture into official cultural programming.

On the other hand, however, Bourdieu also questioned notions of intrinsic cultural worth and excellence that drove official programming, and their ensuing inaccessibility. Instead of advocating the abolition of public cultural programming, or the total relativisation of cultural order, however, Bourdieu championed egalitarian forms of access. Bourdieu's main emphasis lay on the development of an 'emancipatory' or 'compensatory' approach to cultural policy that aimed to provide autonomy from a class-driven system of cultural consumption and dissemination. Bourdieu emphasised the need for recognition of and structural changes to unequal conditions of cultural participation that lay in universal, compensatory education. Cultural programming should thrive to reverse practices drawn from within class-driven systems. This position was favoured over an uncritical inclusive approach to popular cultural contents as pointed out previously. Bourdieu found fault with both access policies, as well as democratisation. On the one hand, he objected to policies that aimed at widening participation in core cultural programmes, but failed to provide

---

7 According to Ahearne (2004) Bourdieu suggested that cultural programming should transform cultural practices drawn from within the class-driven system. Given the limited nature of 'dominated' culture, he opposed the ratification of an uncritical inclusive recognition of popular cultural contents. In a similar way he opposed the extended access to high cultural contents en bloc, as they too depended on class stratifying intentions. The former represented the limitations of a culturally dominated and spiritually impoverished position, whereas high culture represented qualities conducive to the reproduction of social and cultural order.

8 He regarded the inclusion of popular cultural contents, driven by the then culture minister Lang and in more general the influence of the cultural industries, as an overarching threat to cultural production. The socialist culture minister Lang at the time famously promoted a plural understanding of the arts, targeting the inclusion of new minority groups previously disenfranchised. Lang's cultural politics were based on a recognition of popular art forms and youth-culture. The critical response to the so-called ‘everything is culture’ approach accused it of ‘dumbing-down’ and relativism. Among its critics was Bourdieu who accused Lang's popular cultural approach as an ‘inversion of class racism, which reduces working-class practices to barbarism or vulgarity’ (2000: 76).
educational and social requirements needed for cultural participation. In fact, if education was denied, access campaigns facilitated a mere exposure to legitimate culture, rather than an equal participation. Since working-class members lacked essential cultural and educational requirements mere accessibility to it in many ways cemented their exclusion by attributing a lack of participation to their own shortcomings. On the other hand, Bourdieu questioned a popular cultural approach that aimed at widening core cultural contents as ‘therapeutic’ campaigns, which had a mere affirmative and tranquillising effect on the disenfranchised rather than one of empowerment.

Bourdieu’s assessment of access policies as largely ineffective and affirmative of further social exclusion and elitism was also suggested in the fieldwork. Participants in this study often pointed out the superficial and impact-driven nature of access policies. Policies aimed at social inclusion failed to address non-traditional arts audiences and activities by merely granting broader accessibility. This was based on a mere impact-driven, statistic approach, rather than a reflection on core cultural activities and values. A resource manager from Liverpool for instance pointed out how in the course of the Liverpudlian Capital of Culture project access measures had primarily aimed at economic barriers, rather than cultural ones. Unlike Bourdieu, however, Anita went on to suggest how an inclusion of community-based, local forms of culture was needed. Ultimately access policies had to encourage community engagement and partnership, rather than a top-down approach. She thereby suggested how the lack of recognition of alternative forms of local culture kept non-traditional audiences at arm’s length. Access policies in this way often remained aimed at core audiences, and ultimately failed to increase access.

Well, I mean (access) interventions are overly simplistic in assuming the price is the sole factor. But that ignores the fact that people pay to see top football games, even people with poor incomes, partly because it is socially acceptable, partly it gives a sense of identity. So it is not an issue of economic barriers, but simply interest, as you said cultural barriers.

The cultural manager proceeded to point out how cultural access policies had to not only take into account endogenous cultural activities, such as football. She also pointed out the need for compensatory education. This was based on the links
between traditional cultural activities, early education and perceptual barriers to high culture:

Also, I am the only one I know who hears classical music. I don't know anyone else, and it is the perceptual issues around classical music that is difficult. It is those questions like: will I enjoy it, will I know what to do that really are of concern here. And the *McMaster Report* is guilty in some ways of oversimplifying the issues that exist. I think (the report talks) about culture for some people. I think free entrance is a politically accepted way to counterpoise barriers, but it is also about the early exposure to it that is important.

Anita suggested how access policies remained ineffective as they remained limited to traditional art forms, without taking account of educational and perceptual requirements for participation. In addition, they failed to consider local, alternative forms of cultural activities as legitimate, thereby excluding non-traditional art forms and audiences.

Similar concerns as to the importance of education and early exposure to cultural activities were voiced by the director of a large London gallery. Tim stressed how access policies had to not only address structural barriers such as entry costs, but also how the cultural and educational approach of arts institutions had to be adjusted to address a wider audience. He described access policies as a two-step process, in the course of which first structural and then educational policies had to be reconsidered. Tim argued:

One thing is how structurally you can open barriers, so for instance you can make museums free. The issue I guess is what you put on. There is no necessary condition that if you open those doors then you get different strata of population that will come. They won't, because you also have to *change the work itself, what you offer*. So, these things need to go together. I guess you can’t have the latter without the former. So in order to get more people you need to get rid of some of the structural barriers and after that you need to start the process. So the interesting thing is what can do if you get rid of those barriers. I think you then need to work quite hard on the imaginative, non-patronising and diverse thinking when it comes to what to put on. Because the ideal place to get to is for all sort of people to come as a matter of course...

Tim underscored how access policies needed to rethink cultural contents on offer, as well as educational activities to further appreciation in them. The contemporary relevance of Bourdieu's thoughts beyond its French historical context can be demonstrated further through many examples. Access policies to this day have been
notoriously misconceived as broadening access to high cultural venues for non-traditional audiences, usually those with lower levels of educational achievements and with disadvantaged socioeconomic backgrounds. Evidence for the ineffectiveness of access policies pursued by US governments and foundations to expand audiences for high art venues has for instance been given by Mattick (2003). Mattick suggested how access policies that aimed at free entrance of public museums often failed to address those uninitiated, as it were the lack of cultural and educational capital that ultimately kept non-art audiences at bay.

As the statements by Anita showed similar concerns have been raised as to access policies in the UK. Access policies have represented a main staple within cultural policy since the post-war foundation of the Arts Council movement. Since New Labour's rise to government power, inclusion and access policies have been at the forefront of the political agenda, their efforts being particularly directed at the public museums sector. One of the measures hailed as the government's successful step towards the development of a more diverse audience has been the introduction of universal free entrance to state-sponsored museum collections. The apparent increase of visitor numbers since their establishment in 2001 has been frequently reported. However, several studies suggested the limitations of such claims. Cowell (2007: 206) for instance, raised scepticism against major shifts towards inclusion, as pattern of cultural attendance had largely remained unchanged. He therefore stressed the significance of educational and outreach activities in the overall generative approach towards cultural inclusion. He argued:

Cost of entry is rarely a significant factor in deciding whether or not to take part in cultural activity... In this way, free admission may provide the foundation on which programmes of outreach activities can be based, rather than being the major influence on the behaviours of priority groups. (Cowell 2007: 222).

These suggestions largely reflect Bourdieu's own findings in a similar study called *The Love of Art* (1990).

Another example represents the social stratification of school performance. Evidence is provided by the enquiry into international levels of school performance by the

---

9 In 2006 the DCMS report on the impact of free museum admission announced an increase of 28.8m additional visits within the first five years of the introduction of the new measures. The New Labour government also commented how museum audiences had risen by 75% within the first three years, suggesting how 'many' were first time visitors and children. (Cowell 2007: 204).
Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), which assesses curricular and extracurricular 'knowledge and skills that are essential for full participation in society' and access to career development. The most recent study (2006) discussed the links between school performance and socioeconomic background. The report suggests that the chances of passing final school exams and university entrance tests have been between four and six times higher for German students from higher socioeconomic backgrounds, than those from poorer ones. Although the study focused on a broad range of disciplines, results like these support a critical perspective on unequal opportunities in school education, and the resultant social stratification effected through schooling.

### 2.5 Cultural Autonomy Revisited

Although a primary aspect of Bourdieu's work presented an attack on intrinsic cultural values, as the following account will show, his stance on culture displayed complex and at times seemingly irreconcilable propositions. In the following account, a later strand of Bourdieu's cultural analysis will be discussed that explores the genealogy of aesthetic ideas and relevance of their autonomy from a sociohistorical perspective. Although his early research challenged intrinsic cultural values based on the ideological neutralisation of class based production and consumption conditions, this did not result in a final indictment. Bourdieu's interest in promoting cultural participation and compensatory education certainly were early indicators for his recognition of cultural values. Somewhat in contradiction to what some regarded as an economically reductionist account of culture, he in fact attributed culture with 'fundamental modes of thought', resistance and 'cultural excellence' (Bourdieu 1989 in Ahearne 2004). In order to understand Bourdieu's defence of culture, however, a more detailed discussion is in place. The following account will argue that Bourdieu sought to retrieve the unique function of aesthetic autonomy and intellectual freedom from sociological criticism in his later works. He illustrated the emergence of the cultural autonomous sphere in 19th century France. This aimed at the historisation of cultural and artistic autonomy, which, according to Bourdieu, was a necessary requirement for a full understanding of the intellectual and social function of cultural
autonomy. Based on a sociology of cultural production Bourdieu defended cultural autonomy as a historically evolved, rather than transcendent value.

In *The Field of Cultural Production* (1993 [1987]) and *The Rules of Art* (1996 [1992]) Bourdieu described the emergence of the literary field in 19th century France from the social and political conjunctures caused by the rise of industrialisation and commercialisation of the public sphere, failed revolutionary ambition and the remnants of royal arts censorship. To Bourdieu, artistic autonomous tendencies represented a critical response to bourgeois lifestyle, moral censorship and mounting commercial and political pressures. They were a means to seek resistance and protection from the breakdown of old patronage systems through the increasing power of the rising commercial art market, press and industrial mass cultural production, but also exclusionary art salon policies. The development of an autonomous artistic stance that could form the foundation of an independent 'own market' and 'identity, values and myth' has in this way been understood as a means to counter the ensuing decline of the social and economic status quo of artists. The development of an autonomous cultural field assured a degree of 'social recognition', and 'attention' to artistic endeavours. The logic, on which the foundation of the autonomous art world was built, hence depended on the right, and indeed necessity, to define its own principles of legitimacy (1996 [1992]: 77). Bourdieu described the logic of the field of cultural production as the 'economic world reversed', in that it placed artistic value at the opposite end of the scale of commercial success, social recognition and moral servitude. The field of cultural production organised itself in a chiasmatic way to the principles ruling the field of economic, social and political power. The art world emerged as part of a process of social differentiation between pure, restricted and production led art, on the one hand, and commercial art, large-scale production, on the other. In this way, the development of independent, art specific thought was encouraged. The formation of successive artistic traditions and the development of an aesthetic canon depended on the competition amongst artists to determine the aesthetic language of the art world.

'Social art' and art for art's sake were at the heart of artistic rivalry at the end of the 19th century. Although both schools fiercely defended their ideological stance, they were, however, united in their striving for artistic autonomy. Members of both camps defended artistic and cultural independence against bourgeois conformism,
commercialism and political censorship. To Bourdieu, *l'art pour l'art*, however, constituted the final reversal of bourgeois values, as 'the aesthetic revolution cannot be carried out except aesthetically' (1977: 106). *L'art pour l'art* in many ways epitomised the independent artistic movement, as it initiated the incremental abolition of literary and representational elements in the arts in favour of 'iconic', pictorial and non-verbal enunciation\(^{10}\). To Bourdieu, this development presented the quintessential basis for the 'invention of intellectual freedom' and cultural autonomy. To him, it was the final reversal of political, economic and social demands that allowed the development of an independent intellectual, artistic stance.

That artistic values were often defined in opposition to economic or social concerns, and the difficulty of reconciling intrinsic with extrinsic values could be demonstrated in the field research. Cultural managers interviewed for this study appeared to reiterate a tension between social instrumental and intrinsic aspects of cultural production. Although participants showed awareness of the former, they objected to the prescriptive and pronounced role of instrumental concerns in the context of public cultural policy agenda. The study thereby suggested how cultural managers attempted to balance instrumentalism with organisational and artistic goals. The difficulty of negotiating the tension between cultural values and the need to justify public funding was expressed by a curator from London:

> It is right now being encouraged internally from the DCMS to move away from targets, to move away from judging institutions on the basis of audience numbers, and to look into how we might judge work based on quality rather than numbers and accessibility. So I think there is quite a shift taking place… In all of this, no one still has really figured out how you can square both the worth you get from things in terms of financial investment, but also the quality and cultural value.

Anton explained the difficulty of reconciling cultural with instrumental policy criteria by pointing out the lack of objective and quantifiable assessment methods for cultural quality. This created a conflict with an economically driven policy framework. He proceeded to suggest:

> If you are really interested in what the arts, cinema and so on can do, than this is a personal experience. But as soon as you think about it in more general terms, I guess it is really difficult to translate all this into other words.

\(^{10}\) To Flaubert for instance autonomy ultimately depended on the imposition of, or the abolition of the distinction between, form and subject matter, with 'style in itself being an absolute manner of seeing things' (Flaubert in Bourdieu 1977: 106).
Interestingly I have just been talking to someone from the Arts Council earlier this day, and she was saying that the visual arts in London attracts about nine million people a year and costs the taxpayer about two pounds. You can do that, but it doesn't really sum up what the experience is. And so far, we lack some of the ways to analyse this on the basis of what people get out of it, as much as what we put into it.

Anton argued how artistic activities amounted to subjective and experiential values that the impact-driven approach could not account for. In this way he pointed out the contradictions between art intrinsic evaluations and instrumental cultural policies that needed to be resolved. Similar observations on the incommensurability of extrinsic with intrinsic cultural aspects were voiced by Sam. The art centre director suggested how quantitative measures could ultimately not account for artistic values.

Often with measurement in quantitative terms in order to justify public money it's not possible to be authoritative. If you set out to harness culture to produce a particular result you are unlikely to prove that because there are no measurements for that. This doesn't mean though that the impact is nil. It just means that you don't know... If you commission something simply with an impact in mind, that's not working.

Sam stressed how instrumental measures remained illusive indicators for artistic values and experiences, and therefore could not be used as organisational criteria for art production. Although he implied how instrumental concerns were part of artistic production, he suggested how ultimately they proved incommensurable with artistic practices.

2. 6 The Critique of Neoliberal Cultural Policies

The primary objective of Bourdieu’s sociohistorical analysis of culture has been to invert the neutralisation of intrinsic cultural values by highlighting the historicity of the humanist cultural discourse and its values. However, the sociological critique did not deflect from the significance that cultural and intellectual autonomous practice could have. In his later works, Bourdieu became increasingly concerned with the sway of neoliberal economic and political ideology in public governance and art production, and their intrusion into cultural and intellectual autonomy. To Bourdieu, the unique value of the cultural field lay in its production of symbolic and intellectual activities, which acted at arm’s length from religious, political and economic pressures. It was
the autonomy of culture that offered the conditions for 'ethical purity' and 'expertise', which he regarded as a stronghold for unbiased political critique\textsuperscript{11}. Bourdieu in this way counterweighed his critical analysis of intrinsic cultural values with a defence of the political importance of cultural autonomy.

As has been briefly outlined in Chapter One, the increasing sway of impact-driven instrumental policy agenda, and the managerial and entrepreneurial approach towards culture-led social inclusion and urban regeneration policies has been generally regarded as having evoked a tension between socio-democratic and neoliberal public policy principles on the one hand, and intrinsic and instrumental cultural practices on the other hand. The instrumental cultural policy approach has been regarded as part of the attempt to make public state services more competitive, transparent and flexible, and ultimately adhere to neoliberal principles of public service management (Belfiore 2006; Gray 2007). The negotiation of state regulation and market pressures represented a key concern for cultural managers in this study. Whereas most cultural managers argued that public cultural institutions should provide transparent and accountable services, they suggested that an untrammelled concern for political agenda contradicted their organisational goals. Overriding pressure to fulfil impact driven policy directives was generally perceived as a threat to artistic production processes. The dissatisfaction with instrumentalism was particularly clear with regards to social inclusion and access policies. The conflict between artistic goals and political pressures was expressed by a London curator:

\begin{quote}
In recent years diversity and numbers have been the big goal; there is percentage score attached to it. That was going to go down, and the feeling for quality of work and so on was going to go up. The former is not going to disappear entirely but it's just going to have less weight than it used to have. Equally that may as well change in a few years time because all this stuff is politically generated to some extent.
\end{quote}

Although the curator suggested that his organisation aimed to diversify audiences, in this statement he underscored the political nature of explicit impact driven goals. He thereby seemed to imply a distinction between organisational and Arts Council driven goals, dismissing the latter as a mere temporary policy agenda, rather than intrinsic

\textsuperscript{11} Zola's involvement in the Dreyfuss affair represented a prime example of detached, intellectual action.
concerns. The artistic director of a London Theatre group made similar distinctions
between evidence driven policies and his organisation’s own approach to access
policies. Henry drew differences between organisational artistic and policy driven
goals. He suggested:

I think that the art that interest me does change things and the people that
come. It is intervention into social space and it is empowering and challenging,
and part of a cultural and vital conversation. It does these things in a secuitous
and hard to map way...What worries me in instrumentalism that it seems to
want to pin down art and its effects. I don’t think that art works and artists work
(in this way)...I think they do (fulfil an instrumental function), but they can't be
quantified and objectified.

Whereas Henry had earlier described how he attempted to drive audience
development by making his performances accessible, he raised doubt as to the
compatibility of these measures with explicit instrumental goals. By suggesting that
social instrumental policies could not be objectified he effectively dismissed policy
intervention in arts organisations. Henry described the distinction between artistic
and political goals by suggesting how the latter was often open-ended, unplanned
and difficult to evaluate. Given the difficulty of defining quality in this way he
suggested that impact driven measures represented a prop for funding policies:

The easiest way is to prove a utility. And this utility in terms of social and
economic regeneration is used to sway government to give funding. I have
some sympathy with those approaches, but they miss what drives art along,
which is the radical and open and intuitive set of desires... We often start
projects not knowing what they are, not knowing their title. To a frightening
extend we don't know what the outcome is. We go into rehearsal room
together and say what can happen here? Where are we going? And the work
happens in a laborious, investigative process...that is the most important. And
that guarantees the quality of what we are doing. Whereas if we are forced to
say in advance what the outcome is going to be....that is not the work we can
do and I couldn't say that I could do that. We wouldn’t know until we are in the
studio and do the improvising.

By drawing distinctions subjective, improvised and indeterminate, and on the other
hand deterministic and measurable evaluation criteria Henry described the opposition
between intrinsic and instrumental cultural values drawn out in Chapter One. He
thereby expressed his reluctance to adhere to instrumental policy goals. Interviewees
in this way echoed the discussed scepticism against state cultural programming voiced by Bourdieu.

Having highlighted the importance of cultural autonomy in the face of overriding political intrusion, in his later work Bourdieu became increasingly concerned with the way cultural autonomy was threatened by neoliberal developments in public sector policies and the cultural industries at large. In *Free Exchange* Bourdieu discussed the way corporate sponsorship and state intervention undermined relative cultural autonomy, with the *avant-garde* artist Hans Haacke. The account criticised the use of corporate media advertising and sponsoring as a way of installing business interests within arts institutions by exchange of symbolic profit. Political and corporate interference with art production enforced the ideological reproduction of universal and essentialising intrinsic cultural values. Commercial interests interfered with the indeterminedness and constant innovation that artistic production required. It was the task of intellectuals and artists to counteract the imposition of political and social interests, and ideological censorship, by raising critical awareness to the disruption induced by corporate interests and economic market logic.

Bourdieu particularly opposed the growing power of neoliberal principles perpetuated by the cultural industries to influence media and cultural contents. It was through ongoing vertical and horizontal integration and transnationalisation that increasing control over conditions of production and consumption could be assumed (Mitrovic 2005). The cultural industries threatened to impose a pervasive reign of free market economic rationales, which undermined principles of public cultural policy as sites of democratic control (Ahearne 2004: 67). In this way, Bourdieu came to point out the significance of state-sponsored patronage as arbiters of artistic autonomy. Although he had considered the threats to moral and artistic censorship through state programming on the example of the 1980’s and 90s US ‘culture wars’, in his later works he deemed controlled state patronage the lesser evil to corporate sponsoring. Ultimately, Bourdieu and Haacke discussed the possibilities of collective action against such intrusion, for instance by raising media awareness as well as boycotting cultural institutions, which benefited from business cooperation.

The field research suggested that interference with cultural production through commercial and political interests has been a common concern amongst cultural
managers. The director of a Sheffield art centre in particular discussed the influence of the commercial film industries, such as Hollywood, on local film programming. The interviewee suggested how the economic power of large production companies threatened small, independent film production. He suggested how this affected the diversity and quality of films shown in Britain. Mark argued:

Well, here is an example: If you see the newspaper today, there is just a film review called *Buddha Which Has Broken Down In Tears*...This film has got an incredible insight... If you want to understand and care about the world, we have to engage with the world. So, if you look at the advert, it will probably only get reviewed today in The Times, The Guardian or The Telegraph, but if you look at the posters for *Batman*, tell me how much money it costs to do these adverts? And can you see an advert for that film from Afghanistan: No! Now that is about economic power... So what I want to say is: Why has that not got more of a profile and presence? Is that because of Western marketing, should we not know about these things? Do we just want to be entertained by *Batman* and *Harry Potter*?

In many ways, Bourdieu's critique of the increasing overlap between culture, politics and business rings true for the contemporary discourse of cultural policy. As the discussion in Chapters Five and Six will show, the instrumentalisation of UK cultural policy has increasingly drawn on strands of neoliberal economic rationales, with questionable implications for notions of artistic values, cultural democracy and community cohesion.

2.8 'Taste Cultures' and the Defence of Popular Culture

The account so far has discussed Bourdieu's social-critical account of culture. The discussion has highlighted three points: Firstly, Bourdieu's sociological analysis of the unequal distribution of cultural capital as a means of social stratification has been discussed in the context of the French traditional school system, and modern French society at large. This formed the basis for demands for universal access to compensatory education. Secondly, the account presented Bourdieu's enquiry into the emergence of the French literary field, which described the development of intrinsic cultural values as historically and socially derived. Both propositions
ultimately aimed at an attack on modernist cultural assumptions of disinterestedness. Finally, however, it has been argued that the earlier strands of Bourdieu's research have been counterweighted by a defence of the relative autonomy of cultural and intellectual activities. The latter arguments have been particularly salient in the context of the critique of neoliberalism, and the effects of state and market interference with artistic production.

Bourdieu's account has been criticised on many counts. A primary concern has remained the historically and nationally specific nature of Bourdieu's class structural account, whose main focus lay on the highly stratified French social context. A number of commentators critically pointed out Bourdieu's sole concern with class as the single stratifying factor for cultural consumption, at the expense of other factors such as ethnicity, gender or age (Lane 2006: 149). A critical enquiry needed to assess whether Bourdieu's class-based account shows relevance in more egalitarian, diverse and rapidly mobile social settings, such as the USA. Unlike the French context, the American ideology of individualism and self-realisation at least officially refuses class based identity and distinction, potentially promoting a more heterogeneous account of cultural practice. Other concerns have addressed the implications the assumed dissolution of cultural boundaries by postmodern discourse, media industry and popular culture have for traditional hierarchical assumptions. Developments like these question the relevance of high cultural distinctions as a means of social stratification.

Evidence for a more variegated and complex structural relation between cultural consumption and society has been delivered by the sociological account of Herbert Gans. Set in the heterogeneous, socially mobile and ethnically diverse context of the US, the study by the influential sociologist Gans, Popular Culture and High Culture (1999 [1974]), suggested a more differentiated and complex model of cultural consumption. Although, in a similar way to Bourdieu, Gans recognised the importance of class and education as key determinants of cultural participation, he suggested how social factors such as ethnicity, age and gender, as well as the development of local subcultures and individual interests had to be recognised as contributing to a complex, flexible and overlapping relationship between taste cultures and publics (1999: 94).
In line with Bourdieu, Gans presented a sociological framework that structurally linked socioeconomic class, and factors such as income, occupation and education with taste. He argued how knowledge and familiarity were basic requirements for cultural participation. In particular high culture required comprehensive education and familiarity. Taking account of the social heterogeneity and rapid mobility in American society, Gans, however, recognised the relevance of additional social factors to cut across a purely class based stratification of cultural consumption. In this way, he avoided an economic reductionism that critics had opposed in Bourdieu’s works (Alexander in Hall 2003: 47). By taking account of a diversity of social factors, Gans identified five ‘taste groups’: high, upper-middle, lower-middle, low and quasi-folk cultural ‘taste publics’. High culture was enjoyed by mostly highly educated, academic and professional users, who show greater interest in abstract, symbolic and philosophical contents. High culture aspired towards creator oriented contents, defying engagement with prosaic and practical issues. The upper and lower middle taste cultures represented the largest and fastest growing taste groups, catering for better educated and generally affluent professionals. They were interested in representational, practical and ethical concerns, mostly delivered by quality or mass media. In his revised comments, Gans suggested how due to increased social mobility, rising educational standards, as well as the diversity of media contents the boundaries between these taste cultures had become increasingly frail. Sitcoms represented a good example for the way traditionally lower-middle cultural forms were increasingly catering for a wide range of taste groups. Low and quasi-folk cultures addressed the least educated and unskilled. Gans suggested that their lack of cultural initiation, low social status and purchasing power left them with marginal skill and interest to participate in ‘culture’. In a later revision of his account he additionally recognised the significance of ethnicity, gender, youth, religion and region to interfere with class as structuring tastes. He pointed out that taste cultures emerged, which catered for the cultural interests and traditions of ethnic or age-related groups. Such taste cultures could cut across class boundaries. Ethnic taste cultures, for instance, often attracted individuals from all social backgrounds.

Gans’ sociological framework disentangled the strict hierarchical distinction between high and popular culture, and class, by accounting for a plurality of determinants for taste. Gans emphasised how neither taste publics, nor their cultures were bounded
entities, but rather lose classifications that represented mere analytical rather than 'real' entities. Gans based parts of his analysis on the assumed diversity and heterogeneity of suburban, which he found to be more diverse and innovative than the prevalent mass cultural critique had suggested at the time. His defence of individual taste cultures drew on anthropological studies of suburban life and ethnic communities such as Italian Americans, which illustrated the idiosyncratic and autonomous nature of cultural practices. In the *Urban Villagers* he for instance described the selective uses of popular cultural contents by the Boston suburbanites (1962: 182). Gans argued how mass media contents were not passively consumed, but instead questioned and critically commented upon. Individuals, families and peer groups developed idiosyncratic and creative cultural consumption pattern, which contributed to vibrant and active grassroots activities and community life. Based on his observations, he concluded how individuals actively chose between media contents, and used them in accordance to their needs and interests. Taste publics were not bound within immutable class based tastes, nor subject to a passive consumption of mass media. The unboundedness and heterogeneity of taste cultures were furthermore demonstrated by the shared uses of cultural products and aesthetic standards. In his revised account, Gans argued how taste publics, like the upper- and lower-middle-classes, had come to share similar media and cultural institutions, like news magazines, museums and sitcoms, but used them in different ways. New magazines for instance covered a range of contents, which were adopted according to individual interests and needs.

Gans attributed a key role to the mass media industries in making cultural contents widely accessible to many taste publics. The mass media catered for a wide range of taste publics, disentangling the close link between social status groups and cultural taste. According to Fenster (1989: 5), although Gans recognised the significance of class and other social factors as structuring cultural activities, the struggle over cultural order was dissolved by his conception of culture as a 'free market democracy'. Facilitated by the consumerist logic of the cultural industries, creators and consumers actively chose amongst cultural activities. Gans regarded these cultural choices as 'creative', individual acts, whose selectivity became meaningful in relation to individual's interests and background. That is, whilst cultural choices, in particular amongst the lower taste publics, were restricted by the disadvantages of
class position, they were nevertheless valid and meaningful as they related to individual needs and wants.

Gans’ concern for a greater recognition of endogenous and diverse cultural activities reflects on the necessity of a pluralisation of traditional cultural canon and ultimately a more relative stance on core cultural values. According to Gans cultural activities needed to be assessed in terms of the cultural and socioeconomic conditions of cultural consumption, and the significance of local and individualised taste cultures. Gans therefore advocated how a variety of social factors, such as age, ethnicity and locality, needed to be taken into account in order to acknowledge the entire spectrum of taste cultures in one society. Evidence for the necessity of more a variegated and relational approach to artistic assessment was also found in the field study. The artistic director of a Cambridgeshire gallery described how her organisation facilitated local and community-based cultural programming that was based on a contextual and local assessment and community engagement, rather than traditional cultural canon. She, however, pointed out that community arts found little recognition by the funding policies of the Arts Council or DCMS, as the narrow outline of funding requirements often left local cultures unaccounted. Jane described community based cultural programming as follows:

In terms of the directly promoted programme- we look at what is available locally and then we actually look for gaps. So we are not genuinely promoting what people want, although we want clearly for people to come to things, but we are looking to fill gaps, so that people have access to a rounded experience. So we are not necessary guided by people coming in and helping us to come up with a programme. What we do do: We work with communities, we co-produce. We don’t go out and tell them what we have and that we are going to bring that to them. We have a conversation, we ask them what is out there, what they want to do, how that fits with past things and the community.

Jane thereby explained the need to programme cultural activities based on local considerations as public funding left unaccounted alternatives to the traditional humanist curriculum. She described the discrepancy between local and official cultures in the following way:

Because there is a risk to represent just a particular sub section of art, whereas people are more knowledgeable about what art is. What I find on the ground, that local funders have an elitist definition of the arts, and tend not to fund certain things. And if you can break down barriers and define art as
creative practices that usually, but not always involves artistic practice, such as music, drama and so on, you are more likely to get in people and support it.

Jane stressed the need to critically reflect upon official funding policies and core cultural activities as based on historical and group-specific definitions of culture, which did not encompass local and diverse cultural forms. She criticised how funding bodies failed to include less traditional curricula and thereby merely served to reinforce established art forms and organisations.

Jane’s comments in many ways link in Gans’ discussion of popular culture, which addressed the limitations of traditional arts policies. Gans’ main concern lay in the equal recognition of cultural choices, and the defence of popular cultural contents as expressions of individual cultural needs and interests. This was part of his 'subcultural programming', which related cultural taste to the skills, interests and background of taste publics, rather than traditional aesthetic standards. He advocated the equal recognition of taste cultures, although he conceded that higher cultures were preferable. Gans, however, argued that since deep-seated socioeconomic difference and unequal educational levels characterised most of society, different cultural tastes needed to be accounted for. Unless structural differences could be ameliorated to remove educational and cultural differences, cultural policy programming needed to compensate these differences by catering for a broad range of cultural tastes and abilities, rather than an elite selection. In this way, he advocated the pluralisation of cultural curricula and standards.

Gans' account differed from Bourdieu's position in his unapologetic defence of popular culture and the pluralisation of tastes. Whereas both sociologists agreed on the socially divisive nature of cultural and social capital, both came to different conclusions. Whereas Bourdieu had dismissed cultural populism as 'tranquillising', as they merely perpetuated class specific limitations, Gans fully endorsed popular culture. His account of cultural consumption was built on a revision of the mass cultural critique that had pervaded the 1960s and 70s. To Gans, the critique of popular culture as emotionally and morally harmful, 'submissive', 'narcotic' and 'mediocre' was ideologically motivated. Mass cultural critique served the defence of high culture and its exclusionary policies. Access to high culture merely masked socioeconomic inequalities, and served their perpetuation. It made no sense for: 'people to convert to high-cultural standards without supplying them with the income
and educational prerequisites already obtained by the present high-cultural audience' (Gans in Berger 1990: 433). Since structural socioeconomic changes that could lead to long-term democratic shifts in cultural participation were deemed difficult to achieve, Gans concluded that the inclusion and recognition of a diversity of taste cultures was a necessary requirement of liberal-democratic cultural policies.

In his critique of Gans' account, McGuigan questioned the uncritical espousal of the role of the rising cultural and media industries and their mediating role in processes of cultural production and consumption. Gans, for instance, welcomed the pluralisation of popular culture that was driven by processes of commercialisation and commodification, as for instance suggested by Cowen's account *In Praise of Commercial Culture* (1998). To McGuigan, the defence of popular culture as a way of pluralising cultural order, repatriation of meaning, and the ability to 'pick and choose' from media contents ultimately hinted at economic tendencies taken by cultural analysis, and their alignment with consumerism and the cultural industries. This move resembled consumerist strands of British cultural studies, which ambiguously coalesced culture with consumer capitalism and consumer sovereignty. To McGuigan, this position represented just another instance of the uncritical imposition of neoliberal market rationale on spheres of public deliberation (McGuigan 2006; see also Stanbridge 2002). In the light of this critique, Gans' position stands in stark contrast to Bourdieu's indictment of the increasing overlap between free market rationales, commercial interests and cultural production.

### 2.8 Changing Cultural Consumption Pattern

As pointed out above, the critique of Bourdieu's account of culture addressed its limitation to the French social context, his prime concern with class and his espousal of a strict division between high and popular culture. In contrast, Gans' account suggested a more complex and differentiated account of cultural taste groups that takes account of the diverse and plural social setting of the US.

By taking account of multiple taste cultures, Gans attempted to disentangle the strict relation between class and culture in heterogeneous social and cultural societies. He
thus questioned the role of high culture as a marker of social distinction in favour of the equal recognition of lower taste cultures. Evidence for the dissolution of high and low cultural divisions as markers of social distinction has been also suggested by a number of other commentators. A significant contribution to the debate on shifting cultural consumption pattern has been made by Richard Peterson (1992 cited in Bennett & Silva 2006), who challenged the unique role of high art as a marker of social distinction. Peterson suggested how cultural distinctive practices were not restricted to high culture, but embraced a diverse and broad range of cultural activities and knowledge. He argued that in contemporary society, cultural legitimacy and superiority were shown through familiarity with a range of cultural genres. Peterson argued how diverse cultural competence or omnivorousness, instead of high cultural knowledge, had become the main staple of middle-class distinction. He thereby differentiated between 'omnivore' and 'univore' cultural tastes, with increasing numbers of the social upper-classes displaying knowledge and ambition across high and popular cultural forms. In contrast, lower social strata generally favoured a more limited number of cultural genres.

In a similar way, Kane (2003) pointed out the decreasing significance of high art as a marker of social distinction, which had given way to other activities, such as sports or moral conduct. She suggested how amongst American university students and professionals performance in sports, rather than culture and the arts, took a significant role in perpetuating social status. Kane argued how sports affected entry into higher education and later career development through scholarship systems, and played a far greater role than arts practices in social stratification. Observing how 'sports were distinct in enabling participants to engage in exclusionary practices whilst maintaining a populist rhetoric', Kane suggested that it was sport's popular appeal, rather than elitist distance, that predestined it as a tool for social distinction.

2.9 Rethinking the Humanist Basis of Cultural Policy

The discussion so far attempted to give an outline of Bourdieu and Gans’ relational account of the humanist cultural policy discourse on intrinsic cultural values. It is suggested that the relevance of their social and historical analysis of core cultural
values is represented in a continued need for a critical reflection on the ideological nature of the discourse that masks unequal consumption and production conditions. It is suggested that the uncritical perpetuation of humanist ideas of the intrinsic nature of cultural values has resulted in exclusive and socially divisive set of policies. The discussion showed how despite continued evidence for a lack of equal access to and undemocratic representation of core cultural contents public cultural policy institutions have claimed universal value and transcendence. Evidence for the dissatisfaction with traditional art patronage that resulted in a limited focus on core cultural forms and insufficient access policies has been shown in the field work. In line with Bourdieu the account therefore suggests a critical rebuttal of the ideological presentation of the humanist foundation of intrinsic cultural values that distorts the historical and social nature of cultural production and consumption. It suggests how unequal consumption conditions necessitate the provision of compensatory cultural education that recognises socioeconomic and educational differences across social groups, and that ultimately aims at the abolition of cultural and educational barriers through long-term educational provision. Such an approach would recognise the intrinsic value of the relative and historically derived autonomy of artistic and intellectual production from direct political, social and economic influence. It is suggested that the retention of an autonomous cultural field could predicated upon the establishment and insulation of a liberal democratic public sphere, which enables the negotiation of cultural values and activities.

On the other hand, in line with Gans, this thesis highlighted the possibility of a critical revision of core cultural curricula that considers a careful diversification and inclusion of local and alternative cultural activities. Gans’ relevance for the contemporary rethinking of the humanist basis of cultural policy is seen in his recognition of local, idiosyncratic cultural activities, and the opportunities for the democratic repatriation of culture through the media industries. Whereas Gans and Bourdieu suggest different approaches to a renegotiation of cultural policies, their relational analyses of culture have in common a valid critical rebuttal of the ideologically driven and class-based effects of Western cultural policy. It is suggested that the negotiation of intrinsic cultural values needs to show a historically reflective and critical awareness of the socioeconomic and educational requirements for cultural production and consumption conditions. Hence what is to be jettisoned is the ideological
neutralisation of the transcendent and universal value of culture that ultimately has resulted in a socially exclusive and limited foundation for cultural policy. What remains a key remnant of the humanist discourse to be saved is the perpetuation of the relative autonomy of cultural production from overriding political and economic pressures. In line with both Bourdieu and Gans, the intrinsic value of relatively autonomous intellectual and artistic activities is underscored, which represents a constituting part of cultural policy provision.

2.10 Conclusion

The relational account of cultural consumption and production presented a critical, socio-historical analysis of intrinsic cultural values. This chapter showed how cultural consumption and production need to be assessed in terms of their embeddedness in historical, social and ideological conditions. It highlighted the fact that cultural and aesthetic values are rarely free from ideological, economic and political interests. The account thereby stressed the contingent and arbitrary nature of much of cultural ideas. The account focused on Bourdieu and Gans’ analysis of taste as a means for social stratification based on factors such as class, ethnicity and age. The analysis highlighted how cultural activities are contingent on educational and socioeconomic requirements, often resulting in exclusionary and unequal access to culture. Bourdieu’s historical genealogy of the field of cultural production showed how cultural values, rather than being based on philosophical, transcendent ideas, emerged as a response to the intersection of political, economic and moral events. By deconstructing cultural and aesthetic order as products of a historically situated social struggle, the sociological account questioned essentialist assumptions of the arts and culture. This analysis, however, was not to dismiss intrinsic cultural values as arbitrary. The account discussed the way Bourdieu counterweighted a class-based, economic account of culture with a defence of cultural autonomy as intellectual and cultural independence. They retained their relevance because they designated a relatively autonomous sphere of activity at a distance from economic, political and social interests. This was a key requirement for unbiased political action.
The sociological basis of Bourdieu's account has been subsequently discussed in terms of trends indicating the dissolution of hierarchical, strictly bounded cultural and social distinctions. The presentation of Gans' account of North American cultural consumption patterns illustrated a multi-factorial approach to the construction of taste. Given the plural and diverse social constitution of American society, Gans took account of a plurality of taste cultures, which emerged from a multiplicity of social factors and interests. Unlike Bourdieu, he defended the equal recognition of all taste cultures by pointing out the deeply embedded structural inequalities and deficits that prevented equal access to culture. However, his uncritical defence of the proliferation of popular culture through the cultural industries has been problematised as forging a close alignment of the cultural discourse with economic, consumerist market logic. Finally, the account discussed the diminishing role of high culture and traditional class structures to determine cultural taste. Processes of omnivorousness, for instance, encompassed high and popular culture as markers of social distinction. By pointing out the ideological, historical and contingent nature of culture, this account challenged the transcendent and universal claims of intrinsic cultural values. It highlighted the arbitrary and contingent nature of artistic qualities and norms as embedded in social and economic processes of production and consumption. However, this was not to assume the relativisation of cultural values. This account rather had the aim to highlight that a comprehensive analysis of cultural values needs to take into account the broad, socially and ideologically mediated constitution of culture and the arts, whilst preserving its specific cultural value. As Wolff suggests: 'It is important to be aware of any tendency to overstate the autonomy of (cultural) codes and discourses...'. On the other hand, however, it needed to be understood that: 'The aesthetic... resists any simple determinism of its objects by extra-discursive elements... It would be wrong to reduce the aesthetic to the ideological or the social...' (1993: 141). Rather a sociologically informed discussion on cultural values aimed at a 'critique of the ideology of timelessness and value-freedom, which characterises art theory and art history in the modern world' (1993: 143). It was a key aim of the social- critical account to highlight democratic and egalitarian principles of cultural policy provision.
SECTION II

CHAPTER THREE:

Art for Art's Sake
Chapter Three: Art for art’s sake

3.1 Introduction

The first chapter of this enquiry discussed the contemporary debate on intrinsic cultural values in the political and economic context of public sector reform. The resurgence of cultural values has been regarded as based on a rejection of social and economic instrumental cultural policies, as well as changing definitions of the public cultural sphere and citizenship. In the second chapter, the sociological and materialist critique of intrinsic cultural value claims has been discussed in terms of Bourdieu and Gans’ accounts of culture. The sociological analysis of intrinsic values aimed to highlight the ideologically driven, socially produced and historically contingent nature of intrinsic cultural values. The discussion assessed the implications of the sociological analysis of culture for cultural political concepts, such as cultural excellence, access and autonomy.

The discussion so far highlighted the complex and contested nature of cultural values, and their informedness by historically specific production and consumption conditions. The account pointed out the need to assess cultural values and policy rationales taking account not only of the conceptual, but also historically situated and ideological basis of emergence. In order to assess the relevance and function of cultural values in the contemporary debate, the following section endeavours to explore such an intellectual history of intrinsic and instrumental cultural values. The enquiry aims to give a better understanding of cultural terms based on the premise that cultural policy ideas are intertwined or least influenced by an intellectual, political and cultural historical discourse (Bennett 2006). This aims to establish a
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12 This refers particularly to the propositions made by various actors on behalf of intrinsic cultural values from within the cultural sector, such as Tessa Jowell, John Holden or John Tusa.

13 Bennett (2006) for instance suggested that cultural policy, besides its pragmatic and often purely instrumental basis of government policy, is deeply concerned with the conditions and definitions of culture and the arts. In fact, even practical matters reflected ‘assumptions about the role of art in society that intellectuals have formulated, often in a quite different historical context’ (Bennett 2006: 119). The enquiry into cultural ideas and their political and social context, to Bennett, thus represents a way to retrieve the meaning of culture as ‘symbolic practice’, rather than instrumental means. He thereby conceded how a respective enquiry into intellectual endeavour and cultural policy remained difficult to trace, as intellectual assumptions were largely implicit in ‘unspoken policy assumptions or institutional rhetoric’ (Bennett 2005: 473).
foundation, from which to assess accepted and implicit conceptual and ideological assumptions underlying the contemporary cultural policy discourse.

Chapter Three aims to shed light on the conceptual underpinnings of intrinsic cultural values by describing the historical development of art for art’s sake ideas in 19th century Europe. In the art historical debate, art for art’s sake has been recognised as the final consequence of a process of social differentiation beginning in the Middle Ages leading to the development of an autonomous artistic field, and the arrival of a distinct art market and profession (Shiner 2003). Art for art’s sake has by many commentators been described as a response to the forces of modernisation and secularisation (Shiner 2003: 76), the development of a free market economy, technological expansion and the growing economic and social significance of the middle-classes. In this way, Williams in *Culture and Society* (1961), Stolnitz (1960: 31) and Bell-Villada (1996: 8-11) suggested how art for art’s sake represented a means for artists and intellectuals to carve out an autonomous social sphere, where to preserve distinct social and professional ethical codes.

Having reinvoked the intellectual history of art for art's sake, its influence on the emergence of the Arts Council movement and post-war funding system in the UK will be discussed. The discussion will describe conceptual parallels between members of the Bloomsbury group and the founder of the Arts Council of Great Britain, Maynard Keynes, which inspired key ideas for the foundation of the Arts Council.

### 3. 2 Sociohistorical Context of the Emergence of *l’art pour l’art* in France and England

The conceptual and philosophical basis of intrinsic cultural values can be traced back to the emergence of art for art’s ideas. The emergence of art for art’s sake needs to be situated within the changing conditions of a rapidly transforming 19th century society, and the scientific, industrial and religious developments that shifted the texture of social and cultural life. In France, the birthplace of *l’art pour l’art*, the revolutionary upheaval and liberal climate throughout the first half of the 19th century had brought a receptivity for new intellectual and artistic ideas, in particular
due to the receding influence of religious and clerical institutions and the increasing secularisation of modern life. 18th century French enlightenment ideas had already exerted great influence on the cultural consciousness, so much so that the beginning of the Bourbon restoration was marked by a proclamation of freedom of religion and press by King Louis XVIII. However, despite this initial gesture that had brought him popular sympathy, the royal government quickly resigned to reverse the results of the French Revolution, ultimately resulting in the repressive and reactionary regime and its fall. After the failure of the liberal opposition right-wing, ultra-reactionary repression reached its peak in 1822 forcing political activity into the underground.

In a characteristically French manner, literary and intellectual activities were bound up with political activism and found themselves in antiroyalist opposition. Artists particularly opposed the return of royal censorship exercised through official schools and neo-classicist Salons. Since the ancien régime of Louis XIV art production had followed a classicist canon based on scholarly training in ancient history and myth (Collier 1994: 15). Artistic production and commission were exclusive to monarchic patronage with the two main schools, the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture originating in 1648, and the Académie Française acting as gate keepers to scholarly discourse and public audiences. In this way, orthodox artistic doctrines enforced a close dependency of artistic production to a largely elite audience inside or close to the Court, propagating the universal validity of the official artistic canon (Collier 1994: 25). In addition to the royal patronage system, restrictions on cultural life made sure antiroyalist sentiments amongst liberal artists. Liberal intellectuals were removed from public institutions, universities brought back under clerical control and free press suspended. In this unstable political climate the receptivity for notions of liberty in art, the demand for freedom of expression and independence from political and religious influence seemed no surprise.

One of the main modern influences furthering the aesthetic autonomous movement represented the transformation of the art patronage system, which was a result of the emergence of the commercial cultural market. Technological progression and economic expansion marginalised largely ‘slow-producing’ artists, who found themselves increasingly out of step with new requirements to produce in accord with a mass audience. Industrial advances like the typewriter, photography and the printing machine meant the rise of a cultural economy that facilitated greater cultural
commodification and commercialisation. These developments catered for an expanding middle-class culture, which, to many artists, represented an inferior taste culture. Journalism and fiction were chief manifestations of the commercial cultural sphere (Bell-Villada 1996: 43). Yet, artists willingly or not became enmeshed with the forerunners of the modern cultural industry, forced to take up what were deemed ‘mundane’ professions in journalism or teaching. The increasing industrial transformation of the cultural sphere, however, naturally increased their resentment against the expansion of culture, and fuelled fear of the loss of aesthetic roots of art production. The aesthetic movement arose as a response to the development of the modern industrial society and the increasing power of a mainstream middle-class culture.

Industrial, capitalist expansion was particularly advancing in Victorian England. 19th century English society witnessed an unprecedented economic growth establishing it as one of the leading industrial nations. The staple of the British industry presented industrial design and manufacturing, which alongside technological advances in the print industry resulted in the proliferation of affordable design and commercial goods catering for the broadening middle-class. Art and art institutions like galleries and museums were closely drawn to manufacturing as a source of inspiration and cultivation, which ultimately aimed to further trade and industrial expansion (Gilmour 1993: 16).

England’s aesthetic movement was founded on a number of causes. Part of the aesthetic separatist movement sought to counter the superseding of art by design, by insisting on its ‘disinterestedness’ from practical concerns. Much of the opposition, however, also responded to Victorian conservatism. Unlike the politically and culturally restless France, England’s counter-revolutionary climate and middle-class fears of unrestricted democratisation provided for a more repressed political and intellectual context. Fear of revolutionary unrest had triggered a reactionary revival of civic and moral values, which also demanded the religious and ethical service of art to society. These tendencies were illustrated by the emergence of the social control agenda, which initiated the inculcation of moral and social values through art institutions. The emergence of the reformatory discourse of the arts and culture will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter.
British aesthetes responded to Victorian conservatism with a heightened concern for aesthetic independence. In a similar way as the French, they eventually came to benefit from liberal tendencies of the intellectual discourse, which emerged toward the end of the century, and the final pluralisation of religious order. The critical scientific discourse and a general enlightening spirit ultimately came to undermine traditional adherence to moral and religious values previously informing the arts. The emergence of scientific-historical criticism of the Bible, and developments in geological and biological sciences, most notable Darwinism and evolutionary theories, induced scepticism in religious scriptures. In this way, parts of the subdued Victorian morale, which was based on a looming expectation of atonement, everlasting punishment and sin, were progressively undermined by an elevated humanitarian spirit that sourced hope from prospects of reform and active improvement (Gilmour 1993: Ch. 2). The loss of former sources of religious and cultural cohesion thus paved the way for an individualistic and relativist conception of art and culture, which paved the way for the breakthrough of art for art's sake.

### 3.3 British Classicist Roots

A key source for the liberal, enlightenment spirit that furthered the liberalisation in the arts represented British and German Enlightenment theories. Although Kant served as the immediate source of the early French *l'art pour l'art*, he is, in turn, assumed to have been inspired by British classicist philosophers (Stolnitz 1961a: 131; Townsend 1987; White 1973). Stolnitz and Bell-Villada suggest that early precursors of aesthetic autonomous ideas were the Third Earl of Shaftesbury (1671-1713) and British aesthetes such as Hutcheson (1694-1746), Addison (1672-1719) and Burke (1729-1797). Another starting point for Kant's *Critique of Judgement*, which represented in many ways the culmination of enlightenment aesthetic rationale, was the German A.G. Baumgarten (1714-1762). Baumgarten had derived the concept of aesthetic perception from classical Greek 'αἴσθησις' (trans.: sensation), which represented the separation between the sensual and logical (Bell-Villada 1996: 18).

Although largely ignored in England possibly due to his high-level philosophical rendition, Shaftesbury exerted great influence on German enlightenment figures such
as Kant, Herder, Lessing and Schiller. He represented a key figure in initiating aesthetic autonomous thought. As a student of Hume, he exercised polemic critique against the predominant philosophical currents of his time represented by Hobbes and Locke. The term ‘disinterestedness’ described the intrinsic basis of moral action. This contention represented a critique of Hobbes’ utilitarian concept of private, egocentric action, whose sole purpose aimed at the pursuit of pleasure and fancy as a final end. In contrast, Shaftesbury suggested that morality and beauty should be free of self-interest and ulterior motifs. Moral and aesthetic appreciation should be disinterested not only from economic, social and individual gain, but also opinion, pleasure or any other subjective response. In this way, Shaftesbury established the idea of the intrinsic value of morality and beauty. In *The Moralist* he argued how appreciation of beauty: ‘relates not in the least to any private interest…nor has for its object any self-good or advantage for the private system’. (Stolnitz 1961a: 107). He frequently suggested that even pleasure represented an ‘interest’ and therefore an extrinsic cause:

Though the reflected joy or pleasure which arises from the notice of this pleasure once perceived, may be interpreted a self-passion or interested regard, yet the original satisfaction can be no other than what results from the love of truth, proportion, order and symmetry in the things without.

In this way, Shaftesbury pre-empted the notion of free, disinterested beauty to be described by Kant and later aesthetes.

3. 4 German Enlightenment Roots and their French Reading

Kant’s influence on the first appearance of *l’art pour l’art* locutions remains undisputed, although there is a consensus that the transmission of his philosophical writings into French history of ideas developed something of a life of its own. Many scholars have attempted to extract from Kant’s *Critique of Judgement* the basis of subsequent art separatist ideas. Bell-Villada summarises this as:

The experience of beauty has to do neither with gratification…nor with concepts…goes beyond immediate pleasure and claims the universal asset of
all men. A judgement of free and independent beauty assumes that there is not concept or purpose to be serves...What we judge is ‘formal purposiveness’, the form of an object that has no ulterior purpose...Beautiful objects are produced by a genius, whose distinguished mark is ‘originality’, an ‘audacity’ that goes beyond rules (1989: 20)

The commentators, Wilcox (1953) and Egan (1921), have argued how a superficial reading of Kant would have rendered the idea of ‘purposefulness’ of beauty. Yet, to them it remained clear, how a comprehensive reading, which encompassed Kant’s philosophical works ultimately would have illuminated his ideas on the moral and educational qualities of beauty and art. As Wilcox emphasises, the French transmission of Kant into an aesthetic theory was based on a ‘fantastically careless and incompetent misreading’ (1953: 361). This could be to a great extent attributed to the fact that, although by the 1830s l’art pour l’art had been fully adopted by the Parisian avant-garde, and by 1845 had entered into popular consciousness through their locution by artists, critics and journalists, Kant’s original text had not become accessible in the form of proper French translations until 1835. It was in this year that the first publications of Critique of Pure Reason, and in 1846 the Critique of Judgement were issued (Bell-Villada 1996: 36). Writers and popularisers of art for art’s sake ideas had depended on verbal transmission of what they had personally witnessed in conversions with the Germans, relying largely on their own foreign language skills and encounters with their philosophies.

Documented disseminators of German enlightenment ideas, including those by Schiller, Herder, Fichte and Schelling, are Benjamin Constant, the exile Madame de Staël, and the English student of German philosophy and foreign editor of The London Times, Henry Crabb Robinson, who frequented Weimar in order to seek out dialogue with leading intellectuals. The latter has been attributed a significant role in spreading German enlightenment philosophy in England. He initiated public discussions on poetry, and was a close acquaintance of romantic poets such as Wordsworth and Coleridge (Sadler 1870: 171). Robinson has been attributed with possibly the first English literal transmission of the art for art’s sake locution in Reminiscences, where he recounts a conversation with the German Winckelmann: ‘A pure poet has no other end than to produce a work of art, a pure philosopher, no other end than to raise a system of elaborate truth’ (in Egan 1921: 15).
Although Benjamin Constant and Madame de Staël are attributed with having presented German thought to a French public, both have been ascribed with only superficial knowledge of aesthetics and philosophy. In Madame de Staël’s ten year effort to compose *De l’Allemagne*, she praised German philosophers and notes on the aesthetic theories of Kant: ‘In separating the beautiful and the useful, Kant proves clearly that it is not at all the nature of the fine arts to give lessons’ (in Wilcox 1960: 364).

A more significant role has been generally assigned to her contemporary Victor Cousin, a young philosophy lecturer, whose teachings on German metaphysics and aesthetic theory between 1815-1820 were gathered by former students. The 1818 lecture notes displayed a number of art critical tenets that support ideas of *l’art pour l’art*. He suggested that the arts lacked of purpose other than to ‘to excite the pure feeling of beauty’. He noted how: ‘The arts are called the fine arts, because their sole object is to produce the disinterested emotion of beauty, without regard to the utility either of the spectator or the artist. Art is not a means; it is itself its end’ (Cousin 1854: 170). In a typically aesthetic notion, he also points out the special role of music as the quintessential artistic genre: ‘All true arts are expressive, but they are diversely so. Take music; it is without contradiction the most penetrating, the profoundest, the most intimate art.’ (Cousin 1854: 172). Whilst he conceded how art, morality and religious practices ultimately yielded the same effect, that of elevating the soul, he distinguished their function:

> But it is not less true that art, the state, religion, are powers which have each their world apart and their own effects; they mutually help each other; they should not serve each other. As soon as one of them wanders from its end, it errs, and is degraded (Cousin 1854: 183).

These comments in many ways represented a powerful assertion of art separatist ideas, and shows the historically rooted criticism of the alignment of culture with other areas of society.
3.5 The Emergence of *l’art pour l’art*: Theophile Gautier

Cousin’s ideas appeared radically liberal in their own time and his eventual silencing reflected upon the political climate of censorship under Bourbon reign. His opposition and subsequent dismissal, however, brought him the support and popular notoriety amongst French art students, which fuelled the circulation of aesthetic ideas in the underground.

The success of the movement has often been attributed to the subtle and non-inflammatory manner, in which its actors proceeded. The new aesthetic movement bore life initially in scattered remarks and prefaces. A significant contribution to the dissemination of the aesthetic doctrine was made by a number of journals, who offered a platform for art reviews and *feuilleton*. Notably, in 1825, the overtly apolitical journal *Le Globe* published a number of articles, which in an inconspicuous and non-inciting manner gave an account of the new aesthetic movement. Dubois, a victim of royalists himself, alongside a group of former academics had set up *Le Globe* as an instrument of criticism of literary and intellectual life. Through this, they hoped to effect political change in an indirect way. Its devices were the separation of intellectual critique from political and commercial forces, and the development of an international forum for the intellectual *élite*, under the heading of ‘cultural and scientific liberty’ (Gersmann 1993: 153). The selective group should later be called *École de l’art pour l’art* (le National 1834 in Wilcox 370). Other newspapers, such as the *Revue de Paris*, *Le National* and *Revue des Deux Mondes* contributed greatly to the proliferation of the up and coming artistic movement, which was also dubbed *l’art pour l’art*, the ‘new school’, ‘école païenne’ or ‘pure art’.

The final emergence of *l’art pour l’art* coincided with the more general liberalisation of artistic canon from traditional classicist doctrine. A few months before the fall of the Restoration, the battle of *Hernani* marked the famous departure of romanticism. Victor Hugo’s *début* of the Spanish versed drama and his prefaces to *Les Orientales* (1829) and *Cromwell* (1827) signalled the arrival of romanticist theatre and the breakthrough of liberal aesthetic tenets. *Hernani* amounted to iconoclasm as it affronted the very precepts of traditional theatre on its home ground, the *Théâtre-Français*. Romanticism represented the refusal of moral, social and formal constraints of neo-classicist canon. Hugo declared that: ‘Romanticism is nothing
more than liberalism in literature'. Neoclassicism had itself represented the refusal of Renaissance's emphasis on imagination, inventiveness and experimentation. It had opposed its mysticism by calling upon rationality, restraint and order in art. Key precepts represented symmetry, proportion and harmony of design and subject matter, for instance represented by the 'three unities' of 'action, place and time' in drama.

Hugo opposed the emotional effusiveness and propriety demanded by classicist theory. As many proponents of romanticism he rejected it as emotionally vacant, conventional and lacking originality. He demanded the liberalisation of the emotional and experiential basis of art in an attempt to restore its vitality, spontaneity and individuality (Stolnitz 1960: Ch. 7). Hugo stressed the artist's right to follow their whims and moods, declaring the lack of boundaries to artistic endeavour. Art should be free from political or social censorship. He demanded the equality of all subject matter and expressive form by proclaiming: 'There are no good or bad subjects, only good and bad poets...Everything is subject of the arts, everything has a right to be used by poetry' (Hugo 1829 in Luckscheiter 2003: 87). In Cromwell Hugo presented his romantic manifesto, where he defended 'artistic freedom against the tyranny of systems and rules'. Hugo protested against the moralising tendencies of drama, bourgeoisie ethical precepts as well as the artistic control of state theatre (Iandoli 1993: 731). In this way, romanticism with its emphasis on liberalisation of form and subject matter paved the theoretical foundation of l'art pour l'art in France.

Hugo's revolutionary exclamations found the most ardent admirer in Gautier, who should subsequently furnish core sentiments of l'art pour l'art for a wider audience. To Gautier, l'art pour l'art represented a critique not only of censorship, but also of the onslaught of commercial culture, economic utilitarianism, the deterioration of taste and the ugliness of urban life. He deplored the rationalism of public taste that demanded 'meaning and morale', instead of the 'personal charm of pure form'. Artistic standards and lifestyle, to him, opposed bourgeois uniformity and democratic levelling. He complained: 'The French...are indifferent to poetry, pre-eminently anti-

---

14 As the discussion in Chapter Four will show, romanticism's influence on the liberalisation of modern art theory has been pervasive, but lacked conceptual homogeneity. It not only inspired l'art pour l'art, but was also formative for reformatory and enlightenment ideas.
lyrical, unappreciative of metaphors, but gifted with admirable practical sense. The finest book may pass unnoticed.’ (Gautier in Richardson 1958: 61).

Like many of his contemporaries, Gautier was forced to take up a position at a newspaper, Girardin’s *La Presse*, but soon developed a strong dislike for the commercialism of journalistic language and craft. He described the press as the voice of common capitalism, whose sole concern lay in political positioning and mass entertainment. In contrast, in his own work he showed a passionate dedication to beauty, style, individual expression and décor. Having had to adapt to political and censorship in his journalistic profession, he pursued artistic freedom in his theatrical works. His main critique addressed theatre and its control through the *Comédie Française* and its various *comité*. To Gautier, art should represent refuge from utility and political, religious and moral precepts. He insisted on the lack of purposefulness of the arts when suggesting: ‘Nothing is really beautiful unless it is useless; Everything which is useful is ugly, for it expresses some need and the needs of man are ignoble and disgusting, like his poor feeble nature’ (Gautier in Spencer 1969: 12).

Gautier set out his main aesthetic tenets in his prefaces to *Mademoiselle de Maupin* and *Albertus*. In *Albertus* Gautier suggested that poetry was devoid of political intentions, its sole source being pleasure and relief from social upheaval. He insisted that the sole purpose of poetry was to be beautiful, and that in this way it was naturally opposed to functionality and technical progress. One of the most thorough renditions of his ‘new school’ manifesto was given in an article *Du Beau dans l’art* published in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, in 1845. Here Gautier stated:

> The program of the new school...is to seek beauty for itself with complete impartiality, perfect disinterestedness, without asking for any results through any reference or through any tendencies foreign to the subject treated... *L’art pour l’art* would say, not form for form, but really form for beauty, withdrawing all foreign ideas, all turning aside to advance any doctrine, all direct utility (Gautier in Wilcox: 376).

The new school fended against a significant critical and political opposition in defence of traditional religious and classical precepts in the arts. Considerable attack was gathered by the camp of conservative Catholics and their retrograde vision, progressive republicans, as well as the socialist movement of Saint-Simon.
critics and reviewers such as Nisard (see in Wilcox 1953: 372) and the editors of *Le National* (1934) formed part of the opposition on accounts of solipsism, nihilism and irreligious abstraction. The conservative Carrel declared the aesthetic movement to be ‘a school that cultivates art as an end and not a means’, declaring it a ‘ridiculous literary craze’. To him, a purely artistic movement could not exist as it ignored religious engagement (Carrel in Bell-Villada 1996: 51). Similar sentiments were voiced by the critic Saint-Cheron, who lamented the lack of ethical and religious belief, authority or purpose in the movement. In particular the abandonment of Catholicism meant to him a decadent surrender to ‘material satisfaction’ and the senseless enshrinement of form as a new aesthetic ethos. A significant opposition was also mounted by the socially engaged Saint-Simon movement which found in Fortoul its critical voice. He referred to *l’art pour l’art* as ‘the new mania of the century’. To the Saint-Simonistes, art, in a similar manner as science, should be part of a social and civilising progress, dedicated to the service of mankind. In this way, an isolated and introverted art movement that emphasised subjective sensuality without purpose and moral aims represented by nature tendencies towards decadence and inferiority. In this way, a public discussion emerged, which thrived on the opposition between social usefulness and pure art\(^15\).

3.6 The Proliferation of *l’art pour l’art* by the French Avant-Garde and Parnassians

As many commentators have suggested, the *l’art pour l’art* movement is best identified as a cluster of ideas, rather than a finite set of propositions (Beardsley 1966; Spencer 1969: 11). Rose Egan, for instance, pointed out the difficulty of fixing the movement ‘either in concept, or as a clearly linked orderly chain of development’ (1921: 7). Whereas in this way it remains difficult to pinpoint the movement, a few common denominators may be defined. What unites the set of ideas are an emphasis upon the creative imagination and sensuous intuition, the importance of
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\(^15\) This opposition is drawn out in article in *Revue des deux mondes*: ‘We are called upon to choose between the champions of pure art and the apostles of social reform… The poets cry until they are hoarse: ‘Poetry by itself is complete and independent, having not other mission than its own caprice, no other law than its own good pleasure: its sole legitimate purpose is to make its imaginings come of life’. The moralists repeat every day: ‘…to create just to create: That is monstrous egoism…’ (Planche in Wilcox 1953: 375).
style and artistic technique, and the rejection of political, social and economic utility, censorship, moral and religious servitude (Singer 1954; Richardson 1944). To many artists the main driving force of l’art pour l’art was a distancing and dislike of bourgeoisie taste and commercial lifestyle (Singer 1954; Richardson 1944). The sole concern for style and the disregard for artistic conventions were part of the continuous struggle for a heterogeneous art and literary market.

The diversity of the movement was represented by the many artists and critics who declared their commitment to the movement. One of the key figures of l’art pour l’art, difficult to leave unmentioned, was Baudelaire, a keen observer of progressive urbanisation and technological developments. Like many artists he was fascinated by the urban atmosphere and a heightened sensibility for the decadent, coolness and loneliness that city life bore. This experience was epitomised by the flaneur, an urbanite who captured the aesthetics of emergent modern city life. To Baudelaire, the individual experience of the busy fluctuation and momentary impressionism captured by the strolling passenger represented an aesthetic antidote against the dull and mechanical uniformity of middle-class taste. Baudelaire, following the 1848 revolution, changed his stance towards l’art pour l’art, which at first he had rejected as part of his conviction in active humanitarianism and moral reform. Initially he had criticised the formalist approach as ‘sterile’ and ‘contrary to the spirit of humanity’ (Baudelaire in Bell-Villada 1996: 163). However, he soon, too, found his artistic activities at odds with public taste and official censorship. In his main opus Les Fleurs du Mal he had sought to transform inappropriate and obscene subject matter through poetic mastership and harmonious form. As a response to the resultant censorship and prosecution charges he came to insist on the independence of subject matter and the emotive value of art. He argued that poetic mastery ennobled content matter and could transmute even unpleasant subjects into poetic works (Mossop: 79). He suggested how artistic appreciation sourced from pure poetic enthusiasm, the power of imagination and harmony, which would ultimately yield the supreme goal of an elevated and serene ‘aesthetic state’ (Beardsley 1966: 92). In this way he, too, came to oppose social conscience in the arts and suggested: ‘Utility is the most hostile in the world to the idea of beauty’ (1933 in Beardsley 1966: 286).

As the discussion has shown so far, l’art pour l’art sentiments did not arise in isolation from sociohistorical context. To the contrary, l’art pour l’art in many respects
represented a means for artists to sustain and establish economic, social and cultural standing in a rapidly transforming society. In this way anti-bourgeoisie sentiment at times stemmed from a retrograde political stance. To artists such as Flaubert and the Goncourt brothers for instance, aesthetic independence represented a moral foothold against the erosion of their own formerly elevated social status, that they saw deteriorating with the economic rise of the middle-class. In their *Journal* the aristocratic Goncourt’s revealed their increasingly desperate economic situation, for which they blamed the rising bourgeoisie and the revolutionary democratic reform. This illustrates how, at times, the opposition to bourgeoisie culture and censorship reflected a fear of social decline.

*L’art pour l’art’s* influence on artistic developments at the time was pervasive. Their ideals, for instance, found new, if paradoxical expression in ‘realism’. Artistic movements, such as realism and naturalism, were inspired by the emergent positivist spirit of the Second Empire under Napoleon III. The adoption of a realistic depiction of everyday life served one of the main proponents Flaubert to establish a new artistic style. As a consequence, like many of his contemporaries, he battled censorship. He, too, appealed to artistic autonomy in order to defend his work: ‘There are no noble or ignoble subjects; from the standpoint of pure art one might establish the axiom that there is no such thing as subject, style in itself being an absolute manner of seeing things’ (1852 in Bell-Villada 1996: 168). Flaubert famously proclaimed the intention to write a book ‘about nothing, a book without any external connection, which would support itself by internal force of style’ (Flaubert 1852 in Thorlby 1957: 11).

A significant stronghold of *l’art pour l’art* represented a group of poets and writers dedicated to an anthology called: *Le Parnasse contemporain, recueil de vers nouveaux* (1866). Important contributors were poets such as de Banville, de Lisle, de Heredia, Mendès, Baudelaire, Verlaine and Mallermé. The Parnassians have been thereby regarded as a fusion of formerly oppositional fractions of the *fantaisistes* and the *progressistes* represented by the newspapers *L’Art* and *Le Boulevard*. The *progressistes* declared their political independence by opposition to the politics of the Second Empire, and the socialist literary movements of the *école niaise* or the *moralistes immoraux* represented by Sainte-Beuve, Zola or Glatigny (Hoffmann 2001:...
49). Despite their vast heterogeneity the group was founded on their reverence of beauty, variety of style and distance or *impassibilité* to the concerns of everyday life.

3.7 The British Art for Art’s Sake Movement: Walter Pater and Oscar Wilde

The French avant-garde movements of symbolism and Parnassians are known to have exerted significant influence on British aesthetes. In a similar manner to the French, British aesthetes were united in an opposition against middle-class materialism, the stifling moralism of Victorian prudery, religious and political censorship and economic utility in the arts. They represented something of a ‘decadent’ antithesis to the civilising and ‘moralised’ romanticism of Victorian philanthropy, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

One of the first British aesthetes to respond to the French *l’art pour l’art* was Swinburne, who suggested: ‘[It is not] any artist’s business to warn against evil…The poet’s business is to write good verses, and by no means to redeem the age, and remould society’ (Swinburne in Richardson 1944: 245). In *William Blake* he uttered: ‘Art for art’s sake first of all, and afterwards we may suppose all the rest shall be added to her…but from the man who falls to work with a moral purpose shall be taken away even that which he has.’ (Swinburne 1868 in Richardson 1944: 245).

In England, art for art's sake represented a cultural and intellectual response to scientific, religious and economic developments. As has been discussed earlier, towards the end of the 19th century strongholds of traditional morale and religion had begun to be invaded by liberal developments in the sciences, technology and religious discourse. Unprecedented economic and technical growth, democratic reform and the political empowerment of the middle and working-classes meant the emergence of an increasingly commercial and diverse cultural market. In a similar way as the French, English aesthetes entered a cultural economy that catered to a newly literate and rapidly expanding middle and working-class audience. These developments posed a challenge to the aesthetic movement.
Unlike their predecessors, Arnold and Ruskin, who regarded democratic and religious reform as a source of moral decline and a threat to cultural standards, British aesthetes like Walter Pater and Oscar Wilde thrived on the less restricted and liberal mindset. Pater regarded the liberal climate in England as a departure from previous restrictions on cultural activities: ‘Modern thought is distinguished from ancient by its cultivation of the ‘relative’ spirit in place of the ‘absolute’ (Pater 1889 in Iser 1987:15). To him, the modern spirit had given up on claims of university and transcendental truth. He wrote: ‘To regard all things and principles of things as inconstant modes of fashions has more and more become the tendency of modern thought’. (Pater 1986: 150) He suggested that in this culturally ‘relative’ era the only reliable source of knowledge lay in momentary experience and subjective impressions. Pater called upon the art critic not to look for universal ethics, but at the emotive subjectivity of objects. Rather than looking for traditional criteria, the real question should be: ‘What is this song…to me? What effect does it really produce on me?’ (Pater in Bloom 1974: 17).

The Victorian liberal movement sought to counter the uniformity and rationalism of the industrial age with a sense of individualism, variety and sensuous liberty. Sensuous beauty and idiosyncrasy represented a potent antidote against the deadening abstraction and rationalisation of culture. Pater argued:

Beauty, like all other qualities presented to human experience, is relative…To define beauty, not in the most abstract but in the most concrete terms possible, to find, not its universal formula, but the formula which expresses...[a] special manifestation of it, is the aim of the true student of aesthetics (Pater 1986: xxix).

To Pater, art experience was the ultimate source of life enhancement since it could transcend the habitual boredom and temporal limitations of life. He emphasised how art experience lay in momentary gratification, and not social or economic ends: ‘Not he fruit of experience, but experience itself, is the end…To burn always with this hard, gem-like flame, to maintain this ecstasy, is success in life’.

---

16 In *Appreciations* he noted further: ‘Ancient philosophy sought to arrest every object in an eternal outline, to defy thought in a necessary formula, and the varieties of life in a classification by ‘kinds’, or genera. To the modern spirit nothing is, or can be rightly known, except relatively and under conditions.’ (Pater 1889 in Iser 15).

17 In his famous conclusion of *Renaissance* he has often been cited as describing human artistic experience as: ‘With this sense of splendour of our experience and of its awful brevity, gathering all we
Adhering to his conviction in relativism, he dismissed the orthodoxy of religious morality and ritual, and ultimately replaced it with his own aesthetisised ethics: ‘Art is what is significant in life, and so sensibility of insight, corruptible as it is, is the organ of moral knowledge, and art, for all its refusal to worship the idol of vulgar morality, is the only true morality; indeed, it is nothing less than life itself’. In this way, to Pater, art represented a higher moral authority and the final meaning of life. He suggested:

To treat life in the spirit of art, is to make life a thing in which means and ends are identified…Their work is, not to teach lessons, or enforce rules, or even to stimulate us to noble ends; but to withdraw the thoughts for a little while from the mere machinery of life, to fix them…on the spectacle of those great facts in man’s existence which no machinery affects (Pater in Fraser 1986: 201).

Pater suggested how good art represented harmony of form and content. Consequently, music was deemed the most appropriate art form:

Art, then, is thus always striving to be independent of the mere intelligence, to become a matter of our perception, to get rid of its responsibilities to its subject or material…In its consummate moments, the end is not distinct from the means, the form from the matter…Painting must be before all things decorative, a thing for the eye (Pater 1986: 89).

Oscar Wilde, an Oxford contemporary of Walter Pater was greatly affected by his writings. In contrast to the subdued and reclusive existence of Pater as an Oxford scholar, Wilde developed a literary celebrity in London having become fully enmeshed with the modern print market and journalism. Displaying a reckless and hedonist lifestyle, Wilde found himself in natural opposition to Victorian religious and moral sensibilities, which taught temperance, asceticism and moral purity. In his first lecture *The English Renaissance of Art* Wilde began to formulate art for art's sake ideas. He demanded artistic independence, which should be based on the ‘recognition of a separate realm for the artist, a consciousness of the absolute difference between the world of art and the world of real fact’ (Wilde in Dowling 1996: 89). As with Pater, art represented a form of cultural liberalisation from ethical restrictions: ‘Aesthetics are higher than ethics; truth is entirely and absolutely a
matter of style; morals belong to the lower and less intellectual spheres; wickedness is a myth invented by good people to account for the curious attractiveness of others’ (Wilde in Fraser 1986: 186).

Like many of his contemporaries Wilde shared a common concern with censorship that temporarily severed after the assassination of Tsar Alexander II inducing a widespread fear amongst European Royals. As a consequence, stage censorship had been introduced in 1737, as a safeguard against critical political satire and critique of government corruption. By 1843, censorship had tightened as every new play required official approval in terms of good manners, decorum, and the preservation of public peace. It is no surprise, that the outright reckless and hedonist Wilde suffered prohibition from the beginning of his theatrical career. In *Critic as Artist* Wilde highlighted his opposition to censorship by demanding aesthetic primacy over ethical concerns (Bell-Villada 1996: 91). He suggested:

> Aesthetics are higher than ethics. They belong to a more spiritual sphere. To discern the beauty of a thing is the finest point to which we can arrive. Even a colour-sense is more important, in the development of the individual, than a sense of right and wrong... Art never expresses anything but itself... Art has an independent life, just as thought has, and develops precisely on its own lines (Wilde 1973: 86).

Not least, because of Wilde’s witty and provocative sentiments, his assertions have remained axiomatic for European art autonomous doctrines. Given the array of art for art’s sake proponents, amongst whom the most significant and enduring were Pater, Wilde, Swinburne, Whistler, Saintsbury, T.S. Eliot, Edgar E. Poe and Synoms, this account has been highly selective.
3.8 The Bloomsbury Group and the Arts Council Movement

Having highlighted the historical emergence of *l'art pour l'art* through the competing strands of literary movements in the political and cultural context of 19th century Europe, the concluding enquiry will assess the legacy and influence of the intellectual tradition for the emergence of the Arts Council movement and post-war II art funding in the UK. A significant role in the foundation of the Arts Council movement is attributed to the former director of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts (CEMA), the economist and former treasury adviser, Maynard Keynes, and his relation to the Bloomsbury group. Many commentators have explored this relationship as a formative source of his philosophical as well as cultural ethics (Keynes 1975; Louis 2003; Mini 1992; Moggridge 1992 and 2005, Skidelsky, 1992 and 2000; Upchurch 2006). Keynes' support of cultural institutions such as CEMA, the Arts Council of Great Britain, the Cambridge Arts Theatre, London Artist Association and Contemporary Art Society, to name only a few, reflect on his profound belief in the intrinsic qualities of the arts and culture.

Keynes became acquainted with members of the Bloomsbury group when initiated to the ‘Apostles’, an exclusive discussion group at the University of Cambridge. Here he began to develop and discuss his ideas on culture and the economy. Keynes' involvement in the arts and culture has been described to stem from the realisation that the ‘economic problem’, the accumulation of material living conditions, would in the foreseeable future cease to be an intractable social problem. As a result, society ultimately faced the question as to the ‘real meaning' of life, that is:

How to use his freedom from pressing economic cares, how to occupy the leisure, which science and compound interest will have won for him, to live wisely and agreeably and well...We shall once more value ends above means and prefer the good to the useful (Keynes in Backhouse 2006a: 218).

Keynes envisioned an economy that ceased to be governed by ‘national self-sufficiency’ and which used its prosperity for cultural and artistic endowments (Moggridge 2005: 543). This, however, required a change of redistributive government policy.

18 In the article ‘Art and the State’ Keynes referred to ‘national self-sufficiency’ as the: ‘Utilitarian and economic- one might almost say financial- ideal, as the sole, respectable purpose of the community as a whole’.
Keynes shared many of the Bloomsbury members’ views on the independent status of the arts. The formalist Roger Fry, for instance, like Keynes had distinguished between the cultural and the practical spheres of life. Fry described the former as the ‘imaginative life’, which was principally driven by a ‘disinterestedness’ from the objects and concerns of the ‘intuitive’ or ‘actual’ life. Whereas the former represented humanity’s ultimate goal, that is the refinement of sensibilities and education, the latter represented mere necessary requirement for the former. Once social and economic prosperity were accomplished, artistic and spiritual activities attained main significance. To Fry, they presented: ‘The most complete detachment from any of the meanings and implications of appearances…’ (Fry 1956: 51). Cultural activities should not be spoilt by extant concerns. Fry was particularly opposed to the instrumentalisation of artistic education and production as a means to support industrial design and manufacturing as these merely aimed at ‘display’, ‘solely bought as a symbol of a particular social status’ (Fry 1956: 69).

His contemporary, Clive Bell suggested in a similar way a separation of art from worldly concerns. He argued: ‘The essential quality in a work of art is purely artistic. It has nothing to do with the moral, religious or political view of its creator. It has to do solely with his aesthetic experience and his power of expressing’ (Bell in Upchurch 2004: 210). In "Art" Bell suggested further:

The representative element in a work of art may or may not be harmful; always it is irrelevant. For, to appreciate a work of art we need to bring nothing from life, no knowledge of ideas or affairs…Art transports us from the world of man’s activity to a world of aesthetic exaltation. For a moment we are shut off from human interests. (Bell 1958: 27)

To Bell, the meaning and ’ends’ of aesthetic form were to ‘catch a sense of ultimate reality’ (ibid.: 46). Bell, however, contended that only a few selected, either through unspoilt insight or trained aesthetic sensibilities, could mediate and attain this insight.

---

19 Fry illuminates this relation suggesting that: ‘Nature demands with no uncertain voice that the physical needs of the body shall be satisfied first; but we feel that our real human life only begins at the point where that is accomplished.’ He further notes: ‘But the curiosity vision does contemplate the object disinterestedly; the object ex hypothesi has no significance for actual life; it is a play or fancy object, and our vision dwells much more consciously and deliberately upon it’ (Fry 1956: 49 and 55).
As the field research analysis will discuss in more detail later, art for art's sake ideas continue to retain relevance for contemporary cultural practice. Tim, a well-known London curator, for instance, argued:

There is no function to a painting, there is no function to a sculpture necessarily in that it doesn't exist for another reason. It exists for itself. You might employ all sorts of value to it, positively or negatively, but actually it just is.

Another administrator from Birmingham stressed the role of art in 'making sense of life'. Art, to her, represents past time activities that transgressed 'objective value' and the necessities of making a livelihood: 'It's a kind of joy that doesn't involve something you can get out of. It's nothing that is part of your daily work, it's something that takes you away from that, and helps you to make sense of life whether it is in a fleeting moment or a sustained event'.

However, whilst art for art's sake ideas represented key motivation for cultural managers, there also was a recognition of a context specific and interpretative approach to the arts. Many cultural managers stressed how the arts needed to take into account the social, cultural and political background of the audiences, as meaning was determined by interpretation through the audience. At times, these aspects yielded in complex and competing negotiations of art for art's sake ideas. Anton, for instance, championed both approaches:

I think what that means is that art needs to be respected as it is. We cannot compromise an artistic vision... [but] it depends when or where art is seen. In my opinion it doesn’t function on its own, it depends on a response, and viewers who will bring their own ideas and context to the object... Visitors will always bring a whole load of cultural and social values to their experience.

As the discussion in Chapter Five will show, cultural managers were required to negotiate a number of cultural and social aspects of cultural production, rather than focusing on mere artistic criteria.

Based on formalist ideas, Bell and Fry envisioned a system of patronage that allowed artists to act undisturbed by financial and social constraints. In *Art and Socialism*, Fry pre-empted a patronage system at arm's length that endowed artists with freedom
from interference from political and commercial interests. He suggested how, to artists, financial endowments represented a mere means to an end:

> The artist...knows that he cannot really sell himself for money any more than the philosopher...He takes money in the hope that he may secure the opportunity for the free functioning of his creative power...He must work for himself, because it is only by so doing that he can perform the function for which he exists, it is only for working for himself that he can work for mankind (Fry 1956: 61).

The main task of art patronage, Fry found, was to secure artistic autonomy. He therefore for instance argued that it had to represent an alternative to the systems found in aristocracy, plutocracy or the socialist system. According to him either 'suppress original creative power' by subjecting artists to commercial interest, bad taste or the universal inculcation of 'official art'.

It is clear that Keynes shared much of Fry and Bell's notions of artistic freedom and reflected this in his own cultural policies. He forged significant steps towards an independent system of art sponsorship by offering artists and art organisations guarantees against loss, instead of full liability (Glasgow in Keynes 1975: 261). As to the role of the state in the arts, he echoed Fry's earlier writings:

> He [the artist] needs economic security and enough income, and then left to himself, at the same time the servant of the public and his own master...We can help him best, perhaps, by promoting an atmosphere of open-handedness, of liberality...of experiment, of optimism.' (Keynes in Moggridge 2005: 544).

However, Keynes' public art policy aimed not only at artistic participation and entertainment, but also the pursuit of educational and civilising function, that is: 'bringing to everybody in the country the possibility of learning these new games which only the few used to play, and by forming new tastes and habits and thus enlarging the desires of the listener and his capacity for enjoyment...Their ears become trained.' (Johnson 1971: 549). Although Keynes' founding ideas for public cultural policies were a reflection of his liberal humanist convictions, the conceptual

---

20 In 1945, when CEMA was to be dissolved into the Arts Council of Great Britain, in *The Arts Council: Its Policy and Hopes*, Keynes suggested: 'The work of an artist in all aspects, is of its nature, individual and free, undisciplined, unregimented, uncontrolled. The artist walks where the breath of the spirit blows him. He cannot be told his direction, he does not know it himself. But he leads the rest of us into fresh pastures and teaches us to love and to enjoy what we often begin by rejecting, enlarging our sensibility and purifying our instincts' (Keynes in Johnson 1971: 368).
development of Arts Council policies was not without conflict. As the discussion will show in more detail, UK post-war cultural policy should, in the decades following the foundation of the ACGB, take on an elitist focus that served the high arts exclusively. In part Keynes had initiated some of these developments himself. Upon arrival Keynes, for instance, promptly changed CEMA’s initial emphasis on participation and access. Its focus on ‘social service’, the boosting of post-war morale, access and the encouragement of popular participation, were changed in favour of assistance to artists and the maintenance of standards. Henceforth, Arts Council activities were channelled into the support of professional bodies, exclusivity to fine art forms and the financial focus on London. Keynes’ bias for spending on theatre and ballet, initiating a national scheme for the Royal Opera and Covent Garden, are well documented (Moggridge 2005).

Before turning to developments following the foundation of the Arts Council of Great Britain, it is necessary to explore the complex and competing reasons for state involvement in the arts and culture. The following discussion will argue how a changing approach to public art funding emerged as a result of shifting cultural production and consumption pattern in war time Britain. Whereas public arts instruction, taste cultivation and museums policies had since the mid-19th century served primarily the development of industrial manufacturing capacities and economic expansion, it was the solace and entertainment the arts could procure, which resulted in the greater recognition of the art’s intrinsic value.

3.9 Art for Art’s Sake and Cultural Policy

Whereas towards the end of the 19th century economic and social reasoning had provided the main basis for public cultural policies, it was the establishment of war time organisations CEMA and ENSA (Entertainments National Service Association) and their extensive and diverse artistic programming that changed their instrumental focus. Catering for both ‘light’ entertainment and ambitious art programming across the country, the success of cultural display during World War II enhanced the appreciation of the arts and culture’s non-commercial purpose. In many respects, in the immediate context of post-war deprivation cultural programming resulted in the
novel recognition of the art's intrinsic and social values. Art and culture had the primary goal of entertainment, solace and recreation that made eligible non-instrumental and emotional reasons for public arts provision. In addition, an extended arts audience made a growing public demand for the arts evident, justifying arts expenditure in terms of voter appeal. Culture in this way also became a source of national pride and strength in an otherwise deprived country. These, in addition to its emergent success, resulted in the recognition that culture was part of national life and therefore a permanent government responsibility.

The positive response to war time cultural programming ultimately triggered government commitment, if, however, in a decidedly indirect manner. Post-war legislation, such as the Local Government Act of 1948 and Education Act of 1944, provided local government authorities with a legal basis to provide for cultural activities. In addition, a number of other initiatives contributed to the proliferation in areas such as cinematography, theatre and opera. The indirect involvement of governments by lack of a central ministry for culture, however, reflected on the scepticism against full official involvement in arts policies and the development of explicit aesthetic guidelines. As Minihan suggests public arts subsidy in Britain never got rid of its scepticism against art as 'serious government business', and something to be justified on purely intrinsic grounds. In many ways, objections to direct state involvement, was a reflection on the historically imbued liberal economic spirit that had underpinned the economically driven uses of culture since Victorian times. The art's role in furthering manufacturing and design had been determined by market competition and therefore left alone by governments. The hands-off approach to the arts that characterised post-war cultural policies, in this way was founded on complex historical developments, which, as some commentators like Minihan argued, undermined government's full commitment to the arts. Although appreciation of art's intrinsic values had been enhance during war time provision, government stance remained ambiguous and never fully committed.

In many ways this lack of official engagement forestalled post-war developments. Post-war UK cultural policy remained complex and ridden with competing conceptual assumptions. As the former senior research officer with the Arts Council Robert Hutchison suggested:
The Arts Council has stood for, and insisted on, high quality work. It has been a very important stake to take. But the Council has also allowed its concern with quality to become confused and interwoven with preoccupation with prestige, a defence of oligarchy, an exaggerated exclusiveness (1982: 155).

This statement reflects on the inherent contradictions between different sets of principles inherent in the early history of Arts Council policies. As Hutchison suggests the emergence of Arts Council policies in the post-war decades were ridden by binary and often opposing standards. The Arts Council pursued from its onset a dual commitment to the development of 'greater knowledge, understanding and practice of the fine arts exclusively, and in particular to increase the accessibility of the fine arts to the public' (in Minihan 1990: 231). It was set up as an independent, chartered body as opposed to an official government ministry. This was based on the arm's length principle, and the government’s agreement not to interfere with art policies. Although this principle applied to many public cultural institutions, including the BBC, this, however, was not to suggest the absence of political and instrumental interference.

Although belief in artistic autonomy may have inspired part of the Arts Council movement, arts policies lacked impartiality from the beginning. Despite its theoretical distance, the Arts Council of Great Britain began to operate under heavily compromised distance from government control, hegemonic administrative and political structure. As Hutchison (1982) argues, board members and directors of the Arts Council were officially selected, whereas artistic panels and advisory boards were allocated a marginal role. The unrepresentative constitution of the Arts Council board biased much of its initial output. Its primary emphasis rested on middle-class audiences, cosmopolitan, elite institutions such as opera, theatre and professional organisations. This was at the expense of amateur, community art and grassroots arts. Significantly, the arts were defined in terms of 'fine arts exclusively', which ultimately resulted in the social and artistic exclusiveness of selected traditions and genres. The traditional objection to official and centralised cultural planning and systematic organisation had in many instances resulted in discretionary and often opaque deliberation processes and cronyism. In many respects, artistic autonomy in this way became associated with the vexed problem of elitism and social exclusion.
As the discussion will show in Chapter Five, the focus on liberal humanist cultural canon and exclusionary access policies has arguably remained a matter of contention until today. The field research showed, how cultural managers, mostly from community art centres and non-funded organisations, argued how the ACE pursuit exclusive and at times elitist policies, by focusing on professional, metropolitan and established arts institutions. Some managers bemoaned the exclusive recognition of high art forms, at the expense of local and anthropological cultural approaches.

As the discussion so far has shown, the role and function art for art's sake ideas have played in the development of UK cultural policy has remained ambiguous. Although art for art's sake claims have been part of the foundation of UK cultural policy, they have been mixed and superseded by instrumental rationales and political interference. At the heart of cultural policy developments in the UK has been a deep seated scepticism against state-controlled artistic developments on purely artistic grounds. As Minihan suggests: 'Many Englishmen have come to assume the total absence of state aid as the requisite safeguard of full artistic freedom of expression' (Minihan 1990: 244). As has been argued, however, this hands- off approach originally stemmed from the utilitarian and industrial uses of art, and a deep rooted reluctance to promote the arts on intrinsic grounds.

Based on this discussion, it could be argued that the significance of art for art's sake for the development of UK cultural policy lies in having provided a conceptual and philosophical basis, rather than a historically fully realised framework. Art for art's sake inspired the autonomy of artists against their increasing marginalisation. The success of war time cultural programming further enhanced the recognition of the intrinsic merits of the arts and culture as forms of entertainment, solace and enjoyment. As the discussion in Chapter One and the field research has shown, art for art's sake ideas have never lost their appeal for the public cultural policy debate, and continue to represent key principles of public cultural administration. However, UK cultural policy has been significantly defined by economic and political interests since Victorian times, which triggered a deep scepticism against government involvement in the arts for purely artistic reasons. This objection ultimately forestalled full government involvement in art policies and recognition of intrinsic values. The contemporary assertion of intrinsic cultural reasoning as the sole arbiter of cultural
policy rationales contrasts the complex and competing development of cultural policies, and the largely instrumental basis of governance. It is therefore a key contention of this chapter, that within the complex history of cultural policy rationales, intrinsic reasoning has represented a theoretical and aspirational, rather than a defining role.

3. 91 Conclusion

This chapter sought to provide a historical account of the conceptual and philosophical underpinnings of art for art's sake. This had the aim of providing a conceptual basis for the contemporary debate on intrinsic cultural values. Art for art's sake has been described as a response to social, economic and cultural changes, which transformed the cultural sphere in 19th century France and England. It was argued that the aesthetic movement shared an indictment with progressive technological and economic developments of the rising industrial age, bourgeoisie philistinism, moral and political censorship and the commercialisation of the art market. These developments forced artists to assert and preserve an autonomous social domain. In the last part of this chapter, the influence of the movement on the emergence of UK cultural policies has been discussed. The main contention has been that intrinsic cultural values formed a minor part in the historical development of cultural policy rationales. Art for art's sake ideas competed with instrumental rationales, such as economic expansion, social control and national prestige.

Tracing post-war developments of the newly established Arts Council of Great Britain, it has been argued how cultural autonomy from political and economic interests largely remained an idealist stance, unrealised in policy administration. The account sought to illustrate the historically evolved and complex nature of UK cultural policy, which has been informed by competing policy rationales. It has been suggested how government involvement remained largely indirect, which has been attributed to a traditional scepticism against an Art officiel and intrusion into market mechanism. The chapter argued how, in part due to the influence of intrinsic cultural values, post-war Arts Council policies developed an exclusionary stance, which in many ways has retained residual assumptions until today. Based on these
arguments, the account concluded that the contemporary assertion of intrinsic cultural values, discussed in Chapter One, lacks historical and conceptual foundation. Intrinsic cultural ideas have represented an idealist foundation for much of the cultural policy debate, which largely remained unrealised.
CHAPTER FOUR:

The Humanist Tradition
Chapter Four: The Humanist Tradition

4.1 Introduction

In the last chapter the movement of art for art's sake has been represented as a unique response to social, political and economic developments in 19th century Europe. It has been argued how notions of artistic autonomy have been influential in the establishment of the Arts Council of Great Britain, although merely representing a part within the wider instrumental framework for government involvement. The following account discusses the emergence of instrumental cultural policy rationales, which arguably have represented the main motivation for public cultural intervention. In the last chapter, the emergence of economic instrumental reasoning for cultural subsidy has been briefly outlined. However, moving away from purely economic utilitarianism, the account will focus on the deployment of culture in the management and control of the rising working-classes, towards the mid-19th century. This account will explore the social instrumental role of culture and the arts that have stressed moral, intellectual and social aspects.

The development of the social instrumental argument will be discussed in the context of social, economic and political developments of 19th century Britain, which experienced the upheaval of traditional social and moral order. As a result of rapid industrial developments and economic, scientific and political advances, the unprecedented political and social rise of the working-classes became a primary concern for Victorian administrators. The mid-Victorian era was characterised by the public conviction of the social and educative service of arts to society, which ultimately effected their appropriation for policies of social regulation and control. Significantly, however, to Victorian reformers, culture also represented a counterweight to the effects of industrialisation and commercialisation on the public sphere. The development of the enlightenment discourse of culture has been greatly influenced by reformers such as Ruskin and Arnold, who warned against the detrimental effects of the pervasive liberal economic spirit on social and cultural developments.
The theorisation of culture-led social instrumental arguments has, however, not been an invention of Victorian times. The social instrumental argument for the arts has been deeply imbued within Western cultural discourse, having been evoked for the first time in classical Greek philosophy and literature. The long-standing intellectual foundation of social instrumental rationales will be illustrated through an eclectic account of key moments within cultural history. Given the array of cultural arguments, this account focuses on historical sources that have been relevant for the development of Victorian and post-war conceptions of cultural instrumentalism. The main aim of this account is to contribute to the conceptual understanding of contemporary notions of instrumentalism by offering an intellectual historical perspective on its claims.

4.2 Classicism: The Foundation of Cultural Utility

The theoretical foundation for the social, moral and educative function of the arts in Western cultural history was established by classical Greek philosophers, such as Plato and Sokrates. Classicism exerted a significant influence on the Victorian discourse of culture. As Gilmour (1993) points out, Victorians pertained a particular fascination with time, historical trajectory, past thinkers and ideologies, which he attributes to a longing for coherence and meaning in an era of rapid change and the abolition of traditional moral and religious authorities. Besides the Middle Ages and the first English Civil War, Hellenism and Classicism represented popular sources for comforting notions of transhistorical meaning and genealogical trajectory. In this way, English Romantics as well as key Victorian reformers like Arnold and Ruskin were inspired by the invocation of Greek and Roman philosophy and myths.

A close link between culture, art and the state was established by Plato and Socrates. The Grecian lack of distinct aesthetic and art theoretical domain, that as the previous chapters has shown should not be ascertained until the late 18th century, underlay a characteristic fusion between culture and society. To Plato and Socrates, poetry and theatre were not separated from the sphere of political and moral philosophy, which was dedicated to the exploration of ethical and epistemological truth. The arts were part of an ethical and metaphysical discourse
that aimed to ascertain the ideal conditions for a just and virtuous society. Plato discussed the role of the arts in the context of his main concern, the development of an ideal state, and the production of calm, wise and self-controlled subjects. Arguably it is here, where the ‘instrumental’ role of culture and the arts became constituted and explicitly formulated for the first time. According to Plato, art pertained a ‘mimetic’ role, according to which it produced mere images of reality. Unlike philosophy, however, it was not concerned with the contemplation of higher metaphysical or moral truth (Belfiore 2006). In this way, the arts, in particular drama and poetry, amounted to little more than illusions and wanting imitations of life. Plato concluded that the unrestrained and free depiction of human emotions and passions through poetry and theatre could threaten emotional balance and right reason. He argued that through the reflection of unethical and degenerate subjects, for instance the hatred, jealousy and outrage of Medea, in particular the young could be misled, as they represented bad role models that ‘strengthen and stimulate an element which threatens to undermine reason’ (Plato in Beardsley 1966: 47). The participation in reciting and viewing of precarious plays was thought to inevitably result in the unreflected development of bad traits in oneself. For this reason, Plato urged a didactic approach to the arts, which aimed at moral censorship and control.

The imitative function of arts on the other hand also established their instrumental role. If based on right reason and ethical standards the arts could contribute and strengthen social order, moral wealth and character formation. If the overriding goals and values of an ethical society were taken as final evaluative standards for the arts, then their pursuit could be beneficial for moral and civil developments. In this way, Platonian ideas formed the basic foundation for the social instrumental role of the arts and culture within Western cultural epistemology. Belfiore and Bennett (2008), who traced historical intellectual influences for contemporary cultural policy practices, saw in Classicism the predecessors of present notions of cultural ‘instrumentality’.
4.3 German Humanist Tradition: Kant and the Weimar School

Although throughout premodern, Middle-Age history, the social and didactive function of culture continued to the formulated, it is not until Kant’s enlightenment legacy that aesthetic notions should be integrated into a comprehensive philosophical system. It was Kant’s philosophical canon that established the art’s independent disciplinary status. There is a consensus that Kant’s writings steered epistemological and ethical thinking into the modern age, as well as resolving some of the long mediated aesthetic problems regarding the intersubjective validity of aesthetic judgement (Beardsley 1966: 210). Kant’s transcendental idealism aimed to establish the basis for *a priori* judgements in ethical, epistemological and aesthetic questions. He distinguished between two kinds of judgements regarding beauty and the arts: On the one hand, he argued that aesthetic taste was merely an expression of the limited and subjective nature of satisfaction and pleasure. According to Kant, ‘taste’ amounted to little more than subjective judgment. He contrasted subjective aesthetic judgement with ‘disinterested’ judgement, however, which facilitated aesthetic assessments irrespective of ‘the existence of the thing either for myself or for anyone else’. This kind of ‘disinterested’ and ‘purposeless’ judgement laid the ‘transcendental’ basis for the evaluation of both moral and aesthetic beauty.

To Kant, moral and aesthetic sensitivity were still not separated. He argued: ‘This interest [in beauty of nature] is akin to the moral… [and he] can do so only in so far as he previously has firmly established his interest in the morally good’ (Kant 2005: 107). Since the arts and culture were interconnected with moral sensitivity, Kant attributed a practical and didactive function to the arts: ‘Beautiful art is a mode of representation which is purposive for itself, and which, although devoid of purpose, yet furthers the culture of the mental powers in reference to social communication’ (111). In the *Critique of Judgement* the social function of art is explained by humanity’s common tendency towards ‘sociability’. Kant suggested: ‘The Beautiful interests only in *society*’ (104). In his famous essay ‘Of Beauty as the Symbol of Morality’ Kant established the instrumental role of aesthetic perception for the development of moral conduct and social welfare:

Now I say the Beautiful is the symbol of the morally Good, and that it is only in this respect…that it gives pleasure with a claim for the agreement of everyone.
By this the mind is made conscious of a certain ennoblement and elevation above the mere sensibility to pleasure received through sense.

In this excerpt Kant highlights the moral, rather than aesthetic function of the arts. Kant’s philosophy exerted significant influence on the Weimar school and the German enlightenment movement represented by the likes of Schiller, Goethe and Herder. According to German enlightenment proponents ‘Bildung’ (trans. Education) represented the main purpose of culture. As we will see later, the German enlightenment movement greatly affected Victorian reformers. Matthew Arnold, for instance, was deeply indebted to Goethe, whom he called ‘the clearest, the largest, the most helpful thinker of modern times’ (in White 1921: 436). In Goethe’s work Arnold should find the preliminaries for his own cultural programme. Goethe had stressed the power of the arts to develop humanity, and induce moral restraint and harmonious perfection. Cultural activities amounted to a constant intellectual inquiry and the disinterested pursuit of the arts. To Goethe, the artist had an educational role, namely to spread ‘the best’ in culture and further human development. Similar sentiments should later be formulated by Arnold.

4.4 French and English Romanticism

As discussed in Chapter Three, the emergence of the romantic movement initiated the liberalisation of artistic canon from neo-classicist precepts. It inspired the development of *l’art pour l’art* with its emphasis on emotions, subjectivity and the imagination. The influence of romanticism has, however, never been based on a univocal sentiment. To the contrary, romantic movements have been diverse and difficult to generalise, although there is a consensus that they facilitated a general shift in modern cultural theory towards liberalisation. Its diverse tenets depended on the diversity of artists and national context.

The English strand of the romantic movement was indebted to the influence of German enlightenment poets such as Goethe, Kant, Schiller and Lessing. Poets such as Coleridge and Wordsworth travelled Germany to study and translate German
literary and philosophical sources. In this way instrumental and civilising notions formulated by English romantics in many ways reflected enlightenment sentiments. Like the German, English poets suggested how the arts fostered the power of moral and mental regeneration and enhancement. This task was of vital importance to individual development as well as social cohesion. Wordsworth for instance argued that poetry was a source of knowledge and ‘truth, not individual and local, but general’ (cited in Bennett 2006). Poetry should be of service to society as it. This was based on a pessimistic assessment of the consequences of progressive industrialisation and middle-class culture. It was a prevailing view at the time that the emerging modern living conditions were dehumanising and detrimental to the moral and intellectual state of the nation. In line with this, the poet Shelley argued that the only remedy against civil decline was the development and invigoration of sources of knowledge, empathy, moral authority and regeneration. To him, art and the development of the imagination represented the most potent sources of these qualities (Bennett 2006).

4.5 The Sociohistorical Context of Cultural Policy as ‘Social Control’

English romanticism laid the foundation for the Victorian discourse of social control, which evolved around the civilising and educational function of the arts and culture. The emergence of reformatory cultural ideas has to be theorised in the context of the specific cultural and socio-political conditions of mid-19th century England. Whereas Britain’s aesthetes established individualistic and independent aesthetic vision in the perceived relativised and pluralised cultural landscape of the *fin de siècle*, their spiritual predecessors only began to come to terms with the changing tides of modern industrial society, and the concomitant upheaval of traditional social, economic and religious order. The mid-19th century, representing the heights of English humanist scholar’s legislation, was a period concerned with the social, educational and moral consequences of modernism. What these scholars feared were the effects of unprecedented economic expansion, scientific liberalisation, religious decline and the political democratisation of a rapidly growing mass society.
At the turn of the century, England had witnessed the democratic spirit of the French Revolution, and anticipated its inevitable development in the home country. The English reform movement was the result of a number of liberal-democratic political and economic factors, which led to the transformation of the traditionally feudal order of a formerly predominantly rural and mercantile society, into an urban and industrial one. These developments contributed to the incremental transferral of political and cultural authority once held by the nobility and church, to the rule of the free market and a pluralised social sphere. The reform movement was set off by a number of legal legislations, such as the 1832 Parliamentary Reform Act. They effected the political empowerment of a wider part of society by extension of suffrage, for instance through the redistribution of seats from boroughs to counties and northern industrial cities. This resulted in the shift of legislative powers from the aristocracy to the middle- and working-classes. A good indication of these developments represented the doubling of the electorate by 1867. In 1885 the right to vote had become a basic political liberty for all three classes.

The unprecedented expansion of the political electorate was compounded by economic reforms, such as the Poor and Corn Laws. These developments were succeeded by an exponential growth in free trade, manufacturing and industrial production, from which England emerged as the leading producing nation of coal, steel and cotton. Little that is known from censuses at that time suggested a stupendous population increase from 15.8 to 27.4m within the first half of the century. Rising production capacities and commercial activities increased the size and number of industrial cities, such as London, Manchester and Glasgow. The exponential growth of working-class districts was severed though a spatial segregation, the emergence of the modern ‘ghetto’, caused by the emigration of the middle-classes to safer, separate suburbs.

The urban segregation of the social classes furthered middle-class conceptions of the working-classes as a disorderly, violent and morally degenerate mass. Fears were that the political organisation of working-class interests could result in social upheaval and mass gatherings, but also, under the influence of Malthus, that the sheer size of the growing population could outrun food supply. Moreover, the realisation that precarious living and working standards, potential famine and strikes of epidemics could have an adverse effect on industrial production capabilities
ultimately pushed governments into social political action. As a result, governments and local authorities initiated a number of reform acts such as the Public Health Act, the Education Act, reports on sanitation conditions and improvement projects, which aimed at the provision of education, improved housing and working conditions (Levin 1998: Ch. 1).

In this way, the question of ‘what to do about the working-classes?’ established the grounds for a middle-class discourse on social and cultural reform. Considered were decisive steps to ‘socialise’ the masses, teach obedience to law and order, and inculcate industrious spirit, morality and virtue (Thompson 1981; Johnson 1970, Cleere 2002). According to Thompson, the concept of ‘social control’ was based chiefly on modes of inner transformation and socialisation, rather than law enforcement, and aimed at ‘piety and virtue’, ‘honesty, veracity and sobriety’. It primarily aimed at the production of good behaviour, manners and submission to social order (Thompson 1981: 192). It was a common belief of middle-class philanthropists and reformers, as well as factory and school inspectors that social and economic conflicts were the result of a lack of inner strength, bad faith and education, moral failure and lack of individual responsibility. Often this was attributed to a loss of traditional social and moral structure.

The eventual adoption of culture and the arts as an alternative mode of moral and social education was also the result of the decentralisation of religious life and the effective individualisation and pluralisation of religious institutions. A decisive factor in the unravelling of traditional church structure and religious faith in general was the influence of scientific materialism, evolutionary biology and geology that increasingly subjected the sufficiency of scriptures to intellectual and scientific positivism. Chief tenets of atonement, everlasting punishment and original sin began to be doubted as cruel and anachronistic, and many intellectuals, amongst them Arnold and Ruskin, began to rethink the basis of religion. By the 1850s Census recorded the effective pluralisation of England’s church structure, with new nonconformists, Free Church and other Protestant sects claiming independence and individual spiritual authority. Developments like these paved the way for a new foundation for social cohesion and ethical precepts.
Meanwhile severing social conditions were subject of an extended intellectual, public debate. Chief purporters of the social missionary view, Carlyle and Coleridge, adopted a typically paternalistic perception that attributed the ‘English condition’ to the loss of moral authority and social order traditionally legislated by the caring aristocracy. Coleridge saw traditional moral and religious values threatened by extended suffrage and suggested the formation of an authoritative national clerisy. The election of an intellectual élite in charge of moral and social order in fact represented a popular idea amongst Victorians. It was fuelled by a common fear of violent political unrest, but also cultural denigration derived from the ‘tyranny of public opinion’ and what Carlyle called ‘swarmery by numbers’.

A specific concern was the regulation of public houses and ‘the vice of intoxication’, the control of which became the task of a Select Committee. In 1834, its chairman Buckingham suggested three bills aimed at the control of alcohol, which notably included the provision of public spaces and cultural institutions, such as libraries and museums. In this way state provision of the arts became intertwined with the government’s ‘ethical role’ in restricting undesirable life conduct, and the provision of socially and morally wholesome alternatives. The explicit alignment of cultural state provision with measures of social and moral control was suggested by the chair of the Select Committee on Arts and Manufacturers:

> The public libraries, the public galleries of art and science, and other public institutions for promoting knowledge should be thrown open for the purpose of inducing men merely by the use of their outward senses to refine their habits and elevate their minds (in Pearson 1982: 29).

Proposals like these culminated in the 1845 Museums Act that justified state involvement in the arts on moral and social grounds. What in this way gradually emerged was a institutional discourse on ‘cultural’ methods to restrain and inculcate civilised and moral conduct in the lower social classes. According to Sir Henry Cole’s ‘museum idea’, museum visits fell in the same category as educational and sanitary programmes. Cole argued that museums acted as ‘a powerful antidote to the gin palace’ (Bennett 1998: Ch. 5). In a similar way, did Robert Peel, head of the Metropolitan Police force, point out the “softening effect” of the fine arts’ to be facilitated by cultural institutions, like the National Gallery. Significantly, the arts
remained chiefly defined in terms of their social and moral influence, rather than aesthetic experience. In fact, to many reformers the arts seemed beyond the working-class' grasp, who were found to use museums as picnic sites or shelter from bad weather (Cleere 2002: 128). Museums should serve the ‘social perfectibility through art education’. According to Bennett, museum administration amounted to social policies ‘in which culture is deployed as a resource to ‘lift’ the population by making it self-civilising’, a ‘historical task of refining the working-class form the inside, of softening manners, humanising... and purifying thought’ (Bennett: 128). But how was the use of art and culture conceptually linked to their civilising and moral function? The emergence of the discourse on the ‘social control’ function of the arts will be discussed through the eyes of two Victorian art critics and reformers.

4.6 John Ruskin

One of the leading proponents of the discourse on the social and moral role of the arts and culture was Ruskin, whose art criticism can be attributed to his life-long political, social and religious engagement. Ruskin (1819-1900), who was considered one of the leading art critics of his time, laid the foundation for his socially inflected art criticism at an early age. In his youth he was torn between the vocation of an art critic and a cleric, and the question whether liberal artistic activities in themselves were sustainable on moral grounds. Negating this, he subordinated art criticism to the precepts of Protestantism and a religious naturalism, which years later he suggested, had guided all of his writings until his eventual loss of faith in 1858 (Alexander 1973: 162). Although his social engagement should thrive after his ‘unconversion’ experience, he developed political sensibilities early on. His social political engagement was awakened in the 1850s, when, teaching at F.D. Maurice’s Working Men’s College, he became aware of the state of public health and sanitary conditions in working-class households. It was here where he developed a typical ‘classical republican’ vision of the degeneration of civic life, which like many reformers he attributed to the effects of economic liberalism and industrial expansion. Having frequently observed the bad living conditions of the poor, Ruskin attributed them to the effects of limitless industrial expansion and private market economics that pervaded Victorian middle-class ideology. Throughout most of his writings he
criticised the negative effects of exponential industrial developments on labour division and working conditions as causes of ‘alienation’ and spiritual decline, and proposed a number of social policies. He, for instance, suggested the establishment of a ‘citizens’ economy’, where market relations were guided by public service ethics (Harris 1999). Pauperism should be relieved through state pensions, income tax, compulsory school, vocational education schemes and the provision of social services by clerical administrators. Ruskin gave generously to a working-class housing scheme and the Working Ladies’ Guild (Harris 1999). Given his political views, it seemed no surprise that his art criticism should hold similar implications.

Prior to his religious scepticism, in the 1840s the youthful Ruskin had begun to establish himself as one of the leading Victorian art historians and connoisseurs, ironically exerting great influence on the despised middle-class readership. The, as yet deeply religious art historian, caught the spirits and hopes of a politically and economically strengthened middle-class, who, in the middle of the century, were at the height of their cultural and economic power, but who also feared the loss of traditional ethical and religious authority. Ruskin’s art theory affirmed traditional links between religious, cultural and social order, which was decidedly hierarchical, and therefore were a welcome reassurance to a fragile middle-class confidence. In addition, as Dowling comments, by compounding religious ethics with art criticism Ruskin made the arts easily accessible to a culturally uninitiated audience (1996: 27).

In his early works, Modern Painters (1843-1860), Seven Lamps of Architecture (1849) and The Stones of Venice (1851–1853), Ruskin furnished the foundation for a naturalistic imitation theory of art, according to which true art strove towards the representation of natural form and embodiment of the divine spirit. Ruskin’s art criticism was deeply affected by his religious experiences with nature. In Modern Painters he proclaimed:

It was then only beneath those glorious hills that I learned how thought itself may become ignoble and energy itself become base…before, and in the Presence of, the manifested Deity…It was then that I understood that all which is the type of God’s attributes…is in the pure and right sense of the word BEAUTIFUL (cited in Fraser 1986: 113).
To Ruskin, nature embodied divine creation, and faultless moral and spiritual unity. In the first two volumes of *Modern Painters* Ruskin expounded how all good art aspired to copy natural form and thereby claim divine moral authority. Assuming a supernatural and divine presence in nature he ascribed nature’s beauty to the ‘typical’ bodily and ‘vital’ spiritual elements of God. ‘Typical beauty’ represented the external, formal and classical signs of divine nature, whereas ‘vital beauty’ expressed spiritual and moral principles. In nature and the arts formal beauty and spiritual ethics represented an inseparable union.

To Ruskin, aesthetics were compounded with morality and religion. He argued how aesthetic and moral judgement in fact derived from the same human faculty and were human instincts firmly interconnected. Ruskin thereby rejected a purely intellectual and abstract approach to beauty, and suggested ‘analogies’ and ‘reciprocal action’ between the laws of the moral world and of the aesthetic imagination. Ruskin stressed that Christian love and the ‘pureness of heart’ were the sole measuring rods for good art, and demanded that English readers engage moral responsibility when evaluating the arts. He suggested: ‘Ideas of beauty, may it be remembered are the subjects of moral, but not of intellectual perception’ (Ruskin 1986: 151).

A good example for his moral art criticism was presented in *Modern Painters*, which served Ruskin to defend Turner, whom he declared ‘the greatest artist of all times’. Here, he expounded in minute detail how Turner’s landscape paintings depicted truth to the facts of nature and therefore upheld religious ethics and moral righteousness. His admiration was contrasted by defiance of the Old Master tradition, whose use of dark and shadowy tones and ambiguous form were distinct indicators of moral decline, and ‘bad bodily and mental health’. Ruskin irrevocably linked aesthetic form to human and moral characteristics.

Unsurprisingly, Ruskin remained deeply sceptical of the emergence of the aesthetic movement and art for art’s sake. As early as 1858 he argued that ‘Wherever art is practised for its own sake... the art has an influence of the most fatal kind on brain

---

21 He argued: ‘With this kind of bodily sensibility to colour and form is intimately connected that higher sensibility which we revere as one of the chief attributes of all noble minds, and as the chief spring of real poetry’ (Ruskin in Fraser: 116).
and heart… in the destruction both of intellectual power and moral principle…’ (in Birch: Ch. 6: 136). He notoriously took offence with the 1870s Royal Academy exhibitions. After seeing works by Newall, Leighton and Whistler he fiercely attacked the new movement as exclusively concerned with ‘musical or harmonious elements in every art’ (in Birch 137). Compounded by mental decline and personal misfortune, his opposition against the aesthetic movement peaked in the loss of the famous libel trial against Whistler.

The aesthetic movement offended Ruskin’s conviction in the relation between good art, and the moral and social constitution of society. One of the best examples for this can be found in *The Stones of Venice*, where he suggested how the arts and architecture of a civilisation were indicators of their religious devotion and ethical development. Ruskin attempted to demonstrate that art criticism was inextricably linked to a critique of society and its moral constitution. In *The Nature of Gothic* he identified a number of ‘mental characteristics’ that directly corresponded to architectural qualities, such as savageness, changefulness and rigidity. To Ruskin, these represented ‘noble’ characteristics because they indicated ‘an index not of climate but of religious principle’. Ruskin established a relation between social characteristics and architectural structure by distinguishing between different modes of ornaments: servile, constitutional and revolutionary. It were those moral characteristics, rather than aesthetic ones that established artistic and architectural qualities. In this way Ruskin criticised Greek and Egyptian architectural heritage and their striving for perfection as morally and socially questionable. He argued how perfection in design and construction hinged on socially and morally questionable division of labour and social injustice. Builders, for instance, were reduced to mere executers of ideas, rather than equal participants in production processes. Ruskin contrasted the cultural constitution of Greek and Egyptian society with the medieval society’s. Their pursuit of ‘dignity’, ‘effort’ and ‘mercy’ recognised intrinsic qualities, such as individuality and imperfection. The ‘savageness and idiosyncrasies of Gothic buildings represented, to him, religious superiority, and in this way, somewhat paradoxically, artistic superiority. Ruskin insisted how Gothic Christian devotion and their recognition of ‘the individual value of the soul’ resulted in architectural quality because it allowed builders to incorporate individual expression, different skills and creativity. In this way, he concluded ‘that no architecture can be truly noble which is
not imperfect… No good work whatever can be perfect, and *the demand for perfection is always a sign of a misunderstanding of the ends of art* (Ruskin 1996: 339).

Ruskin’s architectural criticism was an unmistakable indictment of English industrial and commercial developments, as he witnessed the triumphant presentation of their success at the Crystal Palace Exhibition in 1851. Ruskin likened the English commercial spirit with the inhumanity of Greek perfectionism. To Ruskin, perfection in manufacturing and design were ‘signs of slavery in our England’. He deeply deplored the fascination with commercial manufacturing and luxury, the pursuit of wealth and prestige, competitiveness and sterile perfectionism as inevitably linked with inhuman working conditions, the division of labour and the degradation of men. He therefore concluded that a change of aesthetic standards would result in a transformation of social ones, too. Ruskin made suggestions, whose potential unpopularity with his middle-class audiences he anticipated in advance. He demanded that nothing ‘not absolutely necessary’ should be manufactured and no exact finish and duplication made for its own sake. In order to achieve this, English society had to sacrifice commercial and mundane interests such as convenience, beauty or cheapness in order to give up immoral and inhuman living and production conditions. He argued that the chief role of arts and design in society was not the pursuit of material wealth, but instead ‘to brighten, to strengthen, to refine, or to form a single living spirit’, and ‘to look for the thoughtful part within individuals’ (Ruskin 1996: 333).

Distressed by the moral and spiritual decline of English society, Ruskin suggested a national system of education that, instead of aiming at mere erudition, served primarily the instruction of industrious and moral people. Ruskin gave practical drawing lessons at the Working Men’s College, aiming, as he told the National Gallery Site Commission, ‘not to making a carpenter an artist, but to making him happier as a carpenter’. To Ruskin, teaching the arts served as moral and social instruction, not taste cultivation.

Despite his dedication to the proliferation of the arts, Ruskin on the other hand, however, also adhered to a strict distinction between working-class and middle-class audiences. He was the author of the *Report of the National Gallery Site Commission*, which assessed the impact of democratic access to art venues. As Cleere suggests,
Ruskin’s report was greatly influenced by the Victorian concern for sanitary reform and social control, critical of the unruly behaviour of the uneducated mass. He feared that the uncleanliness of body odour, contaminative vapours and dirt as one of the main threats to the preservation of art works. Ruskin argued that misguided conduct could damage art works and suggested a two-tier system, which should protect more important works from damage by exclusive exhibition to ‘worthy’ viewers.

Until the end of his life, Ruskin should advocate the interconnectedness of art, utility, religion and morality. In the renowned Slade Lectures he stated that the ‘function of art is…service in the actual uses of daily life…in getting our country clean, and our people beautiful…to state a true thing, to adorn a serviceable one.’ (Ruskin 1996 [1870]: 140).

### 4.7 Matthew Arnold: *Culture and Anarchy*

There are great parallels between Ruskin and Matthew Arnold’s (1822-1888) socially inflected art criticism. Like Ruskin, during the course of his life, Arnold should change his approach to culture following a spiritual reconversion, to which his famous 1853 Preface to *Poems* bears testament. Subsequently he should shift the focus of his work from poetic production to literary criticism, from purely aesthetic to a humanist foundation of the moral and social role of culture. Like many of his contemporaries Arnold feared the loss of comforting certainties that changing cultural order and the decline of the ‘old nation’ threatened. To many, the poem *Dover Beach* epitomised his vision of historical crisis, but also his loss of faith in the religious establishment and traditional church institutions. After 1850 Arnold’s poetical endeavours should dry up and were taken over by his well-known literary critical writings, which laid the basis for his later emphasis on the social and educational function of culture in *Culture and Anarchy* (1869).

Arnold developed political and social concerns through his role as a school inspector. During his prolonged school inspection trips through the country, he witnessed the poor conditions of the working-classes. He blamed middle-class culture, *laissez-faire* capitalism and the absence of state involvement in business, religion and education.
To Arnold, economic liberalism and the unchecked expansion of trade and industrial capacities severed social and moral denigration. His description of the social effects suggested how: ‘one in nineteen of our population is a pauper…without health, without home, without hope’ (Arnold 1965: 210). His criticism of economic utilitarianism was particularly reinforced when in 1862 the Revised Code of the Education Act was approved that made school grants dependent on ‘payment by results’. Its stated aims, to make education ‘if not efficient, at least cheap’ to Arnold epitomised the evil effects of liberal economic logic in national education and culture. He proposed to reform the English school system based on the examples of Prussian and French state education systems. He praised the German Minister for Education Humboldt for his humanist ideals of education and culture. Arnold’s occupation as a school inspector enabled him to assess the educational standards of the nation, at a time when primary schools depended on private donations and the authority of fragmented church denominations. Arnold was alarmed by the lack of basic literacy, knowledge of classic English literature, voluntarism and capriciousness of teachings, but most of all absence of public agencies to report to (Alexander 1973: 177).

Arnold’s interest in political and social critique was truly awakened, however, when in 1859, he was assigned as a foreign assistant commissioner to report on elementary education in France and Italy. Like Ruskin, he found that the French working-classes were superior in terms of their level of cultural appreciation and social conduct. He argued that the French working-classes displayed a similar understanding and interest in cultural and political ideas as the French ‘educated and refined classes’. Arnold attributed this superiority to state-controlled institutionalism and social equality. He argued that only if the common man was given equal opportunities he would desire self-improvement and attain the confidence needed to contribute to the nation. In contrast, Arnold recognised that the low standing of the working-classes in his own country could only be harmful to England’s political power, because ‘the next generation of the lower classes…will have most of the political power of the country in their hands’ (Alexander 1973: 176). He concluded that education was an important means to prepare the newly enfranchised ‘democratic mass’ for their future role. It is noticeable that the publication of this report on France’s popular education in 1861 should be prefaced by the political pamphlet Democracy.
In *Democracy* (1861) Arnold anticipated democratic developments in England as inevitable, yet like many of his contemporaries feared the decline of cultural authority held previously by the aristocratic order and its ‘lofty spirit, commanding character, exquisite culture’ (1993: 11). He feared ‘Americanisation’, the levelling of standards to ‘second-rate ideas’ and loss of individual spirit and ‘high tone’. To countervail these tendencies he demanded that the state should have a greater role in disseminating ‘ideal of high reason, right feeling, representing its best self…and the worthiest instincts of the community’. He proposed a national curriculum and a state-governed public school system. Education should entail the classics of English literature, which Arnold regarded as the prime source of moral education and social instruction. He regarded education in English classics of prime importance to national life, civilising and humanising development, enabling all members of society to qualify for social and political participation (Black 1987: 15).

Arnold’s conception of culture as a form of moral and civilising force has been often attributed to an attempt to replace religious authority with another: high culture. Arnold’s own spiritual crisis and his increasing dissatisfaction with religious institutions and dogmas reflected on the spirit of the time. Arnold increasingly found institutional religious practices to be at odds with intellectual and scholarly discourse. He became disillusioned with the dry dogmatism of historical biblical interpretation and the competitive struggle between religious groups. He regarded constitutional quarrels as mere ‘machinery: ‘And I say that the English reliance on religious organisations and on their ideas on human perfection as the stand, is like our reliance on freedom, on muscular Christianity, on population, on coal, on wealth—merely belief in machinery, and unfruitful’ (Arnold 1994: 355). Instead of relying on the historically derived meaning of orthodox tradition and rituals, he sought to sieve out transhistorical, essentialist spiritual contents. Disappointment by religious institutions, however, he argued how the spiritual authority of religion should be replaced by culture’s. Arnold concluded: ‘I am, above all, a believer in culture’, ‘the study of perfection, [which] leads us …to conceive of true human perfection as a harmonious perfection, developing all sides of our humanity… and society’ (Arnold 1994: 8).

In his later writings, Arnold further developed his concept of culture as the spiritual, educational and moral force that could counter economic utilitarianism and the sole
concern with practical ends that drove common men. In *Essays in Criticism* (1865) he defined culture as ‘disinterested’ form economic and social gains:

Aloof from what is called ‘the practical view of things’, by resolutely following…a free play of the mind on all subjects that it touches. By…refusing to lend itself to any of those ulterior, political, practical considerations…Its business is simply to know the best that is known and thought in the work…and to leave alone all questions of practical consequences and applications, questions that will never fail to have the prominence given to them (Arnold 1986: 326).

Arnold opposed the liberal-economic spirit of ‘doing as one likes’, self-governance, free-trade and excessive industrial expansion as detrimental to common human values. The Benthamite politician Roebuck epitomised England’s prevailing false complacency with economic prosperity and political freedom (Arnold 1986: 328). It is thereby noteworthy how Arnold’s emphasis on disinterestedness draws on philosophical parallels with the art for art’s sake movement.

It is interesting that despite the pursuit of social, moral and educational goals through culture, liberal humanist reformers strictly opposed economic and utilitarian ends. As the discussion will show in more detail later, this contention has significant implications for the assessment of contemporary instrumental cultural policies, which have been linked to New Labour’s neoliberal managerial alignment of governments. Although present cultural led approaches to social inclusion and regeneration have often been justified on the grounds of liberal humanist enlightenment ideas, it needs to be assessed whether in the light of these arguments a departure from historical cultural discourse must be assumed.

Despite his criticism, Arnold conceded how economic development represented a basic requirement to cultural development. Yet, he opposes the pursuit of external merits as an end in itself. Instead, he stressed the importance of inner development and the formation of character. As argued earlier, Arnold was deeply influenced by Goethe’s cultural concepts whom he declared ‘the most helpful thinker of modern times’ (White 1921: 440). As a matter of fact, *Culture and Anarchy* suggested many parallels between Arnold and Goethe. To Arnold, culture represented the ability to exercise one’s critical powers and ‘to see the object in itself as it really is’ (Arnold
1986: 319). He thereby echoed Goethe’s maxim of ‘The true wise as what the thing is in itself’ (White 1921: 438). He praised disinterested perception, which Goethe thought was the basis of self-less religious worship and intellectual enquiry. Arnold conceived of culture as a constant striving and critical enquiry into perfection: ‘The idea of culture is an inward condition of the mind…not a having and resting, but a growing and a becoming, is the character of perfection as culture conceives it’ (Arnold 1986: 347). He thereby echoed Goethe’s well-known endeavour to constantly improve one’s moral and intellectual abilities, and to aim towards the harmonious development of all senses. Arnold also alluded to the classical Greek ideal of εὐφυϊα, the balanced and harmonious development of body and mind. To Arnold, culture taught that: ‘The formation of the spirit and character must be our real concern’ (Arnold 1986: 351).

To illustrate culture’s significance for the ‘harmonious perfection’ of human qualities, he was also inspired by the German Heinrich Heine’s distinction between Hellenism and Hebraism, which represented complementary spiritual and social forces within society and individuals. Both represented cultural forces that only in union could lead to perfection. Hellenism represented the endeavour ‘to see things as they really are’, spontaneity of consciousness, intellectual rigour and flexibility, free play of mind and ‘imaginative reason’. To Arnold these qualities were compromised, and superseded by the passivity of English puritanism. He argued how England was gripped by Hebrew tendencies and a prevailing concern for good conduct and obedience, strictness of conscience, observance of the law and religious orthodoxy. Arnold likened this with the manifestation of a ‘mechanical character’, which resulted in an excessive reliance on liberal religious, political and economic principles, and unreflected obedience to ‘the habits of unintelligent routine and one-sided growth’. It was the duty of culture to reawaken Hellenistic forces- standards, which he described as universal and transcendental: ‘Hellenism is to follow… the whole play of the universal order, to be apprehensive of missing parts’, and ‘to get rid of one’s ignorance, to see things as they really are’ (Arnold 1994: 88-90). Culture to Arnold represented ‘a centre’ of moral authority, right reason, ‘correct information’ and taste. Arnold, however, held a pessimistic view on society’s own ability to conceive the means and ends of culture. He for instance polemically remarked that ‘nine out of ten English’ believed that material wealth represent true achievements, welfare and
national greatness. In *Function of Criticism at the Present Time* he concluded that ‘criticism’ needed to proceed in a ‘subtle and indirect’ way to be heard.

4. 8 The Victorian Legacy, Instrumental Cultural Policy and Museums

Arnold and Ruskin's reformist vision of the arts have been described as part of their social critique of the working and living conditions, as well as the loss of traditional moral and ethical strongholds within a rapidly industrialising society. Commonalities in both liberal humanist accounts have been the rejection of commercial and industrial uses, to which culture and the arts have been put, and the concomitant cultivation of a middle-class culture geared towards economic and social prestige.

The influence of 19th century enlightenment thinkers on post-war cultural policy remains profound, and can be regarded as a main source for the justification of post World War II state involvement. Although part of the foundation of the Arts Council movement had in part been inspired by formalist and art separatist arguments, state cultural provision emphasised the educative, moral and civilising function of the arts and culture. This was reflected through the policy objectives 'access and excellence', which represented two key concerns for the establishment of the Arts Council. The basis assumptions underlying the ACGB had been laid by CEMA, which had aimed to provide wartime solace, recreation, entertainment, but also spiritual and moral enhancement. CMEA had stressed audience development and local initiative by extensive touring and decentralised activities. Its mission statement 'Art for the People' in many ways was maintained, when in 1946 the new charter of the Arts Council announced as one its primary aims 'to increase the accessibility of the fine arts to the public'. The ACGB stressed how access policies were based on educational goals of 'developing a greater knowledge, understanding and practice of the fine arts' (Hutchison 1982: Ch. 6; Minihan 1977: 231-238). Further developments of state involvement in the arts, such as the introduction of the National Theatre Bill in 1948, were based on the general contention of the morally enhancing, educative and civilising role of the arts in society.
The relevance of enlightenment notions of the arts for post-war art policies has not lost its strength for the more recent and contemporary cultural policy debate (see Bennett 2005: 476). Shaw, the former secretary-general of the ACGB, for instance, evoked Arnoldian sentiments when commenting on the conditions of cultural policy in the 1980s. He stressed how artistic provision should endeavour for cultural excellence, pointing out the art’s civilising and moral benefits: 'The arts, like religion, are an influence for good behaviour; as Arnold put it they tend to form the character... [they] encourage an ordered mind and ordered emotions' (Shaw 1987 23–25 in Bennett 2005: 475). In a similar way did the former Minister of Culture, Chris Smith, stress the intellectually enhancing and civilising role of culture. He argued: 'The arts fire the imagination and inspire the intelligence. They are one of the main factors by which we assess a civilisation' (1998 in Bennett 2005: 475).

The role of the enlightenment discourse for the contemporary cultural policy discourse has, however, been most significant in the context of social instrumental policies of social inclusion and urban regeneration. As briefly discussed in Chapter One, following the 1997 election of New Labour, the tackling of 'social exclusion' and the promotion of social cohesion and regeneration became a primary political agenda of the new government. Distinct theoretical shifts in the definition of public provision and welfare facilitated a 'cultural' approach to political and social solutions. Of particular significance for this 'joined-up' account has been the rallying of cultural and social explanations for structural economic and social deficits. In many respects, this approach has been reminiscent of Victorian reformer's assessments, which as has been discussed above, attributed social and political conflicts to a lack of inner strength, education, moral failure, and significantly a lack of individual responsibility. Reformers aimed at the transformation of behaviour, attitude and conduct rather than law enforcement or economic measures to solve the problem of social denigration. In this way they resorted to cultural and moral inculcation as means of social reform. As the discussion in Chapter Six will show in more detail, the culture-led social regeneration approach and the presentation of culture as a social and economic panacea reflect Victorian logic.

Despite stark criticism of the role culture could play in amending social deficits, culture and the art's role in contemporary social inclusion and social regeneration policies has been strongly promoted. The DCMS explicitly identified the instrumental
role of the arts in the fight against key aspects of social exclusion, that is; poor health, crime, low educational achievements and unemployment. In line with this, the ACE frequently confirmed its belief in the broadly educative, community enhancing and character building role of the arts. Enlightenment arguments of the reformatory power of culture have been widely echoed and reiterated throughout policy documents as well as social impact studies. In *Ambitions for the Arts 2003-2006* (ACE 2003) the ACE for instance stressed culture's 'lasting and transforming effect on...people's lives'. It suggests how neighbourhoods, communities and entire generations could benefit from participation in the arts and culture. The arts amounted to 'life changing' experiences, which could shift the identity and purpose of individual lives. The following passage extracted from *Our Agenda for the Arts 2006-8* (ACE 2006) makes a powerful statement on the enlightening and civilising role of the arts:

The arts have an extraordinary power to deepen, broaden and transform...We know about the relationship between arts and creativity and educational attainment, both in terms of formal 'attainment' (passing exams) and in terms of the development of the whole young person – as a communicator, as a problem solver, as a team worker, as an innovator, as a thinker... We know that arts-based resettlement of young offenders increases employability and reduces re-offending.

In many ways this reiterates Arnold and Ruskin's view on the reformatory role of culture.

In this way, it is not surprising that comparisons between the social instrumental role of the arts and culture in mainstream policies and Victorian times have been frequent (Sandell 2003: 45; Sandell 1998; Mason 2005). A number of commentators pointed out the historical parallels between the way arts organisation, in particular museums have been adopted as agents of social change and as instruments of a socially coherent, better educated and improved society. Sandell, for instance, suggested how the newly defined role of cultural organisations in the context of social inclusion drew on parallel ideological frameworks adopted by 19th century Victorian reformers. In a similar way, have Newman and McLean (2004) traced the emergence of contemporary social instrumental rationale for museums to their historical emergence. As Belfiore (2004) conclusively argued that the reformulation of the
historically widespread belief in the positive social impacts of the arts has represented a key aspect of New Labour’s cultural policy. In this way, liberal humanist cultural ideas regained significance as a theoretical framework for public cultural provision.

Although the instrumental cultural policy approach under New Labour has been justified based on residual enlightenment assumptions, it is a key contention of this thesis that its conceptual and ideological basis needs to be closely assessed in terms of its interconnectedness with New Labour’s Third Way approach. Although historical instrumental notions of culture have been highlighted, and explicitly drawn upon to justify contemporary policy rhetoric, the theoretical implications of the present approach remains subject to a more detailed theoretical debate. As has been argued in Chapter One, to many commentators the centre stage the instrumental agenda has taken in the contemporary policy discourse has been based on methodological and theoretical flaws. The critique has been in particular directed at the neoliberal economic underpinnings, and the explicitly entrepreneurial and managerial terms, in which social instrumental policies have been formulated. In order to discuss the ideological context in which present social instrumental policies are couched, and to what extent this suggests a departure from its conceptual roots will be discussed in the following two chapters. Chapter Six will offer an enquiry into the conceptual implications of contemporary instrumentalism that is needed to fully assess their ideological and practical implications.
4. 9 Conclusion

This chapter had two purposes: to provide an intellectual history of the emergence of enlightenment rationales of culture; secondly, to discuss the theoretical conjuncture of enlightenment reasoning with the emergence of the social instrumental justifications for public cultural provision in Victorian and contemporary context. This aimed primarily to retrieve the intellectual and historical basis of contemporary cultural policy assumptions. For limitation of scope, this account provided a mere selective outline of key moments within the history of cultural utilitarianism referring to Classical sources, Kantian enlightenment and romanticism.

The main focus of this account lay on the emergence of enlightenment cultural rationale and policies of social control, which initiated a broad programme for public utility and social management in Victorian England. The account described the emergence of a middle-class discourse on the culture-led social control agenda in the context of rapid industrialisation, urbanisation and political democratisation. The development of the reformatory and civilising role of culture has been discussed through the eyes of Ruskin and Arnold. These reformers developed the general contention of the morally enhancing, educational and softening role of culture in the absence of traditional religious and social sources of moral authority and social cohesion. Both regarded culture as an ethical and moral counterweight to the utilitarian spirit of commercialism and middle-class culture. They not only bemoaned declining educational and artistic standards, but also observed poor working and living conditions of the working-classes in the wake of the modern era. Parallels to art for art’s sake ideas were drawn.

Subsequently, the influence of Victorian social instrumental ideas on the development of post-war cultural policies has been discussed. The account illustrated how Victorian reformatory and enlightenment notions were reflected not only in the post-war establishment of Arts Council policies, but also in contemporary social instrumental policies. However, the account emphasised the historically specific theoretical context of culture-led social inclusion and regeneration policies within New Labour's welfare policy framework. It has been suggested that the contemporary approach to social instrumental policies emerged as part of a neoliberal government framework. In this way, the theoretical continuity between
Victorian and contemporary discourses of social instrumentalism has been questioned. The account highlighted the need for a detailed discussion of the emergence of social instrumentalism within the contemporary policy context, which follows in Section Three of this thesis.
SECTION III

CHAPTER FIVE: Field Research
Chapter Five: Field Research

5.1. Introduction

Based on 25 interviews with cultural managers from across the UK cultural sector, the field research seeks to complement and further develop the historical and theoretical discussion on the tension between intrinsic and instrumental policy rationales. The discussion critically assesses the values, beliefs and practices of cultural managers and their relation to political, economic and social production conditions. This aims to identify the way cultural managers negotiate cultural values in a climate of instrumentalism. The account will assess the complex and competing assumptions, with which cultural managers make sense of cultural practice. The key findings of this study suggest how cultural managers reconcile instrumental policy rationales with cultural practice by accepting and promoting social instrumental values as integral parts of cultural activities. Cultural managers justify the social instrumental role of culture as part of their public and social responsibility, as well as the intrinsically 'social' nature of artistic production and reception. On the other hand, pressures from political and financial intrusion are deflected into an opposition to impact based policies and commercialism. These findings contradict the prevalent assumptions of a binary opposition between intrinsic and instrumental policy rationales, as discussed in Chapter One. Instead of rejecting instrumental policy rationales per se cultural managers pursue a broad spectrum of cultural and social assumptions.

5.2 Research Outline and Questions

The main aim of this enquiry was to assess the way cultural managers in this study negotiated and perceived the tension between competing policy rationales in their everyday professional lives, and to thereby make explicit professional beliefs and concepts, through which they approach cultural policy making. The research attempted to elicit intrinsic and instrumental cultural policy assumptions in terms of their historical, theoretical and philosophical underpinnings, and the political and
ideological conditions and conflicts, which characterise decision making. The analysis aimed in this way to connect topical issues with insights from firsthand experience and practice, enabling theory refinement and advancement. The research sought in this way to reach beyond a purely generic and theoretical debate on cultural policy issues.

The research approach was based on qualitative research assumptions. It aimed at rich and detailed descriptions of individual beliefs, social constructs and values, and the social settings and restraints, in which they are set. In order to ensure degrees of reliability and reproducibility the research report endeavoured to give a detailed discussion of methods, theories and ideas informing the research project (Seale 1999: 141). Theory development and research design were subject to emergent data and key events requiring constant revision of the research process. This was in line with suggestions by Berg (2007), Flick (2006) and Alasuutari (1995), who suggested how qualitative research was largely controlled by a cyclical research process, rather than a mere empirical testing of predetermined research design and hypothesis.

5.3 Qualitative Research Approach

This research project assumed an interpretive qualitative research approach, as this has been particularly implicated in enquiries that concern meanings, concepts, social structures and roles, with which individuals arrange and make sense of their social settings and lives (Berg 2007: 8). Interpretive qualitative research recognises unquantifiable factors, beliefs and values, individual experience, and social constructs that maintain individual's social realities. Although qualitative research methods in some instances have been criticised as 'non-scientific' or 'subjective', often referring to a lack of theoretical foundation in statistical survey methods, robust research criteria were assumed.

Qualitative research has challenged positivist research methods that assume theoretical assumptions akin to those upheld by natural sciences. These concern an objective, value-free and neutral basis for observation and knowledge construction.

---

22 Total reproducibility of research results is deemed highly unlikely given the situationally specific and interpretative research context.
and the separation between theory and observation. In contrast, qualitative research assumes an 'interpretative' approach to social science methodology, which suggests the socially constructed, subjective, contextual and theory laden nature of theory development and data gathering. The interpretative approach presumes an intimate relationship between researcher and research subject (Seale 1998; Abercrombie 1988 and Minichiello 1991). Quantitative theory development and measurement, which are based on statistical representativeness and probability, are challenged by emphasis on generalisability and transferability of data based on analytical and logical explanations of phenomena, and their rich description. Data analysis and generalisability rely mostly on 'logical' or 'analytical' descriptions of phenomena and the context, in which they occur. This will be further discussed under the heading of theory development and generalisability later.

The qualitative approach this study pursued was not to dismiss quantitative methods altogether. There has been a general consensus of the complementary nature of quantitative and qualitative method, according to which qualitative theory development requires theory testing for general relevance based on further empirical studies (see for instance Seale 1999: Ch. 8; Denzin 2003: Introduction; Glaser and Strauss 1967). Denzin in this way argued, that both approaches merely told 'different kinds of stories'. It is therefore suggested that the findings of this research project are subject to further empirical testing.

5.4 Interviewing

5.41 Semi-Structured Interviewing

25 cultural workers from different institutional contexts, genres and professional status were interviewed at their institutional settings. The interviews aimed to explore the subjective perceptions, values and beliefs on competing strands of intrinsic and instrumental cultural policy. Semi-structured interviews were used as they allowed for
flexibility\(^\text{23}\) within interviews to engage in two-way conversation, encourage both participants to give and receive information, to digress within limits from the order of questions and investigate unexpected links and leads through unscheduled probes. Semi-structured interviewing also ensured reliability and comparability of data for later data analysis.

### 5.42 Sampling

Based on the qualitative research approach, sampling followed a theoretical, purposive path, instead of statistical logic (Corbin & Strauss 2008: Ch. 7; Mason 1996; Flick 2004: Ch. 4.4; Denzin & Lincoln 1994: Ch. 14; Silverman 2000). This meant that samples were chosen according to their ability to illustrate and yield rich descriptions of phenomena under study, illuminate events and further theory development. Sampling was controlled by the development of emergent theory with a view to extend, modify and develop assumptions (Minichiello 1991: 199). As Denzin & Lincoln suggest: 'Many qualitative researchers employ... purposive, and not random sampling methods. They seek out groups, settings and individuals where... the processes being studied are most likely to occur.' In a similar way, has Seale (1999: Ch. 8) suggested that qualitative samples 'are not taken to be examples of a class beforehand; the analyst proceeds by selecting cases that illuminate aspects of a general theory...for its power to explain rather than its (statistical) typicality'. For this reason statistical representation was deemed inappropriate for this study as it could not ensure richness and depth of data needed for theory development. Rather, one of the main aims of sampling was to determine typical aspects of the object of study and their theoretical exploration, in order to ultimately ensure transferability and generalisability to similar cases (Flick 2004: 167). Representativeness and generalisability were founded on theoretical, rather than statistical logic. Sampling in

\(^{23}\) According to Berg flexibility in semi-structured interviews may entail the wording of questions, level of language to be adjusted and the freedom of interviewers to answer questions and clarify them (2007: Ch. 4).
this way may aimed to not only involve typical cases, which support a particular strand of theory development, but also deviant and critical cases\textsuperscript{24}.

Defining 'typical' representations of art managers depended in part on preliminary research\textsuperscript{25}, but more so on ongoing cycles of interviewing and analysis. In the course of sampling and interviewing it needed to be considered whether interviews yielded meaningful information on theoretical concerns at hand and supported theory development. As analysis progressed several types of art managers were identified, such as senior and managing directors of a large funded institutions, community art manager, and manager from large and small non-funded organisations. Sampling was, however, significantly controlled by constraints to access. Sampling and interviewing proceeded until data saturation was achieved, that is until no new findings emerged.

Sampling commenced with the compiling of a list of potential interviewees, who could yield useful information to central research themes and concepts. The following factors were taken into account:

I. **Genre/diversity**: Cultural genre and art forms

Assuming that art genre and type of production have significant impact on cultural evaluation and practice, three art genres are represented in the study. Three cultural genres are chosen, comprising classical music and opera, visual arts and theatres. These were chosen as familiarity and knowledge were most prevalent.

II. **Status/rank**: Subsidised and not-for profit organisations

\textsuperscript{24}Patton describes critical cases as those, which illustrate phenomena or events in a dramatic way, or deliver important information for theory development (1990: 236). Deviant cases, according to Seale (1999: Ch. 6) represent an important tool for theory testing and development, as a diverse and wide array of cases is deemed necessary to contribute to the complexity and richness of the argument.

\textsuperscript{25}Choosing criteria for purposeful data gathering required preliminary research and familiarity with the cultural sector, which was based on information obtained through cultural organisations themselves, industry and survey reports and documents from government bodies, such as the ACE and DCMS.
To interview managers with different organisational and professional status and rank has been regarded as important in order to avoid what Becker called the 'hierarchy of credibility' (1998: 90). Becker suggests that legitimacy, expertise and credibility of the range of opinion and content sanctioned by those in power deliver only a limited account of the full range of phenomena under study. In a cynical remark, he therefore argued: 'to doubt everything anyone in power tells you'. Research should address organisations with different positions and status. Although there are a variety of methods to 'rank' cultural organisations (see, for instance, Di Maggio 1987) cultural organisations are distinguished broadly by funding, income, size and reputation. A distinction is thereby made between cultural institutions with public and 'related commercial' remit, although significant overlaps and blurred boundaries between these three categories are assumed. According to Feist (in Selwood 2001: Ch. 19) 'subsidised' or public institutions represent organisations that derive regular revenue from public funders such as the Arts Council of England, regional arts boards, local authorities and other national resources. 'Related commercial' institutions whilst operating on commercial grounds shared similarities with the subsidised sector, as they held a primary concern for cultural development rather than commercial profit.

III. **Position of cultural manager**

Based on Becker's arguments, the study includes cultural managers from different professional ranks and positions ranging from senior artistic and managing directors to administrators working in general administration, education, PR and marketing.

IV. **Location/size**

Sampling addresses cultural managers from across the UK, in order to cover urban as well as rural settings. This is based on the contention that the south of England and bigger cities traditionally receive the main bulk of public funding. The study includes participants from community led and smaller organisations as well.
5.43 Contact, Access and Ethics

In order to establish contact with cultural managers, one-page letters were written, explaining the purpose and subject of the research project, the reasons for addressing managers personally and the interview setting (Pickering 2008: Ch. 3). Written letters were subsequently followed up with emails or calls. In the course of the fieldwork approximately 150 letters to 70 organisations were sent.

The final sample included 25 interviewees (see Appendix 1). Sampling, rather than following an ideal path, was significantly constrained by 'convenience of data', that is respondent's willingness to take part in the study (Strauss & Corbin 2008: 153). This posed a significant problem in the course of data gathering. Although several administrators of different position within each organisation were addressed, cultural organisations chose unwittingly to elect senior managing staff for the interview. Even when it was illustrated that the study would benefit from a range of cultural managers, it was usually explained that senior managers were the most, if not the only ones competent, appropriate and of authority to talk to. This pattern extended even to the head of the PR department at the London Southbank Centre, who, having first agreed to give an interview, subsequently declined suggesting she was not authoritative and knowledgeable enough to talk about cultural issues. In contrast, most cultural administrators in lower positions expressed doubts and reservations to participate. Most administrators in lower positions only agreed to partake in this study after persuasion and reassurance. This explains the high number of senior managers and artistic directors in this study. Considerable effort was, however, exerted to include managers from a range of different positions.

Ethical conduct during field work complied to the basic precepts of consent, confidentiality and trust (Seale 2007: 14). These notions required careful consideration of the implications for participants that could result from intrusion by the interviewer, as well as subsequent research outcomes. Interviewee’s consents were acquired based on honest descriptions of the study and its purpose. However, it was conceded that potential research outcomes could have been detrimental to the participant’s reputation or professional position, or subsequent researchers venturing into the field. These considerations seemed relevant since a majority of the respondents were occupying senior positions within large organisations of national
and international status and reputation. The critical nature of analysis could potentially injure the trust and consent of participants. In addition, some cultural managers wished to stay anonymous as they feared their comments may affect their professional careers or reputation within their organisation. Based on these considerations interview excerpts were treated confidentially revealing only position and appropriate information on participating organisations. The enumeration and order, in which interviewees appear in the analysis, do not reflect on the chronological order, in which interviews were conducted.

5.44 Interviewing and Interview Questions

As Wengraf suggests: ‘scientific research interviewing is a very complex process’ (2001: 33). Choice of language, wording and order of questions were essential criteria for the interview procedure. According to Denzin, questions should accurately, precisely and clearly convey meaning, motivate respondents to communicate their opinion clearly and facilitate a response fitting the content of investigation (1970: 129). The aim of designing and implementing interview questions was regarded as aiming to communicate effectively by ensuring a virtuous cycle of questioning, answering and interpretation, forestalling communicative and interpretive blunders. To this end, it was essential to be aware of special language and language codes, slang, idioms and jargon, issued by the interviewer and the respondents. This was based on the assumption put forward by Becker and Geer (in Berg 2007: 102): ‘Although we speak one language and share in many ways in one culture, we cannot assume that we understand precisely what another person, speaking as a member of such a group, means by any particular word’. Instead of settling for a monolithic use of language and expert terms the interview process took account of different levels of professional experience, expertise and institutional settings of respondents26. In general, the use of abstract, scientific and complex language was avoided as they pertained the potential to cause misunderstanding, intimidate respondents and cause imbalanced interaction based on unequal power-knowledge positions.

---

26 This excluded, however, extreme variations in use of language such as ‘zero-order level of communications’ (Berg 2007: 103).
However, despite precaution, issues of wording and rapport mostly arose *in situ* requiring a change and rethinking of wording subsequently. To give an example, assuming background knowledge in culture and the arts amongst cultural professionals, the phrase 'intrinsic cultural value' had initially been taken for granted. However, understanding and acceptance of this phrase significantly varied between interviewees requiring the rethinking of level of language, resulting in the subsequent omittance of this and similar phrases.

Question formulation and conduct in this research aimed at avoiding bias of 'interviewer and informant relationship'. Whereas the researcher bias, which will be discussed later, takes account of the background knowledge and political stance of researchers, the 'informant bias' concerns the potency of respondent's roles, attitudes, beliefs and background to develop or determine interaction in the interview (Minichiello 1991: 221). This may ultimately result in the manipulation of responses and interactions, positioning, attempts to control interaction or not answering questions. Although it was assumed that a degree of bias was inevitable, given the encounter with knowledgeable, autark subjects, precaution was taken to avoid ambiguous language, such as affectively worded, biased or double-barrelled questions. In addition, advice by commentators such as Minichiello was followed, who suggested different methods to explore possible interviewee bias, such as 'cross-checking information'. Prior and during interviewing this required the acquisition of extensive knowledge about the interviewee and his organisation, and relating his statements to contextual information. A useful cross-checking device also represented comparing statements against evidence of action and practice.

Exploring interviewee bias was regarded as particularly relevant since the key objective of this enquiry concerned the critical reflection on the ideological function of discourse, that is the discursive presentation of cultural reasoning and their relation to socioeconomic and political production conditions and interests. The analysis was cautious to detect biased ideological and socially divisive presentation of cultural values. Discursive acts were therefore not regarded as mere neutral semiotic formations, but as means to produce, distort and reinforce relations of power and inequality. The analysis was thereby in part informed by concepts of critical discourse analysis. Ideological presentation, in contrast to more general definitions, were defined 'critically' as distorted representations of the world, and as enactments of
social, political and economic interests\textsuperscript{27} (Fairclough 1995: 44; see for a similar definition McGuigan 1996: 67-73). This was particularly relevant for question formulation, which aimed to take account of the meaningfulness of language acts and their interconnectedness to social and ideological practices\textsuperscript{28}. What was to be avoided was the ideological presentation of interviewees. Therefore, when formulating questions particular awareness and caution was invested to avoid or to highlight processes of ideological distortion, self-presentation and bias. Since enquiries into cultural and political values were regarded particularly prone to evoke biased self-presentation, questions were avoided that directly addressed cultural ideology and personal opinion on cultural issues. Instead, questions aimed at what could be called procedural descriptions of management, decision-making processes and policy objectives. During the interviews particular awareness was given to evidence for interviewee bias, manifested in the description of a seemingly discretionary and flexible manner of decision making, naturalisation or neutralisation of practices and discourses as universal common sense and taken-for-granted background knowledge, simulated egalitarianism, removal of surface markers of authority and power, and overt control of order and content of discourses. The representation of subjects as autonomous, free and self-sufficient was equally regarded as evidence for interviewee’s self-presentation. \textsuperscript{29} In this way the following questions were formulated:

\textsuperscript{27} Fairclough defines ideology as ‘representation of the ‘the world’ from the perspective of a particular interest, so that the relationship between proposition and fact is not transparent, but mediated by representational activity. So ideology cannot be reduced to ‘knowledge’ without distortion’. (Fairclough 1995: 44)

\textsuperscript{28} As dominant discourses, background knowledge and language codes are used to maintain relations of hegemony, the explanatory endeavour of CDA is to describe their ‘interconnectedness’ with relations of power and to ‘denaturalise’ dominant representations: ‘A characteristic of a dominant IDA (ideological discursive formation) is the capacity to ‘naturalise’ ideologies, i.e. to win acceptance for them as non-ideological ‘common sense’. It is argued that the orderliness of interactions depends, in part, upon such naturalised ideologies. (1995: 27). Part of this analysis entails the historisation of data that assesses the historical development of relations, which produce and shape them.

\textsuperscript{29} By having to refer to management procedures, it was assumed that managers would describe cultural policies in the context of institutional, political and economic production conditions and
1) Can you briefly describe your role and the institution you work in?

2) Given that you receive public funding, what procedures are in place to fulfil public policy objectives?

3) Tessa Jowell suggested that a new language for and new ways of evaluating culture ‘in and of itself’ needed to be found. Today’s emphasis on instrumentalism had lost sight of the intrinsic meaning of culture. How do you assess organisational quality?

4) Labours evidence based cultural policy is often criticised as being explicitly instrumental. The arts historian Stolnitz, however, argued the arts had always been instrumental. The ‘Intrinsic value’ argument emerged not until the 18th century. Even aesthetic separatist such as Roger Fry suggested that the arts should have an educational and civilising role. Yet, Belfiore, a researcher at Warwick University suggested that for instance social inclusion projects could not fulfil artistic and social criteria at the same time. What is the greatest difficulty in cultural production for you?

5) Can you give examples of a project where artistic and other goals had to be met and reconciled?

6) Researchers have questioned the notion of ‘impact’ as methodologically unsound. How do the arts contribute to public policy issues such as education, health, crime or urban regeneration?

7) The researcher Neeland suggested that government intervention was often directed at economic and social barriers alone, and would not recognize deep seated cultural inequalities of arts appreciation. The removal of entry fees to museums, for instance, did not result in the much asserted diversification of visitors. It has been argued that instrumental policy outlook often leaves intact traditional social links to cultural appreciation. Even the demand for a return to constraints, rather than theoretical or ideological assumptions. Questions aimed to discern contextualised explanatory frameworks for cultural activities that referred to production conditions and institutional information. In this way a better understanding of cultural values in the context of their political and historical emergence was expected.
intrinsic evaluations seems often motivated by elitism. Have you had similar experience?

8) The Arts Council, the Think Tank Demos and the American Rand group have talked about the concept of public value as a ‘process of ongoing deliberation’. Value creation in the arts thereby depends on the interaction between different sets of values such as institutional, political and public. How do you discuss and determine the cultural value of arts?

Table 1: Interview Questions

5.5 Interview Analysis

5.51 Thematic Analysis

This study aimed to assess the historical and conceptual assumptions, with which cultural managers made sense of and negotiated the competing argumentative strands within the current cultural policy debate. The central objective of theory development represented the development of concepts, beliefs and practices underpinning intrinsic cultural and instrumental values and policies. In particular, the way cultural managers negotiated the conflict between different policy objectives and cultural values was of interest. A particular emphasis was put on the analysis of political, social and ideological constraints and pressures guiding decision-making and deliberation. The enquiry aimed to discern relations of social and political power, and their enactment in discourses on cultural values. To this end, the analysis endeavoured to contextualise interview analysis into the political, economic and social institutional conditions and settings, in which professional practices took place.
Having comprised about 20 hours of recorded interview material, organising, managing and retrieving meaningful bits from the data evoked a methodological challenge. Coding and theory development were based on a thematic analysis, according to which data were linked to common themes and concepts. Rather than approaching coding as a ‘counting’ of units or clusters of meaning, based on Seidel and Kelle thematic analysis was regarded as an analytical, heuristic process, in the course of which interview data were linked to emerging reoccurring concepts and meaning clusters (in Kelle 1995; see also Coffey 1996: 29). Thematic analysis was regarded as ‘having ideas about data’, identifying and presenting common patterns, irregularities and conceptual elements. In line with Strauss (2008), instead of a mere categorisation, the interview analysis entailed the conceptualisation of data, raising questions and opening new enquiries. In line with an interpretive approach, data coding and analysis took account of the meaning and structure of interview material and their settings, rather than the mere ‘registering’ of text units, such as ‘intrinsic cultural values’. The mere coding of text in this way would have not detected the diverse and at times disparate meaning and context interviewees gave to the same coding units. Since one of main points of enquiry addressed an analysis of the meaning of terms such as ‘culture’ and ‘cultural value’ a mere mechanical reading would have not allowed for an in-depth analysis of emerging conceptual themes. To give an example, as the analysis will show interviewees used different definitions for intrinsic cultural values referring to them variously as artistic and social values, or as interchangeable with instrumental policy criteria. In order to explore those differences in meaning, the analysis attempted to explore the way cultural managers made sense of cultural values in terms of to common themes within the context of their emergence.

Theoretical frameworks for the discussion of cultural values represented the historical and philosophical discourse of humanism and its counterparts, the materialist and relational critique, laid out in previous chapters. The analysis was particularly aware of detecting themes and concepts supporting or undermining either theoretical foundation. Instead of a mere reregistering of concepts, however, interviewee statements were traced to theoretical, as well as contextual backgrounds as a means to detect local, idiosyncratic and ideological modes of negotiation. In this way, a three-fold process of data analysis was assumed: noticing relevant phenomena and
common themes that could describe the negotiation of cultural values within the current policy context, collecting examples of them, and assessing them for commonalities, patterns and structure. In this way common themes were formed that yielded descriptions and explanations of cultural policy practices.

5.52 Generalisability & Reflexivity

A particular challenge for this study was the generalisability of research results. As noted above, in contrast to quantitative approaches, qualitative enquiry has been criticised as less representative and generalisable. This has been blamed on its focus on in-depth data and deductive methods, rather than statistical logic (Coffey 1996: 144). As has been briefly discussed above, however, qualitative research claims equal standards of scientific credibility and robustness based on the generalisability and transferability of analytical and logical interferences. As Alasuutari (1995) argues, a narrow schematic division that deems qualitative criteria less valid is unnecessary when rethinking generalisability and validity in terms of the ability to produce practical, explanatory devices for phenomena. Generalisability may thus be proficiently proven by the 'relevance' and 'transferability' of a given explanation to similar phenomena or settings. He argues:

While local explanation focuses on a particular phenomenon, the relating of that phenomenon to a broader entity is a generalising operation, in which the analysis of the specific phenomenon aims at conceptual appropriation of the broader phenomenon...In some cases a typology or a table constructed on the basis of certain variables may refer to a broader entity than the historically and locally specific structure to which the cases in the material are related (1995: 148).

Alasuutari suggests how analysis aims to make actions and concepts intelligible, by delivering explanations, rather than making statements as to the statistical distribution of phenomena in a population. Generalisation may thus be ensured by relating and explicating phenomena in terms of their relation to social and cultural conditions that provide for a conceptual context or setting. In this study in many ways the emphasis remained on internal validity, and the way phenomena were historically and socially conditioned and represented. This was also in line with Seal (1999: 108) who argues: 'The basis of theoretical generalisation lies in logic rather than
probability... Threats to such transferability are dealt with most adequately if thick descriptions... are provided'. Becker also suggested how replicability may be ensured through close 'description of a natural history of our conclusions, presenting the evidence as it came to the attention of the observer during the successive stages of his conceptualisation of the problem' (Becker 1970 in Seale 1999: 162). The attempt was thus made to provide a reflexive mode of research presentation that makes explicit theoretical advancements and preconceptions relevant to research design and analysis. As Coffey (1996 in Seale 1999) argued 'processes of exploration and abduction' should be made retrievable. In addition, a reflexive mode of research presentation was aimed at that took account of knowledge, expertise and research interest of the researcher, as they may cause 'bias' in data gathering and interpretation (Zinn 1979 in Minichiello 1991: 218).

5.6 Discussion

5.61 Cultural Values as Markers of Social Distinction

The discussion will begin by tracing the way theoretical leads emerged from the first two interviews. The first two interviews were conducted with cultural managers occupying opposite positions in terms of status of power and authority, professional experience and institutional context. Brian is an experienced artistic and managing director of a large organisation in Bristol dedicated to the development of poetry. His organisation facilitates a broad portfolio of activities including a major poetry festival. The organisation has been receiving core funding from the ACE and the local city council, and constitutes a large organisation with about 30 members of staff. On the other hand, the study involved Susan, a young cultural administrator, who had just graduated with an MA in Cultural Management. She was working on her first job as part of a cultural service team responsible for sport, leisure and art in West Sussex.

During the conversations with both managers, it became clear how financial and political constraints, as well as professional status affected their assessment of cultural policy rationales and values. When asked to define criteria for cultural programming, it became apparent how their levels of experience, expertise,
resources, organisational scope and status played into their responses. According to Susan funding was scarce, encompassing community based art projects only, with an emphasis on health and young people. She worked in a small team of three. Given the limited resources and the scope of local services to facilitate community arts, cultural programming was described as being based on instrumental reasoning:

Because it is a non-statuary service, we are always having to justify our funding. We are with the health directorate at the moment, so we are having to prove how it relates to health... I mean, with most our work I would say it's all instrumental, because unless we can show that it benefits the community, we can't really justify it.

Restrictions put on her to fulfil specific policy agenda under the remit of what could be called community cohesion and inclusion, increased tensions with artistic and culturally specific aspects. This conflict ultimately increased her scepticism against the instrumental remit and resulted in an endorsement of cultural autonomous values:

I think they [the arts] should be allowed to [fulfil social functions], but they should not have to. They have often been didactic or a way to pass on a message or a moral way of being or a story. I think there is place for that, but I don't think that there should be the assumption that they should have that function... Sometimes [social goals] can limit or can be a constraint on artists.

When asked to define artistic criteria, she suggested how the arts represented subjective and experiential processes. The interviewee argued how instrumental cultural policy rationales interfered with the intrinsic remit of artistic organisations. In this way, she supported the idealist stance of much of the cultural constituency, discussed in Chapter One. In many respects the critique of instrumental values resulted from her inability, by lack of resources, to implement artistic cultural values.

In contrast, the conversation with Brian showed how financial and political freedom allowed for a relatively autonomous, flexible and discretionary stance towards artistic administration. In this way, the tension between competing cultural policy rationales was resolved by a recognition of both intrinsic and instrumental considerations. Apparent was his description of cultural values as 'context-driven' and as entailing both artistic and social criteria of judgement. In contrast to Susan no strict contradiction was perceived between intrinsic and instrumental values. Brian described the intrinsic qualities of poetry as based on innovation, depth and
technique, but suggested also how art had a significant contribution to make to urban regeneration and social inclusion. He said: 'I think it is all about context. I don’t have a problem in judging the success of a poetry event with criteria that have nothing to do with poetry'. Although both interviewees were accountable to instrumental rationales, community coherence and inclusion, it was evident that his privileged financial and managerial status allowed significant discretion to reconcile a number of different policy rationales in a non-obstructive manner. He argued:

If you are imaginative then finding ways to maintain the integrity of what you want to do, and meeting the bureaucratic criteria [by public funders], should be an exciting challenge and not a closed door.

He thereby suggested that not only his senior management position, expertise and experience, but also the art form he was promoting helped him to implement a range of cultural criteria: 'I don’t know about other art forms, but in terms of developing poetry and literature in general it’s not that much of a problem to meet instrumental aims, because all I really want to is to engage people with the word. I can do that in any context'.

Based on the as yet individual and idiosyncratic interview material and analysis, the study proceeded to explore further ideological, political and economic dimensions of cultural evaluation and the context driven nature of cultural production. The account sought to discuss the social and economic conditions of cultural production conditions.

5.62 Artistic Freedom and Sources of Power

The following discussion will further explore conceptual and ideological aspects of cultural practice and evaluation and their interconnectedness with relations of power, professional position and organisational resources, such as funding, staff and production capacity. The analysis was particularly interested in discussing the way cultural managers defined and negotiated intrinsic cultural values in the context of political, social and economic conditions of cultural production and consumption. A counterpoint to the discussion of intrinsic cultural values represented Bourdieu’s materialist critique of cultural policy, which in the light of the historical and social
genesis of cultural ideas and consumption pattern critically assessed assumptions of universal, transcendental and autonomous presentation of culture. The assessment of how cultural managers defined cultural values in relation to extrinsic conditions, such as instrumental policy agenda, economic pressure, local communities and cultural goals ultimately aimed to discuss the negotiation of the humanist basis for cultural policy making. The analysis demonstrated the continued ideological power of the humanist discourses for contemporary cultural policy, which in many ways resulted in the perpetuation of ideas of excellence and access. The endorsement of artistic values often remained short of a reflection on the materialist requirements of production and consumption conditions, deeming the discussion ideologically removed and socially divisive. There was evidence of a lack of awareness of a relational account of culture, which highlights the need to rethink policies of access, cultural excellence and diversity in a more democratic, inclusive manner.

The analysis began with an assessment of the historical, socioeconomic and political concepts for intrinsic cultural values given by cultural managers in different positions. The discussion showed how powerful cultural managers defined cultural values in an autonomous manner, seemingly removed from the political economy of cultural production. Managers in elevated professional and institutional positions tended to discuss cultural values as part of a discretionary, subjective and opaque production process. The unique qualities of the arts lay in their unquantifiable and illusive outcomes, whose value amounted to intrinsic and transcendental meaning. The discussion thereby pointed out their ideologically removed presentation, which often left unaccounted unequal social production and consumption conditions.

Support for the art separatist foundation of intrinsic cultural values was shown by the director of an internationally renowned arts venue in London. Tom underscored his belief in traditional art for art’s sake ideas as the key motivation for art direction by suggesting how artistic merits were the sole measuring rod for programming. He upheld the relative autonomy of art production from the political economy by suggesting how expertise and peer experience were key assessment criteria. In many ways his statements were representative of the support of the largely humanist foundation for cultural management. Tom argued:
I start from the premise that we don’t put anything on that is not worth doing artistically on its own terms. So I have always been a person who is strong on artistic merits and art for art’s sake if you want. It is a very subjective thing and you rely on people’s experience, expertise, knowledge of the market place, international work and what is out there.

In line with key aspects of the art for art’s tradition Tom stressed how artistic values represented subjective evaluations that nevertheless were transcendent and not class-bound. He stressed intellectual and technical refinement, as well as innovation as key criteria for intrinsic values. Tom pointed out that most artistic assessment criteria were subject to the discretionary deliberation of members of the art world:

We do a lot of work of a traditional kind, but also contemporary stuff, which is quite popular as well. I think that the arts in a contemporary sense are much less hierarchical as they were and that there are lots of musicians in the contemporary side of world, jazz and folk music who are just as innovative and technically and intellectually fine as classical music. But you also look at peer assessment, professional critique, how it fitted into your season, and many more subjective measures.

In a typical way Tom went on to suggest how artistic values stood in contrast to extrinsic socioeconomic and political measures. Although funder’s measures were of concern they presented mere extrinsic, secondary and somehow incommensurable aspects upheld by ‘non-arts people’. He argued:

There are what we call intrinsic factors and extrinsic ones... There are bound to be softer measures and harder ones. It is up to the governors and the board to understand that they have to be interlinked... We do lots of audience surveying on customer experience, focus groups and so on. We do a lot of monitoring both for facilities, programme, catering, and measure ourselves against other London venues. That again is used as an argument for funding and funding increase... So these are important distinctions for a board largely of non-arts people. To give them a tool kit what we are about.

By suggesting how ‘hard’ ‘extrinsic’ measures, referring here to instrumental policy goals, represented a ‘tool kit’ for funding bodies and trustees Tom implied their mere technical nature as part of external policy guidelines and impact driven assessments.

He stressed the mere extrinsic nature of instrumentalism by arguing how governors needed to acknowledge intrinsic measures in addition to instrumental ones. By contrasting his lack of concern for political and economic aspects of cultural production with a belief in art separatist values Tim in many ways showed a lack of awareness of their interconnectedness. As Bourdieu suggested the development of intrinsic ideas of art for art’s sake were the result of the historical development of
humanist canon within the field of cultural production. It was partly the elevated position of key actors of the artistic world, whose economic and social status allowed them to draw distinctions between intrinsic and extrinsic concerns, and to ultimately claim artistic autonomy from the latter. By presenting artistic values as disconnected from the political economy, Tom in many ways perpetuated the socially removed presentation of culture as objective and transcendent. In this way he largely remained unaware of the ideological and economically removed presentation of artistic activities as transcendent and objective.

Similar emphasis on the importance of intrinsic cultural values that were opposed to extrinsic concerns were made by Tim and Sam. Tim, the managing director of a prominent London gallery, highlighted the intrinsic function of art by arguing:

I think what is unique about artistic activity is that it doesn’t need to exist—especially when it comes to the fine arts. There is no function to a painting, there is no function to a sculpture necessarily, in that it doesn’t exist for another reason. It exists for itself. You might employ all sorts of value to it, positively or negatively, but actually it just is.

By suggesting how art works pertained a mere aesthetic value that was removed from extant function or meaning Tim reiterated art for art’s sake ideas. In line with Tim, Sam, the managing director of a large art centre in the West Midlands, whose Arts Council funded organisation has a financial turnover of about £4.2 million, described intrinsic cultural values as largely discretionary and autonomous from instrumental political and economic concerns:

We hardly ever in our everyday life use the words ‘intrinsic’ or ‘instrumental’... We don’t make that differentiation...That is very much coming into vogue as a way of describing things in research programmes, in particular in dealing with public money... In many ways, alongside a lot of my colleagues, we select in terms of what you would call intrinsic meanings. But then, if we have to we will find clever ways to turn that into instrumental terms, if we have to justify ourselves with public funders.

In a similar way as Tom, Sam described how cultural evaluation adhered primarily to intrinsic artistic concerns that stood in stark contrast to the mere extrinsic and political function of instrumental ones. When suggesting that he was able to circumvent instrumental policy when needed Sam highlighted a lack of concern for funding policies. This not only highlighted his adherence to art for art’s sake as the core
reasoning for cultural management, it also underlined his authority as an artistic
director and the powerful position his organisation was in. Given the fact that many
interviewees in this study pointed out the burden funding objectives posed for them,
Sam’s seeming indifference indicated his elevated position. Sam proceeded to point
out how cultural managers and their peers were allowed to deliberate largely
independently from instrumental policy concerns on the quality and content of work.
Appearing ideologically removed, he stressed how artistic quality and values at times
assumed universal and transcendent value. Sam argued:

> We are guided by a shared set of beliefs and values on notions of value. Quality is used as a measure… (We put on) classic stuff like Mozart or
Shakespeare, because they are talking in universals. I would say that the
themes of Shakespeare’s work, of love, war, death, jealousy and empire, and
the way he expressed it from a common man’s point of view, speak universally
across cultures, to anybody.

Sam underscored the universal value of art when he argued that ‘anybody’ could
appreciate the themes of some art works. His adherence to intrinsic cultural values
thereby failed to acknowledge the extensive educational, cultural and social
requirements needed to participate in high art activities. As Bourdieu argued it was
the ideological neutralisation of cultural values as ‘objective’ that ultimately masked
culture as practices of social distinction.

Assuming decidedly humanist, art separatist concepts of intrinsic cultural values
cultural managers in this study stressed how cultural evaluation and quality
assessment were based on criteria driven by the arts constituency. Many
interviewees suggested how experience, peer review and school were key aspects of
evaluation, and how these were in part defined by the ideas and expertise of
members of the art world. In this way the subjective, discretionary and opaque nature
of quality assessment was pointed out. Sam for instance suggested:

> On the whole we have failed to come to one definition (for cultural values). There is no one definition. I deal with many art forms, with film and visual arts.
I would say I interpret what I see in relation of my experience and my
colleague programmer’s experience of many years of assessing and
experiencing arts.
Whereas Sam pointed out how art assessment depended mainly on ‘experience’ and ‘interpretation’, Henry, an artistic director of a theatre company, further underscored the subjective and indeterminate nature of art production:

We often start projects not knowing what they are, not knowing their title. To a frightening extend we don’t know what the outcome is. We go into rehearsal room together and say what can happen here? Where are we going? And the work happens in a laboratory, investigative process…that is the most important. And that guarantees the quality of what we are doing… We wouldn’t know (the artistic outcome) until we are in the studio and do the improvising.

By describing artistic processes as indeterminate and hard to map, Henry pointed out the intrinsic nature of artistic production. He thereby implied its inaccessibility to lay people, but also the difficulty of assessing its outcome and quality in measurable, concrete ways. Henry stressed the importance of presenting challenging and difficult work, whose meaning at times could remain elusive and undefined to an audience and critics. In this way he reiterated key tenets of art for art’s sake, pointed out in Chapter Three, that is the experiential, subjective and immeasurable nature. Henry suggested:

So, for us successful projects are where we feel that there are questions and challenges…There is an acceptance that success won’t be championed by everyone. There will be division in critical response, which is a good thing. Broadly speaking we accept that some people won’t like what we do, but others will be thrilled and excited, or puzzled… (Art) does these things in a secretive and hard to map way. It is open and we are confident that audiences will answer questions…or not that is fine too.

Henry underscored again how quality and success were defined in artistic terms, and were relatively independent of legitimisation by audience or reviewers. Henry’s approach to artistic assessment as removed from popular reception was also voiced by a London curator, who stressed the importance of not compromising artistic production for accessibility. Anton argued:

So excellence is difficult to define and a very subjective thing… But our director for instance emphasized recently the concept of art on art’s terms. I think what that means is that art needs to be respected as it is. We cannot compromise an artistic vision in order to provide access to it. What we can do is remove barriers and obstacles towards in our practice, but not compromise by overly simplistic and didactic text. So it is actually presenting art as it should be.
The previous excerpt reflected on the continued adherence of cultural managers to key aspects of the humanist foundation for cultural policy and art for art’s sake. It was suggested how interviewees defined the arts variously as an autonomous creative process, whose outcome and quality was hard to map and difficult to define in measurable economic or social terms. Significantly interviewees advertised intrinsic cultural values with a simultaneous disconnect from financial resources and freedom from political intrusion. Not only remained favourable institutional production conditions unacknowledged, managers also failed to show awareness of the historical and social genesis of art for art’s sake ideas. In this way the contemporary significance of Bourdieu and Gans’ relational accounts are underscored, which lie in their critical analysis of the relation between socio-economic production conditions, historical genesis and educational requirements on the one hand, and artistic production and participation on the other hand. What their account continue to highlight are the socially divisive implications of idealist cultural assumptions, that often result in exclusionary and limited cultural core programmes.

The seemingly disconnected, idealist presentation of cultural values was also emphasised by the way public cultural managers were able to display managerial latitude, flexibility and diversity in their decision-making. Given their autonomy instrumental and extrinsic concerns seemed to cause little pressure and interference. This was demonstrated by the fact that privileged managers were able to integrate and cater for a number of different cultural as well as instrumental criteria and policy goals, whose facilitation strongly depended on sufficient financial and institutional resources. That these were necessarily interlinked with the ability to command the order and content of cultural production was shown by statements by Tom:

*We do a number of projects that we believe in artistically, but which also have a social side- whether it is to do with reducing gun crime, or promoting social understanding... and these are important things. And they are part of the ways the arts can help to transform society.*

In this excerpt Tom indicated his ability to integrate two essentially contrary cultural evaluative criteria, art for art’s sake and social instrumentalism, due to the large portfolio of activities his organisation was able to accommodate. This kind of evidence is supported by the fact that his organisation belongs to one of Europe’s largest art venues representing a diverse portfolio of activities with substantial Arts
Council funding. That the ability to resolve the tension between intrinsic and instrumental goals into an adherence to artistic ends was a privilege of established, funded institutions was also suggested by Anton’s statements. He argued how due to the managerial latitude of art direction his organisation was able to implement instrumental social agenda in an autonomous way:

I mean one of the problems that we have was how highly instrumentalised education had become. It had become so obvious a tool to further social integration. Some requirements of the funders and the Council are so blatant. I mean some of them even said that projects needed to raise awareness of health issues and so on… and we were keen to move away from the obviously instrumentalised. We created a project within the context that people could encounter as they chose. So we avoided engaging for instance specifically with disabled people only or other groups. We tried to set up proposals within a context so that people could come to it of their own accord and maybe by accident.

Anton here suggested that although funding objectives had in fact become highly instrumentalised, his organisation was able to integrate them into meaningful artistic projects. Given that his gallery represents one of the most established public visual art venues in London presenting 4-5 exhibitions and additional projects a year, his statements seemed to demonstrate the link between artistic freedom and production conditions. However, it was the lack of economic context that produces artistic autonomy that deemed Anton and Tom’s above account ideologically removed. As Bourdieu suggested it is the presentation of culture as autonomous, transcendent and unique in the absence of awareness of the historical and socioeconomic genesis that perpetuates ignorance of the unequal distribution of cultural and social capital.

Whereas it was argued that many powerful art managers unwittingly assumed the authority to determine cultural discourses whilst rarely stating awareness of political and economic power relations and status, there were exceptions. That the ability to choose amongst different, even contrary assessment criteria depended to a large extent on efficient resources, staff and financial security was stressed by Alan. Referring to his plans for a ‘very big education project’ with the Youth Service of Birmingham being staged parallel to the main programme, he admits: ‘To be truthful, these are two very big examples, but we are a big company, too. We can find ways to raise the money’.
That artistic independence ultimately depended on economic and political freedom was, however, best demonstrated by statements made by less senior or powerful cultural managers. In particular cultural workers from community based art centres and smaller art organisations suggested, how art programming was determined by, and in fact could not be mediated without reference to financial constraints, staff resources, locality and venue space. When resources were scarce, cultural managers rarely showed the idealism and claim for cultural autonomy voiced by powerful cultural managers above. Instead, many interviewees stressed how they needed to focus on audience development and community-led activities to justify their programme and to generate income. The manager from a small, rural theatre company for instance described her lack of artistic freedom as follows:

Well, I think if you are a community-based or a subsidised theatre company like the RSC [Royal Shakespeare Company] or the National [Theatre], then you can have wonderful mission statements- if you have the money to put into these kind of things. The [name of the company] has a very, very limited budget. Everything really has to go into selling tickets- that is the main priority. If they can’t make money then they cease to exist. And so, education work is important because it sells tickets.

The sober comments of Margret pay testament to the limited freedom for cultural idealism and artistic independence as the direct result of constraints of resources. She further suggested:

I choose to work with the companies that offer me the money. I can't be that idealistic: I go with the offer. I can't necessarily look at what people stand for and what they have done in the past. I can't pick and choose or say: I don’t like the work you do or have done. I am not in the position to do that. It’s more practical than that. I can't be as lofty and idealistic about that, I am afraid.

The previous statements reflect the limited discretion and autonomy over cultural programming of smaller organisations that stand in stark contrast to the capacities of cultural managers in more elevated positions. Cultural managers from smaller organisations thereby demonstrated how cultural production conditions, such as financial resources, political latitude and institutional resources, represented key requirements for autonomous artistic production and idealism. They showed the interconnectedness between these two aspects of cultural production throwing into doubt assumptions of the universal, transcendental value of culture.
The above discussion of the adherence to art for art’s sake ideas as key values of cultural management stood in stark contrast to the critical analysis of the historical and socioeconomic aspects of artistic production and consumption. Chapter Two discussed the relational critique of core cultural assumptions and values as based on a largely neglected materialist and historical genesis, and the humanist scholastic discourse cemented by Kant. With the aim to dismantle the class-driven basis of cultural production and consumption, Bourdieu and Gans had pointed out the extensive socioeconomic, historical and educational requirements underlying the development of taste cultures. Their critique addressed the ideological function of cultural discourses as tools for social distinction. What relational accounts thereby questioned was the lack of critical awareness of production and consumption conditions in the mainstream cultural discourse that served the ideological distortion of the ‘objective value’ of cultural policy. This often resulted in the foundation and perpetuation of unequal cultural production and consumption conditions, contrasted with their outward presentation as universal and transcendental. The discussion of the field study so far showed evidence for continued support of idealist presentation of cultural values, which often remained disconnected from socioeconomic conditions for cultural production and consumption. Cultural managers in this study showed a lack of awareness of the materialist and ideological basis for the production of cultural values that was indicated through the formulation of the transcendental and unique value of art that left unaccounted educational and social requirements. Comments such as Sam’s demonstrated a lack of awareness of the link between class and cultural participation when he argued further:

I would probably say, putting my hand at my heart, I don’t know any artists whose action come with a desire to exclude people... So it follows from that, that it is up to all of us to take the opportunity to do it. So there are large proportions of society who feel no ownership and interest in the arts...

In this excerpt Sam linked exclusion with artistic motivation, rather than the educational and social requirements needed by audiences to appreciate art. He thereby seemed to suggest how despite equal access this opportunity was inadvertently ignored by non-attendees. In this way Sam implied how art participation was based on taste and interest, rather than other factors. The seemingly removed and discretionary manner in which cultural activities were defined independently of
educational and social conditions of cultural consumption was also suggested by the director of a dance company in the East Midlands:

Well, the thing about Ballet is that all the perceptions about it are all wrong of course, i.e. that it is white and middle-class. It certainly isn’t middle class, it’s simply perceived as something that society liked doing and which is grand. It was certainly white, in that it came out of Russia, England and France, and then the Russian taught the Far East, China, Japan and Korea. But it was also about a certain body build, which was historically very much a European body build I think, as opposed to a Caribbean for instance… And what makes Ballet so likable is the skill of young dancers; and Ballet provides spectacle. But in terms of outreach and what young people want, it’s the fitness and the skill.

In this excerpt Alan unwittingly assumed key arguments of the humanist discourse and intrinsic values by referring to aesthetic and cultural aspects, whilst ignoring or denying the materialist requirements for production and consumption. He decidedly rejected the class-driven perception of ballet, suggesting that it could be appreciated by anyone who valued skill, bodily physique and entertainment. In this way he implied how ballet was subject to universal taste that transcended social, as well as national distinctions. He thereby seemed to ignore the educational and social requirements needed to not only appreciate, but also visit and train in ballet performances. This starkly contrasted Bourdieu’s critique of traditional humanist discourses and art forms. Based on the economic and educational capital needed to visit ballet venues, in *Distinction* Bourdieu had in fact pointed out the decidedly ‘aspirational’ nature of ballet, which he regarded as part of *petit bourgeoisie* efforts for social distinction. He suggested that it was ballet’s social legitimacy as an activity that drove socially competitive technocrats to choose ballet as a cultural preference, despite its unaffordable schemes (Bourdieu 2004 [1979]: 333). He suggested how in the French context ballet was part of a decidedly middle class taste culture that the aspiring petite bourgeois assumed for social distinction, despite lacking in actual cultural or economic capital. In the light of Bourdieu’s critique, Alan’s assertions on ballet’s universal accessibility merely aimed at the objectification of its value, and the ideological distortion of its social and cultural value.
5.63 Resolving the Tension between Intrinsic Cultural Values and Social Instrumental Policies

As the discussion in Chapter One has shown, cultural expenditure has in recent decades increasingly been justified on the basis of social instrumental demands and impact based policies. Instrumental policies have since been generally regarded as undermining art specific values, and as threatening the actual purpose of cultural organisations. The following discussion explores the way cultural managers negotiated the tension between artistic and extant concerns. The question was raised as to how cultural managers resolved the tension between conflicting policy rationales posed by artistic concerns, impact-driven policy demands and the need to assume social, democratic and public values. This study will show that contrary to the theoretical discussion and claims made by leading cultural representatives, cultural managers recognised and accepted the social role of culture and the arts as part of a traditional liberal humanist approach to culture. Social instrumental reasoning was regarded as a reflection on the civilising and enlightening power of the arts. Cultural managers in fact assumed a synthesis between intrinsic and social instrumental cultural rationales. This synthesis was based on a complex, and at times contradictory discourse based on liberal humanist ideas, public accountability, cultural democracy, and at times economic necessity.

The emergence of so-called instrumental cultural policy agenda, such as social inclusion and regeneration, has arguably put greater pressures on the cultural sector to prove its worth in terms of measurable outcomes. Social and economic instrumental benefits of the arts, such as education, health and community enhancement, have become prominent theoretical frameworks for the cultural policy discussion. As the discussion in Chapter One suggested, many commentators pointed out the tension between intrinsic cultural and social values, and explicitly managerial and entrepreneurial ones as having resulted in an impasse within the cultural policy sector. However, the field study showed how cultural managers in fact ascribed a minor role to the tension between intrinsic and social instrumental cultural values. Anton, the curator from a large London gallery, represented a common view amongst interviewees:
I think (art) does all of these things inevitably. I am not one side or the other, I think it is a false dichotomy, I think (artistic and social concerns) are irrevocably interconnected. I think it is a degree of emphasis, and who ever interprets it, because that role is inevitably fulfilled. This question is more about terminology because I think the social function is inevitably part of the artistic process, no matter how explicit it is. If it becomes the driving purpose, then it can overshadow other aspects. But I think that the social function is equally intrinsic, no matter how it is expressed.

Jane, the artistic director of a London gallery seemed to support this view:

My view is that both instrumental and intrinsic effects are the same. They are useful shorthand to make more specific descriptions, for instance setting specific targets based on outreach or whatever- but if you actually go beyond and look at how instrumental factors are achieved you might see that they actually amount to intrinsic factors. So, we don't separate out the two.

Cultural managers in this study often referred to the social function of the arts as an intrinsic part of cultural activities, as culture was set in a social context and pertained social functions and responsibilities. Most managers acknowledged how art required audiences and artists to bring their own social and cultural background in order to make sense of the arts. A good illustration of this is represented by the statement of another London curator, who suggested: 'I mean art has an aesthetic dimension to it, but trying to separate it from its social, historical or cultural dimension is just a false division.' Interviewees reflected on the embeddedness of art in a social context, referring not only to the background experience of audiences, but also the social setting of arts institutions and events. Anton described this as follows:

The most basic idea of the social function is to set up communication and conversation. I don't think anything exists in isolation. I think art does require a viewer to bring their context and political, social and cultural baggage... I think that the social function is equally intrinsic no matter how it is expressed. I don't think anything changes on this value.

The social function of the arts was also regarded in the way art events and institutions functioned as venues for social meetings between audiences. At times this was incorporated into arts works. Tim, another London curator, suggested how an artist facilitated social gatherings as part of the artistic presentation:

One artist, Venetia, (he was) celebrated in the late 90's, I mean it was part of his work to always include a lots of people. He for instance cooked Thai food for his openings, so it was crucial to have lots of people there to share the experience.
Many managers in this study suggested how the arts often had social and political concerns as subject matter. Artists often drew on their social context by challenging or reflecting on specific concerns, and by offering alternative, art specific perspectives. A Liverpudlian resource manager, Anita, for instance argued:

I think anything has a social function. That is fundamental...the arts are not just there to be pretty, and even then it has a social function. So I don’t subscribe to the idea of intrinsic and instrumental side... everyone [artists] tries to tell us something about the way we operate, how we are, how we behave and what society is. And this minute you do exert a social function, and it may not be more than challenging our thought and view.

A similar point was made by Jeremy, the artistic director of a theatre company, who argued how theatre was part of a social interaction that challenged people’s perception and questioned meaning making processes:

I think that our function is to question. As artists working in theatre we ask questions about theatre itself, and the experience of the audience, and about the way that meaning is made. I think that the arts that interest me do change things and the people that come. It is an intervention into social space and it is best if it is empowering and challenging, and part of a cultural and vital conversation.

Whereas many interviewees stressed the communicative, interpretative and sociable site of the arts and culture, they also defined social values in terms of a public remit of art institutions to provide transparent, egalitarian and democratic services. Many cultural managers showed an awareness of political, social and cultural demands put on cultural organisations to provide access, and show awareness of the exclusionary past of traditional cultural policies. An important basis for the support of the social cultural political agenda represented the critique of liberal humanist ideas by various post-modern discourses and community groups that has been pointed out in Chapters One and Two. Cultural managers in this study generally showed an awareness of the politically divisive, class-ridden, Eurocentric and elitist underpinnings of liberal humanist assumptions, and linked these to a commitment to democratic, egalitarian and anthropological definitions of culture. The artistic director from London Jane for instance highlighted the narrow official curriculum of arts as exclusionary:

So it is not surprising that the official definition of the arts in the last 60 years has become quite narrowed into those that are funded through the ACE and
the public purse. So the whole of the musical tradition wasn't taken in, and quite explicitly historically excluded...I mean there are material practices associated with the arts, like sound and music. But when considering art, quite a lot is excluded.

Jane showed an awareness of the traditionally limited focus of core funding policies, suggesting how these excluded alternative and local art forms and their audiences. She later on suggested how art funding should include 'creative activities', rather than focus on established, traditional art production alone. The narrow focus of traditional cultural evaluation was also pointed out by Anton, the London curator:

I mean more traditionally excellence has been about consistency for instance, and excellence used to be judged by a particular vision and championing a particular idea of art. I don't think that is the case anymore, I think too many things have happened too quickly. So there is more emphasis on diversity of experience and responses.

Although Anton had also stressed the intrinsic value of art, he subsequently suggested how traditional cultural evaluation had become more context driven and interpretative. He implied how traditional hierarchical approaches had lost some of their significance in the contemporary art world.

Statements like these suggested how cultural manager were aware of issues of the exclusionary and divisive focus of historical cultural programming, in this way evoking democratic changes to cultural policies. A number of interviewees in fact defined the 'social' in terms of the democratic, inclusive and accessible nature of culture. They underscored the public remit of art institutions that commanded responsibility to provide more transparent, accessible and democratic terms for cultural services. A prominent London curator argued for instance:

In think institutions have a moral responsibility to fulfil a social function. To me the function of an institution is to share work, is to share thinking and experience about work. It is one of our responsibilities to think about who we are talking to.

In a similar way emphasised Anton his public remit:

I mean there are lots of expectations and there is heavy responsibility in working in a public organisation. And my role is to facilitate not only arts organisations, but also access to art experience and ideas. I am also involved in fund raising and we are organising public lectures and book publications, every aspect of my work is about communication...
Cultural managers pointed out the public remit of arts institutions, which lay in the need to ensure broad access and facilitate audience outreach. The need to present a theoretical framework for public funding was thereby in part explained due to past neglect of arts institutions to justify their public constitution. Jeremy, an artistic director from Sheffield for instance criticised the art world’s past failure to engage in a public discourse on its worth:

If you look at the perception of the art world and its actors, the conclusion is that they are slightly irresponsible- live in the clouds. And that is because the art world has not been good enough to describe the extent of their engagement and the importance that it has. Brian Eno said, what the science world has done is building up a presence in the public about its authority and its meaning. So publications like Hawking’s book about time have laid out highly theoretical issues, but they have made a huge impact in the public. So they have moved away from a traditional image of the scientist and engaged with the public. And the art world has failed to do that, it is a long way away from having this public discourse.

Jeremy pointed out how unlike other disciplines, the arts had failed to provide a broad public remit for the arts, which in part was based on opaque and internal production processes. He in many ways seemed to criticise the perpetuation of the art sector’s exclusivity that had resulted in its inaccessibility.

As the discussion in Chapter Four showed, humanist ideas of the educational, morally enhancing and reformatory role of the arts and culture formed a central aspect of the development of official cultural policy in the 19th century. The field work showed that humanist ideas of social instrumentalism continued to form a key justification for artistic activities. Many managers suggested how the arts accrued social benefits, such as personal and community enhancement, education and health. Gloria, a community art manager from Aylesbury, for instance pointed out how art projects and art centres could help people to take part in social life:

(Art) is a way to engage people. I think being creative is a good way to engage. We have got an organisation called ‘Aylesbury Youth Action’, who get young people involved in the community. They did an art project for instance, getting them involved in community life… I mean if they visit the centre, we work with so many different groups and they get so much out of the arts. And people who wouldn’t necessary experience these things elsewhere. I mean it is very broad, we have a lots of people with learning difficulties and do a lots of
different arts. Actually coming somewhere, where they can get involved and develop their skills and express their experience in a friendly environment and interacting with others, is invaluable.

Gloria here likened art centres with social spaces, where community activities could take place and different artistic activities could be explored. She thereby suggested how this evolved around local and community based cultural activities, rather than traditional art forms. In a similar way suggested Alan how art centres could enhance social inclusion and provide education. Unlike Gloria, however, he drew explicit historical notions of enlightenment and social control, discussed in Chapter Four. He argued:

I also feel that the arts have a largely unrealised power to transform a community...We do a number of projects that we believe in artistically, but which also have a social side, whether it is to do with reducing gun crime, or promoting social understanding... and these are important things... To use an analogy with medicine, for instance, no one would advocate to entirely depend upon homoeopathic medicine, but in the mix it has been proven that some aspects of homoeopathy have worked. So in the same way you need to look at the arts as part of the advancement of society.

Alan used reformatory enlightenment notions of culture to justify contemporary social instrumentalist policies. Noteworthy were comparisons of art with 'medicine', and as part of a 'mix' of social-political interventions, as they seemed to recall Victorian notions of the instrumental role of culture in social control. Alan went on to describe a number of social regeneration and education projects his organisation had facilitated, which aimed to 'transform' schools in deprived areas. Similar arguments were made by Sam, who explained his commitment to social regeneration through the enlightening and reformatory function of culture. He argued:

But [art] is also just about entertainment...and to enlighten people and bring them into one place... And I think that in two ways: simply intrinsically by being there. It might well be that a production of Macbeth of Category A murderers in prison might have a particular impact, if put in a context like that... which it wouldn’t on one of my stages. So the same play may have different impacts on different occasions. But then you might well again take a drama in a prison context to resolve conflicts or to talk directly to people about cause and effect.

Sam evoked popular 19th century notions of ‘social control’, suggesting how culture may be directly helpful in reforming criminals and reducing crime.
5.64 Social Instrumentalism and Ideology

The discussion so far has shown the diversity of arguments that sum up the general consensus on the social instrumental role of culture. This consensus stood in stark contrast to the opposition to the instrumental role of culture that has been discussed in Chapter One. Instead of insisting on the reformulation of intrinsic cultural values, participants in this study justified artistic activities based on their direct social impact, the democratic, public remit of cultural institutions, as well as the intrinsically social and interpretative basis of art activities. Although social instrumental aspects intrinsic to the contemporary cultural policy approach were resolved in this way, the negotiation of artistic and social concerns remained conflict ridden. The negotiation of inclusive, public and instrumental notions of culture resulted in contradictory lines of arguments when voiced simultaneously with ideas of aesthetic idealism and excellence. It thereby became apparent how pressures to facilitate a social instrumental role as part of funding requirement, but also caution to countervail elitist imagery, yielded in contradictory assumptions on access and excellence. The London based managing art director Tom for instance argued:

I start from the premise that we don’t put anything on that is not worth doing artistically on its own terms. So I have always been a person who is strong on artistic merits and art for art’s sake if you want... I tend to feel that the [name of organisation]... may have had the image of being an elitist and exclusionist institution- it may not have it any more. I think that the arts in a contemporary sense are much less hierarchical... I mean we also get a diverse audience both in a socio-economic as well as ethnic and demographic sense as well. And I think that feels like a democratic space, as well as an international and local place, in a sense that makes you feel like you belong there and own it.

Tom’s comments demonstrated the conflict ridden negotiation of art for art’s sake ideas on the one hand, and access and cultural democracy on the other. Although the manager began by suggesting his idealist commitment to art separatist criteria, he later succumbed to a somewhat rhetorical rallying of egalitarian terms of art provision. This was premised on a fear of having 'the image of being an elitist and exclusionist institution'. Background research has shown the historically paternalistic remit of the art centre. The interviewee’s institution has represented one of the largest art centres in Europe, which has been hosting an acclaimed national orchestra. Attempting to prove the democratic basis of arts production Tom stressed...
how his institution attracted a diversity of audiences. He later, however, somehow distanced himself from this statement by arguing that these were mere subjective impressions: 'I think that feels like a democratic space...in a sense that makes you feel like you belong there and own it'.

Assuming a mix of arts separatist and democratic claims, Tom inadvertently tapped into the ideological discourse of art organisations that Bourdieu’s relational account had attempted to dismantle. Tom’s insistence on art for art’s sake ideas seemed to remain unaware of the educational and social requirements needed to partake in the arts, and the thereby intrinsic divisive implications of core cultural ideas. In many respects the endorsement of cultural democratic values presented through the contradictory conjuncture with 'art for art's sake', democracy and 'ownership' hint at what Fairclough called 'simulated egalitarianism', the projection of egalitarian relations on hierarchical cultural and social structures. Tim’s statements reflected a common conflict expressed by participants in this study, and ultimately hinted at the difficulty of reconciling traditional humanist notions of the arts with contemporary demands for cultural democracy and inclusion.

A somewhat more reflective account of the difficulty of reconciling instrumental and intrinsic cultural values was given by Anton. He pointed out how his organisation insisted on art for art’s sake ideas as overt instrumental objectives, such as access and education, were perceived to compromise artistic excellence. Anton argued how untrammelled political and ethical prescriptions interfered with artistic goals and were therefore rejected:

I wouldn’t say the one [intrinsic values] excludes the other [social values], I think it is about balance... I think it is possible to see policies that overemphasise the access issue. But our director, for instance, emphasised recently the concept of art on art’s terms. I think what that means is that art needs to respected as it is. We cannot compromise an artistic vision in order to provide access to it. What we can do is remove barriers and obstacles towards in our practice, but not compromise by overly simplistic and didactic text.

The curator illustrated the difficulty of achieving a balanced approach towards the reconciliation of intrinsic with instrumental cultural values. He thereby stressed how art specific aspects represented the core motivation of his gallery, as instrumental ends conflicted with artistic goals. Anton’s concerns ultimately implied the lack of
theoretical and methodological framework for social instrumental policies that allowed for a reconciliation of both organisational and extrinsic goals. This will be discussed in more detail in the next section.

The discussion so far has shown, how despite conflicts, intrinsic and social instrumental aspects were closely assimilated, and how their endorsement indicated a reconciliation of seemingly contradictory policy rationales. Whereas the discussion suggested, how cultural managers justified social instrumentalism with a diversity of arguments, such as humanist and enlightenment notions, and public responsibility, the analysis also showed, that adherence to social instrumental demands formed a response to economic and political pressures. That the acceptance of social instrumentalism functioned as a relief from political and economic constraints, and therefore amounted to practical requirements, was expressed by Tom:

...as the funding is being constantly under threat or nibbled away at... We do a lot of audience surveying on customer experience, focus groups and so on. We do a lot of monitoring both for facilities, programme, catering, and measure ourselves against other London venues. That again is used as an argument for funding and funding increase. [Outreach and education] in the long-term economic development makes sense too. Let’s face it: we are altruistic, but also pragmatic as well.

Tom’s statements indicated how financial and political pressures yielded in impact-driven assessments and instrumental activities, such as outreach and education. He thereby distinguished between organisational and extrinsic goals by suggesting that auditing amounted to a ‘pragmatic’ approach to cultural management. Some cultural managers in fact conceded that instrumental policy rationales represented a purely practical device, that is as main means to secure funding. That education and outreach rather than procuring idealist values, in fact served some cultural institutions as sources of income was demonstrated by the publicist of a small theatre company. Margret argued:

Everything really has to go into selling tickets. That is the main priority. If they can’t make money, then they cease to exist. And so, education work is important because it sells tickets. We do extra education work, but really it’s about getting schools to come to see the play. We liked to get involved into others things, but we don’t have the people or the budget to do that, I am afraid.
The discussion on the way cultural managers perceive and resolve the conflict between intrinsic and instrumental policy rationales has shown how most cultural managers in this study endorsed social instrumental policy rationales. This finding largely contradicted the indictment of instrumentalism that, as argued in Chapter One, has been at the heart of the discussion on intrinsic values. It has been suggested that the endorsement of social instrumental justifications was based on a complex process of negotiation, where social aspects had to be assessed along side art specific organisational goals, instrumental requirements of public funders, financial security and the need to adopt inclusive and democratic policies. In this way, political, financial and public requirements and concerns yielded, at times, contradictory endorsement of competing cultural policy rationales.

5.65 A Critical Approach to Social Instrumentalism

The previous discussion showed how cultural managers in this study assumed a synthesis between social and cultural rationales that was based on humanist enlightenment assumptions, but also a commitment to a transparent policy discourse and public responsibility. The following debate assesses in more detail the way cultural managers evaluated the social instrumental role of culture. The discussion will show how cultural managers from small, community-led organisations generally showed greater awareness of the critical implications of social instrumentalism. The dissatisfaction with instrumental policies was based on the perceived lack of theoretical basis for the cultural role in social inclusion and regeneration programmes, and the narrow focus of public funding bodies on liberal humanist definitions of culture. The discussion will show, however, that the critique of instrumental cultural policies resulted in demands for better assessment methods and policy reviews, rather than the rejection of instrumentalism per se. Even though critique of the social instrumental agenda within cultural policy was voiced, the social role of culture was generally recognised.

The discussion in Chapter One has shown how the critique of instrumental policies has been founded on a number of methodological and theoretical shortcomings that question the effectiveness of the social instrumental agenda to bring about structural
changes to art production and consumption. The dissatisfaction with the methodological basis of instrumental policies was founded on the mere statistical, evidence-based nature of policy objectives. By addressing mere statistical indicators of socioeconomic background and ethnicity, rather than removing structural economic, cultural and education barriers, access policies often amounted to a mere perpetuation of socially divisive cultural policy. A key concern of critics remained the lack of theoretical foundation for a cause and effect relationship between culture and social goals, as well as meaningful long term measures to assess policy results.

Anita, the resource manager with an orchestra in Liverpool was particularly aware of what she called the culture-led ‘regeneration deal’ in the context of her organisation's participation in the ‘Capital of Culture' project. Her organisation has been running one of the oldest education and participation programmes in the UK, showing an enduring commitment and expertise in community outreach and diversity. However, the interviewee raised scepticism against her city's strategy to implement culture-led social regeneration programmes as they left unrecognised the class related, structural basis for social and cultural inequality. In this way social regeneration policies remained ineffective and couched in paternalistic terms:

I mean obviously we are the Capital of Culture this year, so in theory everyone is buying into the idea that culture is part of the regeneration deal. But there is a lot of difficulty and cynicism as well. There is a lot of pressure from the city council that there are tickets made available that people can effort. Again... [criticism is] that this is very simplistic, that it is about the money. But what is important in a city like Liverpool is to recognise that you can't just sit there and do what you do, and expect people to come to you.

Anita bemoaned how culture's contribution to policy outcomes were measured by mere statistical increases of visitor numbers and the number of free tickets given away, whilst failing to engage with the community and recognise local cultural needs. Anita highlighted the ineffectiveness of mere economic measures that ignored cultural and educational barriers to high culture:

So it is not an issue of economic barriers, but simply interest: cultural barriers. And from what I see from my own organisation, if we were to raise the prices to a level without subsidy it would become more cost prohibitive, but on the other hand, we have seen, that the opposite doesn’t work either. We have run a number of access schemes and given away free tickets. And people tend to value them less if they are given away for free. Even if they are just 5 pounds people are much more likely to turn up. Also, I am the only one I know who
hears classical music. I don’t know anyone else, and it is the perceptual issues around classical music that is difficult.

Whilst pointing out the ineffectiveness of economic access policies, Anita stressed the need to address cultural and educational barriers to traditional cultural forms, such as classical music. Anita concluded how the lack of an inclusive and robust long-term approach to social inclusion was partly due to the art sector’s inexperience with addressing explicit social instrumental objectives:

Change comes through inches and not through lots and lots of thing that we can measure. That is the problem: that we cannot quantify (the arts). And really, really good sociologists will tell you that it is about multiple impacts, it is not about my programme only. So the idea of single intervention is not right, but it is the result of a management culture that has emerged. I think that there are more areas to explore there. The art world is quite new to those expectations and not good to measure and express outcomes and so on.

Anita here attributed shortcomings of the current methodological approach to a flawed instrumental approach and its focus on simplistic, single impacts. She thereby suggested how current funding policies set inappropriate and unrealistic goals for arts organisations, implying that they were founded on a ‘management culture’. What lacked was a comprehensive and robust framework for the measurement of instrumental cultural benefits. Anita’s critique in many ways reiterated Bourdieu’s concern as to the ineffectiveness of access policies that failed to acknowledge the material class-driven basis of economic and educational requirements for cultural participation. By focusing on mere economic barriers, rather than providing compensatory education, access policies effectively perpetuated cultural exclusion and elitism. The criticism of instrumentalism voiced by participants, such as Anita, seemed support Bourdieu’s suggestion that cultural and educational capital, rather than mere economic barriers represented key means for access and participation. Many interviewees underscored the need to found inclusion policies on education and early familiarisation. The curator Anton for instance argued:

The arts sector can’t do that on its own. I think we need a lot of education, a broad and well balanced approach that would include the arts at an early stage in life. Now, I think that is a long term project, so whilst I applaud the government’s more instrumental approach, short term political gestures cannot help. So there are huge barriers largely of attitude, but it has very little to do with artists, and not so much with money. I think there are rigid cultural barriers.
Whereas so far the discussion has pointed out the dissatisfaction of participants with the narrow focus of instrumental policies on statistical and economic measures, the study also suggested more endogenous aspects of cultural policy that prevented structural changes. Participants thereby argued how central funding policies per se prevented effective access policies, as their narrow focus on core cultural programming and exclusive art forms excluded non traditional art audiences. By selecting traditional core cultural activities as key measures for cultural programming official cultural policies prevented structural changes to social inclusion and access. Cultural managers pointed out the lack of funding guidelines to acknowledge alternative forms of cultural activities and community-based programmes. This was contrary to assumptions that meaningful access and regeneration programmes required cooperation with and acceptance by the community. What was ultimately needed was a broader recognition of more inclusive, ‘anthropological’ definitions of cultural activities and expression. Anita for instance argued:

I mean the interventions are overly simplistic in assuming the price is the sole factor. But that ignores the fact people pay to see top football games, even people with poor incomes, partly because it is socially acceptable, partly because it gives a sense of identity. So it is not an issue of economic barriers, but simply interest: cultural barriers.

She suggested that government policies pertained to a traditional paternalistic approach, as it often showed little recognition of community-based culture and identities, including local and non-traditional cultural activities, such as football. Its focus on high culture, entrepreneurial developments, tourism and entertainment left engagement with the community ineffective. This reflected on the contradictions between cultural and social instrumental policy goals that were inherent in government policies. Anita thereby underscored the exclusionary implications of current policy developments represented by the McMaster Report:

It is those questions like: will I enjoy it, will I know what to do that really are of concern here. And the McMaster Report is guilty in some ways of oversimplifying the issues that exist. I think it is about culture for some people. I think free entrance is a politically accepted way to counterpoise barriers, but it is also about the early exposure to it that is important (emphasis added).
That the narrow focus of funding policies not only resulted in a limited, economic approach to access policies, but also actively excluded alternative art forms and their audience was also suggested by Jane. The artistic director from London suggested how the narrow cultural underpinnings of government funding undermined the development of local, community based cultural activities, and thereby perpetuated specific, class- based notions of cultural activities. Jane suggested how the focus on liberal humanist definitions of culture ultimately prevented effective inclusion and diversity:

When you look at the *Taking Part in the Art* survey by the DCMS and their definition of the arts, it is not surprising that you get a particular social group partaking in the arts, because they don't ask people about the cultural and historical traditions of other groups. So, it is the part of the mainstream artistic culture...which isn't included in that survey. So, unless people want to partake in the traditional set of arts they are actually not counted in as partaking in culture, which is not true.

The interviewee underscored the traditional hierarchical cultural division upheld by public funding bodies, which conflicted with commitments to cultural democracy and inclusion. She argued how artistic core values favoured by public funding bodies often left unaccounted the context driven and local nature of art practice and therefore strengthened art programmes delivered by large-scale art organisations and those in urban settings. The interviewee concluded, how this limited focus ultimately deprived community-based and grassroots activities:

If you look at a funder like the ACE, what they might consider risky and innovative is so far beyond what we had to do as a rural community that they would not be interested, in what we want to put on either. So, they have gone too far, they are not looking at it from a contextual perspective. It may not be as innovative in terms of what is going on in London, but in a rural district it could be considered actually quite challenging a programme.

Anita and Jane raised criticisms of the way the liberal humanist focus underpinning social instrumental policies left unaccounted a diverse and democratic basis for artistic programming. In many ways, this criticism echoed traditional demands for a greater recognition of alternative art forms and democratic participation, mentioned in Chapter Two (Braden 1978). The arguments presented so far thereby suggested that not only ineffective instrumental policies, but also the narrow focus of art funding policies *per se* threatened long term structural changes to democratic art participation.
Despite their criticism, however, cultural managers stressed the need to further develop the cultural as well as instrumental remit of public funders. Interestingly, Anita contrasted the regressive and outdated approach to regeneration and cultural inclusion taken by the organisers of Liverpool 2008, with new and innovative theoretical approaches to inclusion that were applied within her organisation:

All roads used to have to lead to Rome, people had to get to concerts... [but] not everyone has to end up in a concert... So it is about learning that if we go [into communities] and offer tickets- that doesn’t mean anything. But if there is someone who comes from the community, knows it well and who is prepared to advocate us- that really makes a difference. So these are issues that we are learning about at the moment.

The interviewee stressed the need for active community engagement that could facilitate greater recognition of alternative approaches to cultural participation. It was thereby apparent that her differentiated, critical approach towards the social instrumental role of culture stemmed from her long term experience with education and outreach activities. The importance of context-driven, community-led programming was stressed by many cultural managers, in particularly those working in community art centres and rural areas. That diversity in itself was considered not only a necessity, but also a strength of artistic programmes was expressed by the assistant manager of a Yorkshire art centre. John suggested how his centre’s art scheme attempted to address all sections of the community:

I mean in terms of the intrinsic value we try to pursue- it may sound a bit simplistic- to cater for all tastes. In the last month we had a Polish folk group, we also had an organic gardener for Radio 4’s ‘Gardeners Question Time’. So we try to do something for everyone at as high standards as possible- be it music, folk and so on. So we are trying to have standards and diversity, so we are not appealing to only one section of the community.

John stressed how financial constraints, only two paid part-time staff, and the location of his centre forced him to create flexible and at times improvised art schemes. Instead of following an artistic mission John often went along with ideas from community members. That programming primarily evolved around community engagement, rather than deterministic cultural criteria was also expressed by Gloria, the director of a rural art centre in Aylesbury:

I mean our programme is very broad, we have lots of people with learning difficulties and do lots of different arts. The centre is a place to] actually go
somewhere where they can get involved and develop their skills and express their experience in a friendly environment - and interacting with others is invaluable.

The discussion so far attempted to show how the endorsement of social instrumental cultural policies based on humanist and public values by cultural managers of larger organisations, was contrasted with a more critical assessment by cultural managers from small, community-led organisations. Although most cultural managers supported a social remit of the arts, the absence of overt idealism allowed them to raise theoretical and methodological shortcomings of social instrumental policies. Interviewees thereby stressed how the negotiation of cultural and social instrumental goals was impeded and jeopardised by the exclusive focus on traditional liberal humanist criteria by public funders. Although cultural managers endorsed the role of culture in social inclusion and regeneration projects, they saw this role compromised by a narrow programmatic focus.

5.66 The Rejection of Managerialism and Social Determinedness

The discussion so far has attempted to show the way art managers adhered to social instrumental policies by relying on a mix of liberal humanist assumptions, public mandate and practical concerns. This assessment was contrasted by a discussion of more critical statements by cultural managers from community based, smaller organisations, which highlighted the critique of the exclusionist and undemocratic nature of public cultural provision. The critique highlighted the contradictory nature of social instrumental policy goals that often failed to acknowledge community based and alternative cultural activities whilst claiming to aim at access and inclusion. Public institutions adhered to a narrow and exclusive approach to cultural funding. In the following discussion it is suggested that the synthesis between cultural and social instrumental rationales that has been suggested so far, did not represent a full-hearted endorsement of instrumentalism per se. Whereas many art managers embraced both artistic and social instrumental values, they opposed the managerial logic of instrumental policies. Evocative of the idealist opposition between cultural and economic aims, outlined in Chapters One, Three and Four, cultural managers objected to the explicit managerial operationalisation of instrumental goals through
impact and evidence driven policies. Economic instrumental rationales were regarded to contradict artistic production.

There is a consensus that the role and identity of cultural workers and institutions have changed over recent decades. Public sector reform, but also wider shifts in the cultural, political and social landscape have demanded greater professionalisation and democratisation of cultural institutions. The pressure to accommodate diverse and often contradictory policy rationales such as excellence, social inclusion, cultural democracy, as well as managerial efficiency and accountability have contributed to the changing role of cultural workers as custodians of creative work (Gilmore 2002). Cultural managers have taken on diverse administrative and managerial roles, which encompass tasks such as audience management, marketing, finance and education. In particular, public sector modernisation has made explicit economic managerial demands on cultural organisations, to become more 'customer friendly', accountable, and most of all operationally effective and economically efficient. As discussed briefly in Chapter One, the instrumental focus of the public sector has meant the imposition of an all pervasive auditing system for the measurement of performance and impact. Many commentators described these changes within public cultural administration in terms of a shift towards neoliberal logic (McGuigan 2005), the commodification of public policy (Gray 2007) and explicit entrepreneurialism (Belfiore 2004).

The following discussion assumes that the overt managerial approach to cultural practice of recent decades has evoked residual assumptions of a conflict between artistic and economic values. The historical intellectual tension between explicit economic and social instrumental and intrinsic rationales has already been discussed in previous chapters. It has been suggested how the opposition to the economic instrumentalisation of culture originated as a response to economic, political and social developments of modern, industrial society. The rejection of the increasing commercialisation and secularisation of the public sphere and cultural production has thereby been at the heart of liberal humanist discourse and aestheticism. The following discussion suggests that the contemporary conflict between intrinsic and instrumental rationales thrives on the modern indictment of economic market rationales.
Economic managerial and entrepreneurial logic has formed a significant basis for public sector reform and evidence-based policies. As Belfiore (2004: 189) argues, managerial imperatives of effectiveness and efficiency have made impact measurement and data collection ‘central’ to cultural policy making and evaluation. Emphasis has been thereby put on quantitative and statistical evaluation methods of policy outputs, as a means to assess policy targets and achievements. Belfiore pointed out how the seemingly neutral and depolitisised approach to cultural policy making has formed part of an allegiance to neoliberal and neoconservative political rationales, which underpin public sector modernisation. Comparability and measurability of social and economic impacts have formed key aspects of this economic logic. As has been argued in Chapter One, Eikhof illustrated the opposition between economic and artistic logic as based on notions of measurability. According to him, artistic logic opposed measurability as it opposed individual and collective accountability by reference to purely subjective meaning creation, risk and the constant reconstruction and reinterpretation of artistic goals. As artistic value could not be measured on an objective scale, economic and instrumental market logic opposed cultural evaluation (Bache 2003; Eikhof 2007).

Measurability and impact based assessment as distinguishing factors between economic and cultural logic has been frequently observed in cultural managers’ assessments. Cultural managers distinguished between cultural activities as non-measurable, subjective and intangible, and contrasted them to impact-driven instrumental policy objectives. The following remarks by Tom were representative of the description of artistic activities as intangible:

I would define [art] as something that moves you or not. Something very woolly I am afraid. It's not measurable, it's whether you go and see something and it stimulates you creatively... I think it is individual. I would, for instance, differ from someone in the office on what we think is good or not. I think quality is personal, although when it comes to funding you need to generalise a definition for quality. You could, for instance, say if someone sings out of tune, the vast majority of people would say it is poor quality, but someone might say it moves them more. You cannot tell!

Alan suggested how aesthetic criteria opposed general and abstract definitions. He implies how subjective and discretionary ways of cultural assessment were part of the artistic processes. Similar statements were made by Alan who stressed the subjective nature of art assessment:
It’s very subjective. It’s like in the McMaster Report, it says, you can go to a performance and know it’s perfectly fine, and good and valuable. But you can also go somewhere, where you really think it hit home, it had a quality, it spoke. It had an emotional impact.

Whereas it was a common assumption that artistic value ultimately amounted to subjective and discretionary criteria, some managers suggested more objective assessment methods. That these were, however, counterweighed by experiential measures was pointed out by Anton:

Well, there are three criteria that are traditionally judged with regards to quality. The one is audience figures, then press response and coverage, peer critique and response. So it is a question of balancing those three criteria. So excellence is difficult to define and a very subjective thing.

The assessment of cultural practices as intangible was often linked to the rejection of evidence-based requirements imposed by instrumental policy frameworks. There was a general contention that pressures to adopt deterministic performance criteria and impact-driven outcomes were regarded to contradict artistic production. Tim, the director of a London based art gallery, suggested:

Contemporary art has an intangibility to it... and in that respect doesn’t give you easy answers to anything. Actually a lot of it comes to a place that is quite philosophical. And that’s probably different from offering a policy position or a response to a set of circumstances.

In line with this Anton opposed the impact-based assessment of art as being in intrinsic opposition to art:

In a way, a lots of great projects have come out of resistance to something, and I think artists and curators have the ability and facilities to make something interesting in pressurised situations... But obviously if something is overly instrumentalised then it can suffocate things. If the intention is too clearly detailed than it can be suffocating.

Like a number of his colleagues, Anton and Tim stressed how relative autonomy from instrumental policy rationales was a requirement for cultural programming. Anton went on to argue how instrumental criteria hindered artistic production, as they determined the meaning and outcome of artistic products in advance. He thereby pointed out the difficulty of balancing intrinsic with extrinsic demands:

It is a question to degrees and emphasis on the instrumentalism... I mean one of the problems that we have was how highly instrumentalised education had
become. It had become so obvious a tool to further social integration. Some requirements of the funders and the council are so blatant. I mean some of them even said that projects needed to raise awareness of health issues and so on… and we were keen to move away from the obviously instrumentalised. We created a project within the context that people could encounter as they chose. So we avoided engaging for instance specifically with disabled people only or other groups. We tried to set up proposals within a context so that people could come to it of their own accord and maybe by accident.

Anton demonstrated the opposition between organisational and artistic goals, and instrumental remit that he described as ‘blatant’ and intrusive. He stressed how despite a commitment to education work and access policies, his organisation rejected too explicit and overt adherence to instrumental goals. Anton suggested that an overriding instrumental prescription compromised artistic production processes and artistic participation in a spontaneous and less prescriptive way. Anton’s statements showed that although social instrumental reasoning was regarded as a valid part of the public debate on cultural policy, the difficulty of formulating and implementing measures to justify and evaluate instrumental policies was key concern for cultural managers. In this way he criticised a too explicit instrumental policy framework for its inability to take account of intangible qualities of art production.

Similar statements were given by an independent art manager. Jeremy suggested that the focus on performance measurement did not take into account the indeterminedness of cultural outcomes. He stressed the traditional role of public state subsidy to ensure art production at a distance from political and economic control:

The biggest conflict that we have is that we don’t have enough money to take risks. So what public funding is often about is about accountability, to show an exact outcome. But what about failure? Failure can be a significant part of the creative process, a productive thing to do. But in terms of public investment it is not about risk... In order to get excellence you need some degree of risks and that is the task of the public funding sector.

Jeremy contrasted artistic criteria with demands made by public funders. He suggested how the intangible and undetermined outcomes of artistic production made it difficult to measure them in terms of public policy goals. Funders in this way needed to adapt funding criteria in order to capture art specific values. Although participants in this study thereby recognised the social instrumental functions of the
arts they questioned whether the impact-driven approach could measure the subjective and indeterminate nature of culture-led interventions.

Whereas the discussion so far indicated the perceived opposition between artistic and impact-driven policies as intrusive and overbearing, this was not to fully condemn the need for some kind of auditing system for public expenditure in the arts. As argued above, a number of cultural managers recognised the need for accountability and transparency of public institutions, and demanded improvement of evaluation methods. The education manager from a Nottingham gallery, Sarah for instance suggested how evaluation methods needed ultimately to accommodate both accountability of impacts and the immeasurable aspect of art practice:

I think it is a fine balance meeting your funders needs but also those of the organisation’s, in terms of your own cultural objectives. I mean I come from the education department where assessment and measurement is rife. And I can see the merits and flaws in that really I think there are ways to capture it, but we haven’t found them yet... But I think we should attempt to assess them because anything that is funded needs to be answerable.

The statements of Sarah highlight the conflict-ridden nature of negotiating social instrumental and aesthetic cultural values. Although the manager suggested that there ‘should’ be a concern for transparency and accountability in public cultural provision, she argued how appropriate auditing methods needed to be developed to balance instrumental with intrinsic concerns. Sarah argued how the negotiation of intrinsic and instrumental aims was part of a process of ‘cooperation’ between cultural and other public services:

I sit in both camps. I recognise that the arts have a huge impact... [But] We are not doctors etc., but I think that there is the recognition that we need to build partnerships with those service providers in the region, forming strong relations where both expertise are married together... Rather than to throw an artist into the community and expect that to make a radical difference.

Sarah stressed how the social instrumental role and methods to assess them remained ill defined. She for instance pointed out that whilst being socially instrumental, the arts could not replace social services. Although she believed in the instrumental role of the arts, in particular in education, she illustrated how this role needed to be reconciled with art specific values.
This section suggested how the synthesis between artistic and social policy rationales was counterpoised by a rejection of economic instrumentalism. Although a number of cultural managers supported the need for impact-driven policies in terms of the public accountability of state subsidised cultural institutions, there was a consensus on the largely subjective, intangible and innovative nature of art production and consumption that defied deterministic evaluation criteria. This resulted in the demand for further research into cultural indicators and assessment methods.

5.67 'We are in the Business of Culture, not the Culture of Business'

The previous discussion has pointed out the opposition between cultural practice and impact-driven rationales of current instrumentalism. Whereas this enquiry concerned the instrumental approach to public policy administration, the next section will focus on a general assessment of the business-driven and commercial nature of cultural production. The critique of the commercial approach, taken by much of the cultural industries, indirectly aims at an assessment of the role and function of public cultural provision in ensuring freedom from extant economic and political pressures.

As pointed out in Section Two, the tension between artistic and economic logic as part of core aesthetic tenets has been founded on the opposition to industrial cultural production and commercial culture in the wake of the modern industrial era. The way contemporary commercial culture with its emphasis on consumerism and profit orientation expenses of traditional cultural meanings has been sufficiently laid out by many theorists, most notably in the Western Marxist tradition (McGuigan 1996: Ch. 4). The opposition to commercial and commodified cultural production has been part of the idealistic foundation of art production. The following art manager expressed the opposition to the widespread influence of commercial and political intrusion in cultural production by public cultural policies and the commercial cultural industries. This division was felt so much so that public funding was ceased in order to ensure financial and cultural autonomy:

We were a traditionally funded organisation. But the bad thing was that the organisation was being propped up rather than being invested in creative
practice. So we were part of that mechanism. We had a turnover of about £2.5million, of which about 12% was public subsidy. But this was causing us the greatest problems, because the dialogues with stakeholders were giving us potential problems. So we realised that we had to become more self-sufficient... So it was then that we thought about sustainability.

When probed as to the nature of the 'problems' with public funding, Jeremy implied that the organisation had been under 'the whims of public policies', which were 'fragile'. His critique was based on the political expectations attached to public funding. In the course of the conversation it became clear, however, how independence from political and commercial factors represented one of the main precepts for cultural programming within his organisation. This aim became particularly apparent when the interviewee referred to the pervasive presence of commercial film production that his programmes endeavoured to counterpoise:

We are in the business of culture and not the culture of business. What I try to do is to offer the city a wider choice of cinema than the market... If you take the cinema admissions for the UK there are about £170 million admissions a year, of that 1.3% are for non-English cinema, which is really poor. So, it's taken as self-evident that American film, especially Hollywood cinema dominates the market place. Now, if you look at that... the question is... is that acceptable, is that desired? If we live in a multi-national society, does that reflect that part? I don’t think it does. So we want to reflect a lots of cultural voices...if you look at the posters for Badman, tell me how much money it costs to do these adverts? And can you see an advert for that film from Afghanistan? No! Now that is about economic power as well as all of those different elements. So what I want to say is, why has that not got more of a profile and presence? Is that because of Western marketing? Should we not know about these things?

The respondent clearly stated an indictment with the market competition and marketing power enforced by the commercial film industry. Jeremy stressed how cultural autonomy from political and commercial intrusion ultimately depended on institutional independence, and a financially self-sustaining, yet culturally orientated business model. He argued how this ensured cultural programming that offered artistic independence and diversity. Jeremy stressed, however, how cultural programming needed to take account of the embeddedness of cultural production in
the political economy. He described the conjuncture of financial and cultural independence as follows:

So I don’t programme the cinema in isolation from economic reality, which is that we have a building to run and 70 staff members to pay salaries. But we agree on the board of management that we are both an independent company, we don’t have shareholders. But also we represent cultural diversity, so we work as a team to achieve those aims and set the budget to achieve that vision. So the company grows in the way to support these aims.

The manager’s commercial, yet cultural orientation ultimately enabled him to look critically at the economic imperative undermining art practice.

The last section of this analysis has attempted to demonstrate the conflict between artistic and economic logic guiding art management. Although the overall discussion has illustrated the complex and competing theoretical assumptions and ideological interests, attached to the discourse on cultural values, it should be added that artistic idealism has represented something of a leitmotif in most of the interviews conducted. The adherence to an artistic ‘idealism’ as an intrinsic motivation was particularly apparent in art managers working in small, low-budget institution. The chairman of a lay opera group in Berkshire suggested that despite limited resources and no financial returns:

I went into singing and music because I loved it, and lots of people I know also did it, because they love it. It is a passion…We know that we will lose money on that. However, this is not the main reason we are involved, though I think it is a by-product of what we do.

5.7 Conclusion

This chapter considered the ways in which UK cultural managers negotiate and perceive the tension between intrinsic and instrumental cultural policy rationales by drawing on the views, insights and attitudes expressed by 25 cultural managers from across the UK. The aim has been to reflect and to illuminate the internal tensions and external pressures that affect the negotiation of intrinsic cultural values.

Based on a critical assessment on the way political, social and cultural production conditions, resources and constraints facilitate the negotiation of cultural values, it
has been suggested that cultural managers from powerful public institutions represented liberal humanist cultural frameworks as standard and essential norms of cultural production. It has been argued, however, that the seemingly autonomous, flexible and discretionary nature of evaluation ultimately hinged at ideological driven representations that largely depended on relations of power and status. This argument has been confirmed by comparisons with less powerful cultural managers whose cultural evaluations hinged strongly on practical, financial, institutional constraints.

The discussion moved on to assess the way cultural managers perceived and negotiated the conceptual tension between intrinsic and instrumental cultural policy. A key finding of this study suggested that a majority of cultural managers within this study were endorsing social instrumental rationales based on the invocation of enlightenment notions. This contradicted the indictment of instrumentalism by leading members of the cultural constituency, as presented in Chapter One. The endorsement of the social instrumental function of culture has been explained as a response to the political and financial demands put on institutions to justify public funding in terms of broadly instrumental goals, and to adapt to the shifting role of democratic, inclusive and social cultural institutions. Many cultural managers in this study linked the arts to social, historical and context-driven values and functions. The arts were regarded as tools for communication, subject to context driven interpretation and as pertaining life enhancing, moral and civilising functions.

The negotiation of the conflict between social and intrinsic cultural values represented complex and competing arguments. Public cultural managers discussed intrinsic values presenting a mix of artistic, social and instrumental values, at times rallying an incoherent discourse of intrinsic and instrumental cultural values. The discussion showed how external pressures and demands were linked to the positive appraisal of social instrumental policies. On the other hand, a more critical assessment was made by cultural manager from non-public institutions.

The assumed synthesis of cultural and social instrumental policy rationales observed, however, was not concomitant with a full endorsement of instrumentalism per se. Seemingly evocative of an idealist opposition between cultural and economic reasoning, the study suggested how the impact and evidence-driven framework of
instrumentalism was rejected as contradicting the intangible and indeterminate nature of cultural values. The tension between intrinsic and instrumental cultural values and policy rationales was perceived as impeding arts production if art organisations were expected to fulfil explicit, tangible outcomes. Instrumental policy directives compromised and interfered with artistic programming if they ignored art specific goals and production outcomes.

The final part of the analysis highlighted the principle opposition between artistic, economic and commercial production conditions in the cultural sector. This was exemplified by an institution seeking artistic independence from political intrusion and the commercial cultural industries through financial self-sufficiency and cultural objectives.

A central finding of this study suggested that contemporary cultural practice is informed by a general, if conflict-ridden acceptance of social instrumental values. In many respects this finding contradicted the indictment of instrumental policy rationales, discussed in Chapter One. The study showed that social instrumental aspects are generally recognised as intrinsic concerns of arts administrators, as long as they do not pose overtly instrumental, measurable demands on the arts. Social values and autonomous cultural practices represent principle guidelines underlying the cultural profession, which are compromised if subjected to unconstrained political and financial pressures.

In this way, this thesis promotes the contention that the debate on the conflict between intrinsic and instrumental cultural rationales may need rethinking. The study showed how cultural practice, at times, encompassed a broader and more inclusive approach towards cultural production, which resulted in a complex, context driven discourse on cultural values. The shifting demands concomitant of public sector reform and instrumentalism may have severed the tension between intrinsic and instrumental rationales, having resulted in a reconfigured conflict between cultural and social on the one hand, and economic cultural policy rationales on the other hand.
CHAPTER SIX:
Instrumentalism
Chapter 6: Instrumentalism

6.1 Introduction

In this chapter, instrumental cultural policies will be discussed in terms of their historical, political and socio-economic context of emergence. The conceptual roots of instrumentalism will be traced to economic arguments for public art funding, which arose as part of the increasing managerialisation of the public sphere. The transformation of public sector policy will be discussed in terms of the central role that managerialism and evidence-based policies came to play under the Conservatives. The chapter will discuss the emergence of the economic instrumentalisation of culture on the example of early manifestations of culture-led urban regeneration projects. The subsequent development and enhancement of instrumentalism that took place in the 1990s is attributed to broad conceptual shifts underlying public sector reform and modernisation under New Labour. The account will describe the way basic shifts in public sector policies occurred, which aligned economic neoliberalism with an emphasis on social justice and equality. It will be argued that this uneasy coalition facilitated the redefinition of culture and the arts as a panacea for social deficits. It is in this context that the economic and social instrumental role of culture has been strongly endorsed as part of mainstream policy agenda, such as social inclusion and regeneration. This chapter will focus on a critical assessment of the resultant instrumental cultural policy discourse, which juxtaposes competing assumptions of liberal humanism, social inclusion and neoliberalism. Scepticism is raised against this ‘joined-up’ approach to cultural and social policies by discussing the effects of managerialism and entrepreneurialism on liberal humanist cultural assumptions, cultural democracy and social cohesion.
6.1.1 Literature and Documents

The discussion of documents in this thesis aimed to delimitate and further define research questions and problems, explicate new lines of enquiry and seek support for grounded theory (Gall 1996). The use of literature aimed to further the identification of central issues evolving around the negotiation of cultural values, the explication of theoretical approaches and their critical discussion against the background of a socio-historical, critical analysis. As with any presentation and review of literature the problem of coverage and representativeness posed a problem. As the purpose of the thesis aimed primarily at a critical analysis of key arguments, rather than presenting a detailed literature review, an exhaustive meta-analysis of documents within the subject area was not deemed necessary. Rather the selection of papers aimed to provide a representative, yet selective sample of key documents and text (Randolph 2009). This meant, that text were chosen that could best outline theoretical aspects and relevant phenomena within the discussion on cultural values, and act as representative examples for the development of arguments. The literature review proceeded in part based on the principle of discursive networks that traces the evolution of discourses around culture and instrumentalism. This meant an interrogation of documents that could provide an integrated record of the emergence of key arguments and themes within the wider political context. The selection procedure aimed to ensure representativeness by tracing acknowledged interdisciplinary sources for the subject area of cultural policy, as shown below. As the central concern of the thesis evolved around the conflict between intrinsic and instrumental cultural policies, key policy documents from public cultural policy bodies, that is the DCMS and ACE, were reviewed. Subsequently, the literature review attempted to survey the ensuing secondary commentary and responses to these policy statements and developments by key academic publications, consultancy documents, conference papers and news publications. Key journals in the area of cultural policy were identified as follows (Scullion and García, 2005):

- *International Journal of Arts Management*
- *International Journal of Cultural Policy*
- *Journal of Cultural Economics*
As to additional sources for documents and debate on key cultural policy issues the following consultancies and networks were primarily approached, although awareness of the wide spectrum of other resources was upheld (for a comprehensive list see Wilson 2006):

- Arts Management Network
- Comedia
- Demos
- Euclid
- Compendium.

The evolution of the discourse on the instrumental approach towards cultural policy was traced based on the following documents by the DCMS, ACE and government parties (Connolly 2007; Vickery 2007):

**DCMS:**

- Annual Reports (various years)
- A New Approach to Investment in Culture, 1998
- A New Cultural Framework, 1998
- Policy Action Team 10, 1999
- Culture and Creativity - The Next Ten Years, 2001
- Creative Industries, Mapping Document 2001
- Social Inclusion Action Plan, 2001
- Making it Count: The Contribution of Culture and Sport to Social Inclusion, 2002
- A new approach to Investment in Culture, 2003
- Government and the Value of Culture, 2004
- Culture at the Heart of Regeneration, 2004
- Culture and Creativity, 2007
- Creative Britain, 2009

ACE:

- Annual Reports (various years)
- Addressing Social Exclusion, 2000
- The Arts and Social Exclusion: a review prepared for the Arts Council of England, 2001
- Funding Agreement 2005-8, 2005
- Our agenda for the arts 2006-2008, 2006
- Arts Policies: Developing Arts Practice and Engagement, 2006
- McMaster Report 2009

Other:

- Creating Public Value: an analytical framework for public service reform (Cabinet Office 2002)

The selection of these resources was guided by various aspects. In the first place, it was their chronological appearance that helped to trace the emergence of key policy arguments and statements evolving around instrumental cultural policies of regeneration and social inclusion, as well as intrinsic cultural values. In addition, their relevance was taken into account based on their prominence, frequency of citation and subsequent discussion within the academic discourse and art constituency. This was particularly relevant for Government and the Value of Culture, the McMaster Report and Holden’s publications Cultural Value and the Crisis of Legitimacy and
Capturing Cultural Value. Jowell’s speech was chosen as it represented the conflict and arguable turning point within the discussion on intrinsic and instrumental cultural policies. Vickery (2007) for instance described the significance of her speech as having been presented as a de facto policy statement by the DCMS that gave a definition of intrinsic cultural values. More importantly, however, by acknowledging shortcomings of instrumentalism, Jowell seemed to imply criticism of past policy developments, which were partly the result of her own prior endorsement of instrumentalism. By suggesting how the impact driven approach was methodologically flawed Jowell conceded how it could not always account for intrinsic cultural values, which in fact represented the raison d'être for cultural policy provision. For these reasons Jowell’s speech represented a good example, on which to demonstrate the conflict between intrinsic and instrumental cultural policies against the backdrop of contemporary policy developments.

Speeches like Jowell’s held at the Value of Culture conference introduced what has been perceived as a retrograde reflection on humanist notions of culture (Gibson 2009). One of the most representative de facto policy statements was subsequently issued by the Arts Council. The McMaster Report defined cultural values in decidedly humanist, art separatist terms by drawing on historically derived propositions of autonomous and discretionary art production. In response to the instrumental policy developments of recent decades the McMaster Report underlined the continued adherence to humanist assumptions of cultural values. In this way it not only highlighted the chiasm between intrinsic and instrumental cultural policy approaches, it moreover questioned the impact of postmodern, critical cultural analysis of the humanist foundation of culture. The retrograde adherence to humanist cultural values was contrasted by the relativist, consumerist discursive strand, of which Holden’s discussion on intrinsic cultural value offered a good example. Not only did it ensue a prominent public debate, it also captured the renegotiation of culture in terms of explicit market-driven, consumerist terms.

Whereas these papers were partly chosen as much discussed examples of key argumentative strands and central role within the popular debate on cultural values, policy papers formed the foundation of the literary review and its subsequent discussion. The emergence of the instrumental cultural policy approach was traced chronologically through publications of the DCMS and ACE, as shown above. Key
policy documents that lay the theoretical foundation for the instrumental approach were regarded as *Create the future* (New Labour 1997), *A New Approach to Investment in Culture* (DCMS 1998) and *A New Cultural Framework* (DCMA 1998). As Vickery suggested these consultation papers introduced a ‘repositioning of national cultural policy within New Labour’s manifesto’, as well as further the establishment of policy bodies, such as the DCMS, and funding structures. In this way they lay the foundation for the implementation of New Labour’s instrumental cultural policy approach. Subsequent publications by the Arts Council were regarded as a reflection of social instrumental reasoning furthered by New Labour and the DCMS. Most notably *Social exclusion: A response to Policy Action Team 10 from the Arts Council of England* (ACE 2000), *Addressing Social Exclusion* (ACE 2000) and *Ambitions for the Arts 2003-2006* (ACE 2003) were seen as representing the Arts Council’s turn towards the culture-led social inclusion and regeneration agenda.

6.2 New Labour’s Third Way, Welfare and the Instrumental Argument

There is a general consensus that the emergence of instrumental cultural policy since the 1980s has represented an incremental shift of *raison d’être* from traditional concepts of state patronage of the arts and culture, underpinned by liberal humanist cultural concepts and socio-democratic principles\(^{30}\), to a conjoined political and economic practice. The emergence of the instrumental policy approach was based on broad structural changes to public service provision, which were introduced by public sector reform and modernisation. The impetus to reform was given by broad philosophical and theoretical assumptions that represented a response to global economic and social developments, generally described as the advent of the post-Fordist era. The 1970s financial crisis represented a key event, unsettling attachment to post-war notions of welfare state provision and their reliance on Keynesian macro-economic policies\(^ {31}\). Welfare state policies were challenged by the results of

---

\(^{30}\) This refers to the traditional ‘market failure’ argument, according to which state intervention is required if so-called merit goods are procured.

\(^{31}\) Classic notions of British welfare state are based on 1945-51 ‘old’ Labour government definitions derived from Keynes and Beveridge. These included the provision of a ‘National Minimum’ by means of a social insurance plan and means tested social assistance. According to Keynes, social provision should guarantee full employment by means of active state intervention (Powell 1999).
deindustrialisation, which put heightened demands on public services, but also by what was deemed the emergence of a new phase within the global economy. These new developments resulted in the critique of traditional approaches to welfare state provision, the efficiency of public sector management and state regulation. Dissatisfaction was fuelled by the 'new times' narrative, according to which the new economy challenged modern notions of national identity and social cohesion. The general contention was that advanced capitalist societies like Britain were increasingly characterised by a diversity of needs, fragmentation and differentiation (Hall and Jacques 1990). Economic and social changes were attributed to developments in IT and the media industries. It was a common fear that the expansion of a knowledge based secondary market would have detrimental effects on the labour market, as it created structural disadvantages for those dependent on the primary labour market. What the new economic landscape required was an economically competitive service economy.

In general, there was a consensus that the post-war British welfare system was failing to keep pace with contemporary social and economic developments, which ultimately evoked their abandonment across the political spectrum. The critique of 'classic' definitions of welfare state provision emerged from both sides of the political spectrum. The New Right objected to socialist state intervention as counteracting economic efficiency and compatibility, whereas the New Left vilified public sector professionalism as paternalistic and disempowering. To them, it facilitated middle-class interests and social control (Flynn in Exworthy 1999). Commentators such as Lash and Urry (1987) suggested how governments needed to respond to flexible, decentralised and differentiated production and consumption conditions that required the abandonment of universalist, collective forms of state provision and notions of the 'common good'. This broad theoretical and philosophical reorientation within the public policy discourse prepared the move towards neoliberal, market-oriented service provision.

Following the 'new times' discourse, the Conservative Government made clear its commitment to a reduced, more effective and economically viable approach to public governance and service provision. Conservative political and economic forces were central in constructing and promoting a neoliberal economic government approach, and arguably neoliberal tendencies within society and culture. So-called 'rolling back
the state' policies advocated an attachment to 'enterprise culture' and the privatisation of public sector services and facilities. The neoliberal public sector reform was organised around policies that facilitated the creation of quasi-market mechanism in the public sector realm, introduced the legislation of tight budgetary and political control over public spending and targeted state provision on a means tested basis. Public sector management became redefined by the pervasive rhetoric and practice of 'new public management' philosophy. Its purpose was to provide explicit market and entrepreneurial criteria such as efficiency, effectiveness, competitiveness and accountability for public sector spending.

As many critics bemoaned, the pervasiveness of the managerial, market-driven approach to public governance was further endorsed by New Labour. Although the long-running conservative reign had lost its zeal by the end of the 1990s, neoliberal principles of public sector management were hardly reversed by the incoming government. Part of this has been explained in terms of pressure to keep credibility and trust with the financial markets and extensive business lobby, conservative voters and powerful right wing press, which castigated New Labour's image as a 'tax and spend' party\textsuperscript{32} (see for instance Powell 1999; Hills 1998). In a step-wise manner New Labour upheld the neoliberal economic legacy of previous decades. New Labour legislation in this way reinforced openness to the market and limitations on government regulation via capital control.

What has generally been regarded as an uneasy, if not theoretically vacuous move, was New Labour's acceptance of neoliberal market economic principles and its simultaneous commitment to social justice and equality. This ‘reformulation’ has been central to New Labour's modernising and reform agenda, the much theorised 'Third Way'. The new social agenda was, in part, fuelled by assessments such as the *Borrie Report* (CSJ/ IPPR 1994), issued by the Commission for Social Justice, which consternated that social and economic inequality had dramatically risen over the previous 15 years. New Labour redefined its approach to deprivation by adopting the French derived term 'social exclusion', which defined poverty and social deprivation in terms of a complex cluster of problems. According to this new approach, rather

\textsuperscript{32} The then Chancellor Gordon Brown's conviction in the 'post-classical endogenous growth theory' were influential in driving New Labour's conviction in private sector investment as a source of infrastructural growth and poverty alleviation. These views were also formulated in Tony Blair's 1995 *Mais Lecture*. 
than being the result of economic structural inequality alone, 'social exclusion' pertained to a multiplicity of causes such as unemployment, poor skills and low income.

According to New Labour, the complex challenges that social exclusion posed required an approach that rejected broad ideological principles associated with the divide between the 'Old Left and the Conservatives'. A salient aspect of this ideological levelling, was the advocacy of the 'people first' narrative and modernisation. The resultant restructuring of public service provision were based on the understanding that public service improvement required better measures for public accountability and user satisfaction, such as robust testing, operational effectiveness, controlled spending and testing for 'fitness for purpose'. One of the key developments in this context has been the emergence of impact and evidence-based policies, which aimed at the enhancement of transparency and efficiency of policy implementation. Impact-based policies became part of the pervasive sway of auditing in public sector provision, as a result of which the development and reliance on all-pervading, generating guidance and assessment systems for the measurement of performance, grew (Evans 2005: 961). Many critics suggested, however, that the adherence to neoliberal managerial approaches within public policies represented a departure from ethical and professional public standards. The main objectives of the new approach, such as operational effectiveness in terms of private sector benchmarks, 'value for money' and consumer satisfaction, contradicted qualitative criteria of public service provision. In this way professional, discretionary and ethical judgement traditionally upheld in the public sphere were eroded (Exworthy 1999). In his critique of auditing, Power (1997) for instance suggested that evidence-based policies often served a mere 'validating' role. Instead of representing a tool for policy development and evaluation, performance measures often functioned as a 'guarantee of legitimacy and transparency' themselves. He therefore argued how audits reflected the attempt to make the state more entrepreneurial and managerially efficient.

33 In his Policy Review the former head of the Labour party Kinnock suggested that a new framework for public and private services should be proposed that put 'people first' (Labour Party 1989). The paper has been regarded as having initiated a programmatical reform in New Labour's policy making pushing the acceptance of private- public provision forward (Shaw 1993).
The instrumental role culture had to play in the new policy framework was founded on New Labour's emphasis on cultural and social capital as a key remedy against social exclusion. This new development was based on programmatic changes to 'Old Labour' welfare state theory in New Labour's welfare reform approach. The modernised framework suggested that the challenges of social exclusion were the result of an overcome, passive and negative definition of the welfare state that merely acted as a sticking plaster once deprivation had already occurred. What a new social welfare approach had to bring about, however, was a dynamic, stripped social security system that built on equal opportunities, education and work, rather than a secondary benefit system. The Commission of Social Justice defined New Labour's reform agenda as an 'active' approach to welfare, as a middle-way between the 'levellers' of the Old Left and the 'regulators' of the New Right. The approach combined a commitment to social ethics of fairness, justice and equality with the dynamics of the market economy. This was underscored by a new formulation of citizenship that Third Way theorists like Giddens euphemistically described as 'no rights without responsibility'. As Halpern and Mikosz (1998) suggest, key principles of the new policy approach represented personal responsibility and the replacement of 'dutiless rights' by 'conditional welfare' (Powell 1999: 19). This resulted in a redefined 'contract between state and the citizen' that aimed at the reduction of 'dependency and reliance' on the state by greater efficiency of individuals and private providers.

The reformed approach to social welfare policies advocated individual responsibility and activism and the significant role human and intellectual capital played for employment and social inclusion. In line with this, the Green Paper *A New Contract for Welfare: New Ambitions for our Country* (DSS 1998 cited in Powell 1999) suggested that essential factors in tackling social problems were the fight against 'poverty of aspiration' and a 'change of culture'. That cultural and human capital were prioritised as key factors in social inclusion policies, was illustrated by Tony Blair's campaign for education. Blair justified this move by arguing that: 'Education is...'

---

34 The DSS document *A new Contract for Welfare: New Ambitions for our Country* directed the phrase 'change of culture' pejoratively to 'benefit claimants, employees and public servants'. It further suggested that people of working age should work if capable, and that it was the new welfare state's tasks to encourage this. New Labour's emphasis on personal responsibility raised criticism as to its one-sidedness, but also inappropriate comparison drawn between dependency and 'parasitism' (Jeff Mulgan cited in Powell 2000). Blackman and Palmer (1999 in Powell 2000) for instance pointed out the limited responsibility of governments in job creation and too facile conceptualisation of 'self-responsible action', such as 'Ten Tips for a Better Health'.
the best economic policy there is... The main source of value and competitive advantage in the modern economy is human and intellectual capital. Hence the overriding priority New Labour is giving to education and training’ (Blair, 1998: 10). Giddens (1998) made New Labour's strategic approach to tackling social inclusion clear by arguing: 'Investment in human capital wherever possible, rather than the direct provision of economic maintenance.'

The relative shift from structural, redistributive provision to human capital, self-responsibility and opportunities within an increasingly market-driven society, furnished the social instrumental role of culture and the arts. Culture and the arts became central tools in the fight against social inclusion and regeneration. As the discussion will show in more detail, it were the personal, social and aspirational resources that culture could procure that justified its instrumental role in social and economic regeneration.

New Labour’s social inclusion strategy did not remain without its critics. Commentators like Leys (2003) severely criticised the shift in welfare state politics as a reallocation of redistributive responsibility from deregulated market forces and their effects, to its victims. Similar arguments were made by Shaw (1996) and Delanty (2000), who suggested that New Labour embraced an American vision of a highly mobile society, which was built on an idealist, yet unrealistic vision of equal opportunities. This approach was insufficiently met with structural economic policies, resulting in a one-sided concern for the demand side rather than the supply side of employment. As will be argued later, this criticism has been particularly salient in the context of social and urban regeneration projects, whose entrepreneurial focus has been questioned as furthering speculative competition and 'opportunities', rather than addressing needs directly. That processes of economic and social inclusion were complex and multi-faceted was pointed out by McGregor (1995), who argued that a broad range of approaches was required, which the focus on market-led competition alone could not necessarily provide for. He stressed the importance of a balanced provision of both general human resource development and vocational training, as well as infrastructural measures that attracted long-term employment. In a similar way suggested Merli (2002) that social exclusion could only be amended through improving structural conditions.
The pervasive trend towards managerialism and evidence-based policies in New Labour’s approach has, by its critics, attracted the claim of the theoretically vacant, essentially liberal economic thrust. It was deemed a futile attempt to conjoin contradictory principles of socialism and neoliberal capitalism, which was ultimately overridden by an anti-ideological or ideologically neutralised, pragmatic policy-driven account that eroded professional values. Opponents argued that this had detrimental effects for democratic participation and social provision (Powell 1999: 13; Le Grand 1998; Blackman and Palmer 1999; Leys 2003: 35; John 2000). One of the key critics of the adoption of neoliberal terms in the reform of welfare states has been Bourdieu who feared the introduction of a ‘penal common sense’ in approaching public service provision. Bourdieu and Wacquant feared the erosion of social democratic principles that was driven by the pervasive logic of an international economic neoliberalism. The ideological levelling of the public discourse based on terms such as globalisation, communitarianism or flexibility resulted ultimately in a pejorative definition of deprivation and welfare state, and the successive privatisation of the public sector (Fairclough 2000: 78). The adoption of neoliberal principles thereby undermined democratic participation in the public political and cultural discourse, and threatened the historically derived autonomy of intellectual production and consumption. As discussed in Chapter Two, Bourdieu, as Gans, opposed the proliferation of an exclusionary, middle-class discourse within cultural policy that left unaccounted the uneven distribution of essential educational and cultural skills as a function of class division. Moreover, the cultural industries furthered the imposition of market-driven and commercial interests, which undermined the independence of cultural producers. As the discussion of the emergence of the creative industry approach will show, the proliferation of an exclusionary cultural sphere, which mainly addressed the professional, middle class elite has been regarded as one of the main shortcomings of recent cultural policy developments.

In the following discussion, the general development taken by Third Way policies will be assessed in terms of their implications for instrumental cultural policies. The adoption of economic and social instrumental policies in the cultural sector will be described in terms of the emergent discourse of the cultural industries, urban regeneration and finally recent modernisation models such as ‘public value’. The discussion thereby aims to unpack the competing assumptions underlying the
discourse of instrumental cultural policies. Their effects will be discussed in terms of notions of cultural democracy, social justice, citizenship, community ownership and urban regeneration.

6.3 Cultural Policy and the Creative Industry

The 1970s and 1980s restructuring of public service management, and the managerial and market-oriented discourse had decisive effects on developments in the cultural sector. The politically marginal position of culture made it a soft target for spending cuts, making instrumental arguments in terms of economic growth, education and health its effective 'policy of survival'. The 1976-7 Arts Council's annual report was in fact called *Value for Money*, and propagated culture's role in areas of tourism and industrial expansion. The paradigmatic shift towards economic and social instrumental rationales represented the departure from traditional socio-democratic principles of arts subsidy.

Instrumental cultural policy developments hinged on the dissatisfaction with post-war funding voiced by the political left and right. Left wing political critics, on behalf of community and grass root art groups, challenged the elitist and metropolitan focus of public art subsidy, demanding greater equality, justice and recognition of broadly anthropological cultural criteria. On the other hand, the right bemoaned the distorting effects of state intervention on taste formation, market mechanisms and consumer behaviour (McGuigan 1996: 67). The theoretical departure from traditional patronage models towards a market-driven 'cultural industry' strategy was initiated by Nicholas Garnham, as well as researchers of the Comedia think tank Mulgan and Warpole, who critically undermined the orthodox social-democratic thrust of Labour's Greater London Council (GLC). These commentators brought about a decisive ideological swing by dismantling the post-war foundation of art policies as elitist, managerially and organisationally unskilled, and largely unaware of the private capital-led dimension of cultural production. According to McGuigan (1996) Garnham's analysis of the cultural sector in terms of a market-driven integrated whole had, despite limited immediate practical effects, long-term implications for the dominance of the cultural industries approach. The transformation of identity and purpose of public arts subsidy
followed the example of the wider public sector with the adoption of explicit business language and practices. The Arts Council's *A Great British Success Story* (1983) and *An Invitation to the Nation to Invest in the Arts* (1983a) introduced the basic vocabulary for the new orientation of the cultural sector. Cultural expenditure and activities were redefined in terms of investment, customer orientation and efficient management.

Instrumental policy rationales found further support by the rise of empirical research, originally presented by Meyerscough's *The Economic Impact of the Arts in Britain* (1988), which advanced positivist measures for the art and culture's contribution to economic growth. What this milestone in cultural indicator research intended to do was to give hard empirical evidence for the art's role in areas, such as job creation, tourism, invisible earnings and urban regeneration. In his report Meyerscough stressed the 'instrumental turn' away from culturally specific terms as the only meaningful cultural policy forward:

... Central government spending was levelling off. Arguments based on their intrinsic merits and educational value were losing their potency and freshness, and the economic dimension seemed to provide fresh justification for public spending on the arts (Meyerscough 1988 cited in Belfiore 2004: 95).

Meyerscough's economic argument for culture and the arts, despite substantive criticism, for instance, by the economist Gordon Hughes (see Hansen 1995), became representative of the economic instrumental policy approach of the 1980s and following years. Most notably it represented the basis for urban regeneration initiatives, and later social inclusion.

The full consolidation of the economic argument for the cultural sector was subsequently undertaken by centralising initiatives represented by cultural frameworks such as the DCMS' *A New Approach to Investment in Culture* and *A New Cultural Framework* (1988). According to Vickery, these pursued the ideological centralisation and the harmonisation of an instrumental national strategy into a central policy framework. The goal was to impose an obligation on sponsored bodies and local authorities to prove their social and economic worth. The economic policy strand was further consolidated through New Labour's 'Creative Britain' approach. As outlined in *Create the Future* (DCMS 1997), it had the aim to reposition culture from its formerly marginal position to play a central role in economic and social policies.
The document represented a realignment of culture with the creative industries by building on explicitly managerial and entrepreneurial policies. As part of this plan, the newly founded Department of Culture, Media and Sport was aligned with other government divisions, making it directly accountable to the treasury and government targets. The centrality and endurance of the creative industry approach has been marked by its ten year reissuing of *Creative Britain* (DCMS 2008), presumably in reminiscence of the first New Labour cultural secretary Chris Smith's similarly named manifesto from 1998, where original claims of the centrality of culture and creativity for economic and social developments were reinstated with fresh rigour. The economic and social objectives for culture and creativity were reinforced:

> Our aim is to improve the quality of life for all through cultural and sporting activities... In the global marketplace, our capacity to break new ground will be crucial to our future prosperity, and we need to act now to make Britain's creative industries accessible... to support our creative economy (DCMS 2008).

As discussed in Chapter Two, the adoption of explicit social and economic instrumental policy goals implicit within the cultural industries approach evoked different responses by cultural sociologists, Bourdieu and Gans. Bourdieu remained sceptical of central cultural policy bodies, as he feared the ideological power of an exclusionary cultural discourse that often evolved around an uncritical endorsement of humanist cultural concepts, such as access and excellence. A core aspect of his critique was the defence of the historically derived autonomy of the field of cultural production from direct political and economic pressures. A main threat to cultural autonomy represented neoliberal developments within public sector policies and the cultural industries. In a conversation with Hans Haacke Bourdieu discussed the imposition of corporate, commercial interest within art sponsoring and the ideological power of the competitive, capital-led cultural industries over independent intellectual and artistic activities. As the following discussion shows, Bourdieu’s criticism of the imposition of explicit social and economic instrumental policy agenda has been of continued relevance for the contemporary discussion.
6.4 Urban Regeneration, Culture and its Critique

The crucial part culture was to play in economic and social renewal can be illustrated in the development of culture-led urban regeneration policies. State-sponsored urban regeneration programmes had emerged as part of the 1960s reconstruction schemes. These urban regeneration initiatives, however, were transformed in order to target areas that in the 1970s and 1980s had felt the effects of decade long de-industrialisation. The main problems these areas faced were urban flight, unrest, crime, mobility, privatisation of land and the plural concerns of social degradation (Power and Mumford 1999 in Vickery 2006). The Conservatives' approach, had until the 1990s, pursued an exclusively property-led development programme, whose salient feature was the recasting of social components of deprivation in terms of exclusively economic infrastructural deficits (Deakin 19930). The economic infrastructure argument paved the way for the emergence of the entrepreneurial approach, which defined urban solutions solely in terms of private provision and competitive market mechanisms. Its aims were to 'incentivise' cities for global corporate investors by the renewal of physical infrastructures and the removal of supply-side constraints to corporate capital investments, whilst effectively squeezing out public sector contribution (Imri 2003: 3). This was based on the assessment that local authorities were 'inadequate to deal with the complex task of regeneration' (National Audit Office 1988 in Deakin 1993: 97). The consolidation of this approach was effected by public initiatives such as the Urban Development Grants (UDG), the Urban Development Corporations and initiatives like Action for Cities. These programmes promulgated private partnership 'leverage' and thereby aimed to 'minimise public sector contribution'. Schemes like the 'City Challenge' programme, initiated by the Urban Development Corporations (UDCs), according to which local and regional authorities were to bid for so-called 'Challenge Funds', were exemplary for the entrepreneurial approach to urban regeneration. The competitive rather than needs-tested basis of what became known as the Challenge Fund Model marketed a new mode of evaluating and talking about regeneration in principally pro-market terms.

As critics suggested, however, the neoliberal strategic impetus muted concerns for the complex and multi-faceted nature of social and urban deprivation by focusing on speculative developments and opportunities, rather than social deficits (Oatly cited in
Johnstone 2004: 149). As Deakin (1993) stresses the Conservatives' narrow recasting of social deprivation in terms of economic infrastructural deficits ultimately aimed at a mere limited array of measures such as environmental improvement, physical restructuring and support of business investment. These, however, left unaccounted the domestic or community scale, measured by job creation, and the improvement of public services and neighbourhood environments. Good examples were the London Docklands development, which provoked stark criticism that the 'market-led planning does not work'. Critics demanded a stronger public role in regeneration. The criticism of the long-term economic and social damage of Thatcherite urban regeneration programmes has been decisive in pointing out the intensifying geographical inequalities across different regions, between well off and poor neighbourhoods, education, income and even mortality levels. (Imri 2003; Bianchini 1991 in McGuigan 1996: 104). Part of the concerns were that capital gains were not reaped by local communities, and that economic developments were bypassing inner city communities (Holman in Imri 2003).

After its election in 1997, New Labour retained the commitment to urban and social generation. However, the former focus on economic structural strategies was at least on the surface amended by a broadening of policy rationales to include cultural and broadly holistic assumptions. Governments responded to the central concern of 'social exclusion' in urban areas by showing awareness of complex, 'soft edged' indicators such as quality of life, community ownership and local identity as essential factors for urban regeneration. This arguably prepared the shift from a property and private capital-led to a holistic approach to regeneration. The new approach advocated tests of sustainability, distributive equity, public ownership and local identity.

New Labour's policy shift was presented in *Regeneration Programmes- The Way Forward* (DETR 1997), which emphasised 'ownership' by local communities and a bottom-up approach to regeneration. The later *Planning for Sustainable Development: Towards a better Practice* (1998) elaborates this notion, as it stresses the importance of an interdisciplinary understanding of life quality and social space, fusing formerly formulaic and mechanistic economic notions with an integrationist and sociological understanding of regeneration (Vickery 2004). What followed was the first explicit and detailed account of the aesthetic and design-led contribution of
culture in *Towards an Urban Renaissance* (Urban Task Force 1999). According to Vickery, its significance lay in its recognition of intrinsic components and aesthetic values. It stresses the social functionality of urban spaces, pointing out endogenous human values and motivation as factors for regeneration. The emphasis on sociological and cultural factors as key elements of regeneration was further cemented in New Labour’s policy framework through the DETR White Paper *A Better Quality of Life* (1999). In this paper, Blair defended the irreducibility of intrinsic values of life quality, to which economic growth and prosperity could only be instrumental. In this way, he emphasised human and cultural factors as core elements of New Labour’s Third Way policy framework.

Government directives were passed on to the cultural sector through the DCMS report *Leading a Good Life: Guidance on Integrating Cultural and Community Strategies* (2004). This report stressed the central role that cultural and sociological factors were to play in urban regeneration. It proposed to ‘maximise the overlap between the work and outputs of community and cultural planning’. Culture’s intrinsic role should not be subsumed by the ‘wider community development agenda’. According to Evans (2005), this new policy approach paid tribute to the symbolic qualities of the art and culture, such as heritage and identity.

New Labour’s shift towards the integration of cultural and holistic elements in urban regeneration was broadly inspired by European notions of urbanity and public spaces, which stressed civic identity, lifestyle and design. This shift in conceptualisation can, to a large part, be attributed to key theorists in this area Bianchini, Parkinson and Landry. These theorists were key proponents of a holistic approach to citizenship and regeneration. They challenged creative and lateral approaches to urban planning, over an economically driven model. Bianchini and his colleagues’ ‘creative city’ theory focused on human and intellectual resources as new ‘raw materials’ for urban development that could replace less sustainable assets such as location, natural resources and market access (2000: 3). Culture was presented as a new hub for economic and social developments by introducing cultural and intellectual resources such as ‘human cleverness, desires, motivation and creativity’. Its appeal seemed thereby not surprising since the appraisal of culture and creativity promised flexible, ubiquitous and sustainable resources for city areas and locations that had experienced the gradual extinction of local and regional resources such as
coal and steel. The development of ‘creative cities’ was based on physical reshaping, and the creation of new city images. These were mainly based on architectural developments, public art projects, and recreational opportunities such as cultural venues, cafés and restaurants.

Critics, however, attacked the ‘creative city’ approach as mismatching competing cultural, social and economic claims. The mere rhetorical nature of the former masked the dominance of competitive and entrepreneurial logic. Assessing the outcomes of urban regeneration projects such as Glasgow, critics like Paddison (1993; see also Miles 2005; García 2005; Hubbard 1996) suggested that culture-led regeneration aimed at exploitative marketing and re-branding of new city images, which were represented as hubs of development. City marketing and branding promulgated specific gentrified notions of culture that focused on a middle-class, professional clientèle, whilst leaving unaccounted local cultures and the needs of the indigenous population. Gentrification has been associated with a move from multiple to single occupancy, from culturally and socio-economically heterogeneous to homogeneous constituencies and from renting to owner occupation of houses. The profound implications of the ‘creative city’ approach has been described by Miles as: ‘A cultural zone that can easily be read as a zone of affluence’ (2005: 890). The cultural infrastructure of the new urban spaces bridged anthropological and aesthetic aspects into a culture only affordable by metropolitan, affluent and well-educated. According to Zukin (1995) the metropolitan, middle-class trend within urban regeneration aimed at a single culture, rather than a plurality of ‘cultures’, and therefore prevented the development of community identities and local ownership.

Harvey (1989) and Oatley (1998 in Johnstone 2004) addressed the socially divisive implications of public-private partnerships, which underlie urban regeneration projects. Both suggested that the ‘entrepreneurial’ approach rather than addressing structural redevelopment, rested principally on speculative grounds and ‘opportunities’. They pointed out the absence of regulatory, public management of uneven developments, which ensured public accountability, access and social provision. The focus on ‘local coalitions’ and competition eroded social political programming altogether. The reshaping of city images as new local and national brands combined with the rhetorical rallying of ‘culture’ moreover negated the
marginalisation of deprived, local communities. This was, however, omitted by its fashionable marketing imagery.

The critique of the socially divisive implications of culture-led urban regeneration links in with Bourdieu’s critique of the neoliberal sway in public policies, and their threat to autonomous cultural production and consumption conditions. As pointed out in Chapter Two, to Bourdieu the historically derived autonomy of the field of cultural production that was epitomised by art for art’s sake ideas bore continued relevance, as it offered a sphere for intellectual and cultural activities free from direct social, economic and political pressures. It were the socially divisive implications of the uneven distribution of cultural and educational capital, and exclusionary cultural policy, but also, the increasing dominance of private market mechanisms within public policies that, to him, threatened the basis for independent cultural and intellectual participation. The dominance of entrepreneurial and managerial practices within culture-led urban regeneration seem to reiterated Bourdieu’s fears of the undemocratic and socially unjust consequences of a market-driven cultural policy approach, as it ultimately evolved around an exclusionary middle-class cultural sphere and life style. As the discussion of the culture-led urban regeneration has shown, not only has it primarily addressed a professional, middle-class clientele, key drivers have represented competitive, speculative and commercial developments, which ultimately undermined autonomous and democratic forms of cultural participation. In this way Bourdieu’s critique of a class-based account of cultural production continues to undermine key aspects of the cultural industries approach.

As a final critical qualification of culture-led regeneration, just as the link between cultural programmes and direct or indirect economic benefits has remained unfounded, so has the causal relation between cultural and social regeneration. The generic problem of culture-led social and economic instrumentalism has been identified for instance by the government watchdog QUEST. The assessment of instrumental policies suggests that governments failed to identify an adequate cause and effect, and input and output relation between social and economic objectives and cultural action. Despite or because of the broad, lateral conceptualisation of culture and its links to policy objectives, instrumental policies often lacked adequate theorisation and therefore rendered largely oblivious an adequate policy approach.
6.5 The Social Instrumentalist Argument

As the discussion has illustrated, New Labour's Third Way policy approach strongly centres around social inclusion and responsibility by means of work, education and what could broadly be described as investments into human and cultural capital (Giddens 1998: 102). This is underlined by an 'active' approach to welfare and citizenship, which emphasises personal responsibility, aspiration, and mobility as a means for re-entry into society. It has already been argued how culture's instrumental role has been informed by this approach. The following discussion will illustrate the conceptual foundation and critique of culture's role in social inclusion policies.

The discussion above has shown how New Labour emphasised its commitment to social inclusion and regeneration as a response to pervasive social deficits left behind by previous governments. Social inclusion has since represented a crucial part of New Labour's modernising agenda and 'national renewal' plans. The development and implementation of its policies were principally driven by the Social Exclusion Unit (SEU), which was established in 1997. The foundation of the SEU had the principle objective to create cross-departmental policy solutions to social inclusion. It should actively promote a mix of social, economic and cultural policies as 'joined up solutions to joined up problems' (cited in Belfiore 2004: 93). Although social inclusion had generally referred to as participation in key activities of society (Hills 2001), within New Labour’s template it henceforth became recast in terms of equal opportunities through employment, training and education.

The harnessing of culture and the arts for the 'joined up' policy approach has to be regarded as an extension of the discussed restructuring of welfare state provision and public sector spending, in the course of which culture was to adopt economic and social rationales. Having moved into direct government control, the social inclusion agenda became a chief concern for the DCMS and its dependent bodies. In an agreement between the DCMS and ACE (2000) the ACE was committed to 'promote the role of the Department's sectors in urban and rural regeneration...and in combating social exclusion'. The emphatic endorsement of the social inclusion agenda by the DCMS and the newly established Social Exclusion Unit's Policy Action Team 10 (PAT10) was supported by empirical evidence for culture's social instrumental role.
Matarasso's influential study *Use or Ornament* (1997) represented the cornerstone for the key role that evidence-based research played in advancing government policy. The study represented a comprehensive methodological framework and evaluation guidelines for the assessment of social instrumental policies. The report had the aim of offering an alternative methodological approach to impact measurement that had been used by the ACE at the time. In his approach, Matarasso suggested an array of social instrumental benefits the arts could procure. In many ways, these have since become something of a standard catalogue for the assessment of culture's instrumental role in social inclusion and regeneration. The art's social impact has been assessed in six broad themes:

- personal development
- social cohesion
- community empowerment and self-determination
- local image and identity
- imagination and vision
- health and well-being.

The social impacts suggested by Matarasso have subsequently been complemented by a wide range of other claims (see for instance Jermyn 2001 and 2004; Landry 1996). Despite admitting to limited methodological robustness and unclear theoretical links between policy directives and culture, the report has nevertheless been presented as having provided substantive evidence for the viability of social instrumental policies. This recognition subsequently encouraged a large body of evidence-based research, most of which, however, has been critically dismissed as failing to provide adequate evidence for culture's role in social inclusion. Despite the widespread critique, however, the DCMS and ACE have fully incorporated positivist evidence for social instrumental policies, and culture's social instrumental role has since been commonly accepted. The SEU stated in its strategic policy paper
Preventing Social Exclusion (2000: 41) that 'cultural activities can help build self-esteem and respect for others, develop communications skills and teamwork, foster discipline, and can teach basic life-skills to those vulnerable to social exclusion. The DCMS now makes combating this 'poverty of experience’ a key priority...'. These statements were added by more explicit assumptions on culture:

This report shows that art and sport can not only make a valuable contribution to delivering key outcomes of lower long-term unemployment, less crime, better health and better qualifications, but can also help to develop the individual pride, community spirit and capacity for responsibility that enable communities to run regeneration programmes themselves. (PAT10 1999).

The critique of the social instrumental agenda for the cultural sector rests largely on the competing, and at times incoherent, conjuncture of cultural, social instrumental and managerial assumptions. The implementation of social instrumental goals through a managerial, impact-driven policy framework has thereby been of main concern. As the discussion of the general reliance on auditing and managerial measures in the public sector has already shown, many critics dismissed the approach as ineffective. Power (1997) contested the impact-driven approach as eroding qualitative, professional values and ethics. As impact measures pertained a mere validating, legitimising role of existing policy objectives, they represented parts of the attempt to impose managerial logic on service provision. In a similar way, Exworthy (1999) maintained that impact-driven government guidelines and measures bypassed much needed consultation with professional bodies on their use and effectiveness. More importantly however, managerial denominators of efficiency and effectiveness undermined discretionary values and practices, and the recognition of intrinsic 'public values’. This is in line with critique of the mere advocacy led function of cultural indicators (Belfiore 2004).

More specific criticism of the practical ineffectiveness of culture-led social instrumental policies has been raised by West (2005), who found fault with the short intervals and lack of consultancy process, on which policy initiatives and their reviews were based. These left inefficient time spans for programme development and organisational improvement. Assessments of social instrumental policies needed to take into account community based corporation and context driven assessment measures, which generic measures could not achieve. In this way, he argued, that government reviews and assessment methods amounted to nothing more than a
consolidation of pre-existing aims and perspectives, rather than facilitating incremental improvement. Moreover, he bemoaned the theoretical flaw of high level policy expectations, that were unequally matched by vague terminology as to how cultural institutions could alleviate social exclusion.

Objections to the contemporary policy approach have been largely supported by participants in the field enquiry. As discussed in Chapter Five, a number of cultural managers suggested how social inclusion and regeneration policies pertained a mere narrow focus on statistical measures and indicators. As the comments by a resource manager from Liverpool showed, the evidence-driven policy approach, highlighted on the example of her city’s participation as Capital of Culture, left unaccounted engagement with local communities, identities and cultures, and thereby focused on economic, rather than cultural and social barriers of inclusion. Anita the entrepreneurial aims and the overriding concerns for the development of tourism, consumerism and entertainment as part of the social inclusion approach of her city. This demonstrated how the juxtaposition of neoliberal managerial logic, social instrumental and cultural claims resulted in an incoherent policy approach.

The incoherent approach to culture-led social inclusion is further illustrated by the complex cultural discourse, with which the approach is advertised. As discussed in Chapter Four, enlightenment and reformatory notions have represented key assumptions in the contemporary public cultural policy discourse, led by the likes of Roy Shaw, Chris Smith and Tessa Jowell. To demonstrate the mismatch of instrumental and intrinsic cultural claims with social instrumental policy logic, it is feasible to return to Jowell’s speech *Government and the Value of Culture* once again. As pointed out in Chapter One, Jowell promulgated a mix of intrinsic cultural value arguments, liberal humanist assumptions and culture’s 'aspirational' role. It was the close conjuncture of intrinsic cultural qualities such as ‘personal and social capital’, ‘life quality, personal happiness and ‘opportunities’ and ‘physical poverty’ that resulted in a complex mix of assumptions. Jowell described culture’s ‘intrinsic’ role as ‘addressing poverty of aspiration’ and as a tool ‘necessary to build a society of fairness and opportunity’. Based on the discussion of the neoliberal turn within government policies, however, it is easy to see how the conjuncture between culture, aspiration and ‘opportunity’ resulted in the subordination of cultural values into the neoliberal instrumental policy discourse.
In a similar way to intrinsic cultural values, so have enlightenment and reformatory arguments presented cultural rationales for the social instrumental policy discourse. The conjuncture of liberal humanist discourse with the neoliberal managerial framework, however, reflects on the conceptual incoherency of the social instrumental policy approach to culture. The managerial and entrepreneurial thrust of social instrumentalism, discussed so far, stands in stark contrast to the invocation of liberal humanist arguments frequently engaged. That Victorian enlightenment ideas have been based on an opposition to the rationalisation of culture for economic and social ends has been already discussed in Chapter Four. Victorian reformers, whilst attributing a moral and civilising role to culture, defined culture and the arts as a counterweight to the modern spirit of laissez-faire, economic competitiveness, rapid industrial and commercial developments and middle-class spirit. Significantly, reformers like Ruskin and Arnold had pointed out how sterile commercial and commodified cultural production resulted in social inequalities and worsening working and living conditions. They argued that the development of mental and ethical awareness, and intellectual capacities represented the main purpose of culture. Culture pursued educational and civilising aims, rather than materialist or social ones. Their critique of modern industrial developments has not lost its contemporary significance. As the critique of culture-led social instrumental policies has shown above, humanist assumptions on culture largely contradict the managerial and entrepreneurial aims and outcomes of urban regeneration and social inclusion. As the discussion showed contemporary instrumental policies largely ignored social and cultural objectives such as social cohesion, local identity, cultural diversity and fairness, which Victorian reformers regarded as inherent cultural concern. In the light of this argument, the invocation of liberal humanist arguments in the context of New Labour’s instrumental cultural approach can be called a misappropriation in an attempt to draw support for present cultural policy. In many ways, contemporary instrumental policies contradict the conceptual foundation of social instrumental ideas.

The discussion so far has described the emergence of social and economic instrumental arguments as closely aligned to New Labour’s Third Way public sector reform that recast cultural policies as economic and social panacea. The account illustrated the uneven pairing of social instrumental claims, liberal humanist ideas and
entrepreneurial logic in social instrumental policies. The discussion pointed out contradictory aims and outcomes of social instrumental projects, which evolve around structural, long-term social and economic planning versus speculative competition and marketing; professional ethics and public sector values versus neoliberal entrepreneurialism and market logic; and community enhancement versus gentrification.

In drawing to an end of the discussion on instrumentalism, the account will discuss the way public cultural policies are reassessed in terms of the emergent conceptual framework of 'public value'. 'Public value' has become part of the organisational renewal rhetoric within governments and public cultural organisations such as the BBC and the ACE. By unpacking its theoretical propositions in the context of instrumentalism, the discussion assesses the ideological and practical implications of the concept of 'public value'.

6.6 'Public Value' and the Cultural Sector

As discussed throughout this chapter, public service reform and its adoption of neoliberal managerial and entrepreneurial logic has greatly informed the introduction of instrumentalism in the cultural sector. It has been argued how public sector reform in the last three decades has intensified the commitment to social and economic reasoning and impact-driven policies. Public service renewal has remained an ongoing agenda for the current government with the unrelenting rallying of principles of efficiency and effectiveness, top down management, and competition in the provision of public services (Cabinet Office 2006). However, the growing critique of the market-driven, managerial approach to public service provision has fuelled the debate on alternative and improved conceptual approaches to public service provision. In this context, the inconspicuous academic theory of 'public value' experienced a rise to attention when picked up by government think tanks in the UK and other countries (Crabtree 2002). The appeal of the 'public value' framework has been attributed to its critical assessment of the centrality of market mechanisms in public policies, and their effects on social provision and communities. The government think tank theoriser Mulgan, who was one of the first to pioneer 'public
value’, hailed the new concept as a decisive improvement to the narrow measures of managerialism. Mulgan argued that ‘public value’ theory differed from traditional approaches to public administration, such as ‘new public management’, as it takes account of a ‘full range of factor’ that ‘current public management practice sometimes fails to consider, understand or manage’ (Cabinet Office Strategy Unit 2006). He conceded that the generic managerial approach in the public sector merely mimicked ‘organisational and financial systems used by businesses’. He argued that economic measures, such as the ‘narrow concept of cost-efficiency’, however, were not synonymous with an ‘improvement in service’. Market calculus and evidence-based policies could not account for social and ‘subjective’ values, citizen values (O’Flynn 2007). In particular, these referred to notions of trust, fairness, equity, ethos, and what to Mulgan amounted to ‘prevailing social norms and moral codes of behaviour’ (Kelly: 7). ‘Public value’ has in this way frequently been presented as a new framework for much needed innovation of public services. ‘Public value’ has been regarded as a swing towards collaborative, consultative approaches, which emphasise the unique qualities of the public sector as a political market place, rather than an economic one (O’Flynn 2007: 359). The new paradigm has since also been used in the context of public cultural policies, and has been theorised by the BBC and ACE.

The discussion in Chapter One already showed how ‘public value’ has been presented in the discourse evolving around the reformulation of intrinsic cultural values. In his pamphlets Capturing Cultural Value and Cultural Value and the Crisis of Legitimacy Holden represented ‘public value’ as a means to describe intrinsic cultural values in terms of the diverse, individual and increasingly differentiated needs and wants of sovereign consumers. The ACE described ‘public value’ as a way to reform its policies along the lines of central objectives of democracy, inclusion and diversity. Knell suggests how ‘public value’ was based on ‘personalisation’ of services and the exploration of cultural services based on consumer preference and ‘public consultation’. ‘Personalisation’ meant that art organisations should ‘play on the consumer’s turf’ by not only giving consumers the opportunity to determine access to arts organisations and their products but actually ‘directly shape the way in which artistic products are developed, produced and brought to the market’ (Knell 2006: 6). Knell thereby referred, in particular, to the use of information and communication
technologies (ICT) through which audio and video performances could be made available to a wider audience. ICT moreover offered audiences the opportunity to create or take part in production itself (‘hard p’ personalisation). ‘Hard p’ personalisation facilitated active co-production though ‘blurring the lines between author and user’, ‘inter-authorship’ and ‘combining creativity and consumption’. According to this approach, arts organisations are to heavily rely on participatory processes of meaning-creation, shifting the focus from supply-led to consumer-focused programme making. The creation of ‘public value’ entailed further ‘soft personalisation’ that included such initiatives as consumer centric marketing, customer relationship management and delivery. It has been one of the main claims of proponents of ‘public value’ that its implementation could bring about a greater recognition of intrinsic cultural values and cultural democracy.

This approach, however, has not remained without critique (Crabtree 2006). Main objections have pointed out the conceptual alignment of ‘public value’ with private sector mechanisms, such as consumer sovereignty, which compromised principles of citizenship and public service provision. Although ‘public value’ has initially been theorised as a departure from a focus on managerial and entrepreneurial logic in public governance, it can be argued that the emergence of ‘public value’ in public sector management in fact represents an extension of old beliefs. Evidence for this is for instance delivered by the focus on consumerist logic in ‘public value’ theory, which draws on a conceptual alignment with the ‘people first’ logic, a key aspect of the public sector reform in the 1990s. It was in The House of Commons that the term ‘choice and voice’ was first described as: ‘It’s what people want; it facilitates personalisation.’, and in Blair’s own words: ‘We are proposing to put an entirely different dynamic in place to drive our public services, one where the service will be driven not by government or by the manager but by the user.’ (Blair cited in Newman 2007a: 740; italics added).

The critique of the consumerist ethos and private sector logic underlying public sector policies has been stark. As has been discussed in Chapter One, Clark and Newman (2007) criticised the impact of consumer-driven logic in public institutions as threatening to undermine key principles of public institutions and citizenship. Public institutions and professional ethics needed to be insulated from commercial and economic interests, in order to ensure democratic and egalitarian terms of public
provision. In a similar way, Nielson (2000) dismissed the influence of consumer sovereignty and choice in public policies as eroding public ethics. Drawing a distinction between public and private values, Nielson described the trend towards customer-based quality assessment within the public sector as a market-led, management-orientated approach that determined value in terms of customer satisfaction, rather than professional values. ‘Consumer satisfaction’ and ‘consumer quality’, however, merely assessed subjective preferences, consumer wants and individual interests. Public institutions, in contrast, traditionally relied on the pursuit of public interests, professional ethics and information. Nielson questioned whether the effectiveness of public services could be based on private sector benchmarks, such as consumer satisfaction alone.

Similar arguments were made by Eikenberry who suggested that public institutions sustained inherent values, services and goods by building social capital in the form of information and skills. These, in turn, were crucial means for the mediation of public issues and interests based on shared notions of value. He described public institutions as:

Spheres of our community life, in which we answer together the most important questions: what is our purpose, what is the right way to act, and what is the common good? It is...concerned with moral formation and with ends, not simply administration or the maximising of means. (Elshtein in Eikenberry 2004: 133).

Eikenberry stressed how public services represented democratic tools for the deliberation and provision of goods and services that enhanced social cohesion and cultural developments. That public service provision predicated on less arbitrary principles was also suggested by Kelly (2005) who insisted that public realm mediation had to show concern for contents, validity, and professional or internal measures, which were, at times, irrespective of user choice. In contrast, market-led customer satisfaction was not challenged on the basis of imperfect information, ethical considerations or usefulness. The critical rejection of market-driven notions of consumer preference in the public realm dismantles the overt claims of democratic, inclusive and fair provision of services that can be found in ‘public value’ theory.
As a final comment, in assessing the validity of notions of participation and co-creation in art production, it has been questioned whether arts audiences actually wish for arts organisations to guide their activities according to mechanisms predating customer satisfaction and want. The phenomenon, according to which consumer-focused marketing and production are found to discourage audience attendance is known as the ‘marketing pitfall’. This reflects on the way arts audiences are found to reject overt business- and marketing orientation, as well as customer friendly, ‘safe’ arts production (Boorsma 2006: 74; Voss 2000). These findings contradict key assumptions underlying ‘public value’. Increasing customer orientation and consumer sovereignty in public cultural provision may not only undermine public principles and ethics, which depend on democratic, egalitarian and discretionary terms of provision. The reliance on market competition and consumer logic may also undermine art specific production values, audience attendance is based upon.

6.7 Conclusion

The critical assessment of instrumentalism concludes the enquiry into the conflict between intrinsic and instrumental cultural policy rationales. The discussion aimed to highlight the network of discourses informing social and economic instrumental cultural policies. It has been argued how culture-led social inclusion and regeneration policies draw on a circulation of competing assumptions derived from neoliberal economic, social democratic and liberal humanist cultural discourse. Instrumental cultural rationales have been contextualised within New Labour’s conjoined approach to mainstream public policies, which juxtapose neoliberal managerial and entrepreneurial assumptions with a concern for social justice and equal opportunities. It has been suggested that the contradictory pairing of social democratic and neoliberal principles of governance has resulted in mismatching claims within instrumental cultural policies. It was a key contention that neoliberal assumptions in public cultural policies challenge principles of social justice and cultural development.

The discussion of instrumental cultural policy was assessed in the light of the relational account of Bourdieu. The account suggested that the increasing sway of neoliberal, entrepreneurial and market-led principles within public cultural policies
undermined egalitarian forms of participation by focusing on middle-class cultural spheres. The imposition of instrumental political agenda also threatened the relative autonomy of cultural and intellectual activities. The account discussed the effects of the entrepreneurial, market-driven and commercial approaches to public service provision in culture-led urban regeneration and social inclusion policies. The critique suggested that the misappropriation of culture as economic and social panacea replaced structural, regulatory management and supply-led developments, and resulted in a focus on economic indicators and marketisation. This compromised social and cultural notions of diversity, social justice and local identity. The account criticised the discourse evolving around culture-led social instrumentalism for its distorted mix of liberal humanist cultural, social instrumental and neoliberal rationales. The discussion on managerial tendencies within cultural policies, in particular 'public value', argued how the increasing emphasis on market-led concepts, impacts and consumer sovereignty threatened to erode professional ethics, discretionary service provision and trust in public services. This undermined a democratic sphere where cultural values can be negotiated and expressed in an egalitarian and democratic way. The discussion on the complex and competing underpinnings of instrumental cultural policies suggested the departure of contemporary instrumentalism from its historical and intellectual roots in enlightenment and Victorian reformatory discourse.
Conclusion
This study has been concerned with the contemporary role and meaning of intrinsic cultural values in a neoliberal public policy context. Intrinsic cultural values have been part of a complex and competing debate evolving around a tension between intrinsic cultural, social instrumental and neoliberal economic policy rationales. The study placed the debate in the context of developments taking place in public sector policy and welfare reform spanning the last three decades. The discussion on contemporary cultural policies was complement by an account on the formulation of cultural ideas within European cultural history. By assuming a historical, sociological and critical approach to the contemporary debate, the study suggested how the tension between intrinsic and instrumental cultural values needs to be re-evaluated.

This study concluded that the contemporary assertion of intrinsic and instrumental cultural values represents a misappropriation of their conceptual and historical genealogy. It was suggested that in the context of New Labour’s cultural policy approach, a realignment of cultural values with neoliberal economic policy rationales is enforced. This policy approach is based on a complex discourse of competing cultural and political assumptions, which assume liberal humanist as well as neoliberal logic of cultural provision. This has resulted in an incoherent policy framework, in which not only cultural intellectual roots, but also key assumptions underpinning liberal democratic principles of public provision, are undermined. This argument was based on the contention that liberal democratic principles are based on an insulation of public interests, and professional and ethical values. According to liberal democratic principles, public service provision is based on democratic participation and equitable share in public goods and services, as well as processes of public deliberation. The thesis argued that these processes are disrupted by a shift to market-driven, consumerist and competitive notions of public provision. In this way, the contemporary instrumental cultural policy approach represents a departure from intellectual history, that is liberal humanist instrumental assumptions. The thesis showed that key ideas of enlightenment thinkers assumed that liberal economic spirit and industrial developments were of detrimental effect for working and living conditions, but also cultural and ethical development. The thesis argued how their criticism of modern developments in many respects throws light on contemporary instrumentalism and its effects on social inequality and cultural gentrification in present times. In this way, it has been argued that the appropriation of liberal
humanist arguments as justifications for contemporary instrumental cultural policy agenda remains short of theoretical and historical awareness of its critique.

The field research into the negotiation of intrinsic cultural values suggested that the tension between competing policy rationales, cultural values and political and economic pressures is deflected into a synthesis between intrinsic and instrumental rationales. Both aspects were regarded as inherent concerns of cultural practice. This recognition allowed cultural managers to incorporate competing cultural policy assumptions into a broader cultural political framework. The account emphasised that the negotiation of cultural values, represented a context-driven and institutionally embedded negotiation of, at times, competing policy rationales. The thesis illustrated the conflict-ridden nature of cultural practice, which aimed at a balance between different organisational goals. It was argued that the negotiation of cultural values and instrumental policy rationales was compromised, if impact-driven and commercial criteria represented overriding, deterministic objectives. Although social instrumental aims were generally accepted as part of a commitment to public accountability and as underpinning liberal humanist cultural assumptions, instrumental policies were rejected, if they assumed explicit managerial and entrepreneurial demands.

The analysis commenced with the discussion of the competing network of discourses evolving around intrinsic and instrumental cultural policy ideas in the contemporary debate. Chapter One discussed the invocation of intrinsic cultural values, which rose to prominence in the last decade. The account illustrated how intrinsic cultural value arguments initiated a reassertion of traditional idealist cultural rationales, which resulted in the presentation of the *McMaster report*. The intrinsic cultural values argument raised critique of evidence-based and impact-driven instrumental policy rationales. This approach was paralleled by the reformulation of intrinsic cultural values within the framework of New Labour's joined-up policy approach, which assumes notions of social justice and egalitarian access alongside neoliberal managerial policy rationales. The contradictory nature of the contemporary discussion on intrinsic cultural values was demonstrated by the accounts of Tessa Jowell and the think tank writer John Holden. It was argued that they promoted intrinsic cultural values within a network of discourses, which forged a synthesis between intrinsic cultural values, managerialism and consumerism. The discussion
suggested how the neoliberal think tank writer Holden facilitated a homology between popular cultural and cultural democratic claims, and notions of sovereign cultural consumerism and the cultural industries. It was argued how his attempt to ‘reformulate’ intrinsic cultural values in fact assumed managerial, consumerist logic, and therefore stood in stark contrast to liberal humanist cultural principles, as well as liberal democratic ideas of governance.

The mediation of cultural values through notions of consumer sovereignty and the cultural industries was critically reflected upon. It was suggested that the conceptual conjuncture of cultural service provision with market-driven notions of consumerism hinged on conceptual and philosophical conflicts underlying the division between public and private principles of governance. The contention was held that public principles of service provision have been traditionally defined by liberal democratic notions, which assume formal equality in the formulation of shared notions of the common good, culture, faith and identity. They encompass notions of citizenship, such as democratic participation and egalitarianism. These values are driven by an insulation of public institutions and public deliberation processes. The account suggested that the circulation of competing discourses of neoliberal economic logic, democratic and liberal humanist cultural values threaten these principles of public provision. The discussion provided the basis for a critical assessment of instrumental cultural arguments in Chapter Six.

In response to the idealist representation of intrinsic cultural value arguments pointed out in Chapter One, the thesis proceeded to present a sociological analysis of culture, which assessed the theoretical and philosophical critique of idealist cultural assumptions. Chapter Two illustrated the embeddedness of cultural discourse in historical, social and ideological processes. It highlighted the fact that cultural and aesthetic values are rarely free from ideological, economic and political interests. Rather than representing essentialist, transcendent and universal ideas, the account pointed out the contingent and arbitrary nature of much of cultural ideas. Chapter Two discussed the relational value of culture and cultural participation, which stressed the need to place cultural provision on democratic and egalitarian principles. This contention was based on Bourdieu's critique of Kantian aesthetics. Bourdieu had dismissed notions such as excellence, talent and universality as historically and socially conditioned. According to him, cultural taste and order represented core
instruments for class distinction. Bourdieu suggested how high culture represented
the symbolic mainstay of the upper-classes, as access to culture was structured by
socialisation and education. He highlighted the unequal distribution of cultural capital,
and demanded democratic and egalitarian access to education and culture.

The discussion further showed how social factors such as gender, ethnicity, age, as
well as processes of convergence and omnivorousness represented significant
factors for the social stratification of cultural consumption in different social context.
This was illustrated through the discussion of Gans’ account of American taste
cultures. Gans suggested how, in a socially and culturally less hierarchical societal
context, a diverse and differentiated system of taste cultures could be observed.
Instead of representing bounded, innate entities, taste cultures emerged in different
social context, and often served different taste groups. In this way Gans argued how
a variegated system of tastes emerged, which served the heterogeneous needs,
backgrounds and interests of a diverse society. Gans’ subcultural programme
suggested how in a democratic society, all taste cultures should be recognised and
supported as they reflected the diverse socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds of
its population.

It has been a key concern of Chapter Two to discuss the contemporary relevance of
class and socioeconomic background as stratifying factors for cultural consumption.
The account showed how school performance, but also high cultural activities, such
as museums visits, across different countries still show patterns of social division
along the lines of class and socioeconomic origin. Bourdieu and Gans’ accounts
were therefore regarded as significant reminders of the need to consider context-
driven, democratic and accountable modes of cultural provision.

The sociological account, however, was not to dismiss intrinsic cultural values
altogether. As the discussion showed, despite his critique, Bourdieu subsequently
retrieved cultural and intellectual autonomy from relativisation. He argued that
freedom from political, economic and ideological interests was a main requisite for
intellectual and cultural activities. He therefore critically objected the increasing
influence of the cultural industries and neoliberal logic on cultural production.
Bourdieu’s assertion of cultural autonomy as freedom from extant intrusion should
provide a theoretical basis for a more detailed discussion of the intellectual history of cultural values.

The first section of the thesis illustrated the complex and competing discourses of liberal humanist values, sociological critique and neoliberal logic that underpin the contemporary discussion on intrinsic cultural values. The debate thereby showed how contemporary cultural values and policy rationales are subject to contestation and context driven negotiation, and lacked conceptual clarity. The first part of the discussion resulted therefore in the contention that a further exploration of the philosophical, conceptual and historical genealogy of cultural values and policies was needed, which reconnected contemporary policy assumptions with their theoretical roots.

The intellectual history of cultural policy assumptions served as the theoretical basis, from which contemporary discourses could be further assessed. Chapters Three and Four traced the intellectual and sociohistorical formation of intrinsic and instrumental cultural values to key moments of Western cultural history. The intellectual history of cultural ideas suggested how the emergence of intrinsic cultural values was the result of a process of social differentiation concomitant with the rise of the modern industrial society and commercial art market in 19th century France and England. Art separatist ideas arose at a time of rapid industrialisation, scientific and religious liberalisation and the emergence of a middle-class culture. They formed an opposition to the commodification and commercialisation of the cultural sphere through the emergent cultural industry, which threatened the collapse of traditional art patronage systems. The thesis argued how art for art's sake has been based on a critique of utilitarian economic and conservative rationales and moral censorship, as they undermined artistic liberalisation. It was a key contention of art for art's sake proponents that liberal cultural and intellectual development represented the intrinsic meaning of life, to which economic expansion was merely a necessary prerequisite. In this way aesthetic tenets were developed, which emphasised the 'disinterestedness' of subject matter and form from political, moral and economic concerns.

Although art for art's sake ideas represented a significant conceptual foundation for the conceptual development of cultural autonomy and lifestyle, the account challenged the central role intrinsic cultural values have assumed in the cultural
policy discourse. The discussion showed that although intrinsic cultural values of excellence and cultural autonomy were key assumptions for the development of cultural policy making in Britain, they were ultimately overshadowed by instrumental concerns. It were rather a succession of instrumental reasoning, such as access, national prestige, economic expansion and most recently social inclusion that ultimately represented the main justification for public cultural provision. It has been therefore argued that the minor role art for art's sake ideas have played in the development of UK cultural policy stands in contrast to their present dominance in the public debate. In the light of the historical genealogy of intrinsic cultural values, it was concluded that the contemporary assertion of intrinsic cultural values as the *raison d'etre* for public cultural provision in fact represents a departure from historical and conceptual developments. The thesis argued how the contemporary meaning and function of intrinsic cultural value claims needed to be reassessed as part of the neoliberal instrumental framework. The implications of this approach were discussed in Chapter Six.

Before engaging in a debate on cultural values in the context of contemporary instrumental policies, the thesis first explored the conceptual genealogy of instrumental cultural values. Chapter Four discussed the theoretical and political basis of instrumental values. The account suggested how instrumental values not only represented a key concern throughout European cultural history, they also were the rationales for much of post World War II cultural policy in the UK. It was argued how the foundation for the social instrumental role of culture in public policies was laid by the Victorian reformist movement. The cultural history of instrumental cultural policies showed how the rapidly expanding economic, democratic and social capacities of Victorian England posed challenges to social management and governance. It was as a result of 19th century modern, industrial developments that a middle-class discourse on new moral and social authorities emerged. Leading reformers of that time considered culture a prime source for civil, moral and educational strength. The account illustrated the emergence of an institutional, reformatory discourse, which enrolled cultural institutions as key weapons in the social control agenda.

The thesis stressed how the enlightenment movement shared core assumptions with art for art's sake. Despite their differences, both schools of thought had in common...
an indictment of the economic rationalisation and commodification of culture. This was particularly apparent in the reformist accounts of Ruskin and Arnold who, whilst advocating the social and moral role of culture, opposed the economic instrumentalisation of culture through an emergent middle-class taste. The account argued how Victorian reformers criticised the emergence of liberal economic spirit and industrial developments as based on sterile perfectionism and economic rationalisation. The resultant labour and production conditions had deprecating effects on the lower classes' working and living conditions. The sole concern for material ends and commercialism undermined an interest in cultural, educational and ethical development. Based on these observations, Victorian reformers argued how a lack of national education system and moral development, of which the arts and culture were a key aspect, ultimately impeded social and political developments. In this way enlightenment reformers shared key contentions with art for art's sake proponents, that is, the opposition between cultural and economic concerns.

Based on these arguments, the thesis assumed a conceptual disconnect between historical and contemporary forms of instrumentalism. Although many commentators have drawn conceptual parallels between contemporary forms of instrumentalism and enlightenment and reformatory ideas in an attempt to justify contemporary instrumental policies, it has been suggested how these merely masked the departure of present instrumental cultural policies from their enlightenment, reformatory foundation. This thesis argued how contemporary instrumental cultural ideas, in fact, were based on and masked a neoliberal managerial discourse. The critique of instrumental cultural policies was the subject of Chapter Six.

Chapters Six discussed the emergence of the tension between intrinsic and instrumental policy rationales in the context of the public sector reform and New Labour’s Third Way policies. The discussion began with an analysis of instrumental cultural policies in the context of the ‘managerialisation’ and modernisation of public agencies and welfare policies. It was argued that New Labour’s Third Way policies represented in many ways a continuation of the Conservatives’ government policies. However, as a response to the critique of the structural economic approach to social deficits of previous governments, and the assumptions of changing socioeconomic developments, New Labour began to promulgate a ‘middle-way’ between managerial and entrepreneurial policies and social justice and fairness. It was argued how New
Labour’s Third Way shifted emphasis from structural economic to social and cultural means, such as education, training and employment, as key remedies against social deficits. This was part of an ‘active’ approach to welfare and citizenship. The thesis argued that the emphasis on social and cultural causes, such as opportunities and responsibility, paved the way for culture’s central role in social inclusion and regeneration. It was the neoliberal recasting of welfare and public sector policies, which facilitated culture's instrumentalisation in mainstream social and economic agenda.

The discussion critically assessed the overlap between neoliberal, social political and cultural assumptions. The account illustrated the theoretical divide between cultural, social instrumental and economic claims within the instrumental policy approach. This was exemplified by a discussion on culture-led urban regeneration programmes, which showed how in New Labour’s culture-led social instrumental approach a commitment to social and cultural concerns was unevenly matched with entrepreneurial, marketing-oriented and largely privatised initiatives. The thesis argued on the example of urban regeneration projects, such as the city of Glasgow, how this in part had resulted in exclusionary, gentrified urban developments, which favoured a professional, middle-class *clientèle*. The emphasis on marketised and entrepreneurial methods such as city marketing and branding, competitive tendering and speculative developments, in fact undermined promises of life quality, sustainability, community enhancement, social cohesion and local identities that the culture-led approach had made. Crucially, what the instrumental approach left unaccounted were necessary structural redevelopments of local areas, which showed concern for public accountability and access for locals.

The way instrumental cultural policies provided competing and, at times, incoherent claims was further discussed on the example of social inclusion policies. Chapter Six illustrated how social inclusion had become a central agenda in New Labour’s policy framework. Social inclusion provided a new approach to poverty and social deficits by presenting a multi-dimensional explanatory framework for their causes and solutions. Within this template, human and cultural capital, such as education, training and employment skills, became the panacea for New Labour’s social inclusion policies. The discussion, however, argued that the culture-led social policy
approach often bypassed regulatory, structural redevelopment necessary for the amendment of social deficits.

It was the main aim of Chapter Six to give a critical assessment of the way intrinsic and instrumental values have been recast in the contemporary instrumental cultural policy framework. It has been a main contention that the discourse of instrumentalism has been based on a circulation of competing discursive meanings of liberal humanist, social instrumental and neoliberal consumerist notions of cultural provision that merely masks the dominance of the latter. The thesis critically evaluated the usurpation of cultural and social claims by neoliberal economic rationales and their effects on notions of social justice, cultural diversity and structural economic and social developments. The discussion concluded how the contemporary assertion of intrinsic cultural values needs to be regarded in the light of neoliberal tendencies within public governance, namely as an attempt to appropriate and reinsert culture into the neoliberal economic discourse.

The field enquiry into the negotiation of cultural values supported the irreconcilability of liberal humanist cultural and neoliberal economic rationales. The discussion showed how managerial and impact-based policies represented the main threat to artistic production. Measurable, deterministic and predictable policy objectives undermined artistic values, and the intangible and subjective nature of cultural production. Although social instrumental aspects were in fact regarded as part of the production process, the study suggested how deterministic criteria and policy procedures compromised the implementation of artistic values. The opposition to instrumental values was also based on the critique of the commercialism of the cultural industries and market-driven cultural production. Cultural managers stressed how art production and dissemination required independence from political and commercial pressures in order to ensure diversity of programming.

Whereas a main contention of this thesis proposed the irreconcilability of intrinsic cultural values and neoliberal logic, the field research gave insight into the way cultural managers defined and negotiated the tension between cultural and economic values. It has been a key finding of the analysis that participants regarded social instrumental goals in fact as 'innate' or 'intrinsic' aspects of cultural production and consumption. These findings contradicted the discussion on intrinsic cultural values
presented in Chapter One, which had illustrated the rejection of instrumental cultural rationales by the cultural constituency. Cultural managers in this study justified social instrumental aspects based on a complex and context-driven discourse. Cultural managers took account of a diversity of cultural, economic and political arguments, such as liberal humanist ideas, social and public responsibility, financial concerns and political pressures. By recognising social instrumental aspects as part of everyday cultural administration, cultural managers were able to negotiate extant political expectations with artistic organisational goals. Although the tension between artistic and social instrumental demands was recognised and at times resulted in the juxtaposition of competing and contradictory assumptions, cultural managers generally suggested how the resolution of this tension in fact was an intrinsic part of the artistic and managerial process. The field research in this way showed how the tension between intrinsic and instrumental cultural values needs to be reconsidered. Instead of a binary opposition between intrinsic and instrumental reasoning, the thesis suggested a divide between intrinsic and social instrumental, on the one hand, and economic managerial logic, on the other hand. The field research showed how the negotiation of this tension depends on a context-driven institutional discourse, which takes account of a diversity of organisational and extant demands.

This thesis represented a historical, theoretical and sociological approach to the discussion of intrinsic cultural values in the context of neoliberalism. It highlighted the complex and competing strands of arguments evolving around cultural values in an instrumental policy context. The thesis argued that intrinsic cultural values in many ways continue to represent the ideological stronghold of the cultural sector, yet it is their negotiation with institutional political and economic interests and requirements within the political economy, which determines cultural political outcomes. This thesis identified the retrograde return to idealism, as well as exclusionary, market-driven cultural policy rationales as the main threats to this negotiation. It has been argued that a binary opposition between intrinsic and instrumental cultural policy rationales needs to be rethought by taking account of the intellectual genealogy and institutional context of cultural policy making. Key aspects of cultural production continue to be defined by a concern for artistic, democratic and social concerns. In a climate of neoliberalism the negotiation of these values remains of crucial importance for the cultural sector.
## Appendix 1

### Interview Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Artistic Director</td>
<td>Contemporary Art Gallery</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Art Gallery</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Education Officer</td>
<td>Art Gallery</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anton</td>
<td>Curator</td>
<td>Art Gallery</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Head of Education</td>
<td>Art Gallery</td>
<td>Nottingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Art Gallery</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Marketing Manager</td>
<td>Art Gallery</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Opera</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Opera</td>
<td>Bracknell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>Resource Officer</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Art Director</td>
<td>Art Centre</td>
<td>Loughborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Programme Coord.</td>
<td>Art Centre</td>
<td>Loughborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Ballet</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Stratford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margret</td>
<td>Publicist</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Service Officer</td>
<td>District Council</td>
<td>Wealdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Art Centre</td>
<td>Aylesbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Art Centre</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Art Centre</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Art Centre</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Art Centre</td>
<td>York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare</td>
<td>Marketing Off.</td>
<td>Art Centre</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Art Centre</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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