

A thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

**The Museum of Modern Art, Oxford (1965-
1982): Exhibitions, Spectatorship and Social
Change**

Volume One

Hilary Tyndall Floe

St. Cross College
University of Oxford
Michaelmas Term 2015

ABSTRACT

The Museum of Modern Art, Oxford (1965-1982): Exhibitions, Spectatorship and Social Change

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Hilary Floe
St. Cross College
Michaelmas Term 2015

This thesis examines the first seventeen years of the history of the Museum of Modern Art Oxford (MOMA), from its founding in 1965 until c. 1982. It is concerned with the changing relationships between the museum and its audience, focusing on those aspects of the museum's programming that shed light on its role as a public mediator of recent art. This provides a means to consider the underlying values and commitments that informed MOMA's emergence as a leading contemporary art institution. Chapter one examines the museum's relationship to utopian countercultures through the metaphor of the museum as 'garden'; chapter two considers the erstwhile 'permanent' collection and its connection to corporate patronage; chapter three investigates the parallel forces of institutional critique and institutionalization; and chapter four addresses didactic strains in the museum's representation of an emergent multiculturalism.

Although dedicated to the history of a single regional gallery, the thematic structure of the thesis provides entry points into historical and theoretical issues of broader relevance. It is based on primary research in the previously neglected archive of what is now known as Modern Art Oxford, supplemented by interviews with artists and former staff members, and by close attention to British art periodicals and exhibition catalogues of the period. It is also informed by critical writings on museums and displays, and by artistic, social and museological histories, allowing the museum's activities to be situated within the cultural politics of these turbulent decades.

The thesis suggests that institutional identity – as exemplified by the history of MOMA from 1965-1982 – is porous and discontinuous: the development of the museum over this period is animated by multiple and often contradictory ideals, continuously shaped by pragmatic considerations, and subject to a rich variety of subjective responses.

Table of Contents

VOLUME ONE

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	v
Preface	1
Introduction	1
A Brief History	4
The Scope of the Dissertation.....	7
Critical Approaches to the Institutional Archive.....	9
A Note on Stylistic Conventions	17
List of Abbreviations	19
Chapter One: The Constructed Garden: Art, Play and Social Change, 1966-1971	20
Introduction	20
A Public Garden: The arts under Labour.....	27
Building the Garden.....	32
Constructed Space Participation: Museum as playground	46
Plastic Grass: The high-tech garden	56
‘Discover the Rainbow in Yourself’: Participation and over-participation.....	71
Conclusion: A gallery for everyone.....	82
Chapter Two: Breathtakingly Benevolent: The Peter Stuyvesant Foundation and the Idea of a Permanent Collection, 1965-74	87
Introduction: Collecting at the Museum of Modern Art.....	87
Rothmans and Contemporary Art.....	94
The Peter Stuyvesant Foundation Collection	97
<i>Recent British Painting</i> at the Tate.....	103
Liminal advertising: Crypto-marketing in the art press.....	107
Stuyvesant and Oxford	111
Impermanent Collecting	121
Conclusion	130
Chapter Three: The Sanction of the Museum: Presenting Conceptual Art in Oxford, 1970-1976	131
Introduction	131
The Predicament of the Avant-Garde	134
The Oxford Question	144
Particular Values and Particular Things	153
The Most Glamorous Space of All	163
Exhibition Policy	183
London and Oxford	200
Navigating Commercial Terrain.....	207
Ascetic Aesthetics.....	212

Provocation and Guidance.....	221
Conclusion.....	224
Chapter Four: Into Production and Out of Myth: Demystifying Culture, 1976-1982	227
Introduction	227
I: <i>Into Production!</i> Soviet art in Oxford.....	229
Parting the Iron Curtain	232
A Battlefield of Conflicting Ideologies	242
Interpretation	252
‘Red, Rough and Ready’: Critical reception	257
Soviet Art: Conclusion	267
Oxford, London, India: 1982.....	269
<i>Aspects of Modern Indian Art</i>	276
Critical Reaction.....	280
<i>Gods of the Byways</i>	287
Indian Art: Conclusion	292
Context and Conclusion: <i>A Clearer Picture</i>	293
Conclusion	302
 VOLUME TWO	
List of Illustrations	307
Illustrations	315
Bibliography.....	467

Acknowledgements

During the four years that I prepared this thesis, I have had cause to be grateful to many people in different ways.

Firstly, my deep appreciation and thanks go to my two supervisors, Dr. Jason Gaiger and Professor Brandon Taylor, whose unstinting kindness and guidance have shepherded this project through to completion.

I was fortunate to be a member of the Ruskin School of Art during the course of the DPhil and I owe especial thanks to Paul Bonaventura, Malcolm Bull, and Anthony Gardner, who have each provided valuable suggestions at different stages.

I have been assisted by many people at Modern Art Oxford, who made me welcome among the archives for so long. I am especially grateful to the late Michael Stanley who initiated the project and whose enthusiasm was inspiring during my first year of research. Many thanks are also owed to Paul Hobson, Emily Korchmáros, Ciara Moloney, Hayley Raines, Emma Ridgway, Sally Shaw, Helen Shilton, David Thorp and Sarah Wilkinson.

I could not have carried out this work without the financial aid of my doctoral studentship, for which I thank the Ruskin School of Art, Modern Art Oxford, and anonymous donors; St. Cross College has provided valued additional funding.

My project benefited tremendously from the insights of those who consented to be interviewed: Eileen Armitage, Sebastian Boyle, Jeff Clarke, Michael Cooper, Jill Drower, David Elliott, Helen Ganly, Trevor Green, John Hoole, Antoinette Ibsen, Sir Mark Jones, David King, Barry Lane, Rupert Legge, Stuart and Marya Lewis, Sandy Nairne, John Parke, Kathy Pollen, Tony Rickaby, Graham Stevens, Sir Nicholas Serota, and Andy Walton. Thanks are due also to those who shared their memories through email correspondence, and to the archivists and librarians at the University of Oxford, City University London, the British Library, National Art Library, Blythe House, Tate Archive, Whitechapel Gallery Archive, Oxford Mail and Times Archive, and Oxford Brookes special collections who enabled me to access rare materials.

My ideas have been enriched by conversations with numerous individuals, including Yuval Etgar, Allison Goudie, Anna Kontopoulou, David Lewis, Eleanor Roberts, Gervase Rosser, Vid Simoniti, Lucy Steeds, Alex Taylor, and Naomi Vogt. In particular, I have been shameless in taking advantage of Joyce Arnold and Baillie Card, who generously gave time to comment on work in progress.

I could not have finished the project without my family and friends, who know who they are and how much I have to thank them for.

This thesis is dedicated to Philipp von Lossau for his boundless encouragement.

Preface

I embarked on this dissertation in October 2011 with very few preconceptions about the material at hand. I had been awarded a Collaborative Doctoral Award to write a study on ‘50 Years of Exhibition-Making at Modern Art Oxford, 1965-2015.’ My doctoral studentship was initiated as a partnership between the gallery and the University of Oxford’s Ruskin School of Art. It was a new configuration of the long-standing relationship between the two institutions, and a response to the recent tendency for UK universities and non-academic organisations to collaborate in the funding and supervision of doctoral research on projects of mutual interest. I knew the gallery’s recent exhibition and events programme as a visitor, but very little about its history, which I naively presumed someone would be able to summarise for me upon arrival – perhaps the archivist? This would give me an overview of the topic and help me decide how to define and tackle my project.

As I write in December 2015, budgetary constraints have still precluded the hire of an archivist. With the support of Modern Art Oxford’s Directors, however, I have been given unlimited access to the two rooms of boxes containing more than 70,000 items that constitute the archive. One room contains primarily the exhibition files, which are thankfully in chronological order and could be navigated with the help of the more or less accurate exhibitions list. [figs. 0.1-0.2] The other is filled with cardboard boxes, many labelled ‘misc.’ For want of a better place to start, I began at the beginning, reading through the slender exhibition files from 1966, 1967, and 1968. I was struck not only by how poorly these exhibitions had been documented (no photographs appeared in any of these folders) but also how slight an impression they gave of what

it would have been like to visit the museum at this time. After all, exhibitions are by their nature temporary, and thus discontinuous: what, if anything, knitted them together? What did the building look like, and what about the posters, the catalogues, and the invitations? How did the exhibitions themselves look, for that matter? Why were these artists selected and how did the public respond to their work? Was there educational programming and, if so, of what kind? Who was funding the gallery, and why? These questions seemed to me central to understanding the nature of the organisation and they drove me to look beyond the exhibition files into some of those alarmingly ‘miscellaneous’ boxes.

After consultation with an archivist friend, I decided to implement a crude referencing system: I numbered the boxes, and after a quick survey of the contents I wrote a label that would serve, for example, to differentiate ‘Education 1970s-early 1980s’ from ‘Fundraising inc. building appeals.’ Over the years, the archive had been subject to inconsistent modes of organisation, but I located uncatalogued boxes of slides and boxes of newsletters, a chest full of posters, stacks of exhibition catalogues and ring binders full of press clippings. I began to assemble a digital archive of scanned images collected from the archive, online resources, and from writing to artists and others. It was important to visit other institutional archives to compare their holdings and place MOMA within a wider context; new discoveries continually cast previous finds in a fresh light. The depth of focus that began to seem necessary gradually curtailed the scope of the project. For all that I was researching the history of a single gallery, fifty years began to seem unfeasible within the compass of a doctoral thesis: I restricted the scope from fifty to thirty years, then twenty-five, and finally seventeen, in order to do justice to the detail and complexity I was finding.

Inspired by the upcoming fiftieth anniversary in 2015, Director Michael Stanley provided strong support for the collaborative doctoral award and took on the role of co-supervisor. Following his sudden death in 2012, the celebration was re-scheduled for 2016. Additional knowledge about Modern Art Oxford's past has helped it to take stock of this milestone, and it has been rewarding to see my work spark questions and ideas for its future. Anniversaries are also excellent opportunities for capital fundraising, and the gallery is now applying for the funds to comprehensively catalogue and conserve the archive and to build a designated new gallery for archival displays. Should these plans come to fruition, I hope they will help its deep and fascinating collections to attract the further scholarly attention they deserve.

Introduction

When the Museum of Modern Art in Oxford (MOMA) was founded in 1965 and opened to the public in early 1966, it was by no means clear – despite its impressive name – that it would still be around fifty years later. The gallery appeared in the British cultural landscape as an amateur project at a time when similar contemporary art spaces were proliferating around the country: the Camden Arts Centre in London, the Arnolfini Gallery in Bristol, and the Ikon Gallery in Birmingham all opened within a few years of each other and of MOMA, and all have recently or will shortly celebrate their half-centuries of continuous public programming.¹ These anniversaries prompt historical reflections both internally and externally and, in tandem with the recent growth of academic and curatorial interest in display histories, a long-neglected area of study is now beginning to attract interest.

This thesis is devoted to the first seventeen years of the history of MOMA, from its beginning in 1965 until 1982, closely considering the evolving relationships between the museum and its audience. I look especially at those aspects of the museum's work that shed light on how it conceived of its responsibilities as a public mediator of recent art, and how those notions of cultural value were expressed and received. Such a focus provides a means to investigate the sustaining beliefs and values that underpin the contemporary art institution, both then and now; close examination of the history of this one institution provides fresh entry points into

¹ Arnolfini was founded in 1961, Ikon in 1964, Camden in 1965, the Richard Demarco Gallery in Edinburgh (now closed) in 1966 and the Hayward Gallery in London in 1968.

theoretical questions of broad relevance, such as such as utopianism, institutional critique, multiculturalism and arts sponsorship. If a public arts organisation exists to serve a public, who constitutes this public and what kinds of intervention does the organisation seek to achieve? In an age of austerity, when public funding for the arts seems increasingly under threat, it is critical to reconsider previous struggles to identify and defend the source of art's social significance.

As is the case with most galleries, the archives of what is now Modern Art Oxford (MAO) have never received serious scholarly attention, a shortcoming that this thesis can only begin to remedy. The interest in display history that has emerged since the 1980s has produced important examinations of the development of specific major museums and some ground-breaking works of critical theory.² These texts, which locate art's meaning in its mediation(s) and reception(s) rather than purely in the intentions of the artist, provide a welcome corrective to art history's traditional bias towards the monographic. Temporary exhibitions might seem less important when compared to the long-term impact of a permanent display, but more recently they too have attracted attention, prompting the identification of pivotal 'landmarks' that are rapidly being canonized.³ However, there have been very few

² See for example Frances Spalding, *The Tate: A History*, (London: Tate Gallery, 1998); Sam Hunter, *The Museum of Modern Art, New York: The History and the Collection*, (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1984); and Marcia Pointon, ed., *Art Apart: Art Institutions and Ideology across England and North America* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994). For major theoretical texts, see Douglas Crimp, 'On the Museum's Ruins', *October*, vol. 13, (Summer 1980), pp. 41-57; Carol Duncan, *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*, (London; New York: Routledge, 1995), Donald Preziosi, 'The Art of Art History', in *The Art of Art History: A Critical Anthology*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 507-25; and Brian O'Doherty, *Inside the White Cube: The Ideology of the Gallery Space*, expanded edn., (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).

³ See Bruce Altshuler's *The Avant-garde in Exhibition: New Art in the 20th Century*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998) and *Biennials and*

studies that consider exhibitions through the sustained examination of a non-collecting institution: this kind of ever-changing programming has largely eluded historical study.⁴

Organisations such as MOMA reward scholarly attention: a shifting succession of events and displays permitted its organisers greater license to pursue experimental avenues, allowing them to concentrate not on producing an enduring story about the past for the benefit of the nation, but on diverse and dynamic engagements with contemporary culture. Rather than viewing exhibitions singly as the inspired product of an artist or curator, this institutional emphasis brings into focus parallel strands of activity and competing organisational priorities. What kind of visitor performances did MOMA's multifarious and ephemeral activities stimulate? And as a self-consciously progressive, 'avant-garde' institution, how did the mutating concept of social utility underpin its development? Through these questions, I explore shifting understandings of spectatorship and participation, the cultural politics of the 1960s-80s, and the purpose of art in the changing contemporary world. [fig. 0.3]

Beyond: Exhibitions that Made Art History, 1962-2002, (London: Phaidon, 2013), the on-going *Afterall Exhibition Histories* series, and *Tate Papers*' 'Landmark Exhibitions' issue (no. 12, Autumn 2009).

⁴ What literature there is on these organisations often takes the form of a commemorative publication. While these may contain useful information, they tend to adopt a celebratory tone and favour image over text, and are not intended for a specialist audience. For British examples, see Ekow Eshun, Pamela Jahn, and Martha Pym, *How Soon is Now: 60 Years of the Institute of Contemporary Arts*, (London: ICA, 2008); Jonathan Watkins, Diana Stevenson, and Ikon Gallery, *Some of the Best Things in Life Happen Accidentally: The Beginning of Ikon*, (Birmingham: Ikon Gallery, 2004) and Jonathan Watkins, Simon Chapman, and Ikon Gallery, *This Could Happen to You: Ikon in the 1970s*, (Birmingham: Ikon, 2010); Anne Massey, *Institute of Contemporary Arts, 1946-1968*, (London: ICA, 2014); and *The Whitechapel Art Gallery Centenary Review*, (London: Whitechapel Art Gallery, 2001).

The exception to the lack of historical writing about MOMA is the 1997 MA thesis completed by Julie Burchardi at the Courtauld Institute, entitled ‘Modernism – The Contested Terrain: An historical examination of the Museum of Modern Art in Oxford.’ The staff at MAO were unaware of the existence of this thesis and it did not come to my attention until spring 2015. It provides an accurate and engaging analysis of MOMA’s history within an overriding argument that the gallery represented a sustained challenge to modernist institutional paradigms. Burchardi’s first section seeks to understand the allegiances of the term ‘modern’ in the museum’s title; the second analyses the importance of an exhibiting organisation rather than a collecting one; the third section looks at the significance of the warehouse space in the 1960s and 1970s; the fourth argues for the postmodernism of David Elliott’s curatorial approaches in the 1990s. Although inevitably lacking in detail, given the thirty-year scope of her topic in the confines of a short MA thesis, the defining features identified by Burchardi often overlap with the themes pursued in this dissertation. Although we often differ in points of interpretation, I am grateful for the credence this adds to the present study.

A Brief History

As there is no published history of MOMA, a succinct account will help to frame the present thesis. It was founded in late 1965 by Trevor Green and a small group of fellow modern art enthusiasts, comprising his wife Eileen Armitage, his friends Stuart and Marya Lewis, lawyer Brian Jefferson, and two academics from the

University of Oxford, Derek Robinson and Peter Shaw.⁵ In February 1966, it began to arrange small shows in temporary housing (a warehouse in King Edward Street), and it received its first modest annual grant from the Arts Council of Great Britain not long thereafter. In October it opened in much larger premises at 30 Pembroke Street, a historic former brewery whose occupation was intended to be temporary but has thus far remained the gallery's enduring home. In view of the lack of a modern art museum in the United Kingdom at the time, Green intended to amass a world-class collection as well as create a space for contemporary exhibitions; however, the project never attracted sufficient support to rival the temporary displays, and the last of the British paintings and sculptures he had accumulated were quietly returned to donors in the mid-1970s.⁶ Green left the museum in 1968 to pursue lecturing opportunities overseas, leaving his assistant, Barry Lane, in charge. The South African artist, Peter Ibsen, replaced him in summer 1970, and the museum's programme began heavily to feature French and British conceptual artists.

In the late 1960s, the Arts Council started to chafe at the expectation that it subsidise both the museum and its Oxford neighbour, the non-profit Bear Lane Gallery. It eventually forced a controversial amalgamation in 1972 under the joint title 'Modern Art Oxford,' but Bear Lane Gallery closed in late 1973 and thereafter MOMA reverted to its original appellation. Nicholas Serota was appointed Director in 1973 and continued to focus on conceptual art while developing a much larger audience until his move in 1976 to London's Whitechapel Gallery. In contrast to

⁵ Minutes of the First Meeting of the Museum of Modern Art Limited, 10 February 1966, MAO Archive, Minute Book.

⁶ MOMA's collection was not intended to be exclusively British, but perhaps unsurprisingly this was what Green succeeded in attracting as loans and donations.

this series of relatively short tenures, Serota's successor David Elliott remained in position for a full two decades before leaving in 1996 to take up the directorship of the Moderna Museet in Stockholm. He oversaw two major renovations to the building, of which the first (in 1980-81) greatly expanded the museum's occupation of the former brewery, adding new galleries to the north and claiming the tower as office and studio space. MOMA's first full-time education officer was appointed in 1976. In these years, the museum also radically expanded the scope of its programme, increasing the proportion of historical exhibitions and representing artists from previously neglected parts of the globe.

From 1997 to 2000, the American Director Kerry Brougher oversaw a more conservative programme of high-profile artists, before departing for the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden in Washington D.C. Andrew Nairne, son of long-serving Council President Sir Patrick Nairne and brother of former Assistant Director Sandy Nairne, directed the museum from 2001 to 2008, with Suzanne Cotter as Senior Curator. In 2003, following a significant renovation, MOMA was renamed 'Modern Art Oxford' (MAO), as it is still known. MAO was led by Michael Stanley from 2009 until his death in 2012. Veteran London curator David Thorp covered the position as Interim Director until current Director Paul Hobson's arrival from the Contemporary Art Society in 2013. A year-long programme of celebratory exhibitions and events is planned for the 50th anniversary in 2016, the culmination of a series of small archival projects mounted over the past three years and the last use of the building before its scheduled redesign in 2017.

The Scope of the Dissertation

Rather than look at the museum's exhibitions in isolation, this thesis considers them in conjunction with MOMA's other activities; education events, publications, printed ephemera, building use and funding sources all shed light on the ideals that informed its work, and all contributed to shaping visitor experiences. Interviews, press reviews and education sheets also testify to a richly various history of reception. [fig. 0.4]

I have chosen to confine my study to a comparatively brief seventeen-year period in order to be able to treat my material in depth. The turbulent period from 1965 to 1982 saw the museum pass through the hands of five directors as it sought to establish itself within the national and international landscape of contemporary art. In these years, MOMA presented more than 300 exhibitions, most encompassing multiple works and often several artists, with a variety of supplementary events and writings. By going beyond exhibitions to embrace other aspects of the museum's programming, especially its architecture, educational provision, and short-lived collection, the body of archival material that needs to be considered increases considerably; attempts to place MOMA's activities within a British context reveal further vistas of scholarly possibility.

It would not be feasible to produce a comprehensive narrative account of such a multifaceted and ever-changing institution, and this is not my intention. Instead, I worked selectively: the four chapters revolve around case studies that unpack major themes, and that, through close analysis, open up vital questions about the museum's conception and communication of public value. These case studies have

not been selected for their supposed ‘quality’ or success. Just as T. J. Clark wrote of the need, when writing social history, to listen for ‘the points at which the rational monotone... breaks, fails, falters’, so too can MOMA’s apparent failures – such as *Pioneers of Part-Art: Popa at Moma* (1971), the stillbirth of the permanent collection, or the affiliation with Bear Lane Gallery – serve to illuminate tensions that formed and reformed its relation to the viewing public.⁷ Although these key examples receive the most detailed treatment, they are considered throughout in relation to other, perhaps less characteristic or ambitious aspects of the programme that ran in parallel.

The first chapter, ‘The Constructed Garden: Art, Play and Social Change, 1966-1971,’ considers the utopian strand that prevailed in the museum’s earliest years and which found expression in spectacular installations and events that appealed to the ‘playful body’ as a route to individual self-realisation. The second, ‘Breathtakingly Benevolent: The Peter Stuyvesant Foundation and the Idea of a Permanent Collection, 1965-74,’ contrasts the countercultural ethos of the 1960s exhibition programme with Trevor Green’s founding ambition to create Britain’s first modern art museum, and his attempt to realize this ideal through corporate sponsorship. In the third chapter, ‘The Sanction of the Museum: Presenting Conceptual Art in Oxford, 1970-1976,’ I consider MOMA’s position as the preeminent British venue for conceptual art in the 1970s, asking how the presentation of such cerebral artworks coloured its relationship with visitors and its ability to secure the national funding sources that were its lifeblood. The Bear Lane Gallery, with which MOMA was briefly amalgamated during these years, provides an instructive local

⁷ T. J. Clark, *Image of the People: Gustave Courbet and the 1848 Revolution*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), p. 12.

comparison. Finally, chapter four explores MOMA's increasing orientation towards the global, historical and educational. 'Into Production and Out of Myth, 1976-1982' centres on close analyses of the museum's representations of two national cultures – India and the USSR – viewed in the light of contemporary political and theoretical debates.

Given MOMA's continuous fifty-year development, any chronological scope restrictions come with attendant frustrations; in particular, the decision to concentrate on only the first six years of David Elliott's directorship threatens to make an arbitrary cut across his prodigious twenty-year endeavour. However, the period between 1976 and 1982 was formative, charting the transition from a highly Eurocentric programme to one that substantially incorporated visual cultures of the Eastern Bloc and the developing world. The characteristic internationalism initiated in these years could be considered prescient in terms of later transitions in the art world, and this international outlook would continue to define MOMA's identity for decades to come. Like other aspects of the museum's programme that speak to contemporary preoccupations, I suggest that it is best examined in the context of its historical moment.

Critical Approaches to the Institutional Archive

In contrast to some recent exhibition or curatorial histories which have sought to canonise certain curators as heroic figures engaged in an idealised creative dialogue with radical artists (for example in the Fondazione Prada presentation of *When Attitudes Become Form Bern 1969/Venice 2013*, 1 June-3 November, and *How Soon is Now: 60 Years of the Institute of Contemporary Arts*, published 2008), I

interpret MOMA as an institution that was inherently pluralistic, contradictory and shaped by practical – and often financial – limitations. Rather than seek to distinguish a singular museological identity, I view it as a site of constant contestation and performance within which visitors, artists and employees have articulated their own ideals and identities in relation to ritual cues. Such an approach draws on that pioneered by Carol Duncan to analyse historic collection displays in *Civilising Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums* (1995), although the material under consideration differs in important ways.

Nonetheless, an account of a very small art gallery such as MOMA in its early years must devote attention to the ideas and activities of its individual Directors. This thesis is not, however, intended as to be a ‘curatorial’ history: indeed, the term ‘curator’ is anachronistic and has been avoided throughout in reference to this period. While records of internal discussions and debates are often limited to or erased by the decorous language of committee minutes, I intend the directorial contributions outlined in the thesis to be understood, as Marcia Pointon has suggested, as ‘part of a discursive account of cultural formation rather than as figures in a gallery of liberal heroes.’⁸ Instead of the brainchild of a sequence of individuals, I see the institution as a porous and discontinuous body that includes artists, councils, funding bodies, physical spaces and audiences. As such, views shared by previous Directors in interviews, however valuable, are not given primacy over other sources and perspectives.

My research was also informed by the emphasis placed on design in Mary Anne

⁸ ‘Introduction,’ in Pointon, ed., *Art Apart*, p. 2.

Staniszewski's *The Power of Display: A History of Exhibition Installations at the Museum of Modern Art* (1998), Reesa Greenberg's article 'The Exhibited Redistributed: A Case for Reassessing Space,' (1996) and Charlotte Klonk's *Spaces of Experience: Art Gallery Interiors from 1800-2000* (2009): Staniszewski's analysis of the kinds of viewing subjects generated by the New York MoMA's temporary exhibitions between 1929 and 1970 has been especially instructive both in approach and as a parallel case study. The consideration of MOMA's building design also responds to Suzanne MacLeod's call for an architectural history of museums that shifts emphasis away from the architect's original design seen in isolation, proposing instead a messier exploration of on-going reinvention within the context of a fluid and distributed institutional framework.⁹ Frances Spalding's *Tate: A History* (1998) and Brandon Taylor's *Art for the Nation: Exhibitions and the London Public 1747-2001* (1999) provided compelling comparisons with major London institutions. None of these texts, however, dwell on a single gallery within a timespan as restricted as that of this thesis: in its very close detail and its focus on a non-collecting regional institution, the study is methodologically distinctive.

The greatest part of the research for this dissertation was conducted in the archive at MAO, which provided the MOMA publications, newsletters, posters and invitations, photographs, slides, letters, committee minutes, financial records, funding applications, press cuttings, and education records that made this project possible. However, the archive was assembled in an often-haphazard fashion according to a shifting set of priorities, and many gaps exist. Some of these gaps

⁹ Suzanne MacLeod, 'Rethinking Museum Architecture: Towards a Site-Specific History of Production and Use', in *Reshaping Museum Space: Architecture, Design, Exhibitions*, ed. by Suzanne MacLeod, (London and New York: Routledge, 2005), pp. 9-25.

could be filled through the consultation of other archives: those of related institutions such as the Bear Lane Gallery (also held at MAO), Tate Gallery, Institute of Contemporary Arts (ICA) and Whitechapel; those held privately by artists and exhibition organisers; and especially the records of the Arts Council of Great Britain (ACGB). Visits to the latter at Blythe House proved invaluable in understanding the relationship between MOMA, its funding bodies, other UK arts institutions, and the government's agenda for the arts; they were aided by several published accounts of its history.¹⁰

The opportunity to carry out interviews with exhibiting artists and with former MOMA staff and council members was vital in supplementing archival records with the personal reminiscences of those involved. I was fortunate in the timing of the project, as the majority of the major contributors to the work of the museum are still alive, and many were willing to share their memories. My approach to these oral histories was to solicit recollection through open-ended questions, as much as possible allowing the interviewee to steer the discussion. While much has been forgotten, and what remains is inevitably coloured by subsequent experience and contemporary sensibilities, the anecdotes and narratives that emerged provided useful insights into the ideas that guided decision-making, consciously or otherwise.

¹⁰ Robert Hutchison, *The Politics of the Arts Council*, (London: Sinclair Browne, 1982); Andrew Sinclair, *Arts and Cultures: The History of the 50 Years of the Arts Council of Great Britain*, (London: Sinclair-Stevenson, 1995); Richard Witts, *Artist Unknown: The Alternative History of the Arts Council*, (London: Warner, 1998); Jonathan Harris, 'Cultured into Crisis: the Arts Council of Great Britain', in *Art Apart: Art Institutions and Ideology across England and North America* ed. by Marcia Pointon, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994).

The consultation of contemporary publications was essential to understanding the artistic context of Britain in the 1960s, 1970s and early 1980s. Of particular relevance are the major London art journals *Studio International* and *Art Monthly*, exhibition catalogues from other galleries, works of cultural theory, and government policy reports. Where appropriate, attention is paid to London institutions (such as the ICA, Tate and Hayward galleries) and regional non-municipal equivalents (especially the Arnolfini, Ikon and Midland Group), although more sustained comparisons lie outside the scope of this thesis. Overseas counterparts are more relevant in the third and fourth chapters as the gallery's ambitions and collaborators became increasingly international, but the audiences and funding sources remain primarily British throughout.

Finally, I have benefited tremendously from published secondary sources. Histories of artists, movements and institutions have been essential in establishing a view of the world beyond Oxford. I also draw on theoretical texts about museum and display practice, especially when addressing important thematic concerns such as transnational exhibitions, the politics of branding, and participatory art.

It is important to acknowledge some inherent limitations on the thesis. My interest in institutional histories relates to the ways that art programming can contribute to social and aesthetic discourses. This too is constrained by the sources at hand. The main insights into the public perception of MOMA are provided by published reviews, participant recollections, and the occasional piece of educational memorabilia retained in the archive. As such, the contemporary views of the museum presented in this study are largely those of the art professional, whether

critic, artist or organiser; the undocumented responses of other kinds of visitor remain open to conjecture.

It is now commonplace to observe that archives are constructed entities that generate knowledge according to historically-specific sets of beliefs and priorities.¹¹ The archive of MOMA is no exception. In the period under consideration, the museum's practices of archiving underwent a transition as the early tendency to retain mostly functional documents relating to sales, transport and insurance gradually gave way to a more expansive system of documentation and preservation. This reflected the shift from a 1960s orientation towards the future towards one also concerned for posterity, as well as MOMA's gradual professionalization and its rising staff numbers. It may also be related to the increasing recognition of exhibition organisation as a critical and creative activity analogous to art-making itself.¹² Within the archive, moreover, the density of the records is an index of the perceived importance of the project in question. The exhibitions deemed by MOMA to be the most significant and exciting in any given year are generally those that are the most richly documented, while minor displays and touring exhibits are less well recorded. The case studies in each chapter, therefore, were selected in part for the availability of information. Insofar as the case studies are tied to historical assessments of cultural value, this is not necessarily problematic, for the examination of these norms and assumptions is a core objective of this thesis.

¹¹ For a useful anthology of critical approaches, see Charles Merewether, ed., *The Archive*, (London: Whitechapel Gallery, 2006).

¹² The blurring of the conventional distinctions between artist and 'curator' and the concomitant prominence of the latter as public intellectual is located by Irene Calderoni in the late 1960s, but it was a gradual and uneven development that continues to evolve today. 'Creating Shows: Some Notes on Exhibition Aesthetics at the End of the Sixties', in *Curating Subjects* ed. by Paul O'Neill, (London: Open Editions, 2011), p. 76.

However, this same system of value judgements has also affected the condition of the education records, which are scant and exceptionally disorganised for these years, with little supporting evidence from press clippings. A museum education programme is a vital bridge between the institution and its publics, and the scale and nature of that programme is highly significant. While MOMA's educational activities are discussed in the present study, much more research is needed to fully explore their changing forms. [fig. 0.5] Finally, for want of funds for necessary conservation, the gallery's collection of audio-visual recordings is currently inaccessible. These mostly preserve discussions and performances that took place after 1982, but doubtless contain interesting material.

In recent decades, theoretical writings on the role of 'the archive' (like that of 'the museum') have tended to characterise it as a repository of power and authority whose claims to represent history are suspect. The archive at MAO is, indeed, structured by systems of classification and inclusion/exclusion, revealing historical biases that are now subject to question. But not all museum archives are the same, and the record of MOMA that is now available to researchers in the archive is characterised more by losses and lapses than any very coherent organisational principles. Poorly funded and understaffed, always looking ahead to the future, organisations such as MAO are not well equipped to handle ever-increasing volumes of historical material, even as that material becomes increasingly valuable as contemporary currency. Uncatalogued, stored in conditions that are subject to swings of temperature and humidity, casually rearranged or winnowed as a result of space shortages, and occasionally raided for visitors, projects or loans, MAO's archive can only be described as precarious. While my efforts to digitalise selected

texts and images have assisted with the preservation of certain parts of the archive, other institutional pressures have seen its condition decline, even during the years of my research. Archives such as these have their own power, but their vulnerability and contingency should also be acknowledged. Steps are needed to safeguard them for the future.

A Note on Stylistic Conventions

I have sought to use words in ways that are appropriate to their usage in the decades under consideration, although the connotations may be different today in some cases. For example, ‘modern’ and ‘contemporary’ art are often now distinguished, as ‘modern’ has been aligned to a historicised modernist tradition of the 20th century, while ‘contemporary’ can refer to works made yesterday, or to the artistic products of recent decades, or both. In Britain in the period of this study, however, ‘modern’ and ‘contemporary’ were typically interchangeable and are treated as such in the text. Similarly, the word ‘avant-garde’ is used loosely throughout the study to describe new advanced art that was seen as daring, marginal or oppositional in some way: I do not intend to suggest close affinities with the ‘historical’ or ‘neo’ avant-gardes or any particular political affiliation.

In its first years, the Museum of Modern Art in Oxford was commonly abbreviated to ‘MMA’ in internal documents, and this transitioned to ‘MOMA’ at some point in the early 1970s for reasons unknown. For consistency, I have used ‘MOMA’ throughout, except when indicating the contemporary MAO or its short-lived 1970s predecessor, or when quoting from a primary source. The terms ‘museum’ and ‘gallery’ can refer to different kinds of organisation, with the word ‘museum’ denoting a collection and ‘gallery’ sometimes referring to a gallery of paintings or a commercial operation. Here, however, both words are used to describe MOMA in the knowledge that ‘museum’ was part of its title and that no better English term than ‘gallery’ exists to describe what Germans call a *Kunsthalle*, a non-collecting, non-profit contemporary art display space. Across MOMA’s three floors, the galleries have been described differently at different times, with the exception of the Upper Gallery, which has been titled thus throughout the period and whose capitalisation I have preserved. Reference to the ‘middle galleries’ refers to those on the upper ground floor; the lowest level is variously referred to as the ‘basement,’ ‘lower ground floor,’ ‘lower gallery’ or ‘café’ depending on the year in question. After the expansion in 1981, the ‘Piper Gallery’ and ‘Middle One’ and ‘Middle Two’ appear on the top floor, to the north of the Upper Gallery.

Many of the contemporary newspaper and journal articles are taken from press clippings in the archive. These have usually been labelled with the name of the publication and its date, but not the page number(s) or volume and issue numbers. Although some publications are now searchable digitally, allowing me to check these details and add them to my references, this was not true for the majority; in these cases, therefore, such information has been omitted from the footnote entry and bibliography. Occasionally, the press clippings were not well labelled and the name of the magazine or newspaper, or the date of publication, could not be traced. In such instances I have given what information is available and added a reference to the archival source.

With the home software now available, it is possible to digitally alter and restore archival images, tweaking colours, cropping irregular borders, and erasing dust, scratches and other artefacts of imperfect reproductive technologies and the passage

of time. When digitising images from the archive for the illustrations to this thesis, I have opted to avoid these improving alterations in order to preserve a sense of the archive's materiality. Where digital changes have been made, they have been with a view to accurately rendering the current state of the original, rather than attempting to provide the illusion of an unmediated glimpse of the past.

List of Abbreviations

Arts Council of Great Britain	ACGB
Bear Lane Gallery	BLG
Exhibition catalogue	Exh. cat.
Institute of Contemporary Arts (London)	ICA
Modern Art Oxford	MAO
Museum of Modern Art (New York)	MoMA
Museum of Modern Art (Oxford)	MOMA
Peter Stuyvesant Foundation	PSF
United Kingdom	UK
Victoria and Albert Museum	V&A

CHAPTER ONE

The Constructed Garden: Art, Play and Social Change, 1966-1971

Introduction

From its beginnings in 1965, the founders of the Museum of Modern Art, Oxford sought to make of it an ‘alternative’ site for display. [fig. 1.1] Architect and first Director Trevor Green, and many of the artists he invited to exhibit, envisaged an institution that was different from the ‘traditional’ museum, one in which audiences could interact more directly – and therefore more powerfully – with radical new forms of art. Artist and BBC radio critic Andrew Forge described *Space Place*, the first exhibition organised by the museum, as a ‘garden’ or ‘indoor park.’¹³ [fig. 1.2] This chapter will take up the idea of the ‘museum as garden’ as a means of examining MOMA’s attempts to bring about social change through a transformation of the visitor’s experience.¹⁴ The metaphor resonates strongly with the museum’s unfolding self-identity in the sixties and early seventies, encapsulating many of its aspirations. However, it also captures some of the contradictions behind these aspirations, especially those inherent in the attempt to appeal simultaneously to the state, the counterculture and the private sector, and the uncertain rhetoric of freedom and democracy.

¹³ Andrew Forge and Trevor Green, ‘Space-Place at Oxford’, p. 2: BBC Third Programme broadcast script, 5 December 1966, MAO Archive, box ‘MOMA 1966-1967’ fol. ‘Space Place’.

¹⁴ The garden metaphor here is not related to the Arts Council’s 1984 ‘Glory of the Garden’ report and subsequent initiative to rebalance funding away from London towards the regions.

British art predominated in MOMA's exhibition programme in its earliest years, supplemented by occasional shows from overseas. Under Green (1965-69) and Exhibition Director Barry Lane (1968-70), the gallery played host to between fifteen and twenty exhibitions annually, each displayed for a month or less. [fig. 1.3] Unable to generate so many exhibitions internally with a severely limited staff and budget, MOMA supplemented its programme with touring displays, often produced by the Arts Council of Great Britain (ACGB), which circulated through a network of independent galleries such as Bristol's Arnolfini and Birmingham's Ikon, and their municipal equivalents.

Two main tendencies are evident in the contemporary art shown in the museum's first five years. The first was to display established, mid-career British painters and sculptors. Derek Southall, Patrick Heron, Terry Frost, Harold Cohen, Richard Smith and Tim Scott were among those given solo shows in Oxford in his period. [figs. 1.4-1.6] These artists were critically celebrated for producing mostly abstract work that often melded the painterly and the sculptural. The scale of their works made excellent use of the very large Upper Gallery space at the Pembroke Street premises and garnered overwhelmingly positive reviews in the press. 'The upper room at the Museum is one of the grandest arenas now available to an English painter,' reflected *Studio International* in 1968, while the *Oxford Mail* described it as 'a veritable cathedral' of art.¹⁵ [fig. 1.7] Such exhibitions did much to establish the museum's place amidst the rapidly swelling ranks of British contemporary arts centres in the later 1960s. Similar works also made up the majority of the museum's small and short-lived collection of paintings and sculptures.

¹⁵ John Russell, 'Derek Southall', *Studio International*, (March 1968); 'Bold Venture', *Oxford Mail*, (19 October 1966).

The second tendency that characterised the Oxford museum's early years, while not wholly unconnected to the first, was much more distinctively avant-garde.

MOMA's exhibition organisers were responsible for a series of shows that adopted experimental formats, challenging the hegemony of the static object in favour of new spatial and experiential models. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the art 'environment' was a crucial and ubiquitous concept, which encompassed an overlapping range of emergent practices that art historians might now divide into installation, participation, performance, happening, and/or 'new media'. What these ephemeral or non-object based works were thought to share, among other things, was a defiantly countercultural and non-commercial orientation which sought to bring art and life into a new proximity. By replacing objects with 'spaces' and events, these artists were often deliberately seeking to be uncollectable. They also sought to disrupt what they saw as ossified modes of reception associated with galleries and museums, organisations which, in any case, frequently had little interest in showing this kind of work.¹⁶ The Light/Sound Workshop group's 1967 exhibition was typical in claiming that their novel use of projected sounds, images and films could provide a more 'direct experience of the artists' expression' than any painting or sculpture.¹⁷ [fig. 1.8] Similarly, the undergraduate organisers of 1971's *Pioneers of Part-Art: Popa at Moma* sought to challenge the 'barren mystique' of the autonomous object with interactive works that, it was claimed,

¹⁶ Sandy Nairne, 'The Institutionalisation of Dissent', in *Thinking About Exhibitions*, ed. by Sandy Nairne, Reesa Greenberg, and Bruce W. Ferguson, (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 387-410.

¹⁷ *Light/Sound Workshop*, exh. cat./poster, MOMA, 28 November-23 December 1967.

would ‘break... down the museum-age barriers between the observer and the work of art.’¹⁸

The ‘dematerialised’ nature of much challenging contemporary art and the lack of suitably avant-garde venues – or indeed a dedicated museum of modern art in Britain at all in which to show it – provided for Green in the mid-1960s the rationale for his ambitious plan. He sought to fashion an alternative space which could ‘find room for just such projects as these which do not fit into the existing gallery set-up’ because ‘there is nothing you can buy or take away... the exhibition itself is the work.’¹⁹ Green’s official ‘Statement of Purpose’ for MOMA made even more explicit his sense that it was distinctively suited to, and justified by, the most adventurous and socially-engaged artworks of the 1960s: one of its core responsibilities was:

to make opportunities for artists to create an exhibit projects which are not necessarily related to concepts of “art objects” and may not therefore be saleable and for that reason remain unexhibited in commercial galleries: and to encourage patronage in a form which enables artists to take a wider view of their abilities and responsibilities.²⁰

This ‘wider view’ entailed a close consideration of audience response: despite the coexistence of painting and sculpture shows, ‘live projects *in which everyone can participate* are the main interest and what most distinguish us from other galleries,’ explained Green in 1968.²¹ The radical social implications of ‘environmental’ art

¹⁸ See Mark Powell-Jones and Rupert Legge, ‘Pioneers of Part-Art: POPA at MOMA’, 14-28 Feb 1971, exh. cat/poster, MAO Archive; Powell-Jones quoted in Andrew Hutton, ‘Things to Wear, Jump On, Touch and Explore’, *Oxford Mail*, (13 February 1971).

¹⁹ Forge quoted in Forge and Green, ‘Space-Place at Oxford’, 5 December 1966, p. 1.

²⁰ Trevor Green, ‘Statement of Policy’, 5 September 1967, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (2 of 7) fol. 65/72.

²¹ Green quoted in ‘Showing It Off’, *Cherwell* (6 November 1968), emphasis mine.

production, it seemed, required a new kind of forward- and outward-looking public institution such as the one both he and Lane hoped to create.

Why did he call this radical new institution a ‘museum’? The choice of the term reflected multiple considerations, including the sheer ambition of its founder. Not only did Green intend to amass a permanent collection, but by calling his new organisation a modern art museum, he carved out a unique space for it within the British cultural landscape – a space that subsequently went unfilled until the opening of Tate Modern in 2000 – and sought to establish a direct comparison with the world-famous Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) in New York City. This aspirational equivalency operated on a level of scale and prestige, but it also alluded to scope, signalling an intention to match MoMA’s breadth, which was unusual in having departments of film, architecture, design and photography as well as the traditional fine arts.²² This reflected Green’s interests as an architect, and was carried forward by Lane’s determination to move beyond the high-art parameters of painting and sculpture into applied and even commercial products if the work seemed strong. Lane argues that the amateur backgrounds of those founding British art centres in the 1960s contributed to their experimental ethos. ‘Neither I nor Trevor had a conventional ‘art’ training and therefore we didn’t bring those preconceptions to what we should or shouldn’t be doing.’²³

²² Barry Lane interview, (Modern Art Oxford, 29 March 2013). ‘Trevor never had a problem with the word museum at all, because the model that we had, from the early twentieth century, from MoMA, was fantastic institution... It was a very deliberate choice in his head and I think it ought to be, that’s what ought to go down in the records... now, we’ve got the Design Museum, we’ve got a photography museum, they’re all back in their individual little worlds now.’

²³ Ibid., interview 2013. Lane went on to champion photography at the Arts Council for many decades.

Writing on the fluid category of the ‘environment’ in his *Glossary of Art, Architecture and Design Since 1945*, contemporary British critic John A. Walker commented that ‘what these structures have in common is that they totally enclose the spectator and are large enough to allow him to move about within the work.’²⁴ [fig. 1.9] However broad such a category may appear from today’s perspective, the word ‘environment’ served a purpose within its original context: it emphasised the fundamental preoccupation with the spectator that runs through so much of later 1960s art writing, including that addressing traditional media.²⁵ As Walker’s definition suggests, the term designates an encompassing space, rather than a discrete object of contemplation. More specifically, the environment was conceived as the space surrounding and enveloping a *person*; it was used by artists at this time to communicate a vital concern with art’s audience and society at large. [fig. 1.10] Young artist Jeffrey Shaw, who exhibited at MOMA in 1968’s *Pneu Show*, epitomised this attitude in an article on environmental art in which he declared:

What is needed is some kind of art situation which is a dynamic, revolutionary force – a living situation which transforms life, and not a framed thing which fills space on a wall and which has no active participation in a person’s life...²⁶

²⁴ John A. Walker, *Glossary of Art, Architecture and Design Since 1945*, second revised edn., (London: Clive Bingley, 1977), no. 202 ‘Environmental Art,’ p. 241. Throughout the period of this thesis, the visitor is relentlessly described using masculine pronouns, a convention that reflected the gendered construction of the art spectator and the lack of attention to female equality in these supposedly progressive art circles.

²⁵ Classic texts of the period to explore the relationship between art and the spectator via a discussion of minimalism include Michael Fried, ‘Art and Objecthood’, *Artforum*, vol. 5, no. 10, (June 1967), pp. 12-23, and Robert Morris, ‘Notes on Sculpture, Part II’, *Artforum*, vol. 5, no. 2, (October 1966), pp. 20-23.. For an English example, see Charles Harrison, ‘Roelof Louw’s Sculpture’, *Studio International*, vol. 178, no. 915, (October 1969).

²⁶ ‘This Page is Part of Your Environment - Now Read On’, *International Times*, vol. 1, no. 10, (13-26 March 1967), pp. 7-10.

These environmental shows – which aimed to transform the space of the museum itself into a dynamic, multisensory work of art – were precisely those for which the boldest claims were made about their social impact. Through a closer study of selected Oxford-based ‘situations,’ I shall explore their ambitions in relation to a profoundly utopian and distinctively contemporary discourse of collective and individual metamorphosis. British artists and writers of the later 1960s were increasingly critical of existing frameworks for displaying art, and suspicious of the traditional museum’s role in mediating the art experience. As a new art centre run by a young, progressive architect, however, MOMA was *not* at this point the object of what became known as ‘institutional critique.’ For the artists and organisers involved in these short-lived exhibitions, the museum was viewed positively as the site of transcendent experience and thus a potent instrument of social change.

Such aspirations found early and eloquent expression in Andrew Forge’s 1966 BBC interview with Director Trevor Green, exploring his ideas for the future of the museum upon the occasion of its first self-produced exhibition. *Space Place* (28 November-24 December) was a collaboration between Maurice Agis and Peter Jones for the Upper Gallery space. [fig. 1.11] Forge interpreted this geometrical installation in primary colours ‘in a Utopian sense as a kind of indoor park, a constructed garden.’²⁷ *Space Place* proved representative in a number of ways, allowing Forge’s horticultural metaphor to acquire significance beyond its original context; it usefully ties together a number of themes that united MOMA’s environmental projects of the late sixties and early seventies. I shall argue that the constellation of associated ideas that revolve around the notion of the museum-as-

²⁷ Forge and Green, ‘Space-Place at Oxford’, 5 December 1966, p. 2.

garden do not directly correspond to the reality (or totality) of visitor experience during this period. Rather, they reflect a set of overlapping aspirations born out of the theory and ideology of the moment, a mythic and sometimes unfocussed ideal which various exhibitionary scenarios sought to manifest.

A Public Garden: The arts under Labour

One way in which the garden metaphor resonates is with MOMA's self-positioning as an 'alternative' institution. It sought to be a new kind of museum, reflecting a growing sense of misalignment between traditional institutions and the younger members of the 1960s art world. The problem was not merely the dematerialised, non-object-based nature of many of the works in question, although this was widely perceived as a barrier to inclusion within the commercial gallery or museum collection. For many in this generation, there was also a desire to move away from the values of these display spaces (whether public or commercial), which were felt to enshrine the old at the expense of the new, the dully educational over the vivid and experiential, offering an affirmation of tradition rather than a critique.²⁸ A 1965 *Observer Weekend Review* article clipped for the museum's files, Ian Nairn's 'Wanted: A Museum Revolution,' described Britain's art museums as 'houses of the dead' and called for them to reinvent themselves as inviting and participatory spaces that would allow visitors (especially young people) to use the collections physically.

Get rid of all the small touches in museums that suggest that the public is allowed in on sufferance like peasants into the ducal demesne... The central court of a Victorian museum should include a Victorian pub fully licensed. In a motor museum you should be able to drive a red label Bentley as well

²⁸ Nairne, 'The Institutionalisation of Dissent', pp. 387-393.

as see one. If Greek pots were meant to carry water then, with the masterpieces safeguarded – let them be so used; and if one gets broken, then that is history, too.²⁹

Criticisms of contemporary museum practice were not confined to the young and dissident, however. It is significant that Jennie Lee, Labour's Arts Minister under Prime Minister Harold Wilson (1964-70), was publicly dismissive about what she saw as the antiquated practices of many contemporary museums. Her landmark 1965 white paper, *A Policy for the Arts*, condemned institutions for retaining an air of 'old-fashioned gloom and undue solemnity... that alienates all but the specialist and the dedicated.'³⁰ The assault on established museological values, then, came from above as well as below. Indeed, under the Labour government (1964-70) the state and the avant-garde forged a new, if at times rocky, alliance. Although the Conservatives had also begun to increase funding, this trend accelerated enormously after the publication of Lee's report.³¹ Framing the issue in political terms, she argued passionately that the arts deserved to be considered alongside state education and the National Health Service as an essential provision of the welfare state: 'all new social services have to fight long and hard before they are established.'³² Indeed, in the 1960s, she went on to claim, culture was needed more than ever to balance the effects of modernity. 'In an age of increasing automation... both young and old will increasingly need the stimulus and refreshment that the arts can bring.'³³ Art was seen by the government as a way to fill the increasing leisure time

²⁹ Ian Nairn, 'Wanted: A Museum Revolution', *The Observer Weekend Review*, (25 April 1965), p. 1.

³⁰ 'A Policy for the Arts: The First Steps', Presented to Parliament by the Prime Minister by Command of Her Majesty, February 1965, (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1965). House of Commons Parliamentary Papers Online, accessed 14 May 2012, p. 5.

³¹ Sinclair, *Arts and Cultures*, p. 128.

³² 'A Policy for the Arts', p. 19.

³³ 'A Policy for the Arts', p. 19.

produced by new domestic technologies, as well as a compensation for the dulling effects of an ever-more mechanised existence on the human spirit. More pragmatically, the extension of provision in regions outside London was intended as a form of population management, attracting talented workers away from the capital to alleviate post-war urban crowding.³⁴

To that end, the Arts Council, fortified by the muscular leadership of chairman Arnold, Lord Goodman (1964-72) championed the creation of ‘adventurous’, ‘progressive’ new arts centres in the provinces.³⁵ In keeping with the its liberal policy of encouraging self-organisation in the arts, these were ideally to be founded and run by local enthusiasts rather than centrally managed by the Arts Council: in his opening declaration as Chairman, Goodman declared that ‘artistic life in this country must not be dominated by a small, non-elected, appointed caucus in St. James’s Square.’³⁶ The combination of increasing financial support with a high degree of organisational autonomy saw the number of arts centres in Britain quadruple between 1967 and 1976.³⁷ Trevor Green was quicker than most in responding to the bureaucratic call to action, and wrote to Lee directly requesting support.³⁸ He had been wondering about founding a museum for some time,³⁹ and

³⁴ ‘A Policy for the Arts’, p. 5.

³⁵ ‘A Policy for the Arts’, p. 10.

³⁶ Statement from Lord Goodman quoted in Sinclair, *Arts and Cultures*, p. 153, source not provided.

³⁷ Chris Carrell and Robert Hutchison counted 34 arts centres in May 1967, compared to 133 in 1976. MOMA was not included in the directory, presumably as its focus on the visual arts was considered too narrow to qualify as an ‘arts centre’ for its purposes. ‘Introduction,’ *A Directory of Arts Centres in England, Scotland and Wales*, (London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1976), p. 7.

³⁸ ‘Museum for the Visual Arts to Open Soon’, *Oxford Times*, (12 November 1965); Trevor Green, letter to Jennie Lee, 7 December 1965, ACGB Archive, ACGB/84/214 fol. ‘HTA 159 Oxford – Museum Modern’. Lee’s private secretary replied to suggest he contact Gabriel White at the Arts Council instead.

was able to open the first small displays to the public in January 1966, less than a year after Lee's publication; had he been only a few months later in formulating his plans, in fact, he would likely have been outpaced by the rival plans of Oxford's Bear Lane Gallery council to set up their own expanded 'Oxford Arts Centre.'⁴⁰ He was not the only one to respond to the decade's climate of institutional possibility: the Arnolfini, Camden Arts, Ikon, Richard Demarco and Hayward galleries all emerged in these years. Outside of the capital, however, it was the Oxford museum that had the highest profile at the time; and it was outside the capital that the real experimentation was taking place.⁴¹ By the time the Serpentine Gallery opened in 1970, an Arts Council attempt to finally provide a central platform for young artists, it 'looked to some like the Council [was] copying MOMA in the middle of London, trying to catch up with the trends.'⁴²

How was it that the museum could be taken seriously as an avant-garde institution when it was so clearly a product of government directives? Caught between two

³⁹ Ibid. interview, (London, 7 March 2013).

⁴⁰ 'Warehouse Becomes a Museum', *Oxford Mail*, (8 February 1966). Bear Lane's plans were somewhat more conservative in scale and character, revolving around additional exhibition space for new painting and sculpture, 'occasional exhibitions of modern design in furniture, glass, textiles, ceramics, graphics and light engineering' ('some representation of the applied arts would seem wise in view of the modern concern with technology,' explained the document earnestly), but no mention of environmental art or a permanent collection. A lecture room, common room, reference library and studio flat for visiting artists were all envisaged. Deighton's document compared the proposed centre to those 'common in American institutions, the latest being the Carpenter Centre for Visual Arts at Harvard, in a building designed by Corbusier': 'An Oxford Arts Centre', n.d. [December] 1965, MAO Archive, box 'Bear Lane History and Accounts: ACE Amalgamation' fol. 'BLG History'. In a letter to the Arts Council, she estimated the cost at 'approximately £250,000': letter to Gabriel White, 7 December 1965, MAO Archive, box 'Bear Lane History and Accounts: ACE Amalgamation' fol. 'BLG History'. See also chapter three.

⁴¹ Lane, interview 2013.

⁴² Witts, *Artist Unknown*, p. 291.

identities – both rebel upstart and official outpost, insurgent and establishment – its position may appear, from a more distanced contemporary perspective, to present untenable contradictions. It was, as former MOMA assistant Sandy Nairne has described the ICA during this period, a ‘very official alternative.’⁴³ However, contemporaries seem to have worried surprisingly little about the museum’s dependence on the state. After all, while MOMA may have received Arts Council funding, the provision was hardly generous and it operated on a shoestring. The Council’s policy, based on a post-war abhorrence of the overtly partisan or propagandistic, was to give small grants to many organisations without looking too closely at the details; ‘if it has been comparatively easy for an organisation to obtain a grant, it has always been difficult to obtain an adequate one,’ wrote former Secretary General Hugh Willatt of this period.⁴⁴ Receiving only £4000-£5000 annually before 1970, the museum was physically shabby, rarely affording colour posters or press advertising and run by a Director who drew no salary at all.⁴⁵ So too, Labour and the counterculture may have clashed over other social issues such as drug and obscenity laws, but the former’s idealistic vision of the youth-driven arts centre as an essential social service was fundamentally left-wing, and surely appealed to many.⁴⁶ Perhaps most importantly, the license that the Arts Council

⁴³ Nairne, ‘The Institutionalisation of Dissent’, p. 394.

⁴⁴ Willatt was a long-term Arts Council employee and Secretary General of the institution 1968-75. ‘How the Arts are Promoted’, in *The State and the Arts* ed. by John Pick, (Eastbourne, East Sussex: John Offord Publications, 1980), p. 26.

⁴⁵ On the museum’s critical financial situation in this period, see for example Trevor Green, ‘Director’s Report to the Advisory Council, December 31st’, 1966, MAO Archive, box 001 ‘MOMA History’; Directors of the Museum of Modern Art, letter to Trevor Green, 28 August 1968, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 1-7.

⁴⁶ ‘Some of the people who supported it probably supported it because they thought it was pretty leftwing and they were themselves leftwing,’ comments Green, adding that he and his wife had been Labour supporters and ‘quite left wing in the fifties and sixties. America changed us’: interview 2013.

granted to the organisations it funded to pursue experimental avenues – Goodman once declared that the Arts Council would consider funding ‘any artistic experience short of dementia’ – meant that MOMA was given free reign to determine its programme during this time.⁴⁷ ‘We feel quite unrestricted,’ Green told the *Cherwell* in 1968 of his use of the Arts Council grant, speaking of how it gives the Museum the ‘freedom to experiment with unsaleable and potentially unpopular shows.’⁴⁸ This *laissez-faire* approach meant that artists, organisers and visitors could choose to view the museum not as an extension of the official social structure, but a fertile space outside it. After all, as radical playwright Noel Grieg put it in 1970 – already retrospectively – ‘we were united in that one thing, the belief in at least the POSSIBILITY of genuine alternatives.’⁴⁹

Building the Garden

⁴⁷ Quoted in Sinclair, *Arts and Cultures*, p. 146, source not provided. In spite of this supposed permissiveness, Goodman also insisted on the value of high culture as a civilising influence on the young who ‘lack values, lack certainties, lack guidance’, p. 151. His paternalistic defence of high art stands in contrast to Lee’s vision of a youth-driven cultural flowering in ‘A Policy for the Arts’, p. 19. Arts Council tensions over contested new forms of installation, performance art and theatre played out in its ill-fated ‘New Activities’ committee ‘known to others as “the Dustbin”’: see Witts, *Artist Unknown*, pp. 244-47, and Robert Hewison, *Too Much: Art and Society in the Sixties, 1960-75*, (London: Methuen, 1986), pp. 198-99.

⁴⁸ ‘Showing It Off’.

⁴⁹ Noel Grieg, ‘Brighton’s Combinations’, *International Times*, vol. 1, no. 71, (14-28 January 1970), p. 9. The article, addressing the decline of the late-1960s ‘Arts Labs’ in Britain at the time, concludes that ‘the need for cash has driven us into a relationship with the Arts Council. The more we are drawn in the less easy it is to function as a true alternative; you find yourself adapting to their criteria, wasting time on committees and at meetings, and all for pittances...’

Fantasies of the garden prevailed among the ‘flower children’ of the 1960s British counterculture, as Jonathan Harris and others have noted.⁵⁰ From *Gandalf’s Garden*, a short-lived 1968 hippie magazine and shop, to the music club Electric Garden in Covent Garden, to the girls-and-flowers tropes of psychedelic imagery, it was a conveniently elastic ideal that could (and did) mean different things to different people and which embraced a number of contradictions.⁵¹ [figs. 1.12-1.13]

Consistently, however, it was invoked as a place *apart* from establishment values and influence, as in the cult 1968 film *Performance* in which a walled London garden becomes a countercultural haven of transgression and sensuality, cut off from the conventional society of the city around it.⁵² The garden figured as an image of escape or resistance to a mainstream culture often identified with the built environment; accordingly, MOMA’s alternative identity was articulated in part through its negotiation of the politics of 1960s architecture.

For many in Britain at this time, the monumental architectural structures that housed the establishment not only represented but also served to enforce repressive institutional practices and social norms. Influential theorist Reyner Banham was among those insisting that durable buildings could not be up-to-date: in their very permanence they enshrined and perpetuated out-dated ways of thinking and

⁵⁰ Jonathan Harris, ‘Abstraction and Empathy: Psychedelic Distortion and the Meanings of the 1960s’, in *Summer of Love: Psychedelic Art, Social Crisis and Counterculture in the 1960s*, ed. by Christoph Grunenberg and Jonathan Harris, (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005), p. 15.

⁵¹ The club opened as Electric Garden in May 1967 and was rechristened ‘Middle Earth’ in August, a title that (like *Gandalf’s Garden* and *Oz* magazine) reflects the fantasy and mystical qualities often associated with the natural world: it is described first-hand in Jill Drower, *99 Balls Pond Road: The Story of the Exploding Galaxy*, (London: Scrudge Books, 2014), pp. 495-6.

⁵² Andrew Hill, ‘Performance: La Bohème, the Garden and the Ending of the Sixties’, *Visual Culture in Britain*, vol. 3, no. 1, (2002), pp. 23-36.

behaving, unable to accommodate changing technologies, values, and styles.⁵³

Some architects also adhered to this view. For example, the collective Archigram held the media-based exhibition *Beyond Architecture: An Extension of Pop Culture and Technology* at MOMA in 1967, advocating a move to high-tech mobile and disposable structures incorporating light and sound effects; their particular brand of sugar-rush, McLuhanite futurism is well expressed in a typically highly-coloured prints combining heady fantasy with fashionable images culled from consumer kitsch.⁵⁴ [figs. 1.14-1.16] The 1968 exhibition *CASSA: Fundamental Research at the Centre for Advanced Study of Science in Art* presented comparable designs, stressing the social value of dynamic cities: in a typically robust statement of faith in the transformative potential of design, the catalogue argued that planned urban obsolescence could ‘enable people to see religion, ethics and tradition not as infinitely static, but as part of the continuous evolution of our world.’⁵⁵ [fig. 1.17] Similarly, the contemporary Ikon Gallery was initially conceived as a pop-up affair, a gallery ‘without walls’ that would stay perpetually on the move, touring schools, factories, cinemas and post offices in a state of constant reinvention in order to remain relevant and accessible to as many as possible; in 1965 it settled in a glass-walled kiosk in a busy commercial area, its transparency and fragility rendering the building almost immaterial and pushing its contents forward into the dynamic hubbub of the street.⁵⁶ At a time when the intransigent longevity of buildings was

⁵³ Nigel Whiteley, ‘Toward a Throw-Away Culture: Consumerism, “Style Obsolescence” and Cultural Theory in the 1950s and 1960s’, *Oxford Art Journal*, vol. 10, no. 2, (1987), pp. 3-27.

⁵⁴ *Archigram: Beyond Architecture*, exh. cat./poster, MOMA, 22 February-[?] 1967.

⁵⁵ Marcello Salvadori in *CASSA: Fundamental Research at the Centre for Advanced Study of Science in Art*, exh. cat., MOMA, 4 March-1 April 1968. Reyner Banham also contributed a short text.

⁵⁶ Watkins, Stevenson, and Ikon Gallery, *Some of the Best Things in Life Happen Accidentally: The Beginning of Ikon*, p. 18, p. 21. Ikon’s founders shared a lot of

attracting hostility, the mutable, self-regenerating environment of the garden appealed as their symbolic antithesis and antidote. By drawing on the image of the garden in his commentary, Forge drew a wished-for distinction between MOMA and other institutions, cultural and otherwise. Oxford would be different: here the outside would be invited in, and the old would continually be expected to make way for the new. Within the walled garden of the museum, it suggested, the modes of behaviour encouraged by the 'traditional' museum or gallery (and society in general) could be kept at bay, replaced by new freedoms of visitor response.

Nonetheless, the museum was housed in a historic architectural structure, one in which it still remains. After a few short months in a temporary warehouse home on nearby King Edward Street, the museum moved to its current premises on Pembroke Street in the summer of 1966.⁵⁷ Yet one of the ways Green sought to express his museum's 'otherness' was precisely through his choice of venue. The building had been designed in 1888 by local architect H. G. W. Drinkwater as an extension to Hanley's City Brewery, which occupied the adjacent premises on St. Ebbe's and Queen Street. [fig. 1.18] Praised in 1889 as 'a new fermenting house of the most modern type' with a 'magnificent tun room,'⁵⁸ it had by the end of the 19th century been purchased by Hall's, another Oxford brewery company. In the 1960s,

Green's social idealism; its 1964 prospectus declared that 'Ikon is intended as an antithesis to exclusive art establishments and galleries... [it] has been formed because of the need for an accessible place where the exchange of visual ideas can become a familiar reality,' p. 8. However, its programme in the 1960s was more commercial and object-based and lacked MOMA's relationship to current architectural theory.

⁵⁷ Green, 'Director's Report to the Advisory Council, December 31st', 1966.

⁵⁸ Alfred Barnard, *Noted Breweries of Great Britain and Ireland*, (London: Sir Joseph Causton & Sons, 1889-91), p. 450, p. 454. The subsequent history of the building is described in Liz Woolley, 'Industrial Architecture in Oxford, 1870 to 1914', *Oxoniensia*, vol. 75, (2010) pp. 82-3.

it was owned by Oxford City Council and rented to Coopers, a builders' merchant who used it as a workshop.⁵⁹

Naturally, pragmatic concerns informed the decision to move into the old brewery. Most importantly, it was cheap: the city was weary of the noise and traffic caused by the builders' presence and agreed to lease the central 9,000 square feet for a sum less than a twentieth of its estimated market value, a mere £400 per annum.⁶⁰ For a museum with such uncertain financial prospects, and which had yet to secure steady funding, the low rent was very attractive. (With a similar pragmatism, Jennie Lee had mentioned the conversion of historic buildings as a possible solution to the shortage of affordable accommodation for new arts centres, although it is unlikely she had anything so industrial in mind.⁶¹) At the same time, the building was physically well suited to its new role as gallery, as founding council member and fellow architect Stuart Lewis first observed.⁶² Although in poor condition, it was centrally located, and the variety of room sizes and – in particular – the expansive, top-lit vaulted space on the top floor could accommodate many large artworks. [figs. 1-19-1.20] It also struck Lewis and Green as being very beautiful, reminding Lewis of Le Corbusier's brutalist work with shuttered concrete.⁶³ Green responded aesthetically to the ascending scale of the ceilings, the mixture of atmospheres and

⁵⁹ Stuart Lewis and Marya Lewis interview, (Wootton, Oxfordshire, 24 September 2012).

⁶⁰ Ibid., interview 2012. Rent of £400 cited in Trevor Green, letter to John Witt, Arts Council of Great Britain, 24 May 1967, MAO Archive, box 001 'MOMA History' fol. 'Finance ACGB 1965-71'. In 1966, Green recorded the estimated market value of the rented building at £8,000-10,000 p.a.: letter to K. Kinnear, Arts Council Great Britain, 4 June 1966, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 1-7.

⁶¹ 'A Policy for the Arts', p. 13.

⁶² Green, interview 2013.

⁶³ Lewis and Lewis, interview 2012.

the sense of drama and arrival in the ‘huge, lovely, lofty’ Upper Gallery.⁶⁴

However, the building had been earmarked for demolition and redevelopment and the museum anticipated having to move by 1970 at the latest. By this point, MOMA’s Council of Management hoped to have raised the money needed for what was called ‘Phase 3’: custom-built premises affording 64,000 square feet of gallery space that could host both changing displays and a comprehensive permanent collection of twentieth-century art and design.⁶⁵

The scale of Green’s ambitions at the beginning of 1966 could never have been realised on Pembroke Street or in any existing central Oxford building. In the event, it could not be realised at all: over the years that followed MOMA found itself unable to attract the required funding or donations, no surprise to the Arts Council which called his plans ‘utterly unrealistic.’⁶⁶ By the autumn of the same year, Green had strategically repositioned the museum’s public identity. Instead of stressing Britain’s need for a collection of modern art, he spoke most passionately of the need to support young and experimental artists within a radically accessible, democratic space. The works that most interested him, in particular those that were not readily commodifiable and difficult to sell or collect, were struggling to find an audience; and while England still lacked a dedicated museum of the history of modern art

⁶⁴ Green, interview 2013.

⁶⁵ Green hoped to design the new museum himself. Unfortunately, none of his designs have come to light. Museum of Modern Art Governing Council, ‘Preliminary Development Plan’, March 1966, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 1-7.

⁶⁶ Katherine Kinnear, memorandum to Gabriel White, 7 April 1966, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (2 of 7) fol. 65/72.

along the lines of MOMA's New York namesake, the organisation needed to establish itself before it could hope to attract the collection to match.⁶⁷

The Pembroke Street building presented a strong contrast to both of the two dominant architectural models for art display. It conformed neither to the pedimented neoclassicism of the nineteenth-century landmark museum or to the minimalist white cube, its twentieth-century successor. It also stands out within its local context. Oxford's historic collegiate structures and the nearby Ashmolean's grand, perhaps grandiose, 'temple façade' (1839-45) both carry profound associations of power, knowledge and establishment values. The building occupied by MOMA bears little resemblance to any of these models.⁶⁸ [fig. 1.21] Even for its original purpose, the building is remarkably plain, eschewing the ornamental Italianate facades by which successful Victorian industrialists liked to distinguish their manufactories.⁶⁹ Hanley's ornate main façade looked onto Queen Street, while Drinkwater's extension – in brewing terminology, a 'square room' – was built more simply in deference to its back-street location.⁷⁰ [fig. 1.22] In contrast, despite its contemporaneous origins, the former Osney Power Station (1892) has a historicism and dramatic canal-side setting that align it much more closely with nineteenth-

⁶⁷ Forge and Green, 'Space-Place at Oxford', 5 December 1966, p. 10.

⁶⁸ On the relationship between the 'temple façade' and ritualised visitor performances, see Duncan, *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*, chapter one. MOMA and the Ashmolean had little if any association with one another during this period. Although more recently they have often collaborated, in the 1960s Oxford's two main art institutions evidently did not see themselves as having much in common.

⁶⁹ This became increasingly common in the late Victorian and Edwardian periods. See Woolley, 'Industrial Architecture in Oxford, 1870 to 1914' for a discussion of local Oxford examples.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 'Industrial Architecture in Oxford, 1870 to 1914', p. 83.

century prototypes of museum architecture.⁷¹ Pembroke Street was unusual as a museum not just in its industrial past, therefore, but also for its anti-monumental character, originally adjunct to a more imposing structure. Lewis describes the building's unassuming simplicity as being at the heart of its appeal as a museum, both then and now: in spite of recent trends in museum architecture, he argued, 'you don't need spectacular buildings... the emphasis needs to be on the work.'⁷² The renovation, which took Green and some student volunteers a mere three months, was deliberately kept to a minimum so as to preserve the distinctively rough-edged industrial appearance.⁷³ [figs. 1.23-24] Perhaps partly by virtue of flouting popular expectations of what a museum should look like, Trevor Green insisted that its character was 'remarkably suitable' for his purposes.⁷⁴

MOMA's unconventional aesthetics and relative decrepitude were central to its ethos. The interior was roughly whitewashed, with bare light bulbs, irregular proportions, and – for the first three years – the original slanting concrete floors, retaining gulleys for the drainage of beer. [figs. 1.25-26] The unassuming façade still declared itself, in battered paint, a 19th-century brewery, and was squeezed in next to a pub on a narrow and run-down corner of the city. [fig. 1.27] In 1969, the concrete floors were quickly covered with unvarnished sheets of plywood in an emergency effort to level the floor (Tim Scott's sculptures would not stay upright) and by 1970, the museum's new logo, in a fashionably whimsical, tubular font, had

⁷¹ Ibid., *Oxford's Working Past: Walking Tours of Victorian and Edwardian Industrial Buildings*, (Oxford Huxley Scientific Press, 2012).

⁷² Lewis and Lewis, interview 2012.

⁷³ The renovation is described briefly in 'Warehouse Becomes a Museum'. The principles behind it are discussed in Trevor Green, 'Director's Report on the use of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation Grant for furniture and equipment', March 1969, MAO Archive, box 001 'MOMA History'.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 'Director's Report to the Advisory Council, December 31st', 1966.

been painted in a jaunty strip across the frontage.⁷⁵ [figs. 1.28-30] Although not without its own grandeur, the rough, unpolished effect of the whole was resolutely unorthodox in a fine art context. It abjured both the heroic overtones of the temple-museum and the white cube's pretensions to absolute neutrality, signalling differences from these templates that were not merely aesthetic. As critic William Feaver later pointed out, MOMA became an 'Alternative Space... [with] the free-and-easy air of what was then the "arts lab" philosophy.'⁷⁶

British audiences are now familiar with the practice of converting formerly industrial buildings into public museums and galleries, particularly those for contemporary art: Tate Liverpool (1988) and Tate Modern (2000) are two high-profile British examples of what was lauded in 1994 as 'the hottest trend in museum design.'⁷⁷ In the mid-1960s, however, this practice was entirely unknown, and MOMA may be the earliest example anywhere of a public art museum permanently housed in a post-industrial building. Among scholars who have written about this phenomenon in the Western world, there is a consensus that it was inspired in part by the studios of a generation of young artists in the 1960s and 1970s that moved

⁷⁵ The practical objections to the original flooring became evident in March 1969 during the installation of the Tim Scott exhibition, when the sculptures failed to stand upright on the tilted concrete surfaces. 'We went to put the sculptures up and the floor wasn't flat, because it was an old brewery, and, God... It was 8 by 4 sheets of thick plywood just put down. It took about three days... I've never seen so many people work so hard so fast.' Arts patron Alastair McAlpine stepped in to pay for the replacement floor, which in photos looks scarcely less functionalist than the previous. Lane, interview 2013.

⁷⁶ William Feaver, 'Oxford Blues: A Parable of Memorable Surprises', *Vogue*, vol. 154, no. 4, (April 1990).

⁷⁷ Helen Searing, 'The Brillo Box in the Warehouse: Museums of Contemporary Art and Industrial Conversions', in *The Andy Warhol Museum*, (Pittsburgh: The Andy Warhol Museum, 1994), p. 39.

into disused warehouses and factories in search of affordable workspace.⁷⁸ Artists in New York City were among the first to take advantage of the decline of urban industrialism, and the Pembroke Street building's cast iron columns reminded Green and Lewis of those in New York's peeling downtown lofts.⁷⁹ By the late 1960s, some of these artists were beginning to use these spaces for exhibitions as well as work-spaces, as a way to self-organise. In London in late 1967 SPACE, an artists' collective led by Bridget Riley and Peter Sedgley, began looking for empty industrial sites to reclaim as hybrid spaces for making and showing art. Their first home in St. Katherine's Dock allowed the artists to seize control of the means of display.⁸⁰ The ostensibly commercial Signals Gallery in Wimpole Street (founded by Paul Keeler, Guy Brett, and artists Marcello Salvadori and David Medalla, 1964-66) has been described as another early example of the post-industrial gallery, but while it was situated in a former optical workshop, its white paint and glassy shop-front façade made it much like any other west-end shop in appearance.⁸¹ [fig. 1.31] An apter comparison perhaps is the notorious Arts Lab founded in 1967 in a disused warehouse on Drury Lane.⁸² Headed by counterculture leader Jim Haynes as a

⁷⁸ The literature on this phenomenon is limited, but accounts of its development have been offered by Ibid., 'The Brillo Box in the Warehouse', pp. 39-65; Reesa Greenberg, 'The Exhibited Redistributed: A Case for Reassessing Space', in *Thinking about Exhibitions*, ed. by Reesa Greenberg, Sandy Nairne, and Bruce W. Ferguson, (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 349-367; and Martin Beck, 'Alternative: Space', in *Alternative Art New York 1965-1985*, ed. by Julie Ault, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2002), pp. 249-79.

⁷⁹ Lewis and Lewis, interview 2012.

⁸⁰ SPACE stood for 'Space Provision (Artistic, Cultural and Educational).' David Mellor and Barbican Art Gallery, *The Sixties Art Scene in London*, (London: Phaidon in association with the Barbican Art Gallery, 1993), p. 193.

⁸¹ Greenberg, 'The Exhibited Redistributed', p. 353. Its scientific overtones, which Greenberg acknowledges, were remarked upon by contemporaries and were appropriate to the kinetic art shown at the gallery: M. G. McNay, 'Laboratory of the Invisible', *The Guardian*, (15 April 1965), p. 8.

⁸² In interview in 2013, Lane describes having kept a close eye on the activities of the Arts Lab, and there are also points of connection documented in the archives.

psychedelic artists-run space for creation and informal display and a ‘fluid commune situation,’ its choice of premises was one way of communicating its rebel status as a so-called ‘non-institution.’⁸³ [fig. 1.32] British artists were discovering the subversive and atmospheric possibilities of raw, reclaimed spaces, which allowed them to display their works without having to gain the approval and accept the mediation of conservative museums and galleries. Although sometimes described as ‘neutral’ spaces, they were far from it.⁸⁴ From the beginning, they were closely associated with oppositional, process-oriented art practice, with intermedia experiment and with bohemian lifestyles: ‘raw’ spaces were identified with ‘raw’ experience to express a gritty political and social engagement sharply opposed to the domestic ethos of the typical museum, with its connotations of bourgeois aestheticism.⁸⁵

Reesa Greenberg has noted that, in general, ‘changes in the location and type of exhibition space were initiated by artists, then commercial galleries and lastly institutionalised by museums.’⁸⁶ But MOMA defies this narrative, predating both

For example, Lane and the Arts Lab’s Bidy Peppin corresponded over his search for multiples for the *Unlimited* exhibition (MAO Archive, box Apr-Sept 1969, fol. ‘Unlimited Art’), the Arts Lab’s film director Dave Curtis came with friends to present films in May 1969 (‘Events programme Apr-Aug 1969’, MAO Archive, box ‘Newssheets 1966-1980’), and Lane created MOMA’s New Cinema Club with London precedents in mind (‘perhaps the most progressive provincial film society in the country,’ 1969-70, MAO Archive, box ‘Newssheets 1966-1980’).

⁸³ Jim Haynes, ‘What is an Arts Lab anyway?’, *International Times*, vol. 1, no. 66, (10 October 1969), p. 16; see also Orlagh Woods, ‘Squaring the Circle: Examining Cultural Value through a Re-evaluation of the Arts Lab’, 29 May 2014, leaflet, n.p.; Kenneth Tynan, ‘Shouts and Murmurs’, *The Observer*, (28 April 1968), p. 30; ‘David Curtis & Bidy Peppin and The London Arts Lab’, 2011, <<https://vimeo.com/38641665>>, [accessed 9 November 2015].

⁸⁴ Searing, ‘The Brillo Box in the Warehouse’, p. 42.

⁸⁵ Beck, ‘Alternative: Space’, p. 225; see also Greenberg, ‘The Exhibited Redistributed’, pp. 350-353.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, ‘The Exhibited Redistributed’, p. 350.

the Arts Lab and St. Katherine's Dock, as well as the New York alternative spaces that would prove so influential from the 1970s on.⁸⁷ Even among Labs and Spaces, therefore, MOMA's architecture was highly innovative: as a museum in 1966 it was downright radical in its associations with studio practice and with the physical labour of industry. It became only more so as the factory conversion established itself over the next few years as the dominant style of avant-garde and underground cultural communities on both sides of the Atlantic.⁸⁸ By embedding the nascent practices of an often radical generation of avant-garde artists in the very fabric of the new museum, MOMA presented itself to the public as conceptually allied to the daring and the dissident. The gesture conveyed a determination to make of MOMA Oxford's own 'non-institution': a genuine alternative to the dominant museological norms.⁸⁹

⁸⁷ Ibid., 'The Exhibited Redistributed', p. 350. In 1968, Robert Morris organised a group exhibition entitled *Nine at Castelli* at the uptown warehouse of dealer Leo Castelli; in 1970, a group of artists in New York founded the 112 Greene Street as an exhibition and performance space in a former rag-picking factory downtown. Alanna Heiss, who worked with SPACE while in London, took the idea back to New York and founded the non-commercial Institute for Art and Urban Resources in 1971, which organised a number of temporary exhibitions as well as the Clocktower Gallery (1972) and P.S. 1 (1976), all in derelict city spaces: see 'Interview with Alanna Heiss', in *Alternative Histories: New York Art Spaces 1960 to 2010*, ed. by Lauren Rosati and Mary Anne Staniszewski, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2012), pp. 62-66.

⁸⁸ On the gradual institutionalization of the 'alternative space' and its signature post-industrial style by the late 1970s, see especially Nairne, 'The Institutionalisation of Dissent', Beck, 'Alternative: Space', and Greenberg, 'The Exhibited Redistributed'.

⁸⁹ It was not possible to find any discussions of the value of the post-industrial character of the building in the MAO Archive. When I interviewed Green, he described the choice as 'personal' and aesthetic: 'It wasn't me trying to fit something to some pre-conceived idea of art, or art in society or art in education or anything. I think the word "instinctive" is right.' Whether intentionally or otherwise, however, the building choice had subversive connotations that played a crucial part in its emerging public identity and its possibilities as a framework for exhibitions.

Similar values were communicated in the decision to eschew wall panels and catalogue essays. Although thrift was doubtless a consideration as always, the forfeiting of the authoritative trappings of the traditional museum gave space instead to the artists themselves to print their manifestos in the slender exhibition pamphlets. The displays were otherwise unmediated by the written word, intentionally open to the visitor's interpretation and response. And whereas the traditional museum prized documentation and conservation, MOMA took little interest in preserving a record of its activities, dismantling many exhibitions each year often without ever photographing them.⁹⁰

At the same time that MOMA was attempting to break out of the established model of the museum and create something closer in nature to an open studio, it also sought to give its audience license to behave more freely. It proposed itself not as another rarefied and solemn gallery space but as an extension of the public sphere; like a garden or public park, it wanted to be a place in which people could be 'themselves.' Artists showing at the museum in this period were often anxious to avoid the ritualised attitudes of silence and concentration commonly associated with the art experience, repeatedly expressing a desire to elicit more relaxed and authentic responses.⁹¹ This ideal found early expression in an *Oxford Times* profile of the new museum. [fig. 1.33] The photographer had chosen an accompanying image of two fashionable young women draping themselves casually over Francis Morland's sinuous *35 Degrees Off Conception*, apparently engaged in

⁹⁰ This lack of interest in archiving was wholly characteristic of 1960s counterculture and not documenting activities was even official policy at the Arts Lab: Woods, 'Squaring the Circle', 29 May 2014.

⁹¹ See for example Stephen Willats (22 October-16 November 1967); David Medalla (*Popa at Moma*, 1971); and Carlos Cruz-Diez (*Kinetics and Multiples from Galerie Denise René*, 1971).

conversation.⁹² In the photograph, the languid sprawl of the sculpture echoes and extends the effect of the women's poses with its suggestion of an indolent, or even erotic, pairing of bodies. (Seeing the work during a studio visit the previous summer, painter Patrick Procktor wrote that 'the twisting and entwining shapes are metaphors of the body, headless, limbless, featureless, but miming the poses of relaxation or sexual intercourse like giant strings of macaroni.'⁹³)

Brian O'Doherty has discussed the iconic status of the 'installation shot, *sans* figures' in the mediation of the white cube gallery paradigm; it denies the social and corporeal nature of art's reception so that 'your own body seems superfluous, an intrusion' in the transcendent, retinal absorption of the ideal modernist beholder.⁹⁴ Installation photographs of MOMA's exhibitions, however, often insisted on bodily presence. Besides *New Generation*, press images of Roelof Louw's *Location* (5 October-5 November 1969), *Kinetics and Multiples from Galerie Denise René* (9 January-6 February 1971), and *Platform '70* (14 July-15 August 1970), were among those capturing attractive young women responding vividly and physically to the art

⁹² The photograph was taken at Pembroke Street's first exhibition *New Generation*, an exhibition of recent British art touring from the Whitechapel Art Gallery. Morland was engaged during the 1960s in large-scale dope smuggling using his fibreglass sculptures as transport containers. That this required the destruction of the work upon safe arrival offers a possible reason why this piece seems no longer to be extant. Stewart Home, 'Voices Green and Purple: Psychedelic Bad Crazy and the Revenge of the Avant-Garde', in *Summer of Love: Psychedelic Art, Social Crisis and Counterculture in the 1960s*, ed. by Jonathan Harris and Christoph Grunenberg, (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005), p. 130.

⁹³ Patrick Procktor, 'The New Generation', *Studio International*, vol. 172, no. 879, (July 1966), p. 7.

⁹⁴ O'Doherty, *Inside the White Cube*, p. 15. O'Doherty's critique of the gallery responds to Michael Fried's powerful descriptions of spectatorial experience in his 1967 polemic 'Art and Objecthood'.

on display.⁹⁵ [figs. 1.34-35] However problematic in other respects, these photographs were critical to the museum's public presentation, especially in local newspapers. They enticed the viewer (constructed as male and heterosexual) with views of the playful female body, acted as behavioural cues, and affirmed the superior freedoms afforded by this museum and its new art forms. It was with such brazen and youthful informality – such unabashed disregard for typical museum prohibitions on touch and chatter – that MOMA's modernity was announced to its local audience.

Constructed Space Participation: Museum as playground

Trevor Green selected Maurice Agis and Peter Jones' installation *Space-Place: Constructed Space Participation* as MOMA's first self-generated exhibition. In the words of Andrew Forge, it declared Green's intention to make the museum 'a place where things can happen... music can be played or children can run about, people can talk.' Forge's review favourably contrasted the installation with so-called 'gallery art', with its associations of dullness and elitism. Like MOMA itself, *Space-Place* was for 'real people in real places.'⁹⁶

In terms of its physical constituents, *Space Place* was a geometrical installation in bright primary hues. [figs. 1.36-1.37] Square and rectangular planes of blue, red and green defined a three-dimensional space, set against or jutting out from walls

⁹⁵ See Andrew Hutton, 'Multiple Machinations,' *Oxford Mail*, 11 January 1971; Roelof Louw, *Location*, 5 October-5 November 1969, installation view, in A.H., 'A Tourniquet for the Eyeballs,' *Oxford Mail*, 11 October 1969.

⁹⁶ Forge quoted in Forge and Green, 'Space-Place at Oxford', 5 December 1966, p. 2.

partially covered in black fabric and lit by a large light box. Poles of blue and yellow shot through them at right angles (or what would have been right angles had they stayed upright), ending abruptly in mid-air. The concrete floor of the former warehouse was painted a matte black. Agis and Jones had trained as artists at St. Martin's in the early 1960s.⁹⁷ They originally conceived the work in a Fulham basement in 1964, spending a year transforming a decrepit carpenter's workshop into *Space Place's* first incarnation.⁹⁸ In Oxford, the materials were mostly newly developed synthetics, such as viscotex and lamithane, all donated by industrial sponsors including Pfizer Limited.⁹⁹

The museum went to considerable lengths to ensure that Agis and Jones' geometrical installation in primary colours be seen not as a finished piece for contemplation but as an incitement to further creativity. The show was advertised in the unclassified section of Haynes' cult psychedelic London newspaper *International Times*. [fig. 1.38] Placed next to notices for condoms, typing services and black magic groups, the 'experimental activities in a constructed space' were evidently intended more as an on-going event than a finished work of art.¹⁰⁰ Similarly, the title's generic formulation signalled a level of remove from the art object, and even the practice of fine art itself. As with other early examples of British installation art from the late 1950s onwards, such as *Place* and *an Exhibit* in the late 1950s onwards, nondescript language proposed a neutral and un-ritualised

⁹⁷ Maurice Agis and Peter Jones, *Spaceplace*, exh. cat., Stedelijk Museum, 23 September-15 October 1967.

⁹⁸ Anton Ehrenzweig, *The Hidden Order of Art: A Study in the Psychology of Artistic Imagination*, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1967), p. 172.

⁹⁹ Ibid., *Space Place*, exh. cat., MOMA, 28 November-24 December 1966.

¹⁰⁰ 'Unclassified Advertisements', *International Times*, vol. 1, no. 4, (28 November-11 December 1966), p. 11.

spatial environment, free of stuffy pretensions and open to multiple meanings and interpretations.¹⁰¹ In contrast to the conventional museum framework which was increasingly perceived as old-fashioned and didactic, spaces and places were designed to offer infinite scope for free public response.

As the advertisement shows, *Space Place* was conceived as an environment for personal interaction, rather than as a locus of solemn attention in its own right. And yet the artists' ambitions for the piece were far from modest: their design for the gallery claimed to offer a 'total experience' that could reverse the alienation of 'man from man and man from his nature.' In the slim catalogue, the artists describe a 'place for people – a place where you can meet – to look – to feel – to listen – to laugh – to cry – to love – to protest...'¹⁰² Appropriately, the poster places a fiction of the museum visitor literally at its centre. The dancing stance of the white, male figure in the unitard is powerful, even ecstatic; it pictures the dream of a 'rapturous reconciliation of body and space' that David Mellor sees haunting British art amid the upheavals and transformations of the 1960s.¹⁰³ [fig. 1.39]

Space Place used multisensory stimuli to enhance its effect on the audience. The visual experience was supplemented by a taped soundtrack of 'hoots and booms,' and the museum also invited a distinguished succession of experimental artists and musicians to perform within the gallery.¹⁰⁴ Yoko Ono enacted Tao kōans, Adrian

¹⁰¹ At MOMA, see also Louw's *Location*. The ICA's exhibitions *Place* (1959) and *An Exhibit* (1957, also at the Hatton Gallery in Newcastle) were forerunners of this kind of artistic non-naming. See Mellor and Barbican Art Gallery, *The Sixties Art Scene in London*, pp. 64-5.

¹⁰² Agis and Jones, *Space Place*, exh. cat.

¹⁰³ Mellor and Barbican Art Gallery, *The Sixties Art Scene in London*, p. 65.

¹⁰⁴ Derick Grigs, 'Putting Space on Display', *Oxford Mail*, (3 December 1966).

Mitchell recited anti-war poetry,¹⁰⁵ and John Tilbury performed an action with a piano and some beans to a youthful ‘bearded, jeaned and bell-bottomed audience.’ Typically for the museum in this period, none of these events were documented, although Tilbury’s performance was registered by a local reporter who commented ‘perhaps it was a happening at the Oxford Museum of Modern Art last night, because certain things happened, though it’s hard to explain exactly what.’¹⁰⁶ These scheduled performances added to *Space Place*’s installation to produce a kind of integrated *Gesamtkunstwerk*, reviving a specifically modernist ideal of the total work of art. Of equal importance, however, the performers could be seen as modelling through their actions a new kind of art participant, thereby encouraging visitors actively to participate in their turn. As the artists put it, the visitor was to be ‘participant, spectator and *performer* at the same time.’¹⁰⁷ In doing so, Agis and Jones aimed to imbue him – for the visitor was always referred to as male – with the transcendent agency and freedom they associated with the figure of the artist.

The child was conceived as another model of the ideal visitor. When Green sought funding to film his exhibition in action, he explained that he ‘especially’ wanted to record *Space Place* ‘when it is being used by children,’ who were encouraged to run freely throughout.¹⁰⁸ When the exhibition toured to Amsterdam’s Stedelijk Museum in 1967, the artists even produced a promotional image that shows its brightly coloured planes inhabited by a young blond boy, naked and smiling widely in what

¹⁰⁵ Art Ellefson and Pete Brown also played with their groups according to Raymond Durgnat, ‘Watch this Space-Place’, *International Times*, vol. 1, no. 5, (12-15 December 1966), p. 10.

¹⁰⁶ D.E.G., ‘First, There was a “Ping”’, *Oxford Times*, (23 December 1966).

¹⁰⁷ Mellor and Barbican Art Gallery, *The Sixties Art Scene in London*, p. 195.

¹⁰⁸ Letter Green to Bruce Beresford, British Film Institute, 2 Dec 1966, MAO Archive, box ‘MOMA 1966-1967’ folder ‘Space Place’. There is no indication that this film was ever made.

we are encouraged to see as an elaborate playground.¹⁰⁹ [fig. 1.40] For MOMA's staff and many of the artists that exhibited here, children were representatives of a primitive and uncorrupted nature, acting out supposed liberties of expressive noise and movement that adults idealised as essential to a mythically pre-aculturated humanity. While structural weaknesses prevented audience members from clambering over the installation like a climbing frame (the 'full physical use of the structure' that the artists had hoped for), there can be no doubt that vigorous childlike motion was thought desirable.¹¹⁰ Expressive dance and mime were particularly encouraged, as in one evening workshop at which undergraduates were invited to explore the environment through spontaneous movement.¹¹¹

The emphasis upon children and young adults at *Space Place* was typical of the museum's orientation towards youth. It certainly had a young staff: Trevor Green was thirty-three when he founded the museum, while Lane, his assistant and replacement, took up the post directly after finishing his undergraduate studies in the summer of 1967.¹¹² Its target audience, too, was young: the museum was positioned in the heart of the university city, scheduled its programme around the university terms, and maintained close links with the Oxford University Art Club (OUAC), which held meetings and lectures at MOMA each week (Lane, in fact, was a recent club president.)¹¹³ A 1970 Arts Council memo notes that 'the Museum

¹⁰⁹ Space Place won the Sikkens Prize for its Amsterdam version (23 September-15 October 1967): Mellor and Barbican Art Gallery, *The Sixties Art Scene in London*, p. 198.

¹¹⁰ Agis and Jones, *Space Place*, exh. cat.

¹¹¹ Grigs, 'Putting Space on Display'.

¹¹² Lane, interview 2013.

¹¹³ Purcell, 'Something of a Godsend.'

is certainly earning its place as a student centre,' while casting doubt on its wider popularity.¹¹⁴

Beyond the immediate museum context, the exhibition's idealisation of the juvenile was also symptomatic of a wider fascination with youth in British 1960s culture.

Twiggy, the model declared 'the face of 1966' by the *Daily Express* newspaper, was acclaimed for her waiflike looks, which echoed the childlike fashions of the day.¹¹⁵

More specifically, the counterculture defined itself in large part by the age of its participants; as sociologist Mike Brake has noted, 'youth in itself seemed to be a conscious political role' within the subculture, standing in opposition to the stultifying customs associated with age.¹¹⁶ Meanwhile, a liberalising British education system in an 'age of progress' would let children tap into 'natural talent' with greater self-confidence and thereby, the government claimed, produce a generation with unprecedented creativity.¹¹⁷ 1967's Plowden Report on primary education, which affirmed the superior efficacy of learning through play and individual discovery, only amplified the existing transition towards 'child-centred learning' in British post-war educational theory and practice.¹¹⁸ And among the London underground, the so-called 'free university' movement was beginning to

¹¹⁴ Susan Grayson, memorandum to Peter Bird, 20 January 1970, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (1 of 7) fol. 'January 1970 onwards'.

¹¹⁵ 'Twiggy: A Biography', <<http://www.twiggylawson.co.uk/biography.html>>, [accessed 10 December 2012].

¹¹⁶ Mike Brake, *Comparative Youth Culture: The Sociology of Youth Cultures and Youth Subcultures in America, Britain, and Canada*, (London; Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985), p. 91.

¹¹⁷ 'A Policy for the Arts', pp. 14-15.

¹¹⁸ See especially Part V: Central Advisory Council for Education (England), 'Children and their Primary Schools: A Report', (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1967), rpr. in *The History of Education in England*, <<http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/plowden/plowden1967-1.html>>, accessed 2 September 2012.

take hold as various grassroots organisations attempted to create radically anti-authoritarian new spaces for affordable collective learning.¹¹⁹

This widely-shared admiration for the supposedly natural instincts of the young (whether children or young adults) represented a fundamentally progressive view of the innate goodness of humanity when freed of negative cultural influences, a tradition of thought that goes back at least to Jean-Jacques Rousseau.¹²⁰ As queer theorists and others have noted, uncritical appeal to ‘fantasies of the child’ has often served to promote conservative ‘family values.’¹²¹ However, the MOMA exhibition was not a call to tradition but to utopian change. The central idea seems to have been that if the harmful and repressive forces of culture that distorted the development of the human psyche could be replaced by liberating ones, harmonious social relations would follow. That this supposed return to the superiorities of untrammelled nature was to be achieved through culture was an irony that went unremarked.

Through the figures of the child and the artist, therefore, the discourse around *Space Place* created behavioural cues born out of the political ideology of the moment. Critic Raymond Durnat’s fulsome review in *International Times* praised the exhibition for its restraint towards the spectator, ‘imposing nothing on him, no clutching hands,’ but it was far from the neutral, ‘natural’ environment he imagined

¹¹⁹ For instance, Robert Tasher, ‘Don’t Enroll as a Student, Only a Teacher’, *International Times*, vol. 1, no. 26, (16-29 February 1968), p. 6; Naseem Khan, ‘Interdigital Antiuniversity’, *The Guardian*, (15 February 1968), p. 9.

¹²⁰ Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Emile, or, Treatise on Education*, trans. William H. Payne, (Amherst, N.Y.: Prometheus Books, 2003).

¹²¹ Lee Edelman, ‘The Future Is Kid Stuff: Queer Theory, Disidentification, and the Death Drive’, *Narrative*, vol. 6, no. 1, (January 1998), pp. 18-30.

for his archetypal male visitor.¹²² To the contrary, *Space Place* presented its visitors with a roster of idealised figures whose staged liberation through the playful body they were encouraged to imitate.

In both form and concept, *Space Place* owed an unacknowledged debt to the earlier ICA show, *an Exhibit*, whose arrangement of suspended planes was described as ‘a game an artwork an environment.’¹²³ [fig. 1.41] What the artists did acknowledge, and was also registered by many of the exhibition’s reviewers, was the legacy of early twentieth-century modernism and specifically the utopian dreams of the Dutch De Stijl group.¹²⁴ De Stijl’s interest in unifying painting and architecture was well known to Agis and Jones: their article ‘Theo Van Doesburg is of Today,’ argued for the continued relevance of his theories of total spatial design.¹²⁵ In spite of the work’s futuristic rhetoric, therefore, the work was also profoundly revivalist in nature. It testifies to a renewed interest in the utopian ideals of interwar modernism among the 1960s British avant-garde. [fig. 1.42]

It is not by chance that Trevor Green’s short list of initial exhibition proposals specified retrospective surveys of the Bauhaus, De Stijl and Russian Constructivism.¹²⁶ These avant-garde movements of the early twentieth century were united not just by an abstract formal vocabulary but also a firm commitment to

¹²² Durnat, ‘Watch this Space-Place’.

¹²³ Ben Cranfield, ‘Between Consensus and Anxiety: Curating Transparency at the ICA of the 1950s’, *Journal of Curatorial Studies*, vol. 1, no. 1, (2012), pp. 83-100.

¹²⁴ Durnat, ‘Watch this Space-Place’. *Arts Review* also noted the exhibition’s debt to the Russian constructivists. Denis Bowen, ‘Space Place... Mayrice Agis [sic] and Peter Jones’, *Arts Review*, (10 December 1966).

¹²⁵ Maurice Agis and Peter Jones, ‘Theo van Doesburg is of Today’, *Form*, no. 9, (April 1969), pp. 14-17.

¹²⁶ Museum of Modern Art Governing Council, ‘Preliminary Development Plan’, March 1966.

the pursuit of utopian goals through advanced design. Although important instances of modernism's commitment to the triumphant merging of art and life, these aspects of the movements had been side-lined: Clement Greenberg's narratives of art's autonomous self-realisation and truth to medium left little room for the politicised interrelation of art and architecture.¹²⁷ However, it was precisely this that Green declared as his concept for the exhibition programme 1966-9. MOMA's theme, 'attempts to remove barriers between these arts,' brought together not only his intended historical programme but also the many 'environments' that were contrived within (especially) the Upper Gallery space.¹²⁸ In the face of critical orthodoxies of medium specificity, an alternative modernism was being rediscovered; the historical avant-garde's distinguished legacy of the total work of art was experiencing renewed popularity precisely because of its perceived ability to redefine our social identities.

Agis and Jones shared with their modernist forebears a belief that this unifying, transporting effect could be achieved through form alone. The use of red, blue and yellow and a grid-like format was not an ironic quotation from 1920s art but an earnest return to the principles of spiritual emancipation through universal shape and colour. What they added to the precedents left by De Stijl and others, however, was an insistence on communal and corporeal response. Michael Fried's contemporary essay *Art and Objecthood* may have drawn a clear line between the modernist tradition and what he called literal or theatrical practices that created a heightened awareness of the body in space, but *Space Place* defied this classic

¹²⁷ Clement Greenberg, 'Modernist Painting [1960]', in *The Collected Essays and Criticism*, ed. by John O'Brian, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993).

¹²⁸ Museum of Modern Art Governing Council, 'Preliminary Development Plan', March 1966.

dichotomy.¹²⁹ Dance, music and other incitements to physical exertion inscribed the performing body at the heart of its neo-avant-garde space, and the impact was not merely personal but interpersonal, thanks to the environment's ability to generate communities within its physical confines. As the artists explained in the catalogue, 'a spatial experience produces an awareness of self and as the experience is capable of being shared by others it can provide a means of social living.'¹³⁰ In many ways, the audience was *Space Place*'s true medium, and the litmus of its success.

However laudable they found its intentions, critics suggested that *Space Place* was not successful in providing for its visitors the 'total experience' that it promised. Ray Durnat's review, which claimed 'It frees, explores, transforms you... [one] enters as a passive spectator, becomes a freeman,' nonetheless concluded by complaining that the gallery failed to be sufficiently concealed and transcended, its high roof and walls poorly hidden.¹³¹ Forge and the *Oxford Mail* agreed, and such criticisms are born out by installation photographs which show flimsy-looking coloured boards and wrinkled fabrics arranged stagily over brick walls.¹³² Lucy Lippard famously described the period 1966-72 as witnessing the progressive 'dematerialisation of the art object' through emergent conceptual art practices which favoured idea over form or materiality.¹³³ Although not object-based, the British environmental art that MOMA championed was often emphatically formal and material. What 'dematerialised', increasingly, was the museum itself; the mark of a

¹²⁹ Fried, 'Art and Objecthood'.

¹³⁰ Agis and Jones, *Space Place*, exh. cat.

¹³¹ Durnat, 'Watch this Space-Place'.

¹³² Grigs, 'Putting Space on Display'; Forge and Green, 'Space-Place at Oxford', 5 December 1966, pp. 10-11.

¹³³ Lucy R. Lippard, *Six Years: The Dematerialization of the Art Object from 1966 to 1972: A Cross-Reference Book of Information on Some Esthetic Boundaries*, (London: Studio Vista, 1973).

successful environment was that it dominated and subsumed its setting within its own spectacle. However, at Oxford, at least, the audience for *Space Place* found itself unable to suspend awareness of the world outside.

Only Andrew Forge for the BBC questioned this formulation. He too found *Space Place* ultimately unsatisfactory, but rather than claiming that the artists failed sufficiently to obliterate what he called the ‘strong, old, impure character of the building itself,’ he proposes that they ought to have worked with it, reconciling the space and place of the title.¹³⁴ In fact, Agis and Jones were apologetic about their presence in an art museum, explaining their preference for ‘city squares – parks – playgrounds’ over even a non-commercial and alternative museum. For these artists, MOMA could never be quite enough like a garden: the institution was there to be exceeded, rather than explored or interrogated.¹³⁵

Plastic Grass: The high-tech garden

-Are you afraid of the light?
-Of course you fool – it means rethinking everything!¹³⁶

If *Space Place* promised a mythic return to a pre-aculturated ideal humanity, there was, I shall argue, another kind of garden fantasy at large in the 1960s underground, one which also found expression in Oxford’s adventurous programming. Early in 1967, Trevor Green invested much of a small grant from the Gulbenkian Foundation in the acquisition of the latest audio-visual equipment – carousel slide

¹³⁴ Forge and Green, ‘Space-Place at Oxford’, 5 December 1966, p. 10.

¹³⁵ Agis and Jones, *Spaceplace*, exh. cat.

¹³⁶ *International Times* cover, (15 December 1967).

projectors, screens, tape players and so on – which enabled the museum, as he said, to ‘take a lead in the production of multi-media exhibitions’ across Britain.¹³⁷

Although the publication of Guy Debord’s radical text *The Society of the Spectacle* in 1967 became for many a call to arms, the futuristic programming in Oxford’s new museum bespoke an optimism about the cultural changes taking place in the ‘white heat of the scientific revolution.’¹³⁸

Oxford was not the only place in Britain in which such art and technology projects could be seen in the late 1960s. Kinetic art typically combined programmed movement and artificial illumination, and was a major aspect of sixties avant-garde production in Britain; it would receive its greatest exposure in the ICA’s groundbreaking 1968 exhibition *Cybernetic Serendipity*.¹³⁹ But MOMA was exceptional in the strength of its continued commitment to these new media experiments, repeatedly integrating them into its exhibition programme from the very beginning. These shows were central to the museum’s attempt to engage the visiting public: as Lane put it in a 1968 interview:

Movement attracts people because it involves them and something like the Archigram show is simpler, less distracting and more defined than a painting on a wall. It’s easier to look at.¹⁴⁰

During this period, the museum played host to exhibitions that engaged with the new technologies in a variety of ways. A number aimed to unite spatial design with

¹³⁷ Green, ‘Director’s Report on the use of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation Grant for furniture and equipment’, March 1969.

¹³⁸ Guy Debord, *The Society of the Spectacle*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith, 11th edn., (New York: Zone Books, 2012); Harold Wilson, ‘Leader’s Speech, Brighton’, 1964, <<http://www.britishpoliticalspeech.org/speech-archive.htm?speech=162>>, [accessed 19 August 2012].

¹³⁹ Jasia Reichardt, *Cybernetic Serendipity: the Computer and the Arts*, exh. cat., (London: Studio International Special Issue, 1968).

¹⁴⁰ ‘Showing It Off’.

new media and construction technologies: Archigram, Light/Sound Workshop and CASSA (the Centre for Advanced Study of Science in Art) were all new London collectives that brought together artists, architects and technicians to explore flexible, media-saturated, and disposable forms of high-tech urban living, and all were given major shows at Oxford in 1967-68, perhaps reflecting Green's architectural interests and training. Archigram's *Beyond Architecture* epitomised the mood: 640 slides were rapidly flashed across eight very large, transparent plastic screens, hung at angles around a darkened gallery to a loud pop soundtrack. The exhibition conveyed the excitement of technological possibility with a bombardment of the group's own drawings and images culled from the mass media; its frenetic and enveloping environment was not merely a showcase of ideas but an experimental, multimedia spatial design in its own right.¹⁴¹ [fig. 1.43]

Two of the core members of the Archigram group, Peter Cook and Dennis Crompton, were also involved with Light/Sound Workshop, which was invited to stage its own exhibition in Oxford soon after Archigram's (28 November-23 December 1967). Founded in 1962 and based at Hornsey College of Art's Advanced Studies program, the all-male group was a loose affiliation of individuals whose work revolved around the creation of programmed audio-visual environments.¹⁴² As with Archigram, their ultimate interest was in developing media techniques by which to transform everyday experience, but they had settled in the meantime for designing spaces for temporary cultural events such as Brighton

¹⁴¹ *Archigram: Beyond Architecture*, exh. cat./poster.

¹⁴² Clive Latimer and others, 'Light/Sound Workshop', *Studio International*, vol. 173, no. 888, (April, 1967). The group of members who participated in the exhibition were Clive Latimer, Dennis Crompton, Stuart Brisley, Bill Culbert, Colin Canon, John Bowstead, Peter Cook, Roger Jeffs, Dick Woods, and Paul Harris.

Festival, performances by the Royal Ballet, and Pink Floyd concerts.¹⁴³ They also shared a determination to break away from the perceived sterility and elitism of traditional fine art by embracing the spectacular aesthetics of the mass media. Light, especially, was a potent symbol of modernity's attractions, much as it had been for the Bauhaus forbears who were given a prominent place in the Oxford catalogue sheet.¹⁴⁴ For the group and the counterculture at large, however, the importance of light was more than merely symbolic. The intense sensory stimulation that it could provide was also considered powerfully mind-altering.¹⁴⁵ Anthony Tucker in *The Guardian* was unequivocal about the Oxford exhibition: 'this is a psychedelic event, and it fills a real human need.'¹⁴⁶

Light/Sound Workshop's exhibition brought together a large number of light sculptures and abstract films that harnessed new technologies to dazzle and overwhelm in equal measure. [figs. 1.44-46] The darkened, kaleidoscopic space of the exhibition was intended to replicate the excitement of walking through a neon-saturated Piccadilly Circus.¹⁴⁷ The artists promoted a democracy of individual choice in the gallery with the visitor reconceived as a postmodern *flâneur*, free to

¹⁴³ For more on the activities of Light/Sound Workshop, see Anna Kontopoulou, 'Young Contemporaries 1968: The Hornsey Light/Sound Workshop', (2011) <<http://lux.org.uk/blog/young-contemporaries-1968-hornsey-lightsound-workshop>> [Accessed 20 March 2013], and Maurice Jay, 'Light as Art and Entertainment', *Light and Lighting*, vol. 61, no. 2, (February 1968).

¹⁴⁴ *Light/Sound Workshop*, exh. cat./poster. For a comparative discussion of modernist and postmodernist light art, see Anne Wagner, 'Vision Made Visible', in *Light Show*, exh. cat., Hayward Gallery, 30 January-6 May 2013.

¹⁴⁵ Jonathan Harris, 'Abstraction and Empathy: Psychedelic Distortion and the Meanings of the 1960s', in *Summer of Love: Psychedelic Art, Social Crisis and Counterculture in the 1960s*, ed. by Christoph Grunenberg and Jonathan Harris, (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005), pp. 9-17.

¹⁴⁶ Anthony Tucker, 'A Matter of Light and Life', *The Guardian*, (28 November 1967), p. 7.

¹⁴⁷ Tony Rickaby interview, (ICA, 8 December 2011).

consume the experiences on offer within an exhilaratingly simulacral environment.

As with Archigram, these works were often conceived by their makers as

experiments in living, for, as *OZ* magazine reflected in 1967:

All the indications are that we are heading into an era when total environments will be commonplace – film as a moving tapestry on four walls and ceiling; strobe lights and coloured spots strategically placed...¹⁴⁸

Despite the rhetorical emphasis on visitor freedom – a freedom understood as akin to the free choice of the consumer in the late capitalist marketplace – other formulations revelled in the psychological power of audio-visual media: on the catalogue sheet, Crompton claimed rather ominously that throughout the exhibition, ‘the spectator is fed with information which forms his experience.’¹⁴⁹ Ultimately, these inventions were intended to be user-controlled, a future of which the exhibition could offer only a pre-programmed taste.¹⁵⁰

Another strand of art and technology practice given a platform at the Museum of Modern Art was the late 1960s interest in inflatable structures. Whether as objects, environments or entire buildings, there was a fascination with the possibilities of pneumatic engineering that extended across Europe and the United States and found frequent expression in Oxford.¹⁵¹ This interest peaked in 1968 with high-profile inflatable displays at such varied venues as the Musée d’Art Moderne de la Ville de Paris (*Structures Gonflables*), the Arts Council in Philadelphia (*Air Art*) and with a 84.8 metre high tubular construction by Christo and Jean-Claude at *Documenta*

¹⁴⁸ ‘Other Scenes’, *Oz*, (‘& Other Scenes’ special issue 1969), p. 3.

¹⁴⁹ *Light/Sound Workshop*, exh. cat./poster.

¹⁵⁰ More on the exhibitions by Light/Sound Workshop, Archigram and Stephen Willats is published in Hilary Floe, ‘Are You Afraid of the Light?’ *Spectacular Aesthetics at the Museum of Modern Art Oxford 1967-1968*, (Oxford: MAO, 2013).

¹⁵¹ Beyond the examples discussed below, there was also a large inflatable structure by Graham Stevens in *Popa at Moma* and they were among the featured ideas in *CASSA* and Archigram’s *Beyond Architecture*.

IV.¹⁵² At MOMA it was represented that year by a double-bill of *Inflatable Furniture* (3-22 December) and the Eventstructure Research Group's *Pneu Show* (19 November-22 December). While the former featured commercial products currently available for sale, the latter was an ambitious art installation in the Upper Gallery (its punning title conveying novelty) including aspects of performance, participation, and sculpture. The Amsterdam-based group comprised Jeffrey Shaw, Theo Botschuiver and Sean Wellesley-Miller; Shaw wrote directly to the museum offering a show because he had heard of its 'singular efforts in presenting exhibitions of an environmental nature.'¹⁵³

With the windows and skylights blacked out to darken the space, the gallery was dominated by three very large parachutes pinned down by sand ballasts around the edges. They were inflated from underneath by centrifugal blowers pumping smoke into the room, lending a 'frail monumentality' to their quivering, buoyant forms.¹⁵⁴ Naked light bulbs dangled on cords over each of the parachutes, connected to sound-light modulators, which varied the brightness of the light in response to different kinds of noise made by the audience.¹⁵⁵ The result, titled *Black Airground*, attracted the admiration of the *Cherwell*, which drew comparisons with previous exhibitions:

If you are old enough to remember the joy and excitement of *Space Place*, or the *Hornsey Light Sound* (where the 'Is it Art' nonsense died its final

¹⁵² Marc Dessauce, ed., *The Inflatable Moment* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1999).

¹⁵³ Letter to Barry Lane, 10 June 1968, MAO Archive, box 'MOMA July 1968-Apr 1969' fol. 'OSA Exhibition and Pneu Show.'

¹⁵⁴ Email communication from Jeffrey Shaw, 18 February 2012.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

death) and young enough to clamber over obstacles both physical and academic, you will not, I take it, miss *The Pneu Show*.¹⁵⁶

Like *Space Place*, *Pneu Show* formed a dynamic background for invited performers: in this case, the ‘riotous’ activities of Peter Dockley and friend.¹⁵⁷ Wearing elaborate and bulky costumes (one in a padded cream space suit, the other in a black PVC diving outfit, both fitted with goggles and helmets) they swung from a trapeze fitted to the bars of the ceiling, carrying ropes and a video camera that projected a live feed of the proceedings. ‘So this is what a side-show at the fair will look like in 2000 AD. It’s a happening,’ commented the *Oxford Mail*, seemingly impressed despite itself, under the headline ‘Come into the fog, man and grab a handful of art’:

It’s smoky, like a London fog. There are people standing around, young people, lots of them wearing the uniform of round gold-rimmed spectacles, droopy moustaches, long slender trench coats... Man, this is participation.¹⁵⁸ [figs. 1.47-49]

The contemporary appeal of inflatable structures did not confine itself entirely to young men with moustaches: the new technologies had been largely developed by the American military, and in the UK, the Ministry of Public Building and Works commissioned a survey on ‘air structures’ that appeared in 1971; Jennie Lee had even recommended them as temporary housing for new arts centres in her 1965 white paper.¹⁵⁹ However, they certainly held a particular attraction for young members of the London counterculture: not only were they comparatively cheap and easy to produce, their tactile encounter was thought to provide an inimitably sensual experience. Reframing the gallery yet again as the domain of the playful

¹⁵⁶ Chris Digby-Firth, ‘Art’, *Cherwell*, ([November/December] 1968), MAO Archive, 1960s press file.

¹⁵⁷ Charles Spencer, *Fashion*, (March 1969).

¹⁵⁸ Frances Filson, ‘Come Into the Fog, Man and Grab a Handful of Art’, *Oxford Mail*, (20 November 1968).

¹⁵⁹ Dessauce, ed., *The Inflatable Moment*, p. 8.; Cedric Price et al., *Air Structures: a Survey commissioned by the Ministry of Public Building and Works*, (London: H.M.S.O., 1971); ‘A Policy for the Arts’, p. 13.

body, visitors to *Pneu Show* were instructed to take off their shoes and were permitted to walk on the parachutes (though unlike the high-pressure constructions that were also favoured by MOMA's artists, the parachutes were not firm enough to lift him or her off the ground). Pneumatics not only invited embodied participation, they frequently themselves perceived as bodily, even sexual, entities. The exhibition catalogue for *Structures Gonflables* earlier that year had declared them to have 'a fecundity like that evoked by a swollen phallus, a swelling breast, a blossom ready to burst.'¹⁶⁰ *Popa at Moma's* Graham Stevens drew attention to the 'range of sexual and humorous connotations' associated with the turgid 'skin' of his pneumatic structures, and Banham noted their 'tendency to behave like a living organism when roused.'¹⁶¹ These voluptuously human or animalistic qualities animated the artwork, and they were intended to have a similar effect on the museum visitor as well.

This animation, or activation, was conceptualised in both literal and metaphorical terms. The dynamic structures demanded dynamic responses, and it was claimed that as visitors clambered, rolled and wobbled over different kinds of inflatable, 'the structure becomes a tool for decreasing social barriers and increasing physical contact and bodily awareness.'¹⁶² The unfamiliar bodily sensations and newfound proximities were thought by these artists to encourage an ecstatic loss of social inhibitions in line with 1960s ideals.¹⁶³ [fig. 1.50] Yet the potential, for both Shaw

¹⁶⁰ Claude and Leon Gaignebet, 'Untimely Considerations on Inflatables' [1968], rpr. in Dessauce, ed., *The Inflatable Moment*, p. 30.

¹⁶¹ Graham Stevens, 'Blow-up', *Art and Artists*, vol. 7, no. 74, (May 1972), p. 43; Banham, 'Monumental Wind-bags' [1969], rpr. in Dessauce, ed., *The Inflatable Moment*, p. 33.

¹⁶² Stevens, 'Blow-up', p. 44.

¹⁶³ Jeff Nuttall's influential *Bomb Culture*, a polemic and apology for the London counterculture, was published in 1968 and was typical in calling for the institution of 'a sense of festivity into public life whereby people could fuck freely and

and Stevens, went beyond mere bodily awareness: instead, the liberating and playful physical experience of the work was intended to prompt free thinking. The shift from rigid structures to soft, transparent, flexible ones that respond to human presence was held to exemplify the difference between the social norms of post-war Britain, perceived as repressive, and the possibility of a more open and tolerant society.¹⁶⁴ Shaw's manifesto 'Concepts for an Operational Art' was published the month after *Pneu Show* closed and offers the clearest articulation of these ideas. For him the art object's 'essential revolutionary function as a popular incitement to self-action and environmental transformation' harnessed technologies like those of the inflatable to produce 'new forms of spectacle which are non-alienated' and defy 'market principles.' *Pneu Show*, as a 'particular structuring of art/architecture/spectacle/technology' promised to generate the energy and excitement needed for radical social transformation.¹⁶⁵ The performers' references to the recent advances in space and ocean exploration gave further emphasis to the message of limitless human possibility across new frontiers.

Funded by an Arts Council grant of £120, Willats' *Visual Automatics and Visual Transmitters* ran from 22 October-16 November 1968 and formed the first major presentation of the work of this young artist. The exhibition consisted of elaborate

guiltlessly, dance wildly and wear fancy dress all the time,' a call which resonates with the ideals of the pneumatic art movement: *Bomb Culture*, (London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1968), p. 248.

¹⁶⁴ 'One of the main features of the present environmental design programme is a monumental rigidity which precludes any significant role or identity of the user. It is the same third-rate democracy as the political structure as a whole – the range of freedom given (voting and furniture) is demeaning': Jeffrey Shaw, 'Concepts for an Operational Art', *Art and Artists*, no. 10, (January 1969), p. 47. Similar sentiments were earlier expressed in 'This Page is Part of Your Environment - Now Read On', pp. 7-10, which includes interviews on pneumatic art with Shaw, David Medalla, and Stevens.

¹⁶⁵ Shaw, 'Concepts for an Operational Art', pp. 47-49.

machines – the *Visual Automatics* and *Transmitters* of the title – painstakingly programmed to perform quiet sequences of moving light. The room was darkened and the ten works arranged in a maze-like formation, as much a luminous installation as a display of discrete objects.¹⁶⁶ Photographs of the sculptures reveal highly coloured objects, playful in design, like toys of unknown usage; their intricate geometry offers an unfamiliar iteration of the graphic design that still characterises the artist’s practice. [fig. 1.51] In the catalogue, black-and-white photographs flatten and transform these objects, endowing them with some of the eerie mystery of the modernist photogram. [fig. 1.52] Conway Lloyd-Morgan’s remarkable footage of the exhibition, made while still a student, brings the works to glowing life. Less a true documentation than a lyrical exploration in close-up, the film’s gaze reimagines the objects on show as an enclosing spatial field, filling the screen with pure colour and movement. There is little concern for objectivity here; the camera is often breathlessly intimate with these objects, as enthralled by the whirl of forms as the viewer was supposed to be. Perhaps even more so.

Willats’ catalogue text stressed the centrality of audience involvement to the meaning of his works. Much as with his more recent work, however, viewers were expected to seek elusive patterns in the sequences rather than succumb to aesthetic delight in their formal abstraction. Randomised combinations and deliberate complexity were intended to spur cognitive processes of interpretation and understanding, so that the visitor could ‘build his own order’ through protracted examination.¹⁶⁷ In their investigation of the interaction between individual and environment, the works drew on the artist’s readings in cybernetics and behavioural

¹⁶⁶ Personal communication from Stephanie Willats, 12 April 2013.

¹⁶⁷ Willats to Green, *ibid.*

theory. Willats' effort to advance art through science and technology speaks of the contemporary enthusiasm for cross-disciplinary practice.¹⁶⁸ If there was a potential contradiction in what Willats called the 'controlled triggering of creative behaviour' – a contradiction, perhaps, that runs through each of these exhibitions, with their ambitious claims for a technological society – the catalogue does not acknowledge it.¹⁶⁹

Exhibitions like these and others also deploying new automation technologies in Oxford had a utopian orientation, spatial format and emphasis on the beholder that share features with MOMA's 'constructed garden.' However, their often uncritical celebration of advanced modernity came with an ambivalent attitude to nature as something to be controlled and perfected for social ends, perhaps in an 'arts lab.' This tension also lies at the heart of the garden metaphor: gardens are usually cultivated spaces rather than wild ones, combining nature with human domination as what Susan Stewart has called the 'garden agon.'¹⁷⁰ In contrast to the distrust of a technocratic society common to many on the left, then, groups like CASSA claimed that the new techniques would revolutionise society by 'allowing man complete control of his environment' by saturating that environment with switches and

¹⁶⁸ Such an attitude was exemplified by the Artist Placement Group, led by Barbara Steveni and John Latham, which placed artists within corporations and public bodies in order to integrate art with society. Barry Lane wrote to Steveni in 1969 about the idea of staging a show of the Artist Placement Group's work similar to the Arts Council's upcoming *INNO 70* but this was never realized: Lane, letter to Peter Bird, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (2 of 7), fol. 66/7 'Oxford Museum of Modern Art.'

¹⁶⁹ *Stephen Willats: Visual Automatics and Visual Transmitters*, exh. cat., MOMA, 22 October-16 November 1968.

¹⁷⁰ Susan Stewart, 'Garden Agon', *Representations*, no. 62, (1998), pp. 111-143.

screens.¹⁷¹ These ideals found their analogue in a BBC *Tomorrow's World* segment from April 1968 entitled 'Plastic Grass,' which commented half-seriously, half in jest on the new availability of synthetic landscaping as something that could be considered not only convenient but actively desirable:

The latest thing in plastic flowers looks just as good as the real from the other side of the fence. From close up it can even smell like the real thing if you go over it with scent spray. And one good thing about these is, unlike the real thing, they don't fade or wither away. Just a touch of aerosol polish, and once over with a duster, and they come up looking like new... Of course if you're a stickler for detail, you can also buy plastic worms, plastic birds, plastic fountains, plastic garden chairs.¹⁷² [figs. 1.53-1.54]

Tomorrow's World portrays the plastic garden in its typically droll and quizzical fashion, adopting a gently surrealist tone that exaggerates the futuristic strangeness of what was in fact 1960s commercial reality. The plastic grass in question was, of course, an industrially-produced commodity packaged and sold as a replacement for the real thing; and these technological exhibitions at MOMA, whether of sculptural multiples (a recurrent theme), inflatable plastic chairs, or automated environments, were also engaging both stylistically and materially with the techniques of the mass media. While Eventstructure Research Group wanted to appropriate the spectacle from the commercial marketplace to subversive ends, other artists were keen to enter the mass market themselves: multiples and inflatable chairs were available for sale to the public through the museum, and the environmental experiments of Light/Sound Workshop and Archigram were conceived as early prototypes for commercial realisation on a large scale.¹⁷³ Stevens went so far as to try to market his

¹⁷¹ *CASSA: Fundamental Research at the Centre for Advanced Study of Science in Art*, exh. cat.

¹⁷² 'Plastic Grass', *Tomorrow's World*, BBC, 3 mins., (10 April 1968) <<http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p0154mpj>> [accessed 10 September 2015].

¹⁷³ 'It is the function of LIGHT/SOUND WORKSHOP to investigate multiple media techniques, inviting the co-operation of the photographic, film, optical, electronic and communications industries,' *Light/Sound Workshop*, exh. cat./poster;

inflatable structures as party entertainments for children in a company, Airplay Ltd., in the early 1970s.¹⁷⁴ How can these notions of a dynamic blend of art, mass media and industrial design be reconciled with the founding idea of the museum as a space for the non-commercial? These exhibitions did not always occupy an oppositional position towards capitalism (Simon Sadler has described Archigram's politics aptly as 'rightward techno-libertarianism').¹⁷⁵ However, these high-tech designs, although pioneering, were often impractical beyond the exhibition context. The *Visual Automatics and Visual Transmitters*, Light/Sound Workshop, *Inflatable Furniture*, *Popa at Moma* and *Pneu Show* exhibitions were all beset by technical difficulties.¹⁷⁶ 'Maybe a bit more to be done on that Research?' suggested the *Observer* tartly on the latter, finding the Eventstructure Research Group's

Archigram: Beyond Architecture, exh. cat./poster; see also *CASSA: Fundamental Research at the Centre for Advanced Study of Science in Art*, exh. cat., and *Edition Art*, exh. cat., MOMA, 17 January-11 February 1967. Shaw's politics were more complex than can be described here: in spite of the Marxist leanings and revolutionary exhortations of his published articles, he was also a key early member of Artist Placement Group (APG), an organisation run by John Latham and Barbara Stevani to place artists in industrial businesses for extended collaborations. Undated documents exhibited at Raven Row's 2012 exhibition on APG show that Shaw and Botschuiver pursued a placement with AVON Inflatable Products Division around this time, albeit one to be funded by the Welsh Arts Council rather than by AVON itself. See also *The Individual and the Organisation: Artist Placement Group 1966-1979*, exh. cat., Raven Row, 27 September-16 December 2012.

¹⁷⁴ Graham Stevens interview, (Tate Britain, 28 January 2013).

¹⁷⁵ Simon Sadler, *Archigram: Architecture Without Architecture*, (London: MIT Press, 2005), p. 187.

¹⁷⁶ One reviewer described Willats' works as 'jinxed by technical deficiencies – the squeak of a limping rotor, moving parts which fail to move, expiring lights': Rita Harris, 'Stephen Willats', *Arts Review*, (23 November 1968); Dennis Crompton interview, (Modern Art Oxford, 22 May 2013); Stevens, interview 2013. *Inflatable Furniture* toured to the Welsh Arts Council; an employee wrote to MOMA to comment 'I was thinking of purchasing one or two of the works in the exhibition but, having watched them slowly deflate over the last week, I have decided against it. The exhibition looks quite well in our Gallery but as you say it a pity that so many of the ideas are carried out in such a shoddy fashion': Frances Edwards, letter to Barry Lane, 24 Feb 1969, MAO Archive, box July 1968-April 1969, fol. 'Inflatable Furniture.'

environment on the day of visit both a ‘a non-event (audio-visual machine out of order) and a non-structure (air pressure too low).’¹⁷⁷

Similar complexities arise in connection with the multiple, a buzzword in the 1960s art world and a concept repeatedly explored at MOMA, with dedicated exhibitions *Edition Art* (17 January-11 February 1967), *Unlimited Art: Multiples, the art of the future?* (16 April-10 May 1969) and *Kinetics and Multiples from Galerie Denise René* (1971).¹⁷⁸ [figs. 1.55-56] Oxford’s makers of multiples, which were often sculptural and kinetic, were interested in deploying modern mass production techniques to disrupt the art market (‘is the artist not responsible to his society, the economy, the public... to provide an object of art for everyone at a price he can afford and of a size which his home can accommodate’ asked the catalogue for *Edition Art*, and *Unlimited Art*’s catalogue sheet was critical of the commodification of rarity and the ‘handwritten signature’ that kept art out of the hands of the majority).¹⁷⁹ Takis, a sculptor who exhibited in both *Unlimited* and *Kinetics and Multiples*, was at the forefront of this movement towards mass fabrication. In a 1969 brochure for Unlimited Ltd., a Bath-based company supplying his multiples to the exhibition, he is quoted describing the improvements to artistic quality that multiples could bring:

The artist creating an original work of art is in the position of a man watering a small garden. He will use any means available so that the watering gets done, without looking for any special geometric solution... but if the artist anticipates the multiplication of his original... he is in the position of a man responsible for the irrigation of a whole area. He will have

¹⁷⁷ N.G., ‘Gallery Guide’, *The Observer*, (1 December 1968).

¹⁷⁸ Unlimited Ltd., *Takis Signals TS1 TS2 TS3*, brochure, 1969, MAO Archive, box ‘Apr-Sept 1969’ fol. ‘Unlimited Art.’

¹⁷⁹ *Edition Art*, exh. cat.; *Unlimited Art*, exh. cat./poster, MOMA, 16 April-10 May 1969.

to get down to the essentials and make something perfectly fitting its purpose.¹⁸⁰

In spite of his confidence, the response was very mixed. The works sourced by Barry Lane for *Unlimited Art* were comparatively inexpensive (most ranging between £5 and £20 each) but he found them visually underwhelming. The multiples from *Kinetics and Multiples* were much more dear at an average £140, and MOMA's inflatable plastic chairs, obtained from an international selection of companies, were not only remarkably costly but also sticky and prone to collapse: in spite of their cheap materials and hip, youthful style, they were luxury novelties rather than functional designs for ordinary living. Like *Space Place*, which purported to engage the body but was not sturdy enough for 'full physical use,' Lane warned another gallery that the pneumatic chairs 'do not take kindly to children bouncing on them!'¹⁸¹ In the *Kinetics and Multiples* catalogue, the exhibition's guest organiser Conway Lloyd Morgan explored some of the problems of the genre of multiples as currently available: despite the social possibilities, their high price and low quality (the visual integrity of the work undermined by poor reproductive techniques) failed to 'satisfy those who wish to reach through multiples a completely new public.'¹⁸² [fig. 1.57]

These projects were in the early stages of development, a point reinforced by the rhetoric of 'research', 'information' and 'study' that surrounds so many of these late-1960s collectives that brought artists and technicians together. For Trevor

¹⁸⁰ Unlimited Ltd., *Takis Signals TS1 TS2 TS3*, brochure, MAO Archive, box 'Apr-Sept 1969' fol. 'Unlimited Art.'

¹⁸¹ For example, the 'crystal blow up chair' made by Zanotta, included in the exhibition, cost £18.11.9.; see also letter Lane to Edwards, 8 Jan 1969, MAO Archive, box July 1968-April 1969, fol. 'Inflatable Furniture'; *MULTIPLES and Kinetics*, exh. cat., MOMA and Bear Lane Gallery, 9 January-7 February 1971.

¹⁸² *MULTIPLES and Kinetics*, exh. cat.

Green, the attraction of these exhibitions lay not only in the innovative design activity that would appeal to an architect, but also in their relation to the place of the museum within the university city. His 1967 ‘Statement of Policy’ declared a key objective of his museum to be the encouragement ‘particularly in Oxford itself where the creative activities in science are of the highest world standing, the conditions for a synthesis of creative behaviour.’¹⁸³ This notion of synthesis may have drawn on C. P. Snow’s influential 1959 treatise on the ‘Two Cultures,’ a call for a new reconciliation of arts and science designed to democratise the former and humanise the latter, for collective social benefit.¹⁸⁴ MOMA’s art and technology exhibitions were intended to appeal to academic scientists and engineers, stimulating new collaborations and carving out a place for contemporary art in a city not historically known for its sympathies with advanced art practice. More creative than reliable, these projects may have seemed to belong more properly to the gallery – or university laboratory – than to the marketplace.

‘Discover the Rainbow in Yourself’: Participation and Over-Participation

‘Play in the parks. You must. You can.’¹⁸⁵

While many exhibitions at the Museum of Modern Art embraced a futurist aesthetic, others staged a retreat from modern technologies, favouring simple, handmade styles and a do-it-yourself ethos that seemed more committed to sustaining older, pastoral traditions than to urban progress. *Pioneers of*

¹⁸³ Green, ‘Statement of Policy’, 5 September 1967.

¹⁸⁴ C. P. Snow, *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution: The Rede Lecture, 1959*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959).

¹⁸⁵ *International Times* cover, 30 June 1967.

Participation Art: Popa at Moma was the most explicitly participatory exhibition staged at the MOMA in these years: it picked up themes of childlike play and audience involvement from *Space Place* and other exhibitions while adopting organic, amateurish forms of expression differing from both Agis and Jones' modernist revivalism and the neon-saturated aesthetic of the technology shows. Its colourfully disastrous denouement brings the museum's notion of transforming audience engagement dramatically into focus, signalling both the culmination and the crisis of these founding ideals.

Popa at Moma opened and closed on a single evening in February 1971, a year which Brandon Taylor has identified as 'the *annus mirabilis* – or *horribilis* – of the participation demand.'¹⁸⁶ [fig. 1.58] Following Lane's departure in summer 1970, the role of Director had been taken over by Peter Ibsen, a young South African trained in painting at Chelsea School of Art and appointed directly to MOMA from his Courtauld Institute MA; the exhibition was conceived and organised by undergraduate members of the OUAC, Rupert Legge and Mark Powell-Jones.¹⁸⁷ Their exhibition proposal, originally entitled *Art of the Id*, made typically ambitious claims for a new genre of art that uniquely could stimulate:

the direct interplay of ideas between the artist and the observer, culminating in a spontaneous burst of energy, a desire to respond and give back directly to the work. Up till now this process has been repressed. It is the aim of Id Art to release this response, to free it from the censorship of the Superego. The strict rigours of Museum Code and the one-sided relationship between the artist and Society, have deprived art of a 'Marcuse' dimension.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁶ Brandon Taylor, *Art for the Nation: Exhibitions and the London Public 1747-2001*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), p. 230.

¹⁸⁷ Powell-Jones, now styled Sir Mark Jones, pursued a museum career and was Director of the Victoria and Albert Museum from 2001-2011.

¹⁸⁸ OUAC, 'Art of the Id', [n.d.] 1970, MAO Archive, box 'Oct 1970-Feb 1971' fol. 'Popa at Moma.' Herbert Marcuse was a Marxist philosopher of the Frankfurt School whose ideas were highly influential upon the 1960s counterculture.

Popa at Moma was dominated by a remarkable international group associated with the former Signals Gallery that the students discovered and tapped into. The short existence of this group resulted in an ambitious news bulletin and a series of important exhibitions that brought together artists such as the Brazilians Lygia Clark and Helio Oiticica, Li Yuan-Chia from China, and other kinetic artists from Europe and the United States.¹⁸⁹ All the artists selected for *Popa at Moma* – Clark, Oiticica, Li, Medalla, John Dugger and Graham Stevens – had been connected with Signals and continued to associate thereafter. The exhibition was heavily influenced by Brett's 1968 book *Kinetic Art*; Brett, who by the late 1960s was art critic for *The Times* and regularly reviewing MOMA exhibitions, also lent works for the show.¹⁹⁰ As Medalla wrote to Ibsen in January 1971, 'everybody i spoke to in london thinks it's a coup for moma oxford to stage the first show devoted entirely to part-art.'¹⁹¹

After a chaotic organisation period that drew in even Sir John Pope-Hennessy at the Arts Council, an exhibition spanning all three floors of the warehouse building opened for a Saturday evening preview on 13 February 1971.¹⁹² The works included touchable installations, large pneumatic structures, and wearable objects such as capes and masks designed to heighten awareness of the human body. Titles such as *Discover the Rainbow in Yourself* (Medalla) and *Canalisation of Psychic Energy*

¹⁸⁹ Isobel Whitelegg, 'Signals Echoes Traces', in *Oiticica in London*, ed. by Guy Brett and Luciano Figueiredo, (London: Tate Publishing, 2007).

¹⁹⁰ Guy Brett, *Kinetic Art*, (London: Studio-Vista, 1968). Brett's involvement is mentioned by John Dugger, 'In Paris with Lygia Clark', 2011, personal correspondence, 4 April 2012, After choosing the artists to take part in the final exhibition, artists whose work was previously solicited for inclusion, such as Gerald Hemsworth, Bart Philips, and Peter Hobbs, were disinvited by letter in winter 1970.

¹⁹¹ David Medalla, letter to Peter Ibsen, 20 January 1971, MAO Archive, box 'Oct 1970-Feb 1971' fol. 'Popa at Moma.'

¹⁹² Arts Council involvement with the exhibition is documented in the ACGB Archive, Blythe House, ACGB/29/38 (2 of 7).

(Dugger) recalled the language of New Age spirituality. The press release grandly announced ‘the first full survey of the latest movement in world art’; in lieu of a catalogue, the back of the large poster offered a theoretical statement that reprised the utopian political rhetoric of the ‘Art of the Id’ proposal, promising to remove ‘the barrier around the art object – the barren mystique which sets it in an unalterable mould.’¹⁹³ Medalla underscored the framework of emancipation in a handwritten statement printed on the front, ‘PARTicipation ART is opposed to TOTALitarian ART’, which implied newfound liberation from all conventions of artistic appreciation. [fig. 1.59] The local press printed an article that morning that quoted Powell-Jones as saying ‘part-art is the most successful at breaking down the museum-age barriers between the observer and the work of art.’¹⁹⁴ The exhibition included such germinal works of early participation art as Medalla’s *A Stitch in Time*, Lygia Clark’s *Air and Stone*, and Oiticica’s *Parangolés*.¹⁹⁵ [figs. 1.60-61] The artists were a notably diverse and international bunch: of the six, only Stevens was English, while the others were Brazilian, American, Chinese, and Philippino, a fact that was conspicuously highlighted on the preview card and in promotional materials.¹⁹⁶

¹⁹³ Museum of Modern Art Oxford, ‘Press release: Popa at Moma: Pioneers of Part-Art’, 1971, MAO Archive, box ‘Oct 1970-Feb 1971’ fol. ‘Popa at Moma.’

¹⁹⁴ Hutton, ‘Things to Wear, Jump On, Touch and Explore’.

¹⁹⁵ No complete list of the works in *Popa at Moma* exists in the archives but many are identifiable from photos or descriptions.

¹⁹⁶ MAO Archive, box ‘Oct 1970-Feb 1971’ fol. ‘Popa at Moma.’ It is possible that the birthplaces of these artists played into a taste among the 1960s underground for the ‘exotic.’ The developing world was often fetishised as ‘primitive’ and sometimes described as ‘the garden.’ In a revealing passage, Drower describes the interest of the Signals group (and the Exploding Galaxy theatre/performance collective that grew out of it) with the Venezuelan kinetic artist Jesús Rafael Soto: ‘As “beautiful people” we often stated that we were going back to ‘the garden’ – to a new Eden of our own making... Soto was unusual because he actually came from “the garden” and could effortlessly straddle the world worlds. We “beautiful people” wanted his kind of innocence’: *99 Balls Pond Road*, p. 12.

The largely undergraduate audience apparently took such statements at their word and, buoyed perhaps by the complimentary wine and the energising effects of bouncing on Graham Stevens' large inflatables, began to participate with works of art in ways unintended by their creators. Medalla and Dugger, who arrived to the exhibition three-quarters of an hour late, were indignant at what they saw. Medalla, a Buddhist, objected to the serving of wine at the preview and, according to the *Birmingham Post*, 'told the audience: "You are all Philistines. People should know how to treat works of art."' ¹⁹⁷ Although opinions differed as to the degree of real damage done, Dugger told journalists that he'd seen participants beating his works against a wall, adding 'I have not found this sort of reaction anywhere else but England and nowhere as violent as in Oxford.' ¹⁹⁸ Medalla and Dugger withdrew their works from the exhibition immediately, while Stevens pulled out the following day. Sensational headlines such as 'Art Preview Ends in Uproar' and 'Visitors Wreck Modern Art Show' appeared in local and national newspapers, the latter accompanied by a photograph of Medalla dressed only in a sarong, knee-deep in what appears to be piles of debris. ¹⁹⁹ [fig. 1.62] The publicity that the event attracted was without precedent in the museum's history, as the narrative potency of the events at *Popa at Moma* proved assimilable to a variety of narratives about the plight of modern culture. ²⁰⁰

¹⁹⁷ 'Visitors Wreck Modern Art Show', *Birmingham Post*, (15 February 1971).

¹⁹⁸ Dugger quoted in 'Art Preview Ends in an Uproar', *The Observer*, (14 February 1971), p. 3. A different degree of damage is described in Andrew Hutton, 'Artists Call Spectators Philistines - And Quit', *Oxford Mail*, (15 February 1971).

¹⁹⁹ 'Visitors Wreck Modern Art Show'.

²⁰⁰ One account of the opening of *Pneu Show* describes an event with similar features: 'At the opening of the exhibition there was a large invited audience, which included a party of students. These quickly became bored with the game of changing the light-level with whistles and shouts and started to clamber over and

Critic Anthony Everitt, who attended the opening, diagnosed ‘extraordinary goings-on’ in Oxford as a symptom of the tragic alienation between cutting-edge contemporary art and its suspicious public: ‘many of those present saw no connection between what was in front of them and what is generally believed to be art. And they took action accordingly.’²⁰¹ Another article in the same newspaper (for the *Birmingham Post* published a total of five pieces about the exhibition) only illustrated his point:

Could it not be said that the exhibition fairly sat up and begged for the sort of thing that happened to it? Could it not be that its patrons, confronted with the pseudo solemnities of plastic tubes and polythene bags, sensed that here, at last, was their opportunity to square their account with modern art...?²⁰²

Guy Brett and Caroline Tisdall both defended the intentions of the artists, describing the student crowd as ‘aggressive.’²⁰³ A similar tone was taken by *What’s On*, which asserted that the visitors ‘treat[ed] their work like the temporary (and

into the audience. Feeling obligated to put on a show for the audience and encouraged by the site of two strange figures (part of the exhibit) who swung above the parachutes on a trapeze, the students became increasingly boisterous and the organiser had to put an end to the proceedings. The involvement which had developed was such that, uninterrupted, the end would have been total destruction of the exhibit... a heated discussion ensued...’ Maurice Jay, ‘Light, Movement and Kinetic Art’, *Light and Lighting*, (February 1969). Jay’s description however is not corroborated by any other accounts of the preview and one gave quite a different picture of what would appear to be the same evening: ‘15 minutes and it had spent itself. Then the organiser of the “pneu” show, Jeffrey Shaw, turned off the lights and the air machine. All that was left were groups standing in the mist, analysing their experience’: Filson, ‘Come Into the Fog, Man and Grab a Handful of Art’. Whether these descriptions in fact pertain to different evenings or even different moments of the same exhibition is unclear.

²⁰¹ Anthony Everitt, ‘Popa at Moma: Pioneers of Part-Art’, *Birmingham Post*, (15 February 1971).

²⁰² ‘Over-involved’, *Birmingham Post*, (15 February 1971). The anonymous reporter compared the preview to a bust-up at Wolverhampton football match the same night, preferring the latter as at least ‘it came without the expectation of a grant of £120 of taxpayers’ money.’

²⁰³ Guy Brett, ‘Just a Few Hours of Participation’, *The Times*, (16 February 1971), p. 10; Caroline Tisdall, ‘Participation in Art’, *The Guardian*, (16 February 1971).

inexpensive) decorations provided for one's amusement at a College Ball.' (If the visitors did associate the works with party entertainments, it is not entirely surprising: Stevens had produced one of his inflatables for the winter ball at New College, Oxford, in 1969.²⁰⁴) Tisdall attributed the debacle to the insensitivities of upper-class men, describing the participants as 'Hooray Henrys' and accusing Legge and Powell-Jones, both from socially prominent English families, of seeking to 'promote their own egos as organisers of avant-garde activities.'²⁰⁵ The organisers responded with a letter to Tisdall's editor, noting that of the six artists only Dugger and Medalla had complained of their art being mistreated and that Dugger characterised the damage to his work as 'mainly psychological.'²⁰⁶ Another writer blamed the artists for constructing works of insufficient robustness.²⁰⁷ Li Yuan-Chia's *Environment*, for example, was largely made of white tissue, coloured paper and hanging discs with poems written on them, while the works by Medalla and Dugger were delicately constructed from similarly pliable materials ill-suited for rough use, such as thread, grains, elastic bands, and cloth.

In some cases, journalists exaggerated the extent of the mayhem through ignorance of the original works. Graham Stevens' inflated sculptures were not 'severely damaged by people jumping on them,' for this was their intended function, but suffered from technical difficulties with his blowers on the night of the opening.²⁰⁸

²⁰⁴ Personal communication from Graham Stevens, 24 July 2014.

²⁰⁵ Tisdall, 'Participation in Art'.

²⁰⁶ Rupert Legge and Mark Powell-Jones, 'Letter to the Editor', *The Guardian*, (17 February 1971) 1971).

²⁰⁷ 'Important Idea', *Oxford Mail*, (16 February 1971).

²⁰⁸ 'Visitors Wreck Modern Art Show'. The technical failings were not noted in any of the press coverage but were recalled in interviews with both Legge and Stevens. Legge recalls the spirited engagement of John Sparrow, Warden of All Soul's College, Oxford, with Stevens' pneumatic structures at the preview.

Similarly, what appears to be debris in press photographs of Medalla was in fact the chains and polythene that made up his work, *Down With The Slave Trade*, being dismantled by the artist. Legge and Dugger have both recently downplayed the recklessness of the participants, blaming the misunderstanding of a well-meaning crowd in the absence of the artists' instruction.²⁰⁹ It has even been speculated that Medalla planned to withdraw his works from the show to secure maximum personal publicity.²¹⁰ Despite the liberatory rhetoric of the exhibition, and the differences of interpretation by onlookers, there is no doubt that participation had taken on forms undesirable to some of the artists involved.

In her work on participation, art historian Claire Bishop has identified three main claims which have persisted from the 1960s to the present: that interaction empowers the spectator through the experience of physical involvement; that shared authorship is intrinsically more egalitarian than that of a single artist; and that it promotes community cohesion in an era of social fragmentation.²¹¹ These assumptions, especially the first, underpin many of the exhibitions discussed in this chapter, and were pushed to their limits in *Popa at Moma* in particular. If the promise of freedom held out by these shows could not be kept, what are the implications for our understanding of the playful museum?

²⁰⁹ Rupert Legge interview, (Bath, 16 November 2012). In email correspondence of 4 April 2014, Dugger elaborated 'I lay the blame for the closure on David Medalla who closed the show, not the organizers or the students.' If he felt Medalla's actions were unwarranted at the time, it is not clear why he too removed his art works from the exhibition.

²¹⁰ Antoinette Ibsen, interview 19 April 2012; Antoinette is the widow of Peter Ibsen.

²¹¹ Claire Bishop, 'Introduction: Viewers as Producers', in *Participation*, ed. by Bishop, (London: Whitechapel Art Gallery, 2006).

‘PLAY IS FUN. PLAY IS FREEDOM... Pure play has no rules,’ proclaimed Neville in typically unequivocal prose in his 1970 counterculture polemic, *Play Power*.²¹² His understanding of the ludic as a total absence of restriction figured strongly in *Popa at Moma*’s celebration of the id and in its subsequent, anarchic reception: there was a politically-motivated insistence that the audience could finally take control of works of art, in any manner that they pleased. It is typical of the Oxford museum’s progressive ethos that the organisers of the exhibition received remarkable support in encouraging visitors to contravene behavioural norms traditionally associated with the gallery setting. Indeed, when Dugger and Medalla turned up late to MOMA and withdrew their works, it was because they found the museum’s attitude *too* permissive towards its visitors (complaining that ‘people should know how to treat works of art’ Medalla sounds more like a connoisseurial museum keeper than a 1960s radical.) In an unusual alignment, the Arts Council also blamed Ibsen for exercising insufficient disciplinary oversight, noting internally that ‘such exhibitions which invite participation can naturally *if not properly controlled*... end in something of a shambles’ and considered revoking the exhibition’s grant.²¹³ What this exhibition dramatised was not the suppression of radical art in the institution nor the playful absence of rules, but the persistence of spectatorial norms even in their proclaimed absence. Although the ludic was associated by many of the participating artists with the lifting of ‘museum-age

²¹² Richard Neville, *Play Power*, (London: Jonathan Cape, 1970), p. 257, p. 275.

²¹³ Peter Bird, memorandum to Chairman, 16 February 1971, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (2 of 7). The money was ultimately not withdrawn, due in part to the influence of Guy Brett’s supportive review in the *Times*, but doubt was cast over Dugger’s suitability to take part in an upcoming Arts Council-organised exhibition, *Blow Up*, in light of his behaviour.

barriers between the observer and the work of art,' these boundaries shifted rather than disappeared, rendered visible in the moment of their transgression.²¹⁴

Sympathetic critics lamented the absence of a more 'sensitive', 'contemplative' public, by which they meant one more inclined to attune itself to the artists' own wishes.²¹⁵ Brett's review tried to argue that the artists brought together for *Popa at Moma* were not 'tyrannical,' unlike other artists who organised happenings, but rather encouraged the visitor to 'listen to himself.' While it is true that in the artists' absence the expectations of how the works were to be used may not have been clearly expressed, the didactic expectations embedded in the idea of 'listening to oneself' went unremarked.²¹⁶ In expecting an introspective and reverential engagement with their art, Dugger and Medalla were relying on precisely the conventions of museum reception that their rhetoric forswore. As with so many other playful exhibitions in Oxford and elsewhere, from *Space Place* onwards, there are tell-tale signs, material and discursive, that the practical expectations of ludic behaviour were in fact quite narrowly defined, in ways contrary to the ideological models that emphasised freedom and unpredictability.

In an article entitled 'Art and Play-Power: A New Philistinism?' published in the left-wing English magazine *Encounter* in the summer of 1971, critic Edward Lucie-Smith offered a broad critique of ludic and participatory art that connected *Popa at Moma* with the similar events that had recently taken place at the Tate during

²¹⁴ I explore this issue in more depth in "'Everything Was Getting Smashed": Three Case Studies of Play and Participation, 1965–71', *Tate Papers*, no. 22, (Autumn 2014), n.p.

²¹⁵ See Everitt, 'Popa at Moma' and Tisdall, 'Participation in Art'.

²¹⁶ Brett, 'Just a Few Hours of Participation'.

Robert Morris's exhibition (28 April-6 June).²¹⁷ With reference to the schism on the issue of leisure that Richard Neville had observed between the 'new' and 'old' Left, he described the therapeutic agenda of fun-filled, play-based culture as serving only to assuage feelings of frustration with the status quo, dissipating the energies needed to achieve political reform. Not only did he view such works as novel manifestations of mass-cultural kitsch, he associated the impulse to participation in art with commercial strategies to secure consumer attention:

In marketing, more particularly in the marketing of convenience foods, what the artist now calls 'participation' has long been known, more idiomatically but perhaps more accurately, as 'add-an-egg'. It has been discovered that the housewife buying a packaged cake-mix feels unconvinced of the quality of the end product because she achieves the desired result too easily. She is therefore instructed to add to the ready-made mix, before she bakes it, one additional, natural ingredient – a shell egg.²¹⁸

It is not necessary to agree with Lucie-Smith's conviction that participatory art forms are intrinsically palliative to find something acute in his analysis. Despite the recent resurgence of interest in interactive art practice, a meaningful artistic encounter and the bodily engagement of the spectator do not necessarily correlate. To avoid a misconception of play as a lawless sphere of freedom and authenticity, we need to develop a more nuanced understanding of its social, contextual, rule-

²¹⁷ *Robert Morris*, exh. cat., Tate Gallery, 28 April-6 June 1971. The exhibition has also been discussed in Maurice Berger, *Labyrinths: Robert Morris, Minimalism, and the 1960s*, (New York: Harper & Row, 1989); Jon Bird, 'Minding the Body: Robert Morris' 1971 Tate Gallery Retrospective', in *Rewriting Conceptual Art*, ed. by Michael Newman and Jon Bird, (Chicago: Reaktion Books, 1999), pp. 88-106; Taylor, *Art for the Nation*, pp. 229-230; Alex Potts, *The Sculptural Imagination: Figurative, Modernist, Minimalist*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), pp. 249-255.

²¹⁸ Edward Lucie-Smith, 'Art & Play-Power: A New Philistinism?', *Encounter*, vol. 37, no. 2, (August 1971), p. 59.

bound and performative aspects, which MOMA's 1960s exhibitions often exemplified.²¹⁹

Conclusion: A Gallery for Everyone

Let us build adventures, environments, mazes and gardens we can walk in and be reformed continuously of our fine vitality.²²⁰

Gandalf's Garden and the BBC's 'Plastic Grass' evoke very different kinds of natural spaces, and indeed the notion of the 'constructed garden' may be understood in many ways: was it a private garden or a public park, futurist or primitivist, a mystical wilderness or commercial astroturf? Such contradictions echo the dichotomy of hippies and technocrats often described by cultural historians of the decade: Frances Follin describes, for example, 'a collision between those who thought that science and technology would be the source of a better future for humanity, and those who rejected this in favour of a more 'people-centred', less materialistic future.'²²¹ In practice, however, these lines of distinction often disintegrate under closer inspection. Despite its idealistic, child-centred rhetoric, for example, *Space Place* was constructed from new synthetics donated by no fewer

²¹⁹ A similar point is made in Jacques Rancière, 'The Emancipated Spectator', *Artforum*, vol. 45, no. 7, (March 2007), pp. 272-280, in which he criticised the idea that spectatorship is inherently passive if the spectator does not 'participate' in the work.

²²⁰ Nuttall, *Bomb Culture*, p. 254.

²²¹ Frances Follin, *Embodied Visions: Bridget Riley, Op Art and the Sixties* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2004), p. 64. Similarly, Hewison argues that 'the counter-culture proved as much a fantasy as Harold Wilson's technological revolution. What is significant is that they are united by their mutual opposition to each other': *Too Much*, p. 82. Writing about the ICA in the late 1960s, Ben Cranfield has diagnosed 'an interest in technology, on one hand, and the desire for a "refusal" predicated on "liveness" and participation, on the other': Ben Cranfield, 'Students, Artists and the ICA: The Revolution Within', in *Sixties Radicalism and Social Movement Activism: Retreat or Resurgence?*, ed. by Bryn Jones and Mike O'Donnell, 2010), p. 113.

than three corporate sponsors; on a wider level, the welfare state that so often supported the hippie pursuit of leisure was a product of the economic boom supported by rapid technological progress.²²² And conversely, the most high-tech exhibitions at MOMA, such as those by Archigram and Eventstructure Research Group, were underpinned by utopian visions of emancipation and bodily pleasure. What united these arcadian fantasies, ultimately, was their sheer optimism: the belief that there were no limits to the social revolution underway, nor to art's ability to fuel it.

Marxist theorist Manfredo Tafuri's 1969 essay, 'Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology,' attacked the naivety he saw in contemporary theories of radical culture. He argued that culture's dependency on the capitalist regime rendered it incapable of engendering any true social change; he uses the word 'utopian' negatively to describe artists and architects unable to accept that they are part of the social system and not its undoing. Tafuri's trenchant critique offers a powerful contemporary counter-narrative to the Museum of Modern Art Oxford's aspirations, nowhere more so than his denunciation of the false consciousness propagated by metaphors of parks and forests when applied to urban design.²²³ For Tafuri, the recourse to natural metaphor serves to mystify – indeed, to naturalise – the economic and political contradictions and instabilities riddling the modern city.²²⁴

²²² Brake, *Comparative Youth Culture: The Sociology of Youth Cultures and Youth Subcultures in America, Britain, and Canada*, p. 92.

²²³ Manfredo Tafuri, 'Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology [1969]', in *Architecture Theory Since 1968*, ed. by K. Michael Hays, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1998), pp. 6-35.

²²⁴ 'What does it mean, on the ideological level, to liken the city to a natural object? ... the city is not interpreted as a structure that, with its mechanisms of accumulation, transforms the processes of land exploitation and agricultural and property revenues. As a phenomenon likened to a "natural" process, ahistorical

Something similar could be said of the museum-as-garden: the Edenic myth of paradise and harmony it offered was sometimes oblivious to fundamental tensions within the institution's activities, situated uncertainly between official and oppositional, promoting both progress and regress, atomistic self-revelation and ecstatic communality. The garden, after all, can also serve as an image of retreat from the messiness of politics and of activism into pure subjectivity. In spite of the democratic language surrounding them, the impact of these artworks seems to have been small and experienced by very few. Curiously, given the museum's claim to be 'a gallery for everyone,'²²⁵ Green was unapologetic, describing his approach to audiences in 1968 as 'an attitude of take it or leave it – we're doing something worthwhile and people can join in if they like.'²²⁶ Mostly, people did not: while attendance figures were kept only sporadically, the total number of visitors from January to June 1969 are under 2,000 (or an average of 390 per exhibition), of which approximately two-thirds were students.²²⁷ By September that year, the Council of Management was less nonchalant about visitor figures, which had fallen further to around ten each day. 'There is very little to report this month except a

because it is universal, the city is freed from any structural considerations whatsoever.' Ibid., 'Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology [1969]', p. 8. While in this passage Tafuri is interrogating the Enlightenment theory of Marc-Antoine Laugier and others, he also extends this analysis explicitly to 1960s avant-garde art and architecture through a concerted critique of Pierre Restany's 'Livre blanc de l'art total' (1968), which he considers representative of the ideas of 'the new avant-garde' and which indeed resonates strongly with MOMA's 1960s programming: he attacks as absurd Restany's assertion that art allied to new technology can make man "'*natural* again, having overcome all alienation'" without any substantive political or economic change, p. 30.

²²⁵ Robert de Bosmelet, 'A Gallery for Everyone: The Museum of Modern Art', *Cherwell*, (26 October 1966).

²²⁶ 'Showing It Off'.

²²⁷ Barry Lane, 'General Report and Proposals', 14 June 1969, MAO Archive, box 'Brian Jefferson Papers History of Modern Art' fol. 156.

serious lack of visitors' read the Secretary's Report, and behind the scenes MOMA's ethos and approach were under scrutiny.²²⁸

Barry Lane, who was by then in charge of the museum, advocated boosting attendance through free entrance and more evening events such as lectures and happenings.²²⁹ He had organised performances by counterculture figures such as the Exploding Galaxy, the Boyle Family, John ('Hoppy') Hopkins, Peter Zinovieff, the Oxford Progressive Theatre Group, and others, and founded the 'New Cinema Club of Oxford' in the basement to screen avant-garde films ('we had more people coming through the door for the programme than we did for the exhibitions,' he remembers of his 'good radical stuff.')²³⁰ [fig. 1.63] Others on the Council took a different approach: one argued that it was the 'content and quality' of MOMA's exhibitions that were at fault, and that the museum needed to refocus on more prestigious material. In spite of the museum's founding commitment to young artists and cross-media experiment, and Lane's enthusiasm for a broadened field of visual culture, 'major shows' were needed to fill the Upper and Middle galleries, while 'graphics, furniture, prints, textile designs etc. even paintings by younger unknown artists' should be confined to the basement, where they 'would not reflect on the reputation of the Museum which should come from the more serious exhibitions on the upper floors.'²³¹

²²⁸ Brian Jefferson, 'Secretary's Report to the Council,' 30 September 1969, MAO Archive, box 'Brian Jefferson Papers History of Modern Art' fol. 156.

²²⁹ Lane, 'General Report and Proposals', 14 June 1969.

²³⁰ Ibid., interview 2013.

²³¹ Brian Jefferson, 'Secretary's Report', August 1969, MAO Archive, box 'Brian Jefferson's Papers History of Modern Art' fol. 156. A Council resolution was passed to accede to this plan in August, which may have hastened Lane's departure: Minutes of the Council of Management, 28 August 1969, MAO Archive, Minute Book.

Such internal conflicts were not readily resolved, and in the meantime a large proportion of the museum's programming continued to offer a hedonistic celebration of culture, freedom and the sensuous body that was perhaps best appreciated by the museum's ideal visitor, the privileged white male undergraduate who, like the fictional Charles Ryder at Oxford before him, may have found his way briefly through 'that low door in the wall... which opened on an enclosed and enchanted garden.'²³² [fig. 1.64]

²³² Evelyn Waugh, *Brideshead Revisited: The Sacred & Profane Memories of Captain Charles Ryder*, (London: Chapman & Hall, 1945), p. 29.

CHAPTER TWO

Breathtakingly Benevolent: The Peter Stuyvesant Foundation and the Idea of a Permanent Collection, 1965-74

Introduction: Collecting at the Museum of Modern Art

The metaphor of the museum-as-garden that weaves through the Museum of Modern Art's programming in the 1960s conjures a utopian image of the institution as a place of pleasure, escape and the new; it was a notion riven with internal contradictions and one that, as I have demonstrated, could only ever be partially realised. During this period, Director Trevor Green also nursed another, lesser-known notion of what his museum ought to be. His vision of a permanent collection stands in marked contrast to both the garden concept and the direction that the organisation has taken ever since. He was tactical in his discussions of it, claiming in an appeal for money to collector Peggy Guggenheim that 'the main thing is the permanent collection,' while playing it down in subsequent Arts Council applications and interviews with the student press, in which he claimed that the museum's primary commitment was to experimental, non-commercial exhibitions by young artists.²³³ There was an obvious tension in the simultaneous pursuit of such different goals: the idea of the permanent collection that he cherished during his directorship was clearly at odds with the countercultural ethos that came to

²³³ Trevor Green, letter to Peggy Guggenheim, 8 November 1965, MAO Archive, box 001 fol. 'MOMA History'; no response has been found. Meanwhile, accounts of the museum given elsewhere omit reference to the collection or very much downplay its importance. See for example *Ibid.*, 'Statement of Policy', 5 September 1967; Nick Purcell, 'Something of a Godsend', 1967, MAO Archive, MOMA 1960s press cuttings file; 'Showing It Off'.

characterise the museum. It had a radicalism of its own, however, and was marked by extraordinary ambition and opportunism.

MOMA's founding, in 1965, aroused the excitement that it did in large part because it was heralded as England's first dedicated modern art museum, intending to emulate its New York namesake's huge collection of twentieth-century art and design.²³⁴ Like the original short-term premises in King Edward Street, the converted brewery in Pembroke Street was intended for temporary use only: by 1970, Green predicted in his 'Preliminary Development Plan,' MOMA would have a newly erected building on a much larger scale. Phase 3, as it was called, was hugely ambitious, comprising comprehensive collections of twentieth-century painting, sculpture, architecture and design, photography, drawings, and films, each with their own permanent galleries. The building he envisaged was 64,000 square feet (in contrast to Pembroke Street's existing 11,000) and contained a library, cinema, lecture and seminar rooms, accommodation for visiting fellows, a bookstore, and a café. The cost of this plan was given as £1,263,600, based on a projected endowment of £580,000 and an additional £683,600 for building costs, but there is no detailed breakdown of the projected expenditure and one suspects it may have been based on a very loose and inexperienced estimate by Green.²³⁵ Certainly the Arts Council was not impressed by the figures. 'I have read the estimates and

²³⁴ For example, 'Museum of Modern Art Oxford', *Arts Review*, (August 1966). Green also made the claim that it was the first such museum at the beginning of his 'Preliminary Development Plan', March 1966, p. 1. Calls for a modern art museum, particularly in London, grew alongside interest in contemporary art in 1960s England, and were bolstered by the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation's activities and the Tate Gallery's *Painting and Sculpture of a Decade '54-'64* retrospective. These are discussed alongside previous postwar attempts to found an art museum in Andrew Stephenson, 'Painting and Sculpture of a Decade '54-'64 Revisited', *Art History*, vol. 35, no. 2, (April 2012), pp. 420-441.

²³⁵ 'Preliminary Development Plan', pp. 6-7.

account of the Museum of Modern Art and find them wildly impractical,' wrote Regional Art Officer Katherine Kinnear in an internal report in spring 1966. 'There is no mention of any firm backing from reliable sources,' she noted, and neither were exhibitions and acquisitions accounted for in the current budget. She concluded that it would be 'dangerous' for the Arts Council to invest too heavily in the museum: until the Director 'proved his worth,' he should be given only a token £200 grant.²³⁶ Eventually, a sum of £750 was apportioned for 1966-7²³⁷ and although the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation also gave £5000, this was designated for improvements to the Pembroke Street building and the purchase of basic equipment only, rather than exhibitions or a collection.²³⁸ (By contrast, the Tate Gallery received an unprecedentedly generous £250,000 from Gulbenkian the same year for its new extension.)²³⁹ The BBC *Third Programme* interview with Green in autumn 1966 featured the following exchange, revealing in its awkwardness:

Forge: Can you give any idea of the size of your purchasing grant or what you think it might be?

Green: Well we haven't got a purchasing grant at the moment.

Forge: You haven't got one at all.

²³⁶ Kinnear, memorandum to Gabriel White, 7 April 1966.

²³⁷ Ibid., memorandum to Antony Field, 13 June 1967, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (2 of 7), fol. 65/72 'Oxford: Museum of Modern Art 1965-72'.

²³⁸ 'In the first month of being open, a girl came in, who was sort of interested in it, and she said I'll get my boyfriend to come in and have a look. Her boyfriend's father was the Director of the Gulbenkian Foundation, which had quite a lot of money to give to things like this... it was early days, within a month of two of opening and we had some quite interesting paintings there... this chap came in... and looked around and talked to me and as he was going he said "we don't *usually* solicit applications but if you write in to me then we will be able to do something for you."' Green, interview 2013. That spring, MOMA applied to the Gulbenkian for a lump sum of £65,000 plus a £25,000 annual stipend with which to buy works for the collection: 'Meeting of the Museum of Modern Art Limited,' 1 April 1966, MAO Archive, Minute Book. Details of how the £5000 Gulbenkian grant was used are documented in Trevor Green, 'Director's Report on the use of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation Grant for furniture and equipment', March 1969.

²³⁹ Spalding, *The Tate: A History*, p. 162.

Green: No.²⁴⁰

Who, then, was expected to fund an institution on this proposed scale? During his tenure as Director, Trevor Green pinned his hopes on the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation (PSF), an offshoot of the eponymous cigarette company founded in 1963 on the recommendation of its public relations agents, Frank O'Shanohun Associates.²⁴¹ Heralded by the *Times* as 'the most tangible evidence of a new kind of patronage in England'²⁴² during a period in which corporate sponsorship as we know it today was in its infancy and was not yet underwritten by tax deductions, the PSF became the UK's largest and most prominent corporate programme of cultural patronage that decade.²⁴³ Bryan Robertson went so far as to call its work 'the most remarkable achievement in the patronage of modern British art this century', albeit he did so in the pages of a 1971 corporate publication.²⁴⁴ Its support, commencing

²⁴⁰ Forge and Green, 'Space-Place at Oxford', 5 December 1966 p. 8. *Third Programme* was a BBC radio network with a broadly cultural remit that aired from 1946-1970.

²⁴¹ Alan Kimber, letter to Bryan Robertson, 19 June 1963, Whitechapel Art Gallery Archive, WAG/EXH/2/95/1. Published scholarship about the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation is limited. I am indebted to the key text on the subject: Simon Faulkner, 'Art, Cigarettes and Visual Culture in the Sixties: the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation and the 'New Generation' Exhibitions, 1964-66', *Visual Culture in Britain*, vol. 1, no. 1, (2000), pp. 65-87. However, this focuses on the Whitechapel exhibitions rather than the collection, and additional archival research at MAO and Tate Britain has generated fresh primary material upon which the interpretations in this chapter draw.

²⁴² 'Industry as Art Patron', *The Times*, (1 December 1965), p. 15.

²⁴³ This assertion is often made in the contemporary literature, such as Edward Lucie-Smith, 'Art and Industry - the Need for a New Relationship', *The Times*, (5 April 1966), p. 13, and is reiterated in Deanna Petherbridge, 'Special Supplement: Patronage and Sponsorship: the PS at the Bottom of the Art Balance Sheet', *Art Monthly*, no. 38, (1980), p. 9. For her extensive discussion of the evolution of corporate patronage in this country, see also Chin-Tao Wu, *Privatising Culture: Corporate Art Intervention Since the 1980s*, (London: Verso, 2002), which notes the PSF's 1960s work as an important forerunner of the modern business sponsorship culture which emerged in the 1980s.

²⁴⁴ Lord Robbins et al., *Adventure in Art: An International Group of Art Collections in Industrial Environments*, (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1971), p. 166.

with 1964's *New Generation* exhibition at the Whitechapel Art Gallery, was largely concentrated on the visual arts but also extended to classical music.²⁴⁵ Alongside four *New Generation* exhibitions and their national tours, it also supported exhibitions including the series *Young Contemporaries* and *Northern Young Contemporaries*, and amassed a large art collection.

MOMA was among the key recipients of its mid-sixties largesse: a small early exhibition at King Edward Street, *New Sculpture* (31 May-25 June 1966), was dominated by Stuyvesant loans, and major paintings by David Hockney and Patrick Caulfield were also borrowed in 1966 to add weight to the museum's small but developing 'collection' of loans and promised gifts.²⁴⁶ [fig. 2.1] Significantly, the museum's first exhibition at Pembroke Street, *New Generation*, was a PSF project,

Robertson, who had helped to initiate the PSF's activities through his proposals for the Whitechapel Gallery of which he was then Director, was one of its most important beneficiaries both personally and professionally.

²⁴⁵ 'Patronising - Who Cares?', *The Observer*, (20 February 1966), p. 23.

²⁴⁶ Museum of Modern Art, *New Sculpture 1966*, exh. cat., MOMA, 1966. Four of the seven sculptures in the show, all large abstract works by male sculptors, were loaned by the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation, which although it did not seriously collect sculpture, had acquired some pieces from the sculpture-based 1965 *New Generation* exhibition which it sponsored. The loaned paintings were Hockney's *Rocky Mountains and Tired Indians* (1965) and Caulfield's *View of the Chimneys* (1964). Trevor Green selected his preferred loans from a private publication distributed to many provincial galleries: see Peter Stuyvesant Foundation and Alan Bowness, *Peter Stuyvesant Foundation: A Collection in the Making - 1965 Purchases*, exh. cat., Whitechapel Art Gallery, 1965. In a letter to Justin Knowles of the PSF, 9 December 1965, Green wrote in reference to the catalogue, 'We'd be very keen to have paintings by Blake and Harold Cohen. We would also be very glad to have Donaldson, particularly no. 16, Wells and Caulfield. Somewhat less keen, but still happy with the following: Huxley, Moon, Jack Smith and Wynter. Of the painters not available on your list but which we badly want if any do become available are: Riley, Boshier, Richard Smith and Jaray... we've kept this to the younger ones mostly but any works by the older painters would be of very great interest also...'

as the cover of its catalogue proudly declared.²⁴⁷ [fig. 2.2] The Foundation paid for the exhibition's transport and catalogue and funded half the costs of the opening, a very significant contribution especially in light of the museum's parlous financial situation that year.²⁴⁸ Indeed, it was 'the Directors of the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation' as well as the museum's council who formally requested the pleasure of attendance at the preview, which doubled as the opening of MOMA itself.²⁴⁹ [fig. 2.3] 'Whisky, gin and Stuyvesant cigarettes were in abundance on Tuesday when the Museum of Modern Art opened its new premises in Pembroke Street,' wrote the student newspaper *Cherwell*; the distribution of free products, 'much against the regulations of the building inspector' as Green commented recently, ensured that the new museum and its art were viewed through a haze of carefully branded smoke.²⁵⁰ All of this support, however, was trifling in comparison with the prize that the museum was privately pursuing: the donation of the entire Peter Stuyvesant Foundation collection. In May 1966 Green was writing 'in confidence of the informal offer of the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation Ltd to present its collection of contemporary British art to the museum.'²⁵¹ The following year, PSF Director Michael Kaye confirmed their provisional agreement:

I do confirm that we are still most interested in the Museum as a permanent home for the Collection and if your plans mature as you hope there would

²⁴⁷ Peter Stuyvesant Foundation, Whitechapel Art Gallery, and Robert Hughes, *The New Generation: 1966*, exh. cat., Whitechapel Art Gallery, 1966. During the tour, the gallery's name was not printed on the catalogue cover but indicated merely with a slip-on paper band.

²⁴⁸ 'Meeting of the Museum of Modern Art Limited', 5 August 1966, MAO Archive, Minute Book.

²⁴⁹ MAO Archive, box 'MOMA 1966-1967' fol. 'Oct/Nov 1966 New Generation.'

²⁵⁰ de Bosmelet, 'A Gallery for Everyone: The Museum of Modern Art'; Green, interview 2013.

²⁵¹ *Ibid.*, letter to Christopher Rye, Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, 2 May 1966, MAO Archive box 001 'MOMA History' fol. 'Calouste Gulbenkian'.

seem to be no reason why this should not come about, subject to certain fundamental conditions...²⁵²

In December 1967, an allusion to the plan was published in *Studio International*. Critic David Thompson commented discreetly that the collection 'is probably destined eventually (although plans are not yet settled) for permanent loan to a provincial gallery, with the right to re-exhibit it at specified intervals.'²⁵³

However likely the gift looked in the museum's early years, it was never finalised. The Museum of Modern Art was not, in the event, refashioned as a permanent tribute to the Peter Stuyvesant company's mid-sixties marketing efforts; indeed, it never really became a museum at all. But although the transfer of Stuyvesant's unusual collection did not ultimately transpire, mutual enthusiasm for the idea reveals much about perceptions of the institution from within and without. Why did the upstart Museum of Modern Art Oxford seem an advantageous repository for a corporate collection 'worth between sixty and a hundred thousand pounds' at a time when the institution itself had only £750 to cover its costs for the year?²⁵⁴ And to what extent could the museum sustain its emerging 'alternative' identity when entangled with such a controversial corporation?

²⁵² Michael Kaye, letter to Trevor Green, 19 July 1967, MAO Archive, box 001 'MOMA History' fol. 'Original and Permanent Collection and Loan Collection'.

²⁵³ David Thompson, 'Recent British Painting: The Stuyvesant Collection', *Studio International*, vol. 174, no. 895, (December 1967), p. 256.

²⁵⁴ Green, letter to Christopher Rye, Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, 2 May 1966.

Rothmans and Contemporary Art

Peter Stuyvesant was one of a portfolio of cigarette companies controlled in the UK by Carreras Rothmans. The brand was created by Dr. Anton Rupert, founding Director of the Rembrandt Tobacco Corporation, in South Africa in 1954, and licensed for overseas production to companies such as Rothmans.²⁵⁵ The British Peter Stuyvesant Foundation was inspired in part by the pioneering scheme developed by the Dutch makers of Peter Stuyvesant cigarettes. Beginning in spring 1960, the Turmac cigarette factory at Zevenaar in the Netherlands was decorated with a collection of large, contemporary abstract paintings – chosen according to a theme of ‘*joie de vivre*’ – which hung back-to-back, suspended from the ceilings of the production halls above the heads of workers and the machines.²⁵⁶ [fig. 2.4] Many were commissioned specially for the site and younger painters featured heavily among those chosen by the factory’s Director Alexander Orlow and his eminent art advisors. The collection, which did not remain permanently in the factory but was toured extensively around the world, attracted a great deal of positive publicity. Sir Herbert Read, founder of the Institute of Contemporary Arts in London, wrote in glowing terms of the experiment’s ability to reconcile man to modernity through the introduction of beauty to the otherwise unfulfilling sites of Fordist industrial production. In his rhapsodic essay for the Turmac collection’s

²⁵⁵ Andrew Meldrum, ‘Anton Rupert: Obituary’, *The Guardian*, (23 January 2006); Alex J. Taylor, ‘Forms of Persuasion: Art and Business in the 1960s’, (DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 2014), section 2.1; British American Tobacco (South Africa), ‘Our History’, 9 May 2013, <http://www.batsa.co.za/group/sites/BAT_7N3ML8.nsf/vwPagesWebLive/DO7N5JZ4?opendocument&SKN=1>, [accessed 23 July 2013].

²⁵⁶ Cees Foet and Sotheby’s Amsterdam, “‘A Fifty-Year Adventure in Art’: Sotheby’s to Sell ‘The Former Peter Stuyvesant Collection’ 1960-2010”, Sotheby’s press release, 16 December, 2009, <http://www.batartventure.com/uk/download/persbericht_15.pdf>, [accessed 25 February 2013].

1962 showing at the Stedelijk Museum, he described the Stuyvesant-inspired ‘factory of the future’ in utopian terms as a return to the *Gesamtkunstwerk* principles of the great medieval cathedrals, ‘a great symphony of colour and form... spiritual not worldly, ideal not practical.’²⁵⁷

Worldly concerns were, however, hardly absent from the Dutch collection and the cultural activities of its English offspring. As art historian Simon Faulkner has observed, cigarette smoking was officially declared unsafe in the landmark 1962 report published by the Royal College of Physicians.²⁵⁸ *Smoking and Health* was unequivocal in connecting tobacco to premature death and declared that ‘general discouragement of smoking, particularly by young people, is necessary’ on the part of the government.²⁵⁹ Noting the ‘steep increase in expenditure on advertisements of tobacco goods’ in recent years, particularly those aimed at the young, the report recommended new legislation to limit cigarette advertising. Sales dropped that year, and restrictions on television advertising swiftly followed, concentrating initially on ads that appeared to target children and young men.²⁶⁰

In response, PR expert Alan Kimber created the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation (‘the address and telephone number will be that of our clients, as I cannot see any

²⁵⁷ Sir Herbert Read, ‘Preface’, in *Peter Stuyvesant Collectie*, exhibition catalogue, Stedelijk Museum, 18 January-12 February 1962, n.p.

²⁵⁸ Faulkner, ‘Art, Cigarettes and Visual Culture in the Sixties’, p. 68.

²⁵⁹ *Smoking and Health: A Report of The Royal College of Physicians on Smoking in Relation to Cancer of the Lung and Other Diseases*, (London: Royal College of Physicians 1962), ‘Summary’, p. 7.

²⁶⁰ To curb the youth appeal of smoking, television advertising was banned from children’s programmes and the adverts were no longer allowed to feature anyone under the age of 21. Ads ‘which associated smoking with “manliness” and romance’ were also prohibited in an attempt to staunch the rise in young male smokers. An outright ban on television cigarette marketing in the UK was declared in 1965: Faulkner, p. 68.

practical alternative,' he lamented) in order to provide a more publicly acceptable form of marketing.²⁶¹ For the next four years, it was to spend about £70,000 a year on cultural patronage projects. £40,000 of this money was earmarked for contemporary art, within which there were two main projects: the sponsoring of exhibitions and the acquisition of a collection.²⁶²

From 1964 to 1968, the Foundation partnered with the chronically underfunded Whitechapel to conceive and sponsor a series of exhibitions. 'There can be no doubt of our responsibility for protecting future generations' from cigarettes, stated the Royal College of Physicians.²⁶³ The Peter Stuyvesant Foundation answered in 1964, 1965, 1966 and 1968 with *New Generation*, a prize competition and exhibition that demonstrated a public-spirited concern for young artists at the same time as it was calculated to appeal to young smokers. The scheme, said Kimber of Frank O'Shanohun Associates in a memo, 'has all the ingredients: art, youth (but not too

²⁶¹ Kimber, letter to Bryan Robertson, 19 June 1963.

²⁶² These figures appear in 'Patronising - Who Cares?'. I have been unable to locate an archive for the PSF or Frank O'Shanohun Associates which would document the Foundation's expenditure after 1968, when they evidently stopped collecting and ended the *New Generation* series. Their sponsorship activities continued in reduced form, and their last major project was 1972's *City Sculpture*, which commissioned new works from young sculptors for urban spaces around the UK: Peter Stuyvesant Foundation, Michael Kaye, and Jeremy Rees, *City Sculpture: A Special Issue of Studio International*, (Chatham: Mackay, 1972). The collection was dispersed in the mid-1970s and a 1980 article notes that 'Stuyvesant art sponsorship was severely curtailed in the mid-'70s when business was bad, but today sponsors certain musical events': Petherbridge, 'Special Supplement: Patronage and Sponsorship: the PS at the Bottom of the Art Balance Sheet', p. 9. The declining relationship between the Foundation and the Whitechapel, under new Director Mark Glazebrook (1969-71) is documented in an illuminating correspondence with PSF Director Michael Kaye: Whitechapel Art Gallery Archive, WAG/DIR/3/6. Kaye was a trustee of the Whitechapel until 1971; he left the PSF in 1976 to manage the London Symphony Orchestra.

²⁶³ *Smoking and Health*, 'Summary', p. 7.

young), and internationalism.²⁶⁴ As a ‘premium’ cigarette, the implied affinity with the elite cultural values of modernist art offered a class-based cachet, while the travel scholarships awarded to competition winners resonated with the glamorous jet-set image cultivated by the Peter Stuyvesant slogan, ‘the international passport to smoking pleasure,’ and its aeronautical iconography.²⁶⁵ [fig. 2.5] The project was also distinctive: its only real English precedent was the biennial John Moores Painting Prize in Liverpool, founded in 1957 by the maker of Littlewoods.²⁶⁶

The Peter Stuyvesant Foundation Collection

The Peter Stuyvesant brand was licensed and the cigarettes manufactured by a number of different companies in different markets, and so-called ‘Stuyvesant’ collections were owned by different companies. A number of these individual collections were toured in Britain by the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation, including one of modern Italian bronzes and another of Herman Josef’s drawings of labourers. Despite appearances, these evidently did not belong to Rothmans and were exhibited under the name of the UK Foundation ‘for the sake of tidiness.’²⁶⁷ In the

²⁶⁴ The stipulation ‘not too young’ refers presumably to the reputational risk of being perceived to target the underage. Alan Kimber, ‘Rothmans of Pall Mall Call Report’, 13 May 1963, Whitechapel Art Gallery Archive, WAG/EXH/2/95/1, n.p.

²⁶⁵ Faulkner, ‘Art, Cigarettes and Visual Culture in the Sixties’, p. 76.

²⁶⁶ Hugh Scrutton, ‘Industrial Sponsorship of Art Exhibitions’, in *Patron: Industry Supports the Arts*, ed. by Alan Osborne, (London: The Connoisseur, 1966).

²⁶⁷ Michael Kaye, letter to Norman Reid, Lilian Somerville and Alan Bowness, 17 April 1967, Tate Archive, TC92/208/1. See *Peter Stuyvesant Foundation presents its collection of Josef Herman Drawings*, exh. cat., Oxford University Press, Ely House, 29 June-29 September 1967; *Scultura Italiana*, meanwhile, was shown at the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool (July 1964), Laing Art Gallery, Newcastle (September 1964), Ulster Museum (November 1964), Whitworth Art Gallery, Manchester (December 1964-January 1965), King’s Lynn Festival (July 1965) and Glynn Vivian Gallery, Swansea (October 1965), as well as locations in France, Belgium, South Africa and Rhodesia between 1964 and 1968. Other touring

service of the commercial fiction of a globally unified brand, it could be advantageous for affiliated companies share not only advertising slogans but also an art-based approach to marketing and corporate philanthropy, even touring collections in each other's regions.²⁶⁸ Despite the ostensible connection to these overseas collections, the UK Peter Stuyvesant Foundation's principal collecting activity lay firmly in the field of British painting post-1950, with an emphasis on the 1960s; it was this collection that MOMA was pursuing, and upon which the PSF spent £75,000 between 1964 and 1967.²⁶⁹ The collection was designed along exceptionally innovative lines, both in the scale and professionalism of the undertaking and in its public nature, intended for permanent exhibition rather than conventional private display in corporate headquarters.²⁷⁰

Taking its cue perhaps from the heavyweight advisory committee assembled for Turmac,²⁷¹ the Foundation recruited Alan Bowness, lecturer at the Courtauld

collections associated with the Peter Stuyvesant brand in the 1960s included *Rodin and his Contemporaries*, *Art of the Space Age*, and *Contemporary French Tapestry*, although these were not shown in Britain. Lord Robbins et al., *Adventure in Art*, pp. 221-224.

²⁶⁸ Those licensing the Peter Stuyvesant brand were members of the International Group of Cigarette factories, a collection of 26 independent manufacturers around the world; this is presumably the 'International Group' somewhat vaguely alluded to in *Ibid.*, *Adventure in Art*. The business arrangements are discussed in Taylor, 'Forms of Persuasion', p. 170.

²⁶⁹ Bryan Robertson, 'Recent British Painting' in *Adventure in Art*, p. 166.

²⁷⁰ For more on the history of art in corporate offices, see Wu, *Privatising Culture*, chapter eight; Rosanne Martorella, *Corporate Art*, (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1990).

²⁷¹ Dr. H. L. Swart (Director of the Netherlands Art Foundation), Willem Sandberg (Director of the Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam) and British critic and exhibition organiser Lawrence Alloway are cited by Charles Spencer, 'The Peter Stuyvesant Collection: Paintings While You Work', *The Studio*, vol. 165, no. 837, (January 1963), p. 18. Recent archival research in the records of the Dutch company suggests that Sandberg and Alloway were only tangentially involved, whatever Spencer's article suggests. Sandberg's first name is mistakenly given in the article as 'Carl': Taylor, 'Forms of Persuasion', p. 175.

Institute, Lilian Somerville, Director of Fine Arts at the British Council, and Norman Reid, new Director of the Tate Gallery. These three were given sole discretion over the spending of the allowance, within the PSF guidelines detailed below. This autonomy, along with their names and institutional positions, was trumpeted at every opportunity to add credence to the Foundation's purchases. After all, as art critic David Thompson put it, these three 'could hardly have closer connections with the three "official" bodies already most active in the field' of modern art collecting.²⁷² In addition to their principal responsibilities, Bowness and Reid sat during this period on the Arts Council Art Panel, the Contemporary Art Society's Executive Committee, and the Fine Arts Committee of the British Council;²⁷³ Bowness also joined Somerville on the selection committee for the British Pavilion at the Venice Biennale in 1962, 1964, and 1966.²⁷⁴ Each of the seven painters selected for inclusion at Venice during this period also had work bought for the Stuyvesant Collection, and a number of the same works appeared in both: in a symbiotic arrangement, the Foundation both purchased from and loaned to the Pavilion.²⁷⁵ All ten of the painters in the British Council-organised *Jeunes*

²⁷² Thompson, 'Recent British Painting: The Stuyvesant Collection', p. 253: he is referring to the Arts Council, the British Council, and the Tate.

²⁷³ Angela Summerfield, 'Interventions: Twentieth-Century Art Collection Schemes and their Impact on Local Authority Art Gallery and Museum Collections of Twentieth-Century Art in Britain', (PhD thesis, City University, London, 2007), p. 10 and p. 62.

²⁷⁴ 'British Pavilion in Venice: Timeline', <<http://venicebiennale.britishcouncil.org/timeline>>, [accessed 23 July 2013].

²⁷⁵ These painters were Ceri Richards, Roger Hilton, Gwyther Irwin, Joe Tilson, Bernard Cohen, Harold Cohen, Robyn Denny and Richard Smith. Richards' *La Cathedrale Engloutie* (1960-2), Irwin's *Quintet* (1962), Tilson's *Vox Box* (1963) and Harold Cohen's *Consul* (1965) were all purchased after their Venice showing. Bernard Cohen's *Fable* (1963) and Richard Smith's *Gift Wrap* (1963) are credited in the catalogue as loans from the PSF: *British Pavilion XXXIII Venice Biennale 1966: 5 Young British Artists*, exh. cat., British Council, 1966.

Peintres Anglais in Brussels in 1967 had been purchased for the PSF collection,²⁷⁶ and of the 39 artists represented in the collection at the end of 1965, 27 were already in the Tate Gallery.²⁷⁷

The committee was recruited with the generous initial promise of £20,000 a year to spend on works of art over a two-year period. Unlike Bryan Robertson, they did not receive formal remuneration for their services; Somerville and Reid, at least, were prohibited from doing so by the terms of their employment.²⁷⁸ ('As members of the Purchasing Committee are holding distinguished public positions in the British Art establishment,' noted the PSF's internal 'Outline Recommendations for the Formation of a Collection of Contemporary British Art,' 'it would be unwise to offer direct remuneration for their services.'²⁷⁹) They received instead an annual allowance of £300 per year to purchase for themselves artwork of their choice, along with assurances that the Tate and British Council would have first right of refusal over any works purchased for the Stuyvesant collection. 'I need hardly say', wrote Reid in a letter to the Treasury querying the acceptability of this gift, 'that our advice has been freely given to help the formation of this collection which seemed

²⁷⁶ These painters were Peter Blake, Patrick Caulfield, Harold and Bernard Cohen, Hockney, John Hoyland, Allen Jones, Richard Smith, Bridget Riley and Joe Tilson. See Lisa Tickner, "'Export Britain": Pop Art, Mass Culture and the Export Drive', *Art History*, vol. 35, no. 2, (April 2012), p. 402.

²⁷⁷ Summerfield, 'Interventions', p. 67. A number of purchases were also made from the Tate's Gulbenkian-sponsored exhibition, organised by Alan Bowness, Laurence Gowing, and Philip James. These were Roger Hilton, *The Aral Sea* (1958), Peter Lanyon, *Wreck* (1963), Patrick Heron, *Blue November Painting* (1963) and Frank Auerbach, *Head of E O E IV* (1961): *Painting and Sculpture of a Decade '54-'64*, exh. cat., Tate Gallery, April-June 1964. See also Stephenson, 'Painting and Sculpture of a Decade '54-'64 Revisited', pp. 420-441.

²⁷⁸ Bryan Robertson, letter to Alan Kimber, 26 November 1963, Whitechapel Art Gallery Archive, WAG/EXH/2/95/1.

²⁷⁹ 'Peter Stuyvesant Foundation Limited: Outline Recommendations for the Formation of a Collection of Contemporary British Art', December 1964, Tate Archive, TG 2/5/6/1.

the sort of support to living artists which we should very much like to encourage.’²⁸⁰

For Reid, as for Somerville in Venice, the main financial benefits of the association with Rothmans were professional rather than private: the Tate received major sponsorship for its exhibitions *British Sculpture in the Sixties* (25 February-4 April 1965) and *Young Contemporaries* (27 January-19 February 1967) [fig. 2.6], as well as *Recent British Painting from the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation* (15 November-22 December 1967).²⁸¹

The works chosen were restricted to painting, which was the Foundation’s primary interest from the outset, with the promise of a second sculpture collection to be begun around 1966: the latter never materialised in any significant form. A decision was also made by the PSF to limit acquisitions to British art. This had the advantages, it was argued, of being less expensive than ‘a worthwhile collection of foreign or even just European Modern Painting,’ more easily obtainable, and of generating ‘a more direct impact and appeal to the British people’ by appealing to their sense of national pride.²⁸² (So determined was the Foundation to preserve its

²⁸⁰ Norman Reid, letter to Sir Laurence Helsby, HM Treasury, 31 August 1965, Tate Archive, TG 2/5/6/1; see also Sir Laurence Helsby, letter to Norman Reid, 14 September 1965, Tate Archive, TG 2/5/6/1. Eventually Reid chose to accept only one gift for his three years of assistance, a painting by Sylvia Hartman costing £50.

²⁸¹ Reid’s position on corporate sponsorship evidently evolved over his fifteen years as Director of the Tate (1964-1979). In 1980 he commented that the Tate ought to be ‘completely independent. Sponsors, in the nature of things, are looking for a return on their investment which means that exhibitions are conceived as a scintillating spectacle, something falsely glamorous to bring in the audiences. It is not in the nature of our exhibitions to be that.’ The article notes that Reid had recently declined two exhibitions proposed by cigarette makers; one of them, designed to complement launch of a new cigarette, was declined without Reid needing to consult the trustees: Petherbridge, ‘Special Supplement: Patronage and Sponsorship: the PS at the Bottom of the Art Balance Sheet’, p. 16.

²⁸² ‘Outline Recommendations’, December 1964. The emphasis on Britishness sits slightly at odds with the otherwise emphatic internationalism of the Peter Stuyvesant brand; it may perhaps be imagined that it was British citizens – as with

British character – despite the global reach and South African ownership of the Peter Stuyvesant brand – that the proposal that Jackie Kennedy act as guest of honour at their 1967 Tate opening was declined in favour of the considerably less glamorous Queen Mother.)²⁸³ No work chosen could be made earlier than 1950, and the bulk of the paintings were to be by young artists, making the collection exceptionally contemporary; there was also a declared preference for ‘the artists’ largest and most “public” paintings’, reprising the principles of youth and size adopted by the Dutch collection.²⁸⁴ A determination was also made to purchase, wherever possible, more than one work per artist so as to give a richer account of his (or occasionally, her) individual trajectory. Apart from the works already obtained from *New Generation* (1964), Somerville, Reid and Bowness were to have sole responsibility for building the collection from scratch.²⁸⁵ Through their connections, the PSF succeeded in obtaining a reduction in price of at least 10% in almost every purchase, sometimes considerably more.²⁸⁶ From 1965 through 1967, the paintings were widely distributed to a range of museums and galleries

the British artists enjoying the New Generation travel prizes – who were supposed to enjoy its ‘international passport’ without abandoning their patriotism.

²⁸³ Kaye proposed Kennedy to his board on the suggestion of Reid but they were unenthusiastic: Michael Kaye, letter to Norman Reid, 1967, 17 March, Tate Archive, TC92/208/1 file number 121. The perception of the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation collection as a form of patriotic resistance to American cultural tyranny (and superior culture of monetary support for artists) was expressed in reviews of the 1967 Tate retrospective, and such concerns likely informed the decision to favour English royalty to American fashion icon. Princess Margaret and her husband Lord Snowdon also repeatedly appeared at the *New Generation* openings; a photograph of the Princess smoking at the 1966 reception was reproduced on the cover of the 1968 Interim catalogue: *New Generation: Interim*, exh. cat., Whitechapel Art Gallery, April-May 1968.

²⁸⁴ ‘Industry as Art Patron’, p. 15.

²⁸⁵ *Recent British Painting from the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation*, exh. cat., Tate Gallery, 15 November-22 December 1967.

²⁸⁶ The purchase prices, before and after the discount, are listed in the Tate Archive, TG 2/5/6/1. In 1995, Reid attributed these discounts to the knowledge and influence of the committee: Summerfield, ‘Interventions’, p. 63.

throughout the country whose directors (including Green) selected their preferred loans from a private showing held at the Whitechapel.²⁸⁷ This ensured wide exposure and minimised storage costs for the Foundation.

Recent British Painting at the Tate

It is hardly surprising that the resulting collection appealed to Trevor Green, despite feeling, he says, ‘a bit uneasy’ about its provenance.²⁸⁸ The response to its triumphant showing at the Tate in winter 1967 was almost uniformly admiring. [fig. 2.7] By this point, the collection was more or less complete; long loans to provincial museums and galleries such as the Oxford MOMA were called in so that the full set could be presented in London to maximum fanfare. A few older and more established names, such as Francis Bacon, Ben Nicholson and Graham Sutherland, were set alongside the predominantly younger generation of British painters such as Peter Blake, Richard Smith and Robyn Denny. All but a few were men; successive waves of abstraction hung alongside figurative works largely informed by Pop Art; the catalogue ordered the collection by the artists’ date of birth, underscoring their rising position as the ‘new generation.’ The names of the museums which had received the paintings on loan were listed under each work, further diversifying the collection’s institutional cachet.²⁸⁹

²⁸⁷ Peter Stuyvesant Foundation and Bowness, *Peter Stuyvesant Foundation: A Collection in the Making - 1965 Purchases*, exh. cat.; see also ‘Industry as Art Patron’.

²⁸⁸ ‘Through Justin Knowles I got a lot of access to showing works that I might have otherwise found difficult... I’m not sure I would expect, at that time, an educational/charitable type situation to say no, we won’t accept the money from a tobacco company.’ Green, interview 2013.

²⁸⁹ *Recent British Painting from the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation*, exh. cat.

The Tate exhibition received copious coverage in the national media, and art critics were all but unanimous in their delight with the collection and the Foundation itself. Many were struck by the collection's tone of 'animation and high spirits.' Margaret Drabble on Radio 4 found it 'tremendously cheerful and exhilarating... amusing and enjoyable, a tremendous amount of primary colour.'²⁹⁰ The *Guardian's* Norbert Lynton echoed the sentiments of Robertson in the *Spectator* in noting that 'the collection rivals and in some respects outclasses the Tate's collection in this area,' while the *Financial Times's* Mario Amaya urged the PSF to enshrine it as 'a much-needed and long-promised museum of modern art in London.'²⁹¹ David Thompson commented in *Studio International* that 'during the last three years, the knowledge that a painting had been bought for the Stuyvesant Collection became a new kind of accolade, as prestigious as a purchase by the Tate, the British Council or the Arts Council; almost more so, in fact, for this was a new patron, an "unofficial" one.'²⁹² There was no speculation about possible ulterior motivations for the Stuyvesant patronage, and the *Observer* was typical in lauding its 'breathhtaking benevolence'; Amaya, meanwhile, argued that Britain needed to offer tax deductions to corporations to subsidise precisely this sort of scheme.²⁹³ Encouraged by the Pop-styled Union Jack adorning the cover of the catalogue, critics used the collection as an index of British artistic achievement, often measured in competition with American artists who were felt to be more generously patronised by their national

²⁹⁰ 'Peter Stuyvesant Collection Discussed by The Critics,' Radio 4 transcript, 2 December 1967, Tate Archive, TC92/208/1.

²⁹¹ Norbert Lynton, 'The Stuyvesant Collection', *The Guardian*, (16 November 1967), p. 6; Mario Amaya, 'The Stuyvesant Contribution', *Financial Times*, (21 November 1967), p. 36; Bryan Robertson, 'A Word From Our Sponsor', *The Spectator*, (24 November 1967), p. 658.

²⁹² Thompson, 'Recent British Painting: The Stuyvesant Collection', p. 253.

²⁹³ Nigel Gosling, 'Creaming Off the World's Best', *The Observer*, (19 November 1967), p. 24; Amaya, 'The Stuyvesant Contribution,' p. 36.

corporations.²⁹⁴ [fig. 2.8] Edward Lucie-Smith was alone in striking an ironic note in his assessment of the collection. ‘I thought the motto of the exhibition should have been “The Establishment is sometimes right,”’ he said sardonically on Radio 4, as ‘it is a very establishment collection. The selectors are connected with all the right things... they’ve bought the right pictures.’²⁹⁵

For art historian Angela Summerfield, the PSF collection’s recognisably official character contributed to a growing consensus about what was important in contemporary British art, but her argument – a reading of the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation’s activities as fundamentally altruistic, derived from its press releases – omits to point out that this consensus had not formed naturally but had been carefully engineered.²⁹⁶ To use the terms developed by sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, what the Foundation had achieved with its prestigious buyers and institutional partnerships was to insinuate itself into the hegemonic structures of cultural value, which were realised as symbolic capital for the parent company at a time when it was desperately needed.²⁹⁷ The *New Generation* exhibitions created a storm of publicity around the Foundation as well a star-making enterprise for a line-up of

²⁹⁴ See Robertson, ‘A Word From Our Sponsor’; Gosling, ‘Creaming Off the World’s Best’; ‘Peter Stuyvesant Collection Discussed by The Critics,’ Radio 4 transcript, 2 December 1967. The notion that Stuyvesant patronage helped British artists to compete with the New York School was introduced by Bryan Robertson in the 1964 *New Generation* catalogue, in which he bemoans the state of English corporate patronage in contrast to the ‘superb example’ set by the Americans. See Bryan Robertson and Peter Stuyvesant Foundation, *New Generation*, exh. cat., Whitechapel Art Gallery, March-May 1964, p. 5.

²⁹⁵ ‘Peter Stuyvesant Collection Discussed by The Critics,’ Radio 4 transcript, 2 December 1967.

²⁹⁶ Summerfield, ‘Interventions’, pp. 62-9. When her research was taking place, a stop had been placed on the files at the Tate Gallery relating to the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation, preventing access to relevant documents.

²⁹⁷ Pierre Bourdieu’s concepts of capital have been usefully discussed in relation to corporate arts patronage by Tickner, “‘Export Britain’”, pp. 394–419, and Wu, *Privatising Culture*, ‘Introduction.’

young artists from whom works for the collection would be acquired cheaply; meanwhile, the pedigree of the collecting committee ensured that the pieces they selected would not only be enhanced by their reputations but would also fall strictly in line with the policies of the powerful institutions they shaped.

While contemporary criticism may have been remarkably *uncritical* about Stuyvesant motives, Green, who described them as ‘a fairly canny tobacco company,’ was fully aware that England’s changing regulatory environment inspired their collecting activities.²⁹⁸ As the internal ‘Outline Recommendations’ put it baldly, the main purpose of the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation was to ‘communicate throughout the UK (and abroad in the long term, in conjunction with associated companies)... the patronage of the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation.’²⁹⁹ But to whom were these modern art exhibitions intended to communicate? The PSF’s support for the arts was designed, as Faulkner argues, to cast the company in a positive light before a powerful governmental audience whose favour could help to quell future anti-smoking regulation. The subtlety of the programme, however, lay in its dual address. The demonstration of concern for young people and the arts might well help to smooth tobacco’s political fortunes, but it was also an effective way to market the Peter Stuyvesant brand to the consumer market, operating on several levels.³⁰⁰

²⁹⁸ Green, interview 2013.

²⁹⁹ ‘Outline Recommendations’, December 1964.

³⁰⁰ Faulkner, ‘Art, Cigarettes and Visual Culture in the Sixties’, pp. 65-87.

Liminal advertising: Crypto-marketing in the art press

The PSF collection was designed with a built-in marketing proposal already in mind. £4000 – the same sum spent on the entire *New Generation* show, including six travel bursaries – was to be spent on advertisements for the collection in five leading English visual arts journals in order to maximise awareness within their specialist readerships.³⁰¹ When the series of advertisements eventually began to appear in January 1966, they were placed in *Apollo*, *Studio International* and *The Connoisseur*, publications reaching both avant-garde and more conservative audiences. In glossy full-colour on the inner cover at a time when these journals were illustrated only in black and white, these pages were each devoted to a single painting in the collection. This was reproduced so as to take up half the page, and accompanied by a small photograph of the artist. Next to the image was a paragraph of anonymous pseudo-scholarly art criticism, which mixed erudite references to contemporary movements with passages of vague formal description claiming that these paintings offered ‘the conjectural and the unknown’, a ‘peculiarly nagging tension or ambivalence’, or ‘nuances and insights indefinable before this century.’³⁰² Another short paragraph, entitled ‘The function of the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation,’ was placed unobtrusively underneath subtly to identify the source of this generosity.

³⁰¹ The journals originally mentioned were *Apollo*, *The Artist*, *Arts Review*, *Burlington Magazine*, and *The Studio* (later *Studio International*): ‘Outline Recommendations’, December 1964, appendix ii.

³⁰² These descriptions were used in reference to the works of Alan Davie (March 1967), Richard Hamilton (December 1966) and Francis Bacon (January 1966). The writer is not identified anywhere in the advertisements nor have I found a reference to his or her identity in archival records, suggesting that the texts were not written by any of the three art advisors but likely produced by copywriters at Frank O’Shanohun Associates, the PSF’s public relations firm.

The artists chosen for the advertorials, in order of appearance, were Francis Bacon, Bridget Riley, Patrick Heron, Robyn Denny, Richard Smith, Bernard Cohen, Alan Davie, Richard Hamilton, and Anthony Hill. The list is representative of the collection's sweep, including both older and younger artists working in both abstract and figurative idioms with a heavy male bias. Its academic tone could signify an attempt, as Faulkner argued, to reinforce Peter Stuyvesant's branding as a premium cigarette through association with the elite and rather masculine activity of art appreciation.³⁰³ Cloaked in such sober intellectual garb, it is easy to miss the marked predominance of smoking motifs throughout the series; indeed this curious dimension has not yet been discussed in the literature. Not only are Smith and Hamilton shown smoking – Bacon's headshot, oddly, would seem to show a cigarette flying through the air – but most of the works themselves appear to contain remarkable formal allusions to the products that paid for them. From the long, pale cylindrical forms in Hill's *Relief Construction 1962*, Heron's *Blue November* (1963) and Davie's *White Magician* (1956) to the clouds of smoke suggested by Cohen's *When White* (1963) and Bridget Riley's *No. 2 Untitled* (1965), and Richard Smith's riff on the packaging of Lucky Strike in *Staggerly* (1963), the paintings' hidden referent emerges only when the group is seen together, which their consecutive release largely precluded. [figs. 2.9-2.12] The knowing decision to include Smith's Lucky Strike iconography as part of their own public relations campaign may be interpreted both as a demonstration of humour and as an attempt to forestall any association with crudely overt branding through the winking inclusion of a rival brand. [fig. 2.13] While suggesting the attractiveness of cigarettes to the consumer,

³⁰³ Faulkner, 'Art, Cigarettes and Visual Culture in the Sixties', p. 81.

it also diverts attention from the subtler game of association playing out across the other pages.³⁰⁴

The artists and the buying committee clearly did not intend the collective act of signification presented in these advertisements. No such pattern marks the collection as a whole, and nor would it when the sole authority to purchase was invested in Somerville, Bowness and Reid. But the selection for publication goes beyond coincidence in an act of marketing cunning whose effectiveness surely lay in the very subtlety of the approach: like the larger endeavour of arts patronage itself, these pages advertised cigarettes under a cover of cultural philanthropy. The obliqueness of these suggestions, many of which register at the edge of awareness and whose varying tactics divert suspicion, resonates with contemporary fears and fantasies surrounding so-called ‘subliminal advertising.’ Originating with the American James M. Vicary in 1957, the popular myth held that advertisements could embed secret messages in apparently unrelated content; it became widely believed that pictures of Coca-Cola flashing imperceptibly in a film, or sexual suggestions disguised within an image of the product, could create strong desires for whatever was being sold while consumers remained totally ignorant of their manipulation.³⁰⁵ Despite the protests of advertisers that no such techniques were being used, the ensuing moral panic resulted in their prohibition in the UK by

³⁰⁴ By contrast, Philip Morris’ contemporary project in the US, ‘11 Pop Artists,’ featured several explicit references to their brands within the commissioned prints.

³⁰⁵ William M. O’Barr, “‘Subliminal’ Advertising”, *Advertising and Society Review* vol. 13, no. 4, (2013), Project Muse, <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/advertising_and_society_review/v013/13.4.o-barr.html>, [accessed 28 June 2013].

1958.³⁰⁶ As cultural anthropologist William O’Barr has recently pointed out, Vicary’s claims were falsified, the efficacy of these tactics has been consistently disproven, and no advertising agency has ever been shown to have implemented them.³⁰⁷ [fig. 2.14] Although perhaps inspired by these debates, the advertisements placed by the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation were not true subliminal advertising, for the cigarette references were not actively disguised. Instead, some more noticeable than others, they occupied a liminal territory at the edge of awareness. Their subversion of the paintings in question was furtive but not imperceptible, and seen in this light, other works in the collection take on a new, covert meaning. [figs. 2.15-16]

The Peter Stuyvesant Foundation Collection, then, was in part a ploy to draw the attention of a powerful and cultivated audience to the company’s munificent support for the arts, in the hope of influencing future policy decisions. But the effect also operated in reverse, serving to associate a range of artistic qualities with the act of smoking, and of smoking this brand in particular. The pseudo-journalistic pieces in the art press were one piece of a wider Stuyvesant marketing campaign, launched in 1964, which employed an abstracted, painterly style that combined signature travel motifs with a bright, semi-abstract Pop-inspired formal vocabulary appropriated from contemporary painting, ‘the luxury of travel... conjoined with the innovation and vitality of the avant-garde.’³⁰⁸ [fig. 2.17] Dr. Rupert’s 1971 corporate publication *Adventure in Art* also asserts the value to the tobacco industry of

³⁰⁶ Lawrence R. Samuel, *Freud on Madison Avenue: Motivation Research and Subliminal Advertising in America*, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), p. 107. Similar bans were enacted in the US and Australia the same year.

³⁰⁷ O’Barr, n.p.

³⁰⁸ Faulkner, ‘Art, Cigarettes and Visual Culture in the Sixties’, p. 77.

contemporary art as a universal language. Like Rembrandt's global portfolio of brands, Peter Stuyvesant's 'passport' identity, and the silent act of smoking itself, 'abstract art', it claims, 'is spoken and understood in all the countries of the world... [it is] a bond between peoples.'³⁰⁹ The connection between art and smoking established in their publicity also implied that the contested field of tobacco advertising should be accorded the same rights of self-expression and freedom from censorship as other forms of visual creativity.³¹⁰

Stuyvesant and Oxford

The Peter Stuyvesant collection had been designed for maximum desirability, valuable enough, it was stipulated, to be 'welcome whether it is offered for showing at the Tate or say, at the Edinburgh Museum of Modern Art.'³¹¹ Rumours that the collection would become a new museum in London circulated sufficiently widely for Norman Reid to receive a letter of concern from a fellow trustee, who complained about his advisory position to the Foundation: 'Are we not in principle at the Tate opposed to the foundation of galleries of modern art in the metropolis?'³¹² In fact, the PSF showed no documented interest in bestowing their collection on the Tate, and it declined in 1968 to donate its collection to another major museum, Manchester's Whitworth Art Gallery.³¹³ What was it, then, about

³⁰⁹ Hans L. C. Jaffé, 'Art in the Factory', in Lord Robbins et al., *Adventure in Art*, p. 111.

³¹⁰ A similar argument was made in a different context in Danielle Fox, 'Art', in *Culture Works: The Political Economy of Culture*, ed. by Richard Maxwell, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001), p. 37.

³¹¹ 'Outline Recommendations', December 1964.

³¹² Sir Colin Anderson, letter to Norman Reid 7 July 1965, Tate Archive, TG 2/5/6/1.

³¹³ Faulkner, 'Art, Cigarettes and Visual Culture in the Sixties', p. 86.

the fledgling MOMA that appealed to Rothmans as a home for its carefully constructed PR machine? After all, in 1966 the Oxford museum was brand new, located in a provincial city, with only a handful of donations to its name. Its young Director had no experience of arts management and was financing the operation primarily through his personal overdraft.³¹⁴

There is no archival evidence about the PSF's impressions of the Oxford museum, but certain facts are suggestive. Trevor Green went out of his way to telegraph his sensitivity to corporate objectives, pushing Stuyvesant interests to the fore. A profile on the new museum in the *Oxford Mail* featured a large photograph of Green in *New Generation* with Derek Smith of the PSF, apparently exchanging delighted remarks in front of a sculpture, Ibo, made by senior PSF employee Justin Knowles.³¹⁵ [fig. 2.18] While still at King Edward Street, the same newspaper published a photograph of the Director apparently lost in thought before the Stuyvesant-loaned Hockney painting, cigarette pointedly at his lips.³¹⁶ [fig. 2.19] Justin Knowles, despite never having gone to art school, was offered a solo show at the museum in a 1966 letter also asking for Stuyvesant support.³¹⁷ (Plymouth City Museum and Art Gallery, which received eleven Stuyvesant loans, also hosted a

³¹⁴ Green, interview 2013.

³¹⁵ Derick Grigs, 'Museum of Modern Art in New Home', *Oxford Mail*, (19 October 1966).

³¹⁶ 'Warehouse Becomes a Museum'.

³¹⁷ The initial offer was made in 1966 (letter to Justin Knowles, 3 May 1966, MAO Archive, box 001 'MOMA History' fol. 'Original and Permanent Collection and Loan Collection') despite the fact that Green describes Knowles as 'a very hard-edged, geometrical sort of painter which only had a fairly limited appeal': interview, 2013.

Knowles exhibition in 1967.)³¹⁸ Green also signalled his awareness of the company's travel-themed branding in his letters, such as one to the Foundation's Directors in February 1966:

The main plan of the museum is to develop collections... that will become of international significance, although not necessarily of international character... We believe that a place of high international reputation in so many other fields is the right location.³¹⁹

It seems likely that Green's proposed 'Oxford Biennial Exhibition', a sponsored prize exhibition for young artists reminiscent of *New Generation*, was also made with an eye on winning Rothmans' approval.³²⁰ And whereas the formal structure of national museums like the Tate Gallery restricted the scope of the Stuyvesant collaboration – Reid could not be remunerated for his services, and the Foundation was not allowed to charge entrance to *Recent British Painting* nor fill the preview reception with circulating cigarette 'hostesses' – MOMA was freer to accommodate the company's wishes.³²¹

³¹⁸ PSF loans in 1967 are recorded in the transport list for 'Recent British Painting', n.d., Tate Archive, TC92/208/1. Knowles had one-man shows in Plymouth in 1967 and, after leaving Rothmans' employ, in Oxford in 1970.

³¹⁹ Trevor Green, letter to the Directors of the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation, 1 February 1966, MAO Archive box 001 'MOMA History' fol. 'Original and Permanent Collection and Loan Collection'. In a further letter to Knowles dated 20 March 1966 in the same file, Green repeats his assertion of Oxford's internationalism: 'The international character of Oxford and the development plan of the museum should place it in a unique position in this country to receive the collection.'

³²⁰ Ibid., 'The Oxford Biennial Exhibition', 1966, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 1-7. According to this document, the exhibition was to be 'Sponsored jointly by the Museum of Modern Art and ...' A letter was also sent to Robert Maxwell, media magnate and current Labour MP, requesting support for a 'bi-annual competition,' but unsuccessfully: 'Minutes of the first meeting of the Museum of Modern Art Limited,' 10 February 1966, MAO Archive, Minute Book.

³²¹ 'The Trustees asked for an assurance that the occasion would not be used for 'advertising purposes. For example, they would be happy to see Stuyvesant cigarettes on the tables but they would not wish hostesses to circulate with them.' Norman Reid, letter to Michael Kaye, 11 April 1967, Tate Archive, TC92/208/1. Discussions of the exhibition fee are stored in the same file. By contrast, Green described himself as having 'considerable freedom, I would have thought more

Beyond Green's demonstration of corporate sympathy, however, the appeal of the Oxford museum must surely lie in the elusive notion of the avant-garde that pervaded Stuyvesant branding. While the collectors represented the 'establishment', the collection that they built was extremely contemporary in 1965-7, buttressed by the preference for artists under 30 and proclaimed through the series of adjectives – 'young', 'new', 'recent' – repeatedly attached to their exhibition titles. The Whitechapel Gallery was selected to be the first recipient of funding because in 1963, as Kimber put it, 'it has established itself as the avant-garde of the avant-garde.'³²² For Faulkner, the utility of contemporary art for the Foundation lay in its youthful cool and aspirational class connotations; more specifically, the international circulation of both art and artists chimed with Stuyvesant travel iconography to convey sophistication. But as important as this association with high culture was, so too, was the paradoxically *countercultural* appeal of the art in question. The odd mixture of aristocracy and subculture that marked the Peter Stuyvesant episode found apt expression in the *Daily Mirror's* article 'Margaret meets the Mods and Rockers', in which the accompanying photograph shows the royal guest at the 1964 *New Generation* opening merrily brushing shoulders with London's young artists and mini-skirted dolly girls.³²³ [fig. 2.20] While fine art as a whole may be commonly associated with gentility and connoisseurship, the discourse of the avant-garde stresses contrary values of independence,

freedom than any other institution of this kind in this country, and I think it's a very good thing... The sort of freedom that one has by being independent really of local authority, or to University, or of Government generally – I think this is probably essential, in order to follow a policy in a Museum of Modern Art.' Forge and Green, 'Space-Place at Oxford', 5 December 1966, pp. 8-9.

³²² Kimber, 'Rothmans of Pall Mall Call Report', 13 May 1963.

³²³ Nick Davies, 'Margaret meets the Mods and Rockers', *Daily Mirror*, (10 April 1964), p. 3.

transgression, controversy and hedonism; at a time when officialdom held that smoking was dangerously unsafe, the deliberate association of smoking with the avant-garde's celebration of difference positioned cigarettes as part of an alternative lifestyle marked by a similar daring frisson.³²⁴

Although the Whitechapel seemed cutting-edge to Rothmans in 1963, by 1966 its appeal was lessening. *New Generation*'s first two appearances had garnered good reviews, but its third exhibition in 1966 was less well received and for the critics, at least, the excitement was wearing off. 'The ambience of this exhibition tends to make the artists look already well established,' read a damning anonymous review in *The Times* ('Whitechapel Gallery's good idea gone stale'); it prompted an irate letter to the editor from Robertson, who believed (probably correctly) that such a review would signal the project's demise.³²⁵ When the same exhibition opened at MOMA, however, critics – mostly from local newspapers – lavished praise on both the works chosen and, especially, their placement within the rough-edged, cavernous Upper Gallery, which seemed to offer an ideal arena for large-scale mid-sixties painting and sculpture.³²⁶ And whereas *New Generation* no longer seemed

³²⁴ My argument shares aspects of Fox's discussion of the value of Pop Art for Philip Morris in 1965, but she locates the meanings associated with the avant-garde within a specifically American, Cold War context. Fox, 'Art', pp. 22-59.

³²⁵ 'Now, there is every probability of it being stopped. I hope your critic will be pleased with himself. It will be a radical deprivation for young artists in this country. It will also be a terrible blow for this Gallery, which is totally without funds': 'Whitechapel's Good Idea Gone Stale', *The Times*, (20 July 1966), p. 6; Bryan Robertson, letter to the editor of *The Times*, 21 July 1966, Whitechapel Art Gallery Archive, WAG/EXH/2/108/1. It proved to be the last *New Generation* show, although the PSF also sponsored the much cheaper *Interim* exhibition in 1968 that brought together previous *New Generation* participants.

³²⁶ See 'A Gallery for Everyone: The Museum of Modern Art'; de Bosmelet, 'A Gallery for Everyone: The Museum of Modern Art'; Grigs, 'Museum of Modern Art in New Home'; 'Modern Art Shown to Best Advantage', *Oxford Times*, (21 October 1966).

entirely new to the capital's cognoscenti, Oxford's claim to have the first 'museum of modern art' in England – although not as yet substantiated by a collection worthy of the name – established great excitement around Green's project in those early days.³²⁷

The Tate and the Whitworth were both historic Victorian museums without the freshness and 'edge' of the upstart MOMA; both had large existing collections into which a Stuyvesant contribution might disappear. More so than Manchester, meanwhile, Oxford was renowned as an international travel destination. Even more critically, it offered access to the student body of its prestigious university.

'Smoking and Health' had identified young boys and men as the demographic most attractive to cigarette companies.³²⁸ Oxford's affluent, youthful and predominantly male sixties cohort presented an ideal pool from which to recruit, and it was one to which the museum was heavily oriented, staging exhibitions to correlate with university terms and hosting student lectures and screenings.³²⁹ Moreover, its series of 'environmental' exhibitions, lower-case institutional logo and grubby, post-industrial framework contributed to an avant-garde, countercultural image designed, as I have argued, to appeal to radical sixties youth. [fig. 2.21] At the same time, however, MOMA's Arts Council funding, its connection to the University and the prestigious names on its Advisory Council ensured that the museum retained connections to the social and cultural establishment that were evidently valued by

³²⁷ 'Museum of Modern Art Oxford'.

³²⁸ *Smoking and Health*, p. 4.

³²⁹ Green, 'Director's Report on the use of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation Grant for furniture and equipment', March 1969.

the Foundation.³³⁰ However much the Museum of Modern Art might have cultivated associations with the London counterculture, it had a fundamental respectability that differentiated it sharply from its druggy, unstructured Arts Lab brethren.³³¹

For Rothmans, it was crucial to strike a balance between a desirable avant-gardism and the anarchic or esoteric work that might deter its target market. Turning down a Whitechapel proposal for a Charles Harrison-organised exhibition in 1970, Kaye argued that ‘we have not been content to stay well behind public opinion, but one also has to exercise judgement to determine how far ahead of it one is prepared to go.’³³² The rejection of Harrison signals emerging differences in policy between Rothmans and its rival Philip Morris, which was following its lead in entering the field of art-based marketing, a field it would go on to dominate globally in succeeding decades. Philip Morris sponsored Harrison’s organisation of the 1969 exhibition *When Attitudes Become Form* when it toured to the ICA. *Attitudes*, which was first organised in Bern by Harald Szeeman, marked a shift from its earlier *IT Pop Artists* project both in the embrace of edgier and less obviously branded

³³⁰ In 1966, the museum’s Advisory Council included three heads of Oxford colleges (Alan Bullock of St. Catherine’s, Norman Chester of Nuffield and Janet Vaughan of Somerville). It also boasted senior art world figures such as Sir John Rothenstein, former head of the Tate Gallery; Lord Esher, President of the Royal Institute of British Architects; Philip James, former head of art at the Arts Council; the Royal College of Art’s Richard Guyatt; architect R. W. Cave; critic Edwin Mullins; artists Henry Moore, Harold Cohen, Terry Frost, R. B. Kitaj, John Piper and Prunella Clough; and economist K. G. Knowles: Museum of Modern Art Governing Council, ‘Preliminary Development Plan’, March 1966.

³³¹ ‘Although the Lab claimed to do all it could to discourage any drug use on the premises, its close association with *IT* magazine... and its representative position within counter-cultural associations were enough to keep official support away.’ Nairne contrasts this with the ‘official’ avant-gardism espoused by the ICA. ‘The Institutionalisation of Dissent’, p. 394.

³³² Michael Kaye, letter to Mark Glazebrook, 22 April 1970, Whitechapel Art Gallery Archive, WAG/DIR/3/6.

artworks and in the foray into European patronage.³³³ By contrast, while a David Hockney exhibition had been recently rejected as ‘too well established’³³⁴ for Peter Stuyvesant, Harrison was discounted for favouring inaccessible conceptualists and for being ‘a law unto himself.’³³⁵ Although written a few years after the development of the PSF collection, the Harrison proposal neatly illustrates the predicament of its arts programme, which needed to maintain a cutting edge image in a rapidly developing art world, appropriating the allure of the avant-garde without alienating its clientele.

By 1966 and 1967, the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation collection was already starting to starting to seem dated’ as spatial environments and performative art forms assumed greater prominence. Reviewers treated the Tate show as a ‘summary, of

³³³ The catalogue was prominently emblazoned with the corporate logo and featured a statement from John A. Murphy, the president of Philip Morris Europe, which explicitly connected the show’s ‘new art’ with what he claimed were the innovatory practices of the company: ‘As businessmen in tune with our times, we at Philip Morris are committed to support the experimental’: Philip Morris Europe and Harald Szeemann, *Live in Your Head: When Attitudes Become Form. Works - Concepts - Processes - Situations - Information*, exh. cat., Kunsthalle Bern, 1969. For a discussion of Philip Morris’ involvement with the exhibition, see Claudia di Lecce, ‘Avant-garde Marketing: ‘When Attitudes Become Form’ and Philip Morris’s Sponsorship’, in *Exhibiting the New Art: ‘Op Losse Schroeven’ and ‘When Attitudes Become Form’ 1969*, ed. by Christian Rattemeyer, (London: Afterall, 2010), pp. 220-229. Philip Morris’ active involvement in the ICA version is described in Sophie Richard, ‘Conversation with Charles Harrison, Banbury, 19 May 2013’, in *Unconcealed: The International Network of Conceptual Artists 1967-77: Dealers, Exhibitions and Public Collections*, ed. by Lynda Morris, (London: Ridinghouse, 2009), p. 428, and is further documented in the exhibition’s files housed at the Tate Archive. Continuing interest in the exhibition by multinational art sponsors, meanwhile, is demonstrated by the Fondazione Prada’s elaborate recent restaging in Venice, which erased almost every mention of Philip Morris’ role in the original.

³³⁴ Hockney was seen as crucial to the PSF’s collection in the mid-sixties. The rejection of his show in 1970 shows the fugitive nature of the ‘contemporary’ image Stuyvesant cultivated and speaks to the difficulties facing a permanent collection of contemporary art. Mark Glazebrook, letter to Michael Kaye, 21 April 1970, Whitechapel Art Gallery Archive, WAG/DIR/3/6.

³³⁵ Kaye, letter to Mark Glazebrook, 22 April 1970.

sorts, of British painting during the last... 16 or 17 years.’³³⁶ Despite the Foundation’s pursuit of prestige, venerability was not what the marketing campaign was striving for: the rapid development of art upon which the collection’s effect depended was also what risked making it quickly obsolete. Indeed, the difficulties of collecting the contemporary had significantly informed the structure of Oxford’s Bear Lane Gallery: in 1962, its founder Elizabeth Deighton wrote that ‘a permanent collection, expensive to found and to maintain, quickly loses the essential mark of topicality’ which an exhibition-based modern art institution retains.³³⁷ But MOMA’s insignificant existing collection would not threaten to distract or undermine the impression of corporate munificence, and its Director had shown himself sensitive to branding requirements. Perhaps, as the headline had it, Stuyvesant art really was ‘shown to best advantage’ in Oxford; perhaps, in other words, Rothmans’ desire for a museum of their own was best met by a supposed ‘anti-museum’ whose hip ambience and progressive exhibitions could sustain the fading avant-garde credentials of an aging collection. MOMA offered a chance to strengthen its image as daring and contemporary at a fraction of the cost of a new private museum; it met, but did not exceed, the PSF’s requirements for a radical, cutting-edge ethos.

Thompson’s article mentions a plan to rotate the collection between the museum and on-going Stuyvesant exhibition projects; as Kaye put it, ‘the Museum, when built in its final form, [would] house the Peter Stuyvesant Collection as a basic

³³⁶ ‘Peter Stuyvesant Collection Discussed by The Critics,’ Radio 4 transcript, 2 December 1967.

³³⁷ Elizabeth Deighton, letter to S. J. L. Egerton, 23 June 1962, MAO Archive, box ‘Bear Lane History and Accounts’ fol. ‘Early BL History, accts, reports’.

home between exhibitions and tours which might be arranged.³³⁸ Although in 1971 its final destination ‘still ha[d] to be decided,’ the group of works was never donated to any museum.³³⁹ Unfortunately for Trevor Green, the larger custom-built home upon which the donation depended remained an expensive dream and the museum’s enduring home has so far proven to be the Pembroke Street brewery.³⁴⁰ Meanwhile, Rothmans was growing impatient with the costs of storing and conserving an aging collection and became increasingly interested in sports and music-based marketing, as a 1980 article discloses.³⁴¹ The collection was gradually dispersed in the mid-seventies: some works were sent to the UK or Dutch factories, some to storage, and

³³⁸ Kaye, letter to Trevor Green, 19 July 1967. Further details of a similar scheme are recorded in August 1966: the PSF would loan the collection initially for three or four years and then would house it at MOMA six months of the year thereafter, allowing an on-going Stuyvesant tour programme: ‘Meeting of the Museum of Modern Art Limited,’ 5 August 1966.

³³⁹ Robertson, ‘Recent British Painting,’ in Lord Robbins et al., *Adventure in Art*, p. 169.

³⁴⁰ Unfortunately, no correspondence could be found between the PSF and the museum confirming the cancellation of their agreement. In interview, 2013, Green attributed Stuyvesant’s failure to donate its collection to his own departure from the museum in 1969 and the Foundation’s unwillingness to work with anyone else. While it is true that Green had gone out of his way to reassure the company and that successors Lane and Ibsen were less interested in forming a collection, the continuing absence of the promised new museum building (and the downturn in the British economy in the late 1960s) seems a more likely cause. Given Green’s force of personality, however, it is possible that funding for the building would have emerged had he remained longer in position.

³⁴¹ ‘The present PR manager, Jack Prosser, talks at length about the expense of housing and maintaining a collection of large-scale works, and hints that the company feels unhappy about the quality of its investment (works were purchased out of capital expenditure). The collection was a survey of a particular period, but the Dutch Peter Stuyvesant Foundation which keeps its collection up to date by buying and selling is a more realistic proposition to Mr. Prosser. He thinks that sports promotion is more “product related” and is cynical about the value of arts sponsorship. “No one should distribute company money without regard to its investment potential.”’ Petherbridge, ‘Special Supplement: Patronage and Sponsorship: the PS at the Bottom of the Art Balance Sheet’, p. 9.

some sold, initially in lucrative sales to the Tate, National Museum of Wales and the National Galleries of Scotland, and subsequently at a series of auctions.³⁴²

Impermanent Collecting

The collection that was formed, briefly, at the Museum of Modern Art consisted largely of loans, with donations constituting decidedly the lesser part. Many of the donations were by artists themselves, primarily British artists in their early career who had one-man shows at the museum (such as Derek Southall, Anthony Benjamin, Stephen Willats) with a painting each by Ivon Hitchens and John Piper representing the older school. The majority of works, however, were lent by leading commercial galleries in London: Robert Fraser, Kasmin, and Waddington each provided the loan of works by artists of the Peter Stuyvesant collection profile: Bernard and Harold Cohen, Richard Smith, Terry Frost, Derek Boshier and Patrick

³⁴² Petherbridge mentions that some of the works were sent to the Darlington factory or to storage: Ibid., 'Special Supplement: Patronage and Sponsorship' p. 9. With the approval of his trustees, Norman Reid purchased for the Tate in 1976 Tilson's *Vox Box* (at £1000) Riley's *Deny 2* (£5500), Philips' *Entertainment Machine* (£2000) and Smith's *Gift Wrap* (£2000). Leslie Waddington was appointed to manage the sale of these and other works, which sold for sums much larger than those for which they were acquired, although the PSF alleged that the Tate was offered discounted prices. Reid offered the sum of £30,000 to the Foundation for Bacon's *Study for Self Portrait*, which had been purchased under his advice at £4500 in 1965. This was declined by the Foundation, who mentioned the figure of £120,000. (It was bought by Waddington himself in 1976 for an unknown sum and, after changing hands several times, sold through Christie's in 2012 for £21,545,250.) The Tate was displeased by the conditions of the Philips and Smith paintings, which were damaged by Stuyvesant touring. (See Tate Archive, folders TG 2/5/6/1, TG 4/2/971/1, and TG/4/2/1025/1.) A major group sale of the British collection was later held at Bonhams, *British Paintings of the 50's and 60's: The Property of The Peter Stuyvesant Foundation*, auction catalogue, 29 July 1989. Other works were passed at an unknown point to the Dutch Peter Stuyvesant company. This entire remaining collection, then owned by parent company British American Tobacco, was recently sold through an international series of high profile auctions by Sotheby's as the 'BAT Artventure Collection,' 2010-11.

Heron were each well represented.³⁴³ [figs. 2.22-2.24] For the art dealers behind these galleries, display in the museum promised wider exposure for the artists in their stable, as well as inexpensive storage for large works. They also nursed hopes of turning a more direct profit, with Robert Fraser offering a 10% discount to the museum should it want to purchase any of his loans and the museum negotiating, in turn, a 15% commission from Fraser, Axiom and Marlborough should anything sell through the museum's display.³⁴⁴ In addition to the works from the PSF, which were withdrawn the following year for the Tate retrospective, a few works (such as an important Anthony Caro, *Aroma*) were lent by private collectors. The museum also accepted loans from the British Council and Arts Council collections, these – like other temporary contributions – serving as impressive placeholders, designed to attract more enduring support from wealthy parties such as Rothmans. The museum's approach was summarised by Alan Bullock in the minutes of the Council of Management, winter 1966: 'Would take anything that looked good. Be more choosy in 10 yrs time.'³⁴⁵

³⁴³ For a history of one of these important galleries see Lisa Tickner, 'The Kasmin Gallery', *Oxford Art Journal*, vol. 30, no. 2, (2007), pp. 233-68. The Axiom, Marlborough and Grosvenor Galleries each contributed a loan each as well.

³⁴⁴ It is worth noting that it was not unusual for MOMA in the 1960s and 1970s to act as an agent for an artist during his exhibition and charge commission on any pieces sold; this practice, although not obsolete, is much less common today. All correspondence and other materials relating to the original collection are housed in the MAO Archive, box 001 fol. 'Original and Permanent Collection and Loan Collection.' Debates over the commercial dimension of the museum flared in the early 1970s when negotiating with Bear Lane and the Arts Council over a possible amalgamation.

³⁴⁵ Minutes of the Council of Management, n.d. [winter 1966], MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 1-7. Bullock (1914-2004) was a British historian and founding Master of St. Catherine's College, Oxford; he was also a founding member of the Council. Green himself applied unsuccessfully to design the new college, a position famously filled by Arne Jacobsen: interview, 2013.

In spite of the flurry of initial contributions in late 1965 and early 1966, exhibited in King Edward Street [fig. 2.25], the development of the collection quickly lost momentum. Green was loath to prejudice future capital funding applications for his lavish building scheme by requesting smaller sums for buying artworks,³⁴⁶ while the Arts Council objected to the heavy reliance on their support that resulted from this and resolved to limit their own contributions as a result of this apparent lack of initiative. Barry Lane, who had left Oxford for a position at the Arts Council in 1970, wrote in a memo:

We already contribute almost 80% of their total income and as far as I know they have still made no attempt to raise any additional income themselves. I would have thought that they should be sent a stiff letter saying that we are not prepared to increase our grant until they have made a serious attempt to raise additional money themselves. Up to the time that I left the Museum the Council had not even asked for any financial contribution from either the City, the County, the University or any of the individual colleges.³⁴⁷

In case the donation of the British Stuyvesant collection did not come through, Green concocted an equally radical second plan for the museum.³⁴⁸ His project involved a collection created in partnership with a local industrial firm that would rotate between the museum's galleries and the corporation's own premises, and was undoubtedly inspired by the unique and well-publicised practices of Turmac, the Dutch licensor of the Stuyvesant brand.³⁴⁹ 'Art in the Factory', as their exhibition was known, reached 26 cities in Europe, Australia and Canada between 1962 and

³⁴⁶ Minutes of the Council of Management, n.d. [winter 1966].

³⁴⁷ Barry Lane, 'The Museum of Modern Art Oxford': memorandum to Robin Campbell, 15 December 1970, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (1 of 7) fol. 'January 1970 onwards'.

³⁴⁸ Unfortunately, records of Green's approaches to companies other than Stuyvesant are not preserved in the MAO Archive and thus details of their contents and chronology are missing.

³⁴⁹ Lewis and Lewis, interview 2012. The plan was confirmed by Trevor Green in his 2013 interview with the author.

1969; its title was rather a misnomer, in fact, as the company capitalised on the novelty of the collection's origins in order to drum up maximum positive publicity.³⁵⁰ Green's idea represented an innovative and likely unprecedented inversion of the Dutch company's 'travelling museum,' which had been successfully promoted as a way of overcoming barriers between art and life, the 'people' and the museum, and improving the lives of the working classes.³⁵¹ A variation on this scheme was for an industrial sponsor to purchase 'pictures' for the museum that would be returned permanently after twenty-five years, as a means of keeping the displays up-to-date.³⁵² If Green foresaw a sponsor other than Stuyvesant for this project, this would not have pleased Rothmans, whose publicity and prestige lay to a large extent in the unusual nature of its patronage activities.

Dulux donated many pots of white paint with which to redecorate the warehouse in 1966, Pressed Steel contributed to on-going building repairs from 1969-72, and Alastair McAlpine paid for the plywood replacement flooring in the Upper Gallery in 1969.³⁵³ These, and the Gulbenkian grant, were the only meaningful forms of private support enjoyed in the 1960s by MOMA, and they fell far short of Green's hopes and expectations. No major collection was forthcoming, from any source.

Alongside the association with Stuyvesant and his arrangements with commercial galleries, Trevor Green's industrial loan collection concept conveys a keen

³⁵⁰ Lord Robbins et al., *Adventure in Art*, pp. 222-223.

³⁵¹ In addition to Sir Herbert Read quoted above, this point was also made in *The Studio*'s editorial accompanying Spencer, 'The Peter Stuyvesant Collection', p. 1, and repeatedly in the essays in Lord Robbins et al., *Adventure in Art*.

³⁵² 'Meeting of the Museum of Modern Art Limited', 5 August 1966.

³⁵³ Green, interview 2013; Minutes of the Council of Management, 29 April 1969 and 12 June 1972, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 1-7.

sympathy with business concerns apparently at odds with the explicitly anti-commercial position of his museum-as-garden, with its countercultural ethos and commitment – both proclaimed and apparent – to showing non-commercial art. What emerges from these contradictions is an unfolding museum identity marked by unstable polarities, affirming through much of the programme the importance of novelty, technological innovation, experimental use of media, and a defiantly outsider perspective, while privately attempting to assemble a historical collection of painting by courting big business. These contradictions also course through the 1960s exhibition programme, which placed more orthodox arrangements of painting and sculpture (often of artists, like Harold Cohen and Patrick Heron, represented in MOMA and PSF collections) alongside the museum's distinctive happenings and environments that rejected the commercialism of object-based art.³⁵⁴

Perhaps MOMA's daring reclamation of the Pembroke Street warehouse harboured similar contradictions. On one hand, as I have argued, the overtly post-industrial setting resisted the norms of fine art display and alluded to emergent studio and display practices among young artists in London and New York. Conversely, however, the industrial history of the museum building might seem to offer an unusually sympathetic backdrop to an industrial collection such as Stuyvesant's, reminding visitors of the economic basis of their munificent patronage even while its avant-gardism added lustre to the corporate brand. Perhaps the museum's furnishings possessed a similar semiotic fluidity, if not an outright bifurcation of

³⁵⁴ Patrick Heron (21 May-15 June 1968); Harold Cohen (18 June-13 July 1968). Other contemporary artists working in traditional media who were awarded 'one-man' shows at MOMA in the sixties were Anthony Benjamin (10 October-4 November 1967), Derek Southall (27 February-23 March 1968), Tim Scott (12 April-26 May 1969), Bridget Riley (26 April-17 May 1969) and Terry Frost (13 May-7 June 1969).

meaning. [fig. 2.26] The elegant tubular steel furniture, custom-made by an architecture student of Green's from the Oxford Polytechnic and upholstered in black leather, traced its stylistic origins back to Marcel Breuer and the Bauhaus, whose utopian dream of uniting art and life via exemplary design resonated with the ambitions of contemporary environmental artists.³⁵⁵ Even the left-wing Bauhaus embraced the practicalities of mass production and business by the early 1920s, however, and by the 1960s its formal vocabulary was increasingly associated with corporate America.³⁵⁶

If such dualities permeated the museum's physical structure and furnishings as well as its programme, corresponding political contradictions may be found within even some of its most radical exhibitions, and within the sixties counterculture itself. As we have seen, the Museum of Modern Art's 'alternative' identity was central to its suitability for rebranding Peter Stuyvesant, and anti-corporate sentiment was much less marked in the underground than might be imagined today. The attitude of many visual artists and other members of the avant-garde is, perhaps, captured by Hans Haacke's account of his involvement with 1969's *Attitudes Become Form* exhibition, sponsored by Philip Morris:

Since most of us smoked and smoking was not yet generally recognised as potentially lethal, we were not concerned about lending our work and name to

³⁵⁵ Along with his wife Zoe, Mike Cooper volunteered to help with the conversion of the museum building as well as constructing its chairs and tables, and matching projection screens: Michael Cooper interview, (Modern Art Oxford, 13 February 2013). On the tensions within the Bauhaus between utopian socialism and the commercial exploitation of designs such as Breuer's, see especially Frederic J. Schwartz, 'Utopia for Sale: The Bauhaus and Weimar Germany's Consumer Culture', in *Bauhaus Culture: From Weimar to the Cold War*, ed. by Kathleen James-Chakraborty, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006), pp. 115-138.

³⁵⁶ *Bauhaus 1919-1933: Workshops for Modernity*, exh. cat., MoMA, November 8 2009-January 25 2010, p. 12.

the promotion of a peddler of unhealthy products. The implication of corporate sponsorship on culture was not yet recognised as an issue. The issues that riled us were the Vietnam War, race relations, the ‘establishment’ a.k.a. ‘le pouvoir’ in France.³⁵⁷

Multinational corporations such as Rothmans, in other words, were not necessarily seen to embody the evils of the power structures against which 1960s radicals rebelled; nor were government strictures about the medical risk of cigarettes likely to deter many members of the alternative youth culture, whose on-going battles over obscenity laws and the right to consume drugs such as cannabis and LSD was indicative of a thorough distrust of official recommendations.³⁵⁸ There was also a certain progressive logic to the notion of a collection circulating between museum and industry, whether it be Stuyvesant-sponsored or otherwise. As art historian Hans Jaffé wrote in *Adventure in Art*, ‘the Peter Stuyvesant Collection does not wait patiently and passively for interested callers – it visits people in the workrooms, in factories and in offices throughout the world...’³⁵⁹ Assertions such as these resonated with the increasingly forceful critiques of the sterility and traditionalism of the museum framework and with neo-avant-garde attempts to reclaim a social role for art. An extreme contemporary example of this attitude is the call to arms published in 1967 by the young T. J. Clark and his fellow Situationist activists: ‘It is not enough to burn the museums. They must also be sacked... Everything of value in art has always cried aloud to be made real and to be lived.’³⁶⁰ However far

³⁵⁷ Haacke is quoted from a 2008 interview with the author in di Lecce, ‘Avant-garde Marketing: ‘When Attitudes Become Form’ and Philip Morris’s Sponsorship’, p. 223.

³⁵⁸ Hewison, *Too Much*, p. 131. Resistance to obscenity and drug laws was often played out across the pages of *International Times*, whose pro-drug editorials and series of nude ‘IT girls’ garnered close attention from police.

³⁵⁹ Jaffé, ‘Art in the Factory,’ p. 111.

³⁶⁰ T. J. Clark et al., *The Revolution of Modern Art and the Modern Art of Revolution [1967]*, (London: Chronos Publications, 2003), n.p.

Green's various business-led collection schemes might have been from Clark's Marxist exhortations, both posed a profound challenge to museum orthodoxies at a time when such changes were being demanded by the museum's core constituency of the young and alternative.

If it is possible to find unexpected points of convergence between MOMA's different public faces, the tensions between them also threatened one another. The fate of the collection offers perhaps the clearest example of the museum's inability to sustain itself as both museum and anti-museum. As originally conceived, the works held by the museum were to be permanently on display on Pembroke Street's ground floor, with the upper floor for exhibitions and the lower for lectures and a 'library' of periodicals.³⁶¹ Because of its failure to accrue significant further donations, the amassed body of works was not often shown and did not assume prominence within the programme. Deprived of the permanent display area that was originally intended, the collection was presented in sections and at intervals between exhibitions, particularly in the summer during university recess when the museum's primary audience was away.³⁶² [fig. 2.27] Compared to the novelties and splendours of the exhibition programme, and in the face of its developing public

³⁶¹ Anthony Fawcett, 'Oxford Art Museum', *Studio International* vol. 172, no. 881, (September 1966).

³⁶² It is not clear when and which parts of the collection were displayed as its showings were not publicised or well documented. However, some works were shown – supplemented by further loans, which tended to upstage them – in the summers of 1968 and 1969, and in September 1970 as well; photographs exist of these displays, which included artists like Richard Smith and Barry Flanagan. Under Peter Ibsen's directorship the collection was only shown 'a few times' according to Nicholas Serota, 'A Loan Collection', December 1975, MAO Archive, Council of Management Files 8-30.

identity as an ‘alternative space’, the museum’s artworks seemed less compelling even to its staff.³⁶³

The absence of these works from the walls of the museum, and its shifting reputation, prompted requests for their return. In 1968 Ivon Hitchens asked for the return of his crucial early loan, *Hellespont*, after reading in the *Oxford Magazine* that it was not currently on view. He added disapprovingly that its display had clearly been superseded by ‘the advancing taste of your patrons & the increasing experimentation of your exhibitions.’³⁶⁴ In 1974, incoming Director Nicholas Serota decided to return to their original owners the 15 works that then remained, some in ill repair due to inadequate storage.³⁶⁵ His accompanying letters confirmed the museum’s change in direction, explaining that ‘we have reluctantly decided to return a number of works... we now feel that the commitment to temporary exhibitions will prevent us from showing them regularly in the future.’³⁶⁶

³⁶³ Nonetheless, the idea of the permanent collection did not go away and was revived at intervals by Ibsen, Serota and Elliott in turn, although never with much success. In 1972, shortly after the amalgamation with the Bear Lane Gallery, Ibsen proposed ‘a permanent exhibition that would be a thorough, rich and complex introduction to modern art’ of the last 60-100 years; this was conceived in didactic terms, to be a show of a ‘historical and instructive nature as an aid to the general public’ and possibly accompanied by a book: Report of an Informal Meeting of the Council of Modern Art Oxford, 2 December 1972, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (1 of 7) fol. 1970-72. For Serota and Elliott, see chapter three.

³⁶⁴ Ivon Hitchens, letter to Trevor Green, 5 November 1968, MAO Archive, box 001 ‘MOMA History’ fol. ‘Original and Permanent Collection and Loan Collection’.

³⁶⁵ Serota, ‘A Loan Collection’, December 1975. The storage issues are discussed ominously in Council minutes from 1970 which note the poor conditions of several works and attribute this to the storage area being also used as a workshop. Minutes of the Council of Management, 1 September 1970, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (2 of 7) fol. ‘Oxford: Museum of Modern Art – Minutes’. Tess Jaray and Patrick Heron were compensated financially for damage to their paintings.

³⁶⁶ For example, Nicholas Serota, letter to Robert Fraser, 16 March 1975, MAO Archive, box 001 ‘MOMA History’ fol. ‘Original and Permanent Collection and Loan Collection’.

Conclusion

Trevor Green's failure to amass a serious collection of modern art may appear as inevitable in retrospect as his involvement with corporate interests now seems so compromising. But easy cynicism about the motives of business sponsorship collapses the complexities of the period, risking falsely simplified moralising that overlooks changing perceptions of tobacco as well as the very real and continuing difficulties of securing adequate funding for the arts. However grateful one may feel today that the Museum of Modern Art Oxford escaped reformation at the hands of the Peter Stuyvesant company, Green's MOMA, attractive to radical and corporate audiences alike, succeeded briefly in sustaining a myriad of contradictions. Within the historical configurations of that eventful period, it was likely the museum's recent genesis that allowed it strategically to promote the old and the new, 'insider' and 'outsider', corporate and non-commercial, the industrial factory as well as the utopian garden. Neither lasted far beyond the end of the 1960s.

CHAPTER THREE

The Sanction of the Museum: Presenting Conceptual Art in Oxford, 1970-1976

Introduction

This chapter asks how it was that the Museum of Modern Art managed to translate the staging of challenging conceptual art exhibitions into popular success under the directorship of Nicholas Serota, when his predecessor Peter Ibsen had pursued a comparably ambitious programme only to see declining visitor numbers and a gradual loss of Arts Council support. Answering this question requires considering the museum's relationship to issues of commercialism, national identity, international networks, institutional critique and even interior design. Financial pressures continue to play an explanatory role.

Peter Ibsen took over directorship of MOMA in summer 1970. He held this position until his resignation three years later, when the Council of Management appointed Nicholas (Nick) Serota his successor, a role he held until 1976. During the years of

Ibsen and Serota's management the museum was profoundly reoriented, as the idea of a permanent collection faded and the museum's colourful abstracts and countercultural environmental pieces gave way to a more austere series of important conceptual art exhibitions.

As we have seen, aspects of the 'museum-as-garden' ethos persisted into the first years of Ibsen's directorship, with major exhibitions such as *Kinetics and Multiples from Galerie Denise René* and *Popa at Moma: Pioneers of Part-Art* exemplifying these tendencies. The continuities that these exhibitions maintained with the tenor of the earlier museum may be largely attributed to the limited authority granted to both Lane and Ibsen to determine the museum's identity. After Trevor Green's exit, the small Council of Management had begun to take a very active role in the museum's programme, meeting frequently and controlling even the choice of exhibitions. As the advertisement for Ibsen's position in 1970 made clear:

The Museum Director is expected to show initiative in suggesting exhibitions and other events in the Museum's programme, but the Museum's policy is, in general terms, and frequently in specific cases, laid down by the Council...³⁶⁷

This strategy was a response to the perceived inexperience of Lane and Ibsen; as time passed, the Council began to grant Ibsen much more creative license. His interest in conceptual art led to exhibitions such as *Travel Art: A Documentary*

³⁶⁷ 'Advertisement for the position of Museum Director of the Museum of Modern Art Oxford', [summer] 1970, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (2 of 7). The Arts Council was not pleased with this arrangement. After the appearance of the advertisement for the new Director, Arts Council liaison Peter Bird wrote to the museum, 'I think it would only have been courteous and I hope useful to you to have discussed this with myself in advance of deciding what the duties of the post should be... I believe that you will find it extremely difficult to find a suitable person at the salary offered unless that person is given a fair degree of independence regarding the exhibitions which are put on...' Peter Bird, letter to Stuart Lewis, 21 May 1970, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (2 of 7).

Exhibition by Jacques Caumont (9 October-6 November 1971) and a site-specific earth installation by Richard Long (9-23 December 1971).³⁶⁸ [fig. 3.1] By the time he left in 1973 after a stream of increasingly uncompromising exhibitions, the museum had become not only ‘the most interesting public gallery in England’ according to *Studio International*, but its preeminent public venue for conceptual art.³⁶⁹ Nonetheless, visitor figures declined from an already low position, as did the subsidy from the Arts Council, which imposed increasing pressure on the museum to amalgamate with the more accessible and commercial Bear Lane Gallery only a few streets away.³⁷⁰

The exhibitions organised by Ibsen discomfited many at the Arts Council. Peter Bird, its representative on the museum’s Council of Management, complained in 1973 of ‘an undue preoccupation on MAO’s part in the recent past with conceptual

³⁶⁸ The changing delegation of responsibilities is recorded in the Minutes of the Council of Management, 1 May 1971, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 1-7, which records Ibsen’s comments: ‘the Council was not originally involved as much as it had been since the resignation of Mr Trevor Green... He himself had not had sufficient administrative experience to cope with the Museum in the same way that Mr. Waterlow manages the Bear Lane Gallery, and said he feels it is essential he is advised by the Council. He organises the exhibition programme almost entirely, and of late his Council had had little time to discuss this. Financial and administrative problems were the main feature of their meetings, which tended to be long.’ The change in the programme has been noted by others: ‘By the middle of 1971, Ibsen had developed a strong programme that began to distinguish Oxford from other regional galleries’: Lynda Morris, ‘The Museum of Modern Art in Oxford 1965-1975’, *Studio International*, vol. 190, no. 978, (November-December 1975), p. 239. Morris’ lengthy essay contains factual inaccuracies but nonetheless provides an invaluable contemporary perspective on the institution.

³⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, ‘The Museum of Modern Art in Oxford 1965-1975’, p. 239.

³⁷⁰ MOMA was given a grant of £5,000 in 1969-70, £6,050 in 1970-71 (during which it ran an additional deficit of £1,574 bringing the total deficit to £2,922), and £5,500 in 1971-72. Following the amalgamation with Bear Lane Gallery in spring 1972, MOMA’s £2,922 deficit was cleared by the Arts Council and a joint grant of £9,000 awarded to the new collective body for 1972-3.

art,’ and suggested it should strive to become ‘more appealing.’³⁷¹ Ibsen’s successor, Serota, had worked as a Regional Art Officer for the Arts Council from 1970 until his Oxford appointment in summer 1973.³⁷² His programme evinced a series of views on contemporary art, however, that differed sharply from those of his former colleagues: the exhibitions he organised further cemented MOMA’s reputation as an international centre for avant-garde visual art.³⁷³ As Sophie Richard’s 2009 study argued, ‘under Serota’s directorship, from 1973 to 1976, MOMA... became a landmark institution in the network of Conceptual artists.’³⁷⁴ Moreover, it did so while securing rising attendance and public subsidy in a time of national economic crisis.

The Predicament of the Avant-Garde

In fashioning a public for art of the early 1970s that was often (despite the growing discomfort of some British artists and critics with this vocabulary) described as ‘avant-garde,’ the exceptionally challenging nature of that art posed serious

³⁷¹ Bird quoted in Minutes of the Council of Management, n.d. [winter 1966].

³⁷² ‘Sir Nicholas Serota, CH Authorised Biography’, <<http://www.debretts.com/people-of-today/profile/3380/Nicholas-Andrew-SEROTA>>, [accessed 29 August 2014].

³⁷³ The now-canonical character of most of the names chosen is only reinforced by the names of the artists who had exhibitions planned by Serota for MOMA which fell through or were postponed until after his departure: these included Robert Ryman, Lothar Baumgarten, Patrick Caulfield, Richard Long, Bruce Nauman, Joseph Cornell, Dan Graham, Victor Burgin, and Richard Tuttle. Nicholas Serota, ‘Provisional Exhibition Programme 1975/76’, 1975, and ‘Museum of Modern Art, Oxford 1976/77’, 1976, both MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 8-30.

³⁷⁴ Sophie Richard, *Unconcealed: The International Network of Conceptual Artists 1967-77: Dealers, Exhibitions and Public Collections*, (London: Ridinghouse, 2009), p. 157.

difficulties.³⁷⁵ While the museum had come to be known for radical culture, the exhibitions from 1966 to 1971 were often aesthetically spectacular, engaging the senses with vivid colour, sound, new technologies and witty pop-cultural references. The theatrical, ephemeral environments discussed in the previous chapter may have moved definitively away from the static art object but their aesthetics remained seductive; by contrast, the ‘dematerialisation’ favoured by conceptual artists rejected spectacle, paring away visual interest in favour of a frequently monochrome emphasis on text and diagram. Moreover, the new practices were geographically more diverse: rather than revolving around London’s (counter)cultural spaces, the conceptual artists invited to show at MOMA circulated within an expanded transatlantic geography whose centres were found overseas, in northern continental Europe (West Germany, Switzerland, Belgium, France and the Netherlands) and the United States.³⁷⁶

The transition taking place within conceptual art circles in the late 1960s and early 1970s was not fundamentally a question of exchanging one style for another, or even of exchanging objects for environments as others were also doing: it was much

³⁷⁵ Two major radical exhibitions of this period used the term ‘avant-garde’ in their title (*A Survey of the Avant-Garde* at Gallery House, July-Oct 1972, and *The British Avant-Garde* at the New York Cultural Center, May 1971) and in both exhibition catalogues the organisers (Rosetta Brooks and Charles Harrison respectively) expressed strong discomfort with the phrase: see ‘Introduction,’ Gallery House, *A Survey of the Avant-Garde in Britain*, exh. cat., Gallery House Press, 27 July-28 October 1972, p. 1, and ‘Virgin Soils and Old Land’, *Studio International*, vol. 181, no. 933, Special Issue: The British Avant-Garde, (May 1971), p. 203. The dispute over the name of the show between Harrison and Donald Karshan, the patron of the exhibition, is discussed in Joanna Melvin, ‘Studio International Magazine: Tales from Peter Townsend’s Editorial Papers 1965-1975’, (PhD thesis, University College London, 2013), p. 179. Harrison felt that “‘the concept of the avant-garde seemed dated’” and suggested *New Art from England* as an alternative; when his proposal was rejected, he distanced himself from the title in his catalogue essay. Brooks was more ambivalent.

³⁷⁶ Richard, *Unconcealed*.

more profound. Modernism's theory of art experience as the exaltation of pure vision was in crisis: conceptual art sought answers not in a sumptuous appeal to the senses but by addressing the mind, and its insistence that art can operate as contextualised idea rather than autonomous image demanded an entirely new conception of the roles of artists, beholders, critics and galleries. That the exposure of Britain's audiences to conceptual practice and theory came somewhat late by the standards of other Western countries made it demand no less dramatic a shift.³⁷⁷

The difficulty British audiences faced when encountering radical art in the early 1970s may be illustrated by the frosty reception met by two important exhibitions staged in London in the summer of 1972: *A Survey of the Avant-Garde in Britain* at Gallery House (27 July-28 October), and the Arts Council's *The New Art* at the Hayward Gallery (17 August-24 September).³⁷⁸ Both were ambitious early attempts to provide an overview of the most cutting-edge recent art made by native artists; both, unusually, were organised by women, Anne Seymour (seconded from the Tate

³⁷⁷ For a personal account of the transformative impact of New York conceptual art theory, see Charles Harrison, 'Feeling the Earth Move', in *Since 1950: Art and Its Criticism*, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009), pp. 127-146. Although he was a leading London critic for *Studio International*, he was still in the late 1960s an admirer of Greenberg's modernist formalism and adds 'if it seems a bit odd to have regarded [Morris] Louis as a still controversial figure in 1969, I can only plead that this was England...', p. 128. The idea that 'England was slow' to appreciate conceptual art is also asserted in Sophie Richard, 'Conversation with Sir Nicholas Serota', in *Unconcealed: The International Network of Conceptual Artists 1967-77: Dealers, Exhibitions and Public Collections* (London: Ridinghouse, 2009), p. 464.

³⁷⁸ Anne Seymour, *The New Art*, exh. cat., Hayward Gallery, 17 August-24 September 1972; Gallery House, *A Survey of the Avant-Garde in Britain*, exh. cat. *The New Art* has attracted substantial recent scholarly attention, including Taylor, *Art for the Nation*; William Wood, 'Still You Ask For More: Demand, Display and "The New Art"', in *Rewriting Conceptual Art*, ed. by Michael Newman and Jon Bird, (Chicago: Reaktion Books, 1999), pp. 66-87; and Joy Sleeman, 'The New Art, Hayward Gallery, London, 1972: New as compromise, or when what happens around the exhibition is as interesting as what happens in the exhibition', *Sculpture Journal*, vol. 21, no. 2, (2012), pp. 63-74.

for *The New Art*) and Rosetta Brooks, administrator of Gallery House.³⁷⁹ Critics, visitors, and even exhibition organisers met the two exhibitions with bemusement if not hostility, finding the work challenging to understand. Both exhibitions prompted textbook enactments of what Brian O’Doherty identifies as the ‘classic avant-garde hostility’ between radical artist and perplexed audience, dramatised in proportion to the magnitude of the break with established artistic values.³⁸⁰

Brandon Taylor has noted that ‘shock and bewilderment formed the responses of older and more conservative folk’ to *The New Art*, but they were not the only ones – despite a list of artists whose names are now firmly enshrined in the canons of postwar British art.³⁸¹ [fig. 3.2] Critical response was overwhelmingly negative, in both the art press and the newspapers, and found expression in emotive language. In the *Times*, Paul Overy found the incomprehensibility of the works ‘so infuriating and depressing that it is quite difficult to look objectively at the few good works there are here.’³⁸² In *Art and Artists*, Eddie Wolfram also found the exhibition ‘sad’ and ‘depressing.’³⁸³ For William Feaver in *Art International*, the show was ‘well seasoned with irritants. Not that it was notably new’; Art & Language’s contribution was singled out as ‘a prolonged wriggling into ideas of the theory, the nature and the purpose of art through torturous semantic and philosophical demands,’ the

³⁷⁹ Gallery House (1972-3) was a short-lived non-profit alternative space run by Sigi Krauss in Goethe Institut premises in South Kensington.

³⁸⁰ O’Doherty, *Inside the White Cube*, p. 76.

³⁸¹ Taylor, *Art for the Nation*, p. 233. The final list of artists included in the show was Keith Arnatt, Art-Language, Victor Burgin, Michael Craig-Martin, David Dye, Barry Flanagan, Hamish Fulton, Gilbert & George, John Hilliard, Richard Long, Keith Milow, Gerard Newman, John Stezaker, and David Tremlett. Bruce Mclean and Roelof Louw withdrew late in the organisation process.

³⁸² Paul Overy, ‘Stimulating or Just Infuriating?’, *The Times*, (21 August 1972), p. 5.

³⁸³ Eddie Wolfram, ‘London/Edinburgh’, *Art and Artists*, vol. 7, no. 8, (November 1972), p. 44.

visitor experience evoked using a metaphor of physical abuse. Nigel Gosling's *Observer* headline, 'British Brain-Bashers', makes the exhibition sound equally excruciating.³⁸⁴ Marina Vaizey also felt the exhibition was designed to antagonise the viewer; in the *Financial Times*, she described it as 'an arid desert ... intensely dispiriting':

I have visited the Hayward on numerous occasions and I cannot pretend that I have grasped much of what is going on; nor do I think that all the artists, although they are showing in a public gallery sponsored by public funds, are in the least bit interested in telling us what is going on, or in making things or displaying things that are intelligible to even the most assiduous visitors.³⁸⁵

Caroline Tisdall's *Guardian* review of the Hayward show, although sympathetic, admitted that it left audiences 'foiled and frustrated' because, in her view, the art was 'not produced specifically with the public in mind.'³⁸⁶

Impassioned letters of complaint about the exhibition were posted not only to the Hayward Gallery, but to the *Guardian* as well. One letter to that newspaper recounted 'the frustration which got hold of me as I started looking at the thousands of mathematical formulae, unconnected words and incoherent sentences stuck on the upper gallery walls'; the letter-writer suggested to Tisdall that she was 'suffering unnecessarily' in her attempts to appreciate such works. Another letter took up Tisdall's own phrase, explaining that 'what angers me is the arrogant assumption of the critic that I am not "with it" if I go to an art exhibition and am frustrated and

³⁸⁴ William Feaver, 'London Letter: Summer', *Art International*, vol. XVI, no. 9, (November 1972), p. 38; Nigel Gosling, 'British Brain-Bashers', *The Observer*, (20 August 1972), p. 30, p. 30.

³⁸⁵ Marina Vaizey, 'The New Art', *The Financial Times*, (19 September 1972), p. 3.

³⁸⁶ Caroline Tisdall, 'Art Think', *The Guardian*, (17 August 1972), p. 10.

foiled if I fail to find a visual end product.³⁸⁷ *The New Art's* organiser herself found these pieces arduous to engage with: Seymour admitted in her catalogue essay that:

the difficulty with the language-oriented work is the amount of pre-reading which is necessary, but other kinds of work also demand a much more detailed kind of thinking than perhaps seemed necessary before.³⁸⁸

The exhibition may have been criticised as elitist, but even the consummate insiders of London's art world struggled to locate its value at the time.

The three-part *Survey of the Avant-Garde in Britain* is now perhaps best known for including Stuart Brisley's astonishingly abject extended performance *And For Today... Nothing*, and it is not surprising that many reviews were just as dismissive of the Gallery House exhibition as the Hayward's.³⁸⁹ [figs. 3.3-3.4] Feaver called it an extension of the Hayward show ('alternative specimens of New Art') albeit more overtly political in tone; its 'participation rites, slogans to be picked out of sandheaps, questionable assertions' were no more to his taste than the high theory at the Hayward, for:

the desire to make art "relevant", and so by one definition or another non-art, tends, in all these instances, to be a vain endeavour: as harmless as a vicar parading in Hells Angel clothing, or Ruskin endorsing the nobility of labour

³⁸⁷ 'Letters to the Editor: When is a Conceptual Artist not an Artist?', *The Guardian*, (23 August 1972), p. 10

³⁸⁸ 'Introduction,' in Seymour, *The New Art*, exh. cat., p. 6.

³⁸⁹ The artists included in the exhibition are too many to list but included David Medalla, John Dugger, Stuart Brisley, John Latham, Jeffrey Shaw, David Lamelas, Victor Burgin, Gerard Hemsworth, Graham Stevens, Stephen Willats, Carolee Schneemann, and Ian Breakwell. See Gallery House, *A Survey of the Avant-Garde in Britain*, exh. cat.. Brisley's performance involved his protracted immersion in a bath filled with cold black water, surrounded by decomposing offal, and was reviewed by Tisdall as 'well-nigh indescribable': Stuart Brisley, 'And For Today... Nothing', <http://www.stuartbrisley.com/pages/27/70s/Works/And_for_today___nothing/page:7>, [accessed 11 December 2014]; Caroline Tisdall, 'Avant-garde to All Intentions', *The Guardian*, (25 August 1972), p. 8.

by setting a few undergraduates to work playing at building a road near Oxford.³⁹⁰

Hilary Spurling's review in the *Observer* failed to register any socio-political dimensions to the works, for she was preoccupied with the use of non-traditional media, which she attributed to a 'more or less apathetic desire to shock.' Like the critics of *The New Art*, she too registered an affective response:

A succession of large, white-painted spot-lit rooms occupied with so little confidence that most of them seem empty, and several of them actually are (save for a few simple equations set out on the walls, or a collection of neatly framed blank sheets of paper, or a series of essays on meaningfulness and related subjects compiled in strange jargon and stranger grammar, nailed down or chained up to empty shelves.) The general effect is one of unrelieved pathos...³⁹¹

To cultural conservatives, the Hayward and Gallery House exhibitions seemed almost indistinguishable; others saw differences, some favouring the latter for its inclusion of art that overtly engaged social issues. 'Unlike at the Hayward, there is some real visual impact in this accrochage,' wrote Wolfram, singling out Stuart Brisley and David Medalla as 'evidence that post-object art can get closer to making a direct contact with life and consequently with ordinary people'; Guy Brett felt much the same, praising 'formal freedom' allied with 'a passionate social concern.'³⁹² Tisdall, exceptionally, wrote positively about both exhibitions. Her report on Gallery House qualified her previous Hayward review, assuring alienated readers that visual analysis and the personal encounter still mattered: contrary to her earlier assertions, 'it's the experiencing of the piece that counts,' after all.³⁹³

³⁹⁰ Feaver, 'London Letter: Summer'.

³⁹¹ 'Romantic Loner', *The Observer*, (24 September 1972), p. 36.

³⁹² Guy Brett, 'Forward with the Avant-Garde', *The Times*, (29 August 1972), p. 6; Wolfram, 'London/Edinburgh'.

³⁹³ Tisdall, 'Avant-garde to All Intents'.

Peter Ibsen showed both Medalla and Brisley at MOMA, along with other artists (such as Graham Stevens, Gerard Hemsworth, Ed Herring and Stephen Willats) whose work also appeared in the 1972 *Survey*.³⁹⁴ Artists from *The New Art* also feature prominently on the list of solo shows organised by Ibsen in Oxford: Gerard Newman (9 October-6 November 1971), Richard Long (9-23 December 1971), Hamish Fulton (4-23 April 1972) and John Stezaker (31 March-15 April 1973). These exhibitions were mostly organised in advance of either London show, and they testify to the exceptional nature of Ibsen's commitment to the avant-garde. Ibsen knew Gallery House well, nonetheless, and he attended *Survey*. After the show, he wrote to Ed Herring, a young artist represented therein by a list of twelve statements in English and German entitled *Derivative Analytical-Reflexive*

Notations:

I very much liked the work you showed at Gallery House recently, despite some difficulty in understanding it, and I wondered if you would like to show the same piece and/or another in our lower gallery in January...³⁹⁵

Herring became one of a remarkable series of male conceptual artists given one-man shows in Oxford in the first half of 1973: Stezaker, John Blake, Daniel Buren, Douglas Huebler, Michael Druks, Christian Boltanski, Jean le Gac, and Sol LeWitt were the others, all initiated and organised by Ibsen, along with a group show called *Fluxshoe* (10-25 February); the ambitious show of conceptual [*Drawing*] that he

³⁹⁴ Medalla and Stevens showed in *Popa at Moma*, 1971; Herring's one-man show ran 28 April-27 May 1973, and Hemsworth's 3-17 June 1972; Willats coordinated the *Cognition and Control Project: Insight Development*, 14 October-5 November 1972; Brisley performed with Marc Chaimowicz in *Fluxshoe*, 10-25 February 1973.

³⁹⁵ Peter Ibsen, letter to Ed Herring, 8 November 1973, MAO Archive, box 'MOMA Jan-Dec 1973' fol. 'LeWitt/Huebler/Herring'. The statements were self-descriptive, the first reading 'The Notework is an inseparable whole of 50/50 component parts each part being of indivisible particularities': Gallery House, *A Survey of the Avant-Garde in Britain*, exh. cat., p. 33.

arranged came just earlier, in late 1972 (18 November-23 December).³⁹⁶

Emboldened by increasing experience and perhaps conscious of his imminent departure from the museum, Ibsen's programme dropped its concessions to past notions of art.³⁹⁷ Of the twelve shows staged between February and June that year, not one focused on painting, drawing or sculpture in their traditional forms.

Viewers in the summer of 1972 had found *The New Art* and *Survey* challenging, but they had generated popular and critical attention; *Survey* had even elicited some positive reviews. In Oxford, however, MOMA received very few visitors in spite of the significant profile of the artists filling its galleries: attendance dropped to less than half, from around 11,180 in financial year 1969-70 to an estimated mere 5,000 in 1973-4.³⁹⁸ Although Huebler, LeWitt, Boltanski and Buren, in particular, were internationally renowned conceptual artists receiving their first public shows in England, even local publications paid them scant notice. LeWitt's *Wall Drawing* (27 April-28 May) was the only show in this period to be reviewed even briefly in

³⁹⁶ Ibsen also approached Americans Mel Bochner and Barry Le Va about solo shows in spring 1973, without success: see MAO Archive, box 'MOMA Jan-Dec 1972' fol. 'Drawing'. *Fluxshoe* was a touring exhibition of Fluxus-inspired art, albeit an ever-changing one with many works made specifically for Oxford: MAO Archive, box 'Jan-Dec 1973' box 'Fluxshoe.' [*Drawing*] was remarkable in being not only a sustained examination of the use of drawing in conceptual art but also for the artists involved, who included Mel Bochner, Alan Charlton, Hanne Darboven, Barry Flanagan, Dan Graham, Gerard Hemsworth, John Latham, Bob Law, Agnes Martin, Keith Milow, John Murphy, Gerard Newman, Dennis Oppenheim, Robert Smithson, Lawrence Weiner, Richard Wentworth, and Bill Woodrow. For more on this exhibition see Lucy Steeds, 'Exhibitions [of Drawings] in Britain, 1964-1980', in *Towards Visibility: Exhibiting Contemporary Drawing 1964-1980*, ed. by Julie Enckell Julliard, (Dijon: Les presses du réel, 2015), pp. 54-85.

³⁹⁷ Antoinette Ibsen interview, (Oxford, 17 March 2014).

³⁹⁸ Precise visitor figures are hard to find from Ibsen's period, suggesting they were noted only casually, perhaps an indication of the lack of importance attached to them as a measure of success. The former number is quoted in 'Attendance Figures for the Year Ending 31 March, 1970', [n.d.] 1970, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 1-7, the latter in Nicholas Serota, 'Director's Report 1974-5', [n.d.] 1975, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 8-30.

the national press, an honour likely occasioned by his parallel showing at London's Lisson Gallery.³⁹⁹

After starting work at the museum, Serota continued to organise headline exhibitions by radical young artists of precisely the kind that reviewers in 1972 had found so infuriating. In one respect such overlaps are unsurprising, for Serota had worked closely on *The New Art* as Anne Seymour's assistant.⁴⁰⁰ Four of the fourteen artists from *The New Art* were given major Oxford exhibitions in 1974, the first year of his programme: Hamish Fulton (25 May-23 June), Barry Flanagan (20 October-24 November), John Hilliard (ditto) and David Tremlett (3 December-12 January 1975).⁴⁰¹ [fig. 3.5]

The 'Director's Report' for the year 1974-5 estimated visitor attendance at an outstanding 26,000, more than five times that of the previous twelve months.⁴⁰² The following year, it rose to more than 37,000.⁴⁰³ Critics from the *Birmingham Post*, the *Times*, the *Guardian*, the *Observer*, the *Financial Times*, *Southern Arts* and

³⁹⁹ Georgina Oliver, 'Sol LeWitt: Wall Drawings', *The Connoisseur*, (July 1973); there was also a very brief mention in John Russell, 'Hitchen's England', *Sunday Times*, (20 May 1973). Huebler, Herring and LeWitt received brief joint local comment: See Douglas Lee, 'Spheres and Squares', *The Cherwell*, (10 May 1973), and Judy Brundin, 'Artists Put Ideas First...', *Oxford Mail*, (23 May 1973) and F.W.D., 'Douglas Huebler', *Oxford Times*, (11 May 1973). Neither of the important shows by Boltanski and Buren seem to have received any critical coverage at all.

⁴⁰⁰ Sleeman, 'The New Art'.

⁴⁰¹ While Serota had started work at the museum the previous summer, exhibitions planned by Ibsen, a funding shortfall, and a renovation of the building meant that his own programming did not commence until February 1974.

⁴⁰² Serota, 'Director's Report 1974-5', [n.d.] 1975. Strangely, the 'Modern Art Oxford Policy Statement' by Serota, 23 Jan 1975, quotes the figure at only 21,000: ACGB/29/38 (1 of 7). The reasons for the discrepancy are unclear, but there is no doubt that the increases were dramatic.

⁴⁰³ *Ibid.*, 'Director's Report 1975-6', [n.d.] 1976, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 8-30.

Studio International were regularly making the journey to Oxford to review his exhibitions. In spring 1974, the Arts Council increased its annual funding from £9,500 for MOMA and Bear Lane jointly, to £15,250 for MOMA alone; it rose to £32,500 the following year, far above inflation.⁴⁰⁴ Given the powerful public antipathy to ‘brain-bashing’ conceptual art in Britain at the time, how was this dramatic transformation in the museum’s popular and economic fortunes achieved?

The Oxford Question

In the absence of the private patronage that Trevor Green had originally envisaged, MOMA remained reliant on the Arts Council for almost all income throughout this period. (‘It wasn’t very much, but what it was we were highly dependent on, and we were very aware that we needed the Arts Council to think this [programme] was interesting,’ comments Sandy Nairne of his time as Assistant Director at MOMA, 1974-6.⁴⁰⁵) The Arts Council had not taken a very active managerial role towards the museum during the 1960s, but the subsequent decade saw the advent of a more interventionist approach that tied its fortunes to those of the neighbouring Bear Lane Gallery. The conflicts that arose between the three bodies illuminate the expectations placed on MOMA. They disclose a local, national and international

⁴⁰⁴ John Barrow, Treasurer’s Report for Year 1974-75, 1975, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (1 of 7) fol. ‘pre 1976 April’; Minutes of the 23rd Meeting of the Council of Modern Art Oxford, 25 March 1975, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 8-30. The £32,500 included a £2,500 allowance for an artist-in-residence scheme. In his budget for 1975-6, for example, Serota requested estimated that adjusted for inflation, he would need only £22,000 to maintain the current programme, but nevertheless he requested £32,000.

⁴⁰⁵ Sandy Nairne interview, (London, 20 May 2014): ‘The week before the Arts Council committee would come we were completely focused on that committee, because 80% of the revenue in that period was coming from the Arts Council.’

context through which the museum's developing identity – and Serota's directorial strategies – may be better understood.

Bear Lane Gallery, named after the narrow street in central Oxford in which it was situated, was founded by Elizabeth Deighton, the wife of a fellow of Pembroke College and former undergraduate at the University.⁴⁰⁶ The gallery opened in May 1958 with *Contemporary British Landscape Painters* and the intent to remedy the Ashmolean Museum's perceived failure to expose undergraduates to recent art.⁴⁰⁷ [figs. 3.6-3.7] As a non-profit selling gallery which specialised in contemporary British sculptures, paintings and prints fashioned on a domestic scale, it operated on an innovative model.⁴⁰⁸ The gallery relied upon a largely university audience and clientele,⁴⁰⁹ and was located in a low-ceilinged, cramped, sixteenth-century terraced house, 6 Bear Lane, rented from Lincoln College.⁴¹⁰ Bear Lane Gallery succeeded in obtaining charitable status in 1963 and thereafter was modestly supported by the Arts Council, the Oxford City Council, and the County Education department in addition to its own modest revenues.

⁴⁰⁶ 'British Art Consultant to Visit College', *Wilmington News-Journal*, (2 March 1968), p. 5.

⁴⁰⁷ Elizabeth Deighton, 'Memorandum for the Franks Commission', [1964], MAO Archive, box 'Bear Lane History and Accounts' fol. 'Early BL history, accts, reports'.

⁴⁰⁸ Bear Lane Gallery combined non-profit commercial activity with charitable status and the receipt of grants from foundations and other bodies. In 1963, Deighton wrote that 'I believe this is the first selling gallery to achieve charitable status': letter to S. J. L. Egerton, Chairman of Coutts & Co, 5 April 1963, MAO Archive, box 'Bear Lane History and Accounts' fol. 'Early BL history, accts, reports'.

⁴⁰⁹ 'November is really our peak month... we find that it is at the beginning of the academic year that both the J.C.R.s and individual undergraduates buy.' Ibid., letter to John Piper, 7 December 1959, Tate Archive, TGA 200410/1/1/278.

⁴¹⁰ Andrew Hutton, 'A Crisis of Survival Faces Oxford's Art Galleries', *Oxford Mail*, (November 1971). 6 Bear Lane escaped 1970s plans by the college for demolition and presently accommodates students.

It was repeatedly suggested to MOMA that it collaborate with the contemporary visual art centre already established in the heart of Oxford, but relations were strained from the first. Green's plans for a new modern art museum in the city pre-empted and impeded Bear Lane's serious but less well-developed intentions to expand in a similar direction.⁴¹¹ ('Our young man has certainly been busy... It is a pity we were not quicker off the mark!' wrote Deighton in December 1965.)⁴¹² Although younger and inexperienced in arts management, Green had secured the support of prominent figures and – after some initial awkwardness – Deighton sought to take advantage of MOMA's momentum by combining their two appeals.⁴¹³ Green was less enthusiastic, refusing to be pinned down to details and expressing reservations about Bear Lane's commercial dimension: 'There is an overwhelming agreement between the members of the museum's council and its advisors about the unwisdom of trying to merge the functions of the museum with that of selling works,' he wrote in 1966.⁴¹⁴ As the museum took firmer shape, plans to integrate the two institutions were shelved indefinitely. In the summer of 1967, an Arts Council internal memo argued that:

a merger with the Bear Lane Gallery... will NOT happen, partly because the Bear Lane Gallery is in a very unhealthy position, not financially, but due to relations between the governing council and the gallery staff. Trevor Green is right not to consider working with them as their aims and outlook are

⁴¹¹ See chapter one for more details.

⁴¹² Elizabeth Deighton, letter to Peter Carter, 20 December 1965, MAO Archive, box 'Bear Lane History and Accounts: ACE Amalgamation' fol. 'BLG History'.

⁴¹³ For example, Deighton approached the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation and the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation for support after Green did: MAO Archive, box 'Bear Lane History and Accounts,' fol. 'Bear Lane History.'

⁴¹⁴ Trevor Green, letter to Elizabeth Deighton, 4 March 1966, MAO Archive, box 'Bear Lane History and Accounts: ACE Amalgamation' fol. 'BLG History'.

completely different... If the Bear Lane Gallery packed up, which it might well do, he would probably receive a bit more from us.⁴¹⁵

Bear Lane Gallery did not fold, however, leaving the Arts Council to (under)fund two modern art organisations in the same small city. Preliminary discussions for a merger in early 1969 stalled after Sir William Hayter, chairman of the Bear Lane Council, insisted on what the museum felt were unreasonable conditions.⁴¹⁶ In 1969 and 1970 the Arts Council canvassed staff and contacts on what became known as 'The Oxford Question,' requesting opinions on which of the two was the more expendable. The reports tended express reservations about both organisations while considering the museum the more important overall due to its more adventurous outlook.⁴¹⁷ The Arts Council decided that the best route was to force administrative integration, sparing itself the negative publicity of closing a well-loved gallery while in effect transferring the gallery's prestigious council members to the museum's less storied management committee.⁴¹⁸

⁴¹⁵ Katherine Kinnear, minute paper to Tony Field, 13 June 1967, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (2 of 7) fol. 65/72. The internal difficulties to which Kinnear referred likely related to a difference of opinion between the gallery's manager, Joan Crossley-Holland, and its Council on the relevance of contemporary craft and ceramics to Bear Lane.

⁴¹⁶ Sir William Hayter, letter to Trevor Green, 22 February 1969, MAO Archive, box 'Bear Lane History and Accounts: ACE Amalgamation' fol. 'BLG Amalgamation with MOMA'.

⁴¹⁷ Reports by Peter Bird, Kenneth Garlick, Anthony Field and Susan Grayson are held in the ACGB archive, ACGB/29/38 (1 of 7) and (2 of 7), along with other unsigned documents in the same files.

⁴¹⁸ In October 1971, the Museum of Modern Art Council consisted of John Barrow, artist Robert Carruthers, poet John Fuller, Stuart and Marya Lewis, and Brian Jefferson, while the Bear Lane Gallery Council comprised Sir William Hayter, Christ Church philosopher David Pears, Nick Waterlow, Michael Maclagan (Lord Mayor of Oxford 1970-71), Peter Meyer, Alderman C. J. Peers and John Piper: Minutes of the 2nd Meeting of the Oxford Council for Modern Art, 16 October 1971, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 1-7.

From spring 1971, the pressure to amalgamate was intensified, triggering the resignation of Bear Lane Director Nick Waterlow.⁴¹⁹ [fig. 3.8] The Arts Council's hope was that a joint managing committee would be forced to rationalise the galleries into a single programme and premises, combining strengths and eliminating inefficiencies along specific lines determined by the Arts Council itself. Unless full amalgamation and the transfer of activities from Bear Lane to Pembroke Street were achieved by the beginning of financial year 1972-3, it was announced in October 1971, all national funding to the gallery would be terminated; further, it would not be redirected to the museum, which was badly in need of supplementary income. Despite the promise that 'assuming amalgamation and appropriate unified staffing there would be a strengthening of funds,' these threats, which also 'assumed the quitting of the Bear Lane premises,' met with an angry response from the governing councils of the museum and, especially, the gallery. As council minutes record:

Mr. Carruthers asked if the Arts Council did not consider Bear Lane useful. Mr Bird replied that the Arts Council did not see the Bear Lane as necessary as it once was. Sir William Hayter commented that Bear Lane was expected to die and pretend not to. His Council preferred simply to cease... Mr. Bird reiterated that the Arts Council had hoped for an amalgamation.⁴²⁰

The Arts Council was taken aback by Hayter's refusal to countenance the survival of Bear Lane under these terms (an internal memo had predicted the organisation

⁴¹⁹ Nick Waterlow, letter to John Piper, 20 August 1971, Tate Archive, TGA 200410/1/1/278. He remained an active Council member for several years thereafter, before leaving for Australia in 1977 where he pursued a distinguished curatorial career until his death in 2009. See 'Obituary: Nick Waterlow', *The Telegraph*, (25 November 2009).

⁴²⁰ Minutes of the 2nd Meeting of the Oxford Council for Modern Art, 16 October 1971. The Oxford Council for Modern Art was a joint body of Bear Lane, MOMA and ACGB representatives formed in spring 1971 to discuss possibilities for amalgamation.

would opt for an ‘honourable death’ after amalgamation).⁴²¹ In the confusion that followed, Deighton succeeded in negotiating a last-minute compromise that would allow a combined organisation to retain 6 Bear Lane in addition to the Pembroke Street warehouse for a period not longer than two years, with a larger overall grant.⁴²² Under Peter Ibsen’s leadership, the new joint organisation was christened ‘Modern Art Oxford’ or ‘MAO’, the occasion for numerous puns.⁴²³ A joking ‘Baby Greetings Telegram’ sent by Waterlow to Ibsen acknowledged the months of tense negotiations with reference to the contemporary Cultural Revolution:

BIRTH OF MAO STOP THOUGHTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN STOP
‘AN EASY BIRTH MAKES A LAZY SLOATHFUL AND SPOILT
CHILD STOP A DIFFICULT BIRTH MAKES A CHILD STRONG OF
WILL HARD OF FIBRE STEADY OF DIRECTION STOP’ GOOD LUCK
STOP⁴²⁴ [fig. 3.9]

A press release in spring 1972 put a happier face on the situation, claiming ‘everyone involved is confident that this new step forward will be as revolutionary as the abbreviated title implies.’⁴²⁵ [fig 3.10]

⁴²¹ ‘Realistically BLG i.e. Nick will choose amalgamation but on his own terms... then close BLG to save money + staff – an honourable death’: unsigned handwritten note, [1971], ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (1 of 7) fol. ‘January 1970 onwards’. Bear Lane Gallery was commonly abbreviated to BLG in writing at the time, and this abbreviation in lower-case also appears on certain posters from the late 1960s.

⁴²² Peter Bird, memorandum to Robin Campbell, 12 November 1971, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (2 of 7) fol. 1970-72.

⁴²³ Council minutes do not record discussions around the choice of name but it is clear from the jokes and other commentary that followed that everyone was well aware of the reference to Mao Zedong: see ‘Chairman MAO for Oxford’, *The Guardian*, (29 April 1972), p. 11; ‘Chairman Nick’, *Oxford Mail*, (5 May 1972); Marina Vaizey, ‘Modern Art Oxford’, *Financial Times*, (25 May 1972), p. 3. Admiration for Maoist politics was not unusual among Britain’s new left in the late 1960s to mid-1970s: see chapter six of Tom Buchanan, *East Wind: China and the British Left, 1925-1976*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012). It is difficult to know exactly what kind of statement was being made with the name of the new organization but it was evidently light-hearted and certainly not disapproving.

⁴²⁴ N.d. [1972], MAO Archive, fol. A1/1/1 Council Correspondence ‘April 1972-December 1973.’

⁴²⁵ Press release, [spring] 1972, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (1 of 7) fol. ‘Jan 1970 onwards’.

Bear Lane Gallery continued limply with diminished hours and diminishing sales, under contentious joint council supervision, until Serota's new leadership and a looming £2,500 annual deficit prompted the decision to close it in December 1973.⁴²⁶ In so doing, the museum won back much of the goodwill of the Arts Council, its most essential patron, at a time when the latter 'had lately been pressed by the Minister to cut out dead wood.'⁴²⁷ Serota told the *Birmingham Post* that he had not planned to close Bear Lane Gallery, but had been 'overtaken by events.'⁴²⁸

Why was the Arts Council so insistent that Bear Lane Gallery and MOMA amalgamate when their approaches and functions were acknowledged by all to be different, and when such intervention was at odds with the organisation's founding principles? The Arts Council was purposely designed to have an 'arm's length' relationship to the government, but also to maintain a similar distance from the organisations it funded: this was to save art from the impoverishment of centralised control.⁴²⁹ Hugh Willatt, Arts Council Secretary-General from 1968 to 1975,

⁴²⁶ Peter Ibsen had overall directorial control of MAO, overseeing Conway Lloyd Morgan as Bear Lane's gallery manager with responsibility for its exhibitions. Both men were assisted by secretaries. There was also a part-time cleaner and gallery assistant during this time. Ibsen and Lloyd Morgan worked in parallel and administrative efficiencies were not achieved.

⁴²⁷ Arts Council representative Anthony Field quoted in Minutes of the 15th Council of Modern Art Oxford, 13 November 1973, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 1-7.

⁴²⁸ Terry Grimley, 'Modern Art Oxford's Future Secured', *Birmingham Post*, (January 1974), MAO Archive, press clippings file.

⁴²⁹ The Arts Council's Field, for example, who was closely involved with the Bear Lane and MOMA decisions, declared in a 1977 conference paper 'Art and Government' that 'what I think is particularly important for the creative artist is not only the autonomy of the Arts Council, but the autonomy of a tremendous number of organisations we subsidise': Brandon Taylor, ed., *Art and Politics: Proceedings of a Conference on Art and Politics held on 15th and 16th April, 1977* (Winchester: Winchester School of Arts Press, 1980), p. 32.

described its role as one of ‘giving with encouragement and without calling the tune.’⁴³⁰ In Oxford, however, it was definitely calling the tune, an intervention prompted not only by the inefficiency of supporting two organisations that it could not (or would not) fund beyond the scantest subsistence levels, but by dissatisfaction with both and a desire to reconcile perceived extremes within a carefully dictated middle ground.

Arts Council administrators were at times mistrustful of Ibsen, who they considered managerially inexperienced and excessively high-brow in his artistic sensibilities; they also objected strongly to what they considered the museum’s ‘lethargic’ financial management, which seldom remained within the annual budget, running into debt from which the Arts Council felt periodically obliged to provide rescue.⁴³¹ By contrast, although Bear Lane was financially more proactive, receiving grants from the city and county as well as generating income through sales, by the 1970s the Arts Council considered its artistic programme compromised by the need to generate revenue:

While we would not wish them to put on too commercial exhibitions, we do not give them sufficient subsidy to enable them not to have to... in any case [it] does not have the premises to do really good exhibitions.⁴³²

While Willatt described an Arts Council that gave ‘maximum freedom to the recipients,’ the struggles over Oxford suggest a very different and more precise set

⁴³⁰ Willatt, ‘How the Arts are Promoted’, p. 38.

⁴³¹ Peter Bird, memorandum to Robin Campbell, 8 February 1971, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (1 of 7) fol. ‘January 1970 onwards’. As reward for amalgamation, the Arts Council gave a one-off grant of £2922 in March 1972 to clear the museum’s debt; nonetheless, by April 1974, MAO was running a renewed deficit of £3997. See Barrow, Treasurer’s Report for Year 1974-75, 1975; ‘Income and Expenditure Account for the Year Ended 31st March 1972’, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 1-7.

⁴³² Peter Bird, Paper for Art Finance Committee, 10 March 1971, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (1 of 7) fol. ‘January 1970 onwards’.

of expectations held for those in receipt of public funds.⁴³³ While MOMA's exhibitions were considered insufficiently 'assimilable' by the public,⁴³⁴ those at Bear Lane, by contrast, were unduly 'conservative.'⁴³⁵ As Bird delicately explained, the Arts Council 'saw art in Oxford as a mixture of the Bear Lane and the Museum' and there was, therefore, 'the necessity for a slight shift in the Museum's policy which he felt was not entirely dependent on its director.'⁴³⁶ Instead, it seems, it should be determined by the Arts Council itself. Bear Lane's crooked and terraced house was judged cramped and 'rather shabby,'⁴³⁷ but the museum in its industrial building was instructed to 'exhibit shows of a more domestic nature.'⁴³⁸ Domesticity, in this context, implied both intimate spaces and the sort of accessible artwork in traditional media that might be attractively displayed in a middle-class home; it may also connote Britishness. It referred to exhibitions that were closer to Bear Lane Gallery's terrain. [figs. 3.11-3.12] It was hoped that MOMA would retain its appeal to university students, while Bear Lane would bring to the new MAO its schools activities and influential council members. Amalgamation, in other words, was intended to dilute the eccentricities of both galleries.⁴³⁹ In coercing the two into

⁴³³ Willatt, 'How the Arts are Promoted', p. 23.

⁴³⁴ 'Mr. Pears said it was generally felt that BLG offered modern art in a more assimilable form... Mr. Bird felt there would be no bad feeling if the Council said it was closing BLG to form another policy for the Museum which would make it more appealing.' Minutes of the 8th Meeting of the Council of Modern Art Oxford Ltd., 19 January 1973, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 1-7.

⁴³⁵ Anonymous handwritten note, n.d. [1971], ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (2 of 7) fol. '1970-72'.

⁴³⁶ Minutes of the 2nd Meeting of the Oxford Council for Modern Art, 16 October 1971.

⁴³⁷ Kenneth Garlick from the Ashmolean Museum quoted by Peter Bird, memorandum to Chairman [Sir John Pope-Hennessy], 'The Oxford Question', 1 July 1969, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (2 of 7) fol. Feb 1969-March 1974.

⁴³⁸ Minutes of the 2nd Meeting of the Oxford Council for Modern Art, 16 October 1971.

⁴³⁹ 'Arnolfini in a way was more of a cross between the Bear Lane and a Museum of Modern Art in Oxford, in the sense that it was tending to show mainstream British

a merger, the Arts Council intended to pit the priorities of one committee against the other in the hope that from the wreckage would emerge an institutional *juste milieu* – one, moreover, that adhered to its own specifications. ‘It was an extremely acrimonious shot-gun wedding,’ according to Serota, and the union lasted less than two years.⁴⁴⁰

Particular Values and Particular Things

Under threat from the Arts Council, Bear Lane and MOMA and their respective advocates were forced to articulate the value of their existence, revealing highly divergent understandings of what would make for a meaningful art encounter. Both sides felt that the two galleries were physically suited to different kinds of exhibitions, and therefore any attempt to unite the two in a single building would result in a loss of aesthetic diversity and a contraction of visitor experience. (‘Mr. Barrow reminded the meeting that the Museum’s premises were large, somewhat austere spaces contrasting with the carpeted, comfortable domesticity at Bear Lane.’⁴⁴¹) Bear Lane partisans were particularly averse to the atmosphere of the museum’s building. Council member Walter James bemoaned the ‘damp disused warehouse air of the Museum,’ and in a 1971 article for *Studio International* that made the case for keeping Bear Lane, Oxford-based painter Jeff Clarke condemned

art, not much international art... It was seen by the Arts Council as a model and I think we were seen by the Arts Council as being slightly deficient in comparison to that model,’ Nicholas Serota interview, (Tate Britain, 7 July 2014).

⁴⁴⁰ Ibid., interview 2014.

⁴⁴¹ Minutes of the 2nd Meeting of the Oxford Council for Modern Art, 16 October 1971.

it as ‘physically forbidding.’⁴⁴² When it finally closed, his letter of protest extended his criticism of the experience of viewing art in the Pembroke Street building:

For a committee boasting architects for eight years we find further that at last a positive move is being made to make the Museum more inviting and intimate. It will need luck as well as ideas... when people talk of Bear Lane’s intimacy they are talking of something real and inherent – built into the fabric of the place, a quality of unity that encourages people to withdraw into and [sic] artist’s idea, without being distracted by a feeling of isolation or intimidated by the space around them.⁴⁴³

Clarke was not alone in having doubts about the building during this time. While Tisdall in the *Guardian* called MOMA ‘the most splendid exhibition space outside London,’ Oxford student magazine *Isis* failed to be inspired by its lofty scale and industrial character, complaining that:

Cold expanses of white wall together with inadequate heating, lighting and an occasional leak in the roof conspire to make what is potentially a fine gallery into a kind of aesthetic mortuary where work is laid up for its penultimate rest... Despite highly adventurous exhibits M.O.M.A. attendances have been decreasing.⁴⁴⁴ [figs. 3.13-3.14]

Even John Barrow, MOMA’s council chairman, was ambivalent about Pembroke Street in 1972: although the Upper Gallery was ‘a space with a national reputation among younger painters and sculptors,’ the lower floors were ‘awkwardly forested with cast-iron columns.’ Still less inviting to the public, he felt, was the siting of the building within the city, on a ‘dismal, depopulated street which is basically a city

⁴⁴² Walter James, letter to William Hayter, 15 May 1969, MAO Archive, box ‘AGM + Council meetings 1963-1969’; Jeff Clarke, ‘Bear Lane’s Troubles’, *Studio International*, vol. 182, no. 983, (November 1971). Clarke concluded diplomatically that both had their value and deserved to be preserved.

⁴⁴³ Ibid., Statement to the Council of Modern Art Oxford, 8 December 1973, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (2 of 7) fol. Feb 1969-March 1974.

⁴⁴⁴ The *Isis* article description pertains to the physical premises during Ibsen’s time and is contrasted to Serota’s plans to ‘humanise the gallery, and, consequently to popularise it.’ David Bainbridge, ‘Art: MOMA’, *Isis*, (6 February 1974); Caroline Tisdall, ‘[untitled]’, *The Guardian*, (2 January 1974), p. 8.

centre traffic relief route with dangerously narrow footpaths. (Were Pembroke Street more like Turl Street in character, it would be a different matter.)⁴⁴⁵

Criticisms of the Bear Lane building had also been levelled from within: Deighton herself had written as early as 1966 of the need for the gallery to move ‘because of the uncertainty of the lease, its overcrowding, and tis [sic] state of delapidation [sic].’⁴⁴⁶ Others agreed. Although the *Oxford Mail* missed Bear Lane’s ‘unrivalled atmosphere,’ *Southern Arts* magazine refused to mourn its passing: compared to the glossy new commercial Oxford Gallery on the High Street or the ‘exceptionally beautiful spaces’ at MOMA, Bear Lane, ‘tucked away down a narrow alley, began to look cold and damp and threadbare’ and had become ‘largely neglected and unvisited’ since the late 1960s.⁴⁴⁷ [fig. 3.15]

Not only did these two art centres present different spaces, they attracted different audiences, too. In 1969 it was noted that because of their loyalty to Bear Lane, ‘many members of the committee have not set foot in the M.M.A,’ but that it was well attended by undergraduates.⁴⁴⁸ A certain student cachet continued through Peter Ibsen’s tenure, and there was also a ‘steady stream of visitors – artists, gallery

⁴⁴⁵ Turl Street is a picturesque pedestrian road in the centre of the old city, flanked by three medieval colleges. The museum anticipated having to leave Pembroke Street within the next few years, as the building was at the time earmarked for demolition and redevelopment. Accordingly, council members were considering alternative sites. John Barrow, draft letter to Sir William Hayter, [October] 1972, MAO Archive, Council of Management files 1-7.

⁴⁴⁶ Elizabeth Deighton, letter to Sir William Hayter, 4 January 1966, MAO Archive, box ‘Bear Lane History and Accounts: ACE Amalgamation’ fol. ‘BLG History’; Clarke, ‘Bear Lane’s Troubles’.

⁴⁴⁷ ‘Memories of Threadbare Lane’, *Southern Arts*, (March 1974); Andrew Hutton, ‘Gallery Shuts: What Next?’, *Oxford Mail*, (9 January 1974).

⁴⁴⁸ Bird, memorandum to Chairman [Sir John Pope-Hennessy], ‘The Oxford Question’, 1 July 1969.

directors, critics – down from London at this time.’⁴⁴⁹ Nonetheless, its appeal to the townspeople, and even university faculty, was by all accounts minimal.⁴⁵⁰ Indeed, MOMA’s attendance was low overall, and there were comments from MAO’s council in January 1973 that ‘the present atmosphere at the Museum was bad.’⁴⁵¹ Retrospectively, Norman Rosenthal described a museum whose programme was so unusual, so inscrutable, and so poorly attended that it ‘felt very much like a secret, almost occult, centre.’⁴⁵² Kathy Pollen, who worked as a secretary at Bear Lane and then MOMA, felt the gallery was ‘cosy’ and describes Ibsen’s MOMA by contrast as a ‘very arcane, non-public-attractive place.’⁴⁵³ In Clark’s analysis:

It is unfortunately thought by many of the public to be more avant garde than is the case... and due to its admission charges can prove a moderately expensive family outing – and usually a lonely one – perhaps inevitably creating something of its own elite.⁴⁵⁴

Defences of Bear Lane often downplayed its commercial activities in order to rebut the assumption that it was a ‘super sales gallery’ undeserving of subsidy.⁴⁵⁵ Clarke contrasted it with its neighbour, the self-supporting Oxford Gallery, drawing a sharp

⁴⁴⁹ Teresa Gleadowe, ‘Modern Art Oxford: Interview with Nicholas Serota’, *Southern Arts*, vol. 1, no. 2, (April 1974), p. 8.

⁴⁵⁰ Serota hoped to rectify this, writing that ‘as you well know one of the museum’s main problems is that it has failed to establish itself as a centre which contributes to the life of the town, or even to the life of the senior members of the University. It remains, in spite of earlier efforts, essentially a student orientated organisation’: letter to Peter Bird, 14 September 1973, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (2 of 7) fol. Feb 1969-March 1974.

⁴⁵¹ Among those expressing similar sentiments were Pears, Waterlow and Carruthers. Minutes of the 8th Meeting of the Council of Modern Art Oxford Ltd., 19 January 1973.

⁴⁵² ‘A Note on Joseph Beuys,’ in *Joseph Beuys: The Secret Block for a Secret Person in Ireland*, exh. cat., Royal Academy of Arts, 22 July-16 September 1999, p. 14. Rosenthal describes MOMA’s Beuys exhibition as a turning point in the reception of new art practices in Britain.

⁴⁵³ Katharine Pollen interview, (Bath, 5 December 2013). Pollen assisted Conway Lloyd Morgan at Bear Lane; after Serota assumed directorship of MAO she worked for him at MOMA until July 1974.

⁴⁵⁴ Clarke, ‘Bear Lane’s Troubles’.

⁴⁵⁵ Conway Lloyd Morgan, memorandum, n.d. [1973], MAO Archive, fol. A1/1/1 ‘Council Correspondence April 1972-Dec 1973’.

line between Bear Lane's high art and the apparently vulgar activity of exhibiting craft:

Charges had been made against the gallery of commercialism and showing to sell. If the Arts Council members or others wish to refresh their ideas as to what a commercial gallery in Oxford means, then I urge them to go and find out in the High Street by making their way through the jewellery, cut glass and pottery ornaments.⁴⁵⁶

Although dismissive of the value of peddling cut glass and pottery, Bear Lane supporters often praised the gallery's sales dimension when it came to fine art; Clarke among others argued that while exhibitions give artists exposure, sales provide them with income ('I speak for a profession... as long as there are artists, Bear Lane will be needed.')⁴⁵⁷ In Deighton's original conception of the gallery, sales served not merely to cover costs but were a key part of its value in the public sphere. She outlined her rationale in 1964:

1. It encourages the private patronage of the arts. While the bulk of patronage is moving into the hands of institutions... it is artistically healthy (and of considerable benefit to the artists financially) if a 'buying' public, developing its own criterion, is encouraged.
2. The fact that pictures are offered for sale, allows the gallery to induce artists to show their latest and best works...
3. A selling gallery is a lively gallery.⁴⁵⁸

Ten years later, in a newspaper article entitled 'A Lesson to be Learned from the Death of Bear Lane,' Deighton added a new justification for commercial activity: it created a balance of funding that restored authority to the gallery to determine its own direction. It was damaging, she wrote, that MAO's economic reliance on the

⁴⁵⁶ Clarke, Statement to the Council of Modern Art Oxford, 8 December 1973. Although Clarke was dismissive of the Oxford Gallery in 1973, it did assume some of Bear Lane's role in the city and he himself showed there in the late 1970s. See Sarah Tisdall, 'Oxford Gallery', *Southern Arts*, no. 5, (July/August 1974), pp. 14-15.

⁴⁵⁷ Clarke, Statement to the Council of Modern Art Oxford, 8 December 1973.

⁴⁵⁸ Elizabeth Deighton, 'Memorandum of Bear Lane Gallery, Oxford', 1964, MAO Archive, box 'Bear Lane History and Accounts' fol. 'Early BL history, accts, reports'.

Arts Council had forced it to cede control over policy. ‘The theory of a balance of power is not a bad one.’⁴⁵⁹

Clarke and fellow painter Terry Frost addressed the perceived moral issues around commerce, writing passionately of Bear Lane’s ‘honesty.’ A letter of protest at the closure from the Reading University Fine Art department, including Clarke, Frost, Patrick Heron and Martin Froy, made the vague but evocative claim that ‘to a great many people the BLG stands for particular values and particular things and has been able to stand aside from fashion.’⁴⁶⁰

What were these particular values? One of them, evidently, was the embattled position of artistic modernism, which constituted Bear Lane’s bread and butter but had been getting increasingly short shrift at MOMA since the 1960s. John Piper suggested the museum and not the gallery be closed, for ‘during the time they have both existed BLG has shown more things I personally like’ and moreover Bear Lane continued to privilege traditional concepts of high art and aesthetic experience: unlike MOMA, evidently, ‘BLG is neither didactic nor educative. Education in art, when it is real education, comes via painting and sculpture, not through lectures and furniture and architecture.’⁴⁶¹ (In the opinion of the Bear Lane council in 1969, MOMA did not hold exhibitions but merely ‘events,’ a policy it resolved never to

⁴⁵⁹ Ibid., ‘A Lesson to be Learned from the Death of Bear Lane’, *Oxford Mail*, (14 January 1974).

⁴⁶⁰ Martin Froy et al., letter to the Arts Council, 29 November 1973, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (2 of 7) fol. ‘Feb 1969-March 1974’.

⁴⁶¹ Letter to Lloyd Morgan, MAO Archive, box ‘Bear Lane AGM + Council meetings 1963-1969.’ In fact, Bear Lane had a long-established education programme.

adopt.⁴⁶²) But Bear Lane's character was tied up not only with the decline of modernism but also with notions of tradition, domesticity, dignity and other middle-class virtues felt to be lacking at the museum. Frost sent another letter from his own signature alone, extolling in remarkably conservative language:

the humbleness of the place, its lack of pretension, lack of Bond Street and Big Money... MOMA has become too exclusive... I do not ever see it giving the kind of spiritual feed that has been provided by the exhibitions at Bear Lane. It has something to do with Quality, Respect, and Continuity.⁴⁶³

For him, Bear Lane was the underdog in a cutthroat corporatist climate: 'I think it will be a sad day for the majority if the Take-over, Supermarket, Speculator attitude backed by public money destroys the more personal type of involvement that belongs to Bear Lane'; in his view, the gallery had been annexed by MOMA and the Arts Council who jointly represented a set of elitist, metropolitan values that threatened diversity and small enterprise.⁴⁶⁴ Deighton, too, attempted to portray Bear Lane as disruptive to the new status quo, suggesting that 'galleries, profitless though they be, are risky bets compared as with museums' and that the Arts Council preferred more familiar institutional models.⁴⁶⁵ The perception that Ibsen's museum somehow represented the embodiment of Arts Council ideals was erroneous, for MOMA too was subject to reforming pressures from London bureaucrats. Instead, these misapprehensions indicate the embattled feelings of Bear Lane Gallery's staff and artists, forced to conclude that their cultural contributions were no longer considered cutting-edge or deserving of state support, even by the middle-of-the-road standards of the Arts Council.

⁴⁶² Minutes of the Council of Bear Lane Gallery Ltd., 22 February 1969, MAO Archive, box 'Bear Lane AGM + Council meetings 1963-1969.'

⁴⁶³ Terry Frost, letter to the Council of Modern Art Oxford, n.d. [December] 1973, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (2 of 7) fol. Feb 1969-March 1974.

⁴⁶⁴ Ibid., letter to the Council of Modern Art Oxford, n.d. [December] 1973

⁴⁶⁵ Deighton, 'A Lesson to be Learned from the Death of Bear Lane'.

If the kind of art at home in Bear Lane Gallery was in some senses abandoned to the free market in Oxford in the early 1970s, it was not due to any real partiality on the part of the Arts Council for MOMA's conceptual art. However, when the Oxford Gallery was succeeding nearby in selling contemporary art (and craft) without subsidy, it became harder to justify national subvention of Bear Lane's similar activities; the works on show at the museum seemed to have very little commercial appeal, and thus much greater need for external subsidy. Although Frost and Clarke rhetorically distanced Bear Lane from Mayfair's for-profit galleries, other contemporaries saw it 'like a little West End gallery, what you'd find on Cork or Dover Street.'⁴⁶⁶ Lynda Morris described it disparagingly as doing 'a reasonable trade in selling contemporary prints to "dons' wives,"' casting the gallery as both bourgeois and feminine in implied contrast to a radical and masculine identity for MOMA.⁴⁶⁷

Although MOMA from its beginning had taken a small percentage of the cost of works sold from its exhibitions, such sales were so rare as to be financially negligible.⁴⁶⁸ As Ibsen described his policy to the *Oxford Times* in 1970:

⁴⁶⁶ Andy Walton interview, (Oxford, 9 April 2014). Bird believed that 'many of the things they show are not much above the level of a frankly commercial gallery like the Oxford Gallery.' Paper for Art Finance Committee, 10 March 1971.

⁴⁶⁷ Morris, 'The Museum of Modern Art in Oxford 1965-1975', p. 238. For Clarke, meanwhile, the gallery existed to support 'boys who were really serious about painting,' 'mostly not figurative, but in some way established': interview 2014. In fact, Bear Lane was unusual in being founded and largely run by women, and in showing a number of female artists such as Prunella Clough, Sandra Blow, and Bridget Riley.

⁴⁶⁸ Sales were unusual enough that a hypothetical 'discussion developed around what percentage the Museum in its special, non-commercial position should levy on work sold by unknown artists; 20% was thought fair. Peter Ibsen undertook to

‘the sale of pictures is quite incidental to our function as a centre... If people are interested enough to want to buy a particular picture that we exhibit, we assist them, of course.’⁴⁶⁹

While the Arts Council was keen for MOMA to learn from Bear Lane’s ‘selling technique,’⁴⁷⁰ Ibsen was adamant that he did not want his programme to be influenced by commercial concerns and argued that any move in this direction would deter artists and damage the reputation of the museum.⁴⁷¹ Despite being assisted in the production of certain exhibitions by dealers with whom he had made contact, such as Nicholas Logsdail, Jack Wendler and Ileana Sonnabend, Ibsen remained uncomfortable about conjunctions of art and business. In a 1975 interview with Lynda Morris, he was described as:

apprehensive [...] in his attitude to recent [art] work, which he found was making increasing concessions to commercialism. He left Oxford around the time that Gallery House closed, and felt it was the end of an open, idealistic era.⁴⁷²

In spite of staunch public denials, Ibsen’s concern over commerce was by the early 1970s shared by Bear Lane’s own Nick Waterlow. In a 1971 council meeting, Waterlow expressed a desire to be less reliant upon income from commission, which was unpredictable and which limited the kind of exhibition the gallery could arrange.⁴⁷³ Moreover, his artistic interests tended in another direction: as early as 1968 he publicly lamented the fact that “‘Oxford taste is perhaps exemplified by semi-abstract landscapes,’” adding that in his view easel painting was dead, and

consider the problem.’ Minutes of the Meeting Held 23 June 1971, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 1-7.

⁴⁶⁹ ‘Modern Art’, *Oxford Times*, (20 November 1970).

⁴⁷⁰ Anthony Field, ‘Memorandum to Art Director, “Oxford Art Galleries”’, 11 March 1971, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (2 of 7) fol. Feb 1969-March 1974.

⁴⁷¹ Minutes of the 7th Meeting of the Council of Modern Art, 6 January 1973, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 1-7.

⁴⁷² Morris, ‘The Museum of Modern Art in Oxford 1965-1975’, p. 240.

⁴⁷³ Minutes of the Council of Management, 1 May 1971.

“the whole structure of taste needs to be raised above wall decoration: inhibitions and preconceptions have to be destroyed.”⁴⁷⁴ These ambitions were at variance with the gallery’s economic realities, and attempts in the early 1970s to organise more innovative exhibitions proved financially calamitous. These included not only an interactive surrealist installation, *Dorothy* (30 May-20 June 1970) but also those that had objects for sale.⁴⁷⁵ [figs. 3.16-3.17] Waterlow reported to the council in some frustration in January 1971 that although popular with visitors, *Dorothy* had not only resulted in a loss of income during the exhibition, but had even had a ‘damaging effect’ on sales from the three shows that followed. Paying customers, it seemed, disliked the exhibition’s experimental nature so much that they avoided the gallery for months thereafter.⁴⁷⁶ However artistically successful, such experiments could not responsibly be repeated. Waterlow concluded that ‘the most realistic policy from a financial point of view would be to stage reasonably conservative exhibitions which would bring in a steady income.’⁴⁷⁷ If by drawing attention to Bear Lane’s inability to keep up with artistic developments Waterlow hoped to spur further funding from the Arts Council, his strategy backfired.

In the late 1950s and early 1960s, Bear Lane’s position as a registered charity that was also a selling gallery seemed to represent a successful innovation. Deighton

⁴⁷⁴ ‘Showing It Off’. The writer added that due to financial considerations, ‘for the present, at any rate, his shows must remain within a sober definition of Art.’

⁴⁷⁵ *Kinetics and Multiples* was a joint effort with MOMA across the two sites. ‘The recent Multiples show was financially a small disaster’: Bear Lane Gallery Council, ‘Basic Proposals for Amalgamation’, [1971], MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 1-7. For Richard Allen’s 1971 exhibition, see Conway Lloyd Morgan, ‘Manager’s Report’, [December] 1972, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 1-7.

⁴⁷⁶ Minutes of a Meeting of the Council of Bear Lane Gallery, 23 January 1971, MAO Archive, box ‘Bear Lane History and Accounts: ACE Amalgamation’ fol. ‘Bear Lane Gallery Ltd: Council Minutes May 1969-March 1972’.

⁴⁷⁷ Minutes of a Meeting of the Council of Bear Lane Gallery, 23 January 1971

was proud of the success of this hybrid model for improving arts provision at low cost and hoped to see it copied around the country. In 1964, she promoted the idea in an unsolicited letter to Jennie Lee: ‘I would suggest a pattern has been established here which calls for relatively little (though vitally important) expenditure of public money and works within the limits it has set itself.’⁴⁷⁸ In retrospect, however, Bear Lane’s success was dependent upon art-historical conditions that proved short-lived. In the late 1950s and the 1960s, the gallery had tapped a rich vein of mostly British, mostly abstract work that was taken seriously by critics and was also commercially viable. By 1973, the model no longer worked, at least in Britain. Artists working in the modernist tradition such as John Piper and Terry Frost (and their less-successful kindred) were no longer considered to be at the forefront of contemporary art: their successors at MOMA were unlikely to generate sales in a provincial city such as Oxford. Frost and his fellow painters might have praised Bear Lane for ‘standing outside of fashion,’ but its inability to keep up with current artistic tendencies within a commercial framework precipitated its closure.

The Most Glamorous Space of All

It seemed to Oxford locals with an interest in the museum that very quickly after Nicholas Serota was appointed the institution appeared to have more money to spend, something that sparked interest and attention.⁴⁷⁹ In fact, the first months of his directorship were financially very difficult, as it became evident that MAO would end the financial year 1973-74 with a deficit of £2,500 if it went ahead with

⁴⁷⁸ Elizabeth Deighton, letter to Jennie Lee, 23 November 1964, MAO Archive, box ‘Bear Lane History and Accounts’ fol. ‘Early BL history, accts, reports’.

⁴⁷⁹ Jeff Clarke interview, (Oxford, 5 March 2014); Pollen, interview 2013; Antoinette Ibsen interview, (Oxford, 19 April 2012).

the planned programming for its two premises.⁴⁸⁰ Emergency measures were required: the museum cancelled upcoming exhibitions and shut its doors from mid-December through late February; Bear Lane was closed permanently following an Extraordinary General Meeting of the Council of Modern Art Oxford, 8 December 1973, with a vote of five to two. In advance of the meeting, chairman John Barrow wrote to the council to explain that maintaining two galleries:

cannot be done. The strain is too great and shows itself in a number of ways: the meagre quality of some of our exhibitions, the tired desperation that overtakes our peripatetic staff, the increasingly threadbare aspect of our premises, and, particularly apparent to me, a swelling undercurrent of frustration and anger that runs through Council meetings.

He added that ‘the Arts Council views the time and energy that has gone into maintaining two premises as largely mis-spent. That time and energy, it feels, should have been directed to evolving a better exhibition programme.’⁴⁸¹ As we have seen, the decision to close Bear Lane was not without controversy and opposition, especially from local artists and residents. The Arts Council, however, received MOMA’s gestures of acquiescence and financial restraint warmly. Despite the reduced costs associated with centralising the programme in a single building, it awarded an annual grant that was 60% larger than the previous year, with a supplementary £1,500 for publicity purposes and £500 for renovation.⁴⁸² (Serota

⁴⁸⁰ Nicholas Serota, letter to Lucy Milton, 9 November 1973, MAO Archive, box ‘MOMA Jan-Dec 1973’ fol. ‘Francois Morellet’.

⁴⁸¹ John Barrow, letter to the Council of Modern Art Oxford, 3 December 1973, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (2 of 7) fol. Feb 1969-March 1974. Another relevant factor was the state of Bear Lane Gallery itself, which was selling less than before and which was discovered to be in a condition of ‘physical and administrative chaos’ in the summer of 1973: minutes of the 14th Meeting of the Council of Modern Art Oxford, 18 September 1973, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 1-7.

⁴⁸² Minutes of the 17th Meeting of the Council of Modern Art Oxford, 12 March 1974, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 8-30. Rising costs associated

had applied for only £1000 in publicity funds.)⁴⁸³ Some of the Arts Council's faith in Serota may have derived from his social and educational background (public school, Cambridge University and the Courtauld Institute, his mother a senior politician and life peer from 1967) and his professional demeanour, which contemporaries describe as self-assured and highly focused.⁴⁸⁴ Although only twenty-seven when he started, his three years working for the Arts Council in London had given him insight into the mechanisms of that organisation and he had established an internal reputation as experienced and trustworthy.⁴⁸⁵ Unlike Peter Ibsen, who excelled at working with artists but struggled with committees and described himself as 'incapable of the politics involved in raising money from the Arts Council and private sources,'⁴⁸⁶ Serota was already a confident administrator and communicator, capable of packaging his ideas so as to map successfully onto bureaucratic requirements, and was experienced with budgets and grant applications.⁴⁸⁷ Concentrating resources into Pembroke Street, establishing hitherto

with inflation account for only a portion of the increase, as the Arts Council's overall budget rose only 24% the same year. Witts, *Artist Unknown*, appendix.

⁴⁸³ Serota, letter to Peter Bird, 14 September 1973.

⁴⁸⁴ Lewis and Lewis, interview 2012; Ibsen, interview 2012; Pollen, interview 2013.

⁴⁸⁵ Serota, interview 2014; Nairne, interview 2014. The same point was made by Deighton; given her views on the Arts Council it seems likely she did not intend a compliment when she noted that Serota 'had the great asset of being known to, and highly respected by his previous employers, the Arts Council, who are now our main, and indeed nearly sole, source of finance': 'Memorandum to the Council of Management', n.d. [c. December] 1973, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 1-7.

⁴⁸⁶ Morris, 'The Museum of Modern Art in Oxford 1965-1975', p. 239.

⁴⁸⁷ Serota's facility with museum finances was demonstrated not just by his ability to stick to budget but in other details, such as the fact that he registered MOMA for exemption from VAT in 1974 with a projected annual savings of £800: Nicholas Serota, 'Director's Report', May 1974, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 8-30. Antoinette Ibsen agreed that her husband struggled with management and committee meetings, interview 2012. In interview, 2014, Serota acknowledged the usefulness of his professional connections to the Arts Council. His aptitude for fundraising and pragmatic rhetorical flexibility stood him in good stead later as Tate Director, as a 2012 profile noted: 'He has dealt with five different Prime Ministers.

unprecedented financial discipline and showing a willingness to fundraise from businesses, foundations and municipal bodies as well as the Arts Council all helped to demonstrate the ‘constructive approach’ that it had previously found lacking in Oxford; it gave the administrators the confidence to approve his programming decisions.⁴⁸⁸

If the influx of Arts Council cash in early 1974 helped to create an aura of excitement and import around Serota’s MOMA that reversed the public image of a struggling institution – an aura that belied its on-going problems – it did so in part because of the targeted manner in which the supplementary grants were spent. A strategic renovation was undertaken in winter 1973-4 which did not aim to resolve the building’s structural issues but which polished and updated the Pembroke Street galleries and exterior on a tight budget.⁴⁸⁹ ‘The whole frontage was made far more attractive, open, with far better signage,’ remembers Pollen. In addition to looking more expensive, ‘it looked really cool.’⁴⁹⁰ Serota and architect John Ellis whitewashed over the psychedelic tubular lettering that had ornamented the façade since 1970, and new glass doors on street level opened into a newly screened-off

“You tend to use different arguments,” Serota explained. “Mrs. Thatcher was very keen on an entrepreneurial attitude, and bringing in private money. Tony Blair’s government was more interested in access and education.” Calvin Tomkins, ‘The Modern Man: How Nicholas Serota is reinventing the Tate Gallery’, *The New Yorker*, (2 July 2012), n.p.

⁴⁸⁸ Anthony Field quoted in Minutes of the 15th Council of Modern Art Oxford, 13 November 1973.

⁴⁸⁹ The outstanding structural problems included leaks and the fact that the building was in contravention of fire safety legislation: ‘at the moment the fire people were turning a blind eye and had been for ten years,’ noted John Barrow in the Minutes of the 27th Meeting of the Council of Modern Art Oxford, 20 March 1976, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 8-30. These issues were among those intended to be addressed by the capital building project in planning from late 1975.

⁴⁹⁰ Pollen, interview 2013.

foyer, with a bookstall and postcards for sale.⁴⁹¹ [figs. 3.18-3.20] In addition to fresh white paint throughout the interior (much applied by the Director personally), repairs were made to the roof and the lighting updated.⁴⁹² The museum had hired a handyman to sand and refinish the plywood McAlpine floors on the top floor but Serota decided the results were ‘too shiny’ for his taste. With the assistance of undergraduate volunteer Sandy Nairne, he removed excess varnish from the entire floor using wet-and-dry sandpaper in early 1974, the period in which electricity shortages resulted in the three-day week.⁴⁹³ [fig. 3.21] Sisal matting for the ground and lower ground floors was sewn together by Serota and Pollen to cover the industrial concrete, ‘a cheap, temporary solution to the problem of unifying spaces and changing the atmosphere of the building’;⁴⁹⁴ the carpeting and a new, ‘more intimate’ gallery created on the ground floor for the display of graphic work were designed to alleviate criticisms levied at the museum’s atmosphere from Bear Lane’s supporters. [fig. 3.22] ‘The idea is... to make the building feel warmer and more human in scale,’ he told the *Oxford Mail*.⁴⁹⁵

⁴⁹¹ It is unclear when the façade was painted over and whether the tubular lettering was replaced with an updated design, as in one design by Ellis from early 1974 (MAO Archive), or left plain as it appears the next surviving photographs from c. 1977. The old lettering appears in photos of the façade taken in spring 1974, suggesting that the repainting may have been delayed until summer for budgetary or other practical reasons. Serota remembers the façade as having been painted plain in email correspondence, 9 and 10 October 2015.

⁴⁹² The Arts Council was very impressed by Serota’s willingness to undertake some of the physical work of renovation himself to save money, as noted in Richard Francis, ‘Oxford, Museum of Modern Art’, 27 January 1975, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (1 of 7) fol. ‘correspondence/minutes pre 1976 April’. Serota’s wife, Angela, also helped.

⁴⁹³ Serota, interview 2014.

⁴⁹⁴ Unfortunately, the minutes went on to read ‘It has serious disadvantages – increased risk of fire, texture poor for freestanding sculptures, collects dirt.’ Minutes of the 26th Council of Modern Art Oxford, 26 October 1975, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 8-30 .

⁴⁹⁵ Richard Yates, ‘It’s Different, It’s New and It’s Free’, *Oxford Mail*, (22 February 1974).

Further to this end, the bookstall and a few months later, a new coffee and sandwich bar in the basement were established not to generate income (although they covered their own costs) but to foster a more lively social atmosphere. There was nowhere in Oxford at the time to buy books of modern art and poetry, and the bookstall ‘attracts visitors into the museum, makes the building feel bright and populated and offers interest over and above the current exhibitions’,⁴⁹⁶ it was run by Angela Serota, the Director’s wife, who had previously managed the bookshop at the Hayward.⁴⁹⁷ In place of the previous system whereby the receptionist would make coffee for visitors upon request, a full café was installed on the lower ground floor. ‘[It] was about trying to encourage students to come and stay, to regard it as a place where they would meet each other,’ Serota says.⁴⁹⁸ [figs. 3.23-3.24] A successful fundraising effort ensured that the museum paid only £1000 of the £3000 renovation cost from its operating budget; in addition to the Arts Council grant and to funding from the Southern Arts Association, MOMA attracted support from collectors and from Blackwells, the Oxford bookseller, the first substantial private support it had received since its opening.⁴⁹⁹

As part of his campaign to boost the public profile of the museum, Serota used the injection of Arts Council publicity funding to revamp its graphics. Driven to desperate economies, Ibsen had designed most of MOMA’s posters, invitation

⁴⁹⁶ Serota, ‘Director’s Report’, May 1974.

⁴⁹⁷ Tomkins, ‘The Modern Man’, n.p. The newsheet of May-June 1974 lists an international selection of books, magazines and catalogues from prominent public and private organisations: MAO Archive, box ‘Newssheets 1966-1980’ fol. ‘1974.’

⁴⁹⁸ Serota, interview 2014.

⁴⁹⁹ John Barrow, letter to Peter Bird, 8 January 1974, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (2 of 7); Yates, ‘It’s Different, It’s New and It’s Free’.

cards, and catalogues himself.⁵⁰⁰ The results were elegant and plain, mostly small text on white backgrounds; the programme guides, which were intermittently produced, were typed on coloured paper and plainer still. For additional savings, posters often advertised three or four exhibitions at once, or were not produced at all. While they conveyed the necessary information and have a restrained appeal, it is not surprising that the results lacked visual excitement and variety, or that they did little to evoke the unique character of a particular display. [figs. 3.25-3.26]

In early 1974 Serota hired a professional designer, Peter Miller, to produce a simple and dramatic folding newsheet that proclaimed the museum's name in outsize, bold lettering (often printed in a vivid yellow, red, or blue) underneath changing notices and descriptions of exhibitions and other events. [fig. 3.27] It was a successful formula to which Sandy Nairne, who was responsible for pasting the texts and images with cow-gum on proofs of each new issue, adhered strictly.⁵⁰¹ 'What I knew perfectly well was there was never any point in discussing with Nick any change in the design,' he comments in retrospect. 'Nick had complete clarity of ideas about design, presentation, style.'⁵⁰² The striking concertina format of the newsheet was considered very successful, and became influential as a model for

⁵⁰⁰ Ibsen, interview 2012. Touring shows and special events were often accompanied by posters of their own onto which host organisations would print their name and details, which accounts for their being comparatively more colourful and varied during the period 1970-1973. This is true, for example, of that for *Fluxshoe*, which the artist-organisers designed, or *Concrete Poetry*, which was on Arts Council tour.

⁵⁰¹ It is not clear from the MAO archives whether the first issue of Miller's redesigned newsheet appeared in April 1974, in time for the Beuys exhibition, or only in May-June 1974 (the April newsheet, if produced, is missing.) A different and less sophisticated version was made for the partial reopening of the museum for *The Photography of Paul Nash* in Feb-March 1974, with the note 'We apologise for the temporary nature of this issue. The next issue (energy crisis permitting) will establish a new format.' MAO Archive, box 'Newsheets 1966-1980' fol. '1974.'

⁵⁰² Nairne, interview 2014.

other arts institutions.⁵⁰³ It employed the British Rail Alphabet font, which was carried throughout building's signage, stationary and shopping bags and was extended to the exterior on a dramatic flag: it was a minimal 1965 sans-serif typeface designed for maximum clarity and legibility from a distance. It was used not just on the railways but also by airports and the NHS in the 1970s, associating its sober authority with other national public services.⁵⁰⁴ The museum posted the newsheets to members, critics, and local schools, and they were shown to artists as evidence of the organisation's professionalism and panache.⁵⁰⁵ This proved helpful when persuading major international artists to consider exhibiting in Oxford: it was crucial that 'even if it was a very low-budget place, it was a place that... was well-ordered about how it did the publicity.'⁵⁰⁶

The posters also received on-going investment. They too were professionally designed by Miller, but in contrast to the overt and consistent branding of the newsletters, each exhibition poster was given individual treatment.⁵⁰⁷ Although remaining largely monochrome, their boldness and variety made the results livelier and more noticeable than in previous years. Halftone prints of black and white photographs and sans-serif fonts established a connection to the dominant style of the conceptual art they mostly advertised. [fig. 3.28]

⁵⁰³ Serota, interview 2014. A folding newsheet of exhibition and event notices had been briefly produced at the museum in 1968, but discontinued due to financial shortages.

⁵⁰⁴ Architectural plans by John G. Ellis for the Museum of Modern Art, July 1973-January 1974, MAO Archive; John L. Walters, 'Britain's Signature', *Eye Magazine*, vol. 18, no. 71, (Spring 2009), n.p.; Nick Job, 'Rail Alphabet', <http://www.doublearrow.co.uk/rail_alphabet.htm>, [accessed 9 October 2014].

⁵⁰⁵ Serota, letter to Peter Bird, 14 September 1973.

⁵⁰⁶ Nairne, interview 2014.

⁵⁰⁷ Not every exhibition had its own accompanying poster. As today, they were produced for those considered the most important.

By improving the style of the museum's publicity materials, and ensuring that they were consistently produced and distributed, the Director sought to 'establish the museum as a lively and interesting place to visit.' This was allied with increased advertisement in local and specialist publications, and – in particular – a concerted media blitz around the museum's reopening in early 1974 intended to highlight the change in leadership and propel MOMA firmly into the public eye.⁵⁰⁸ The press hailed Serota for introducing free admission to the museum, although in fact Ibsen had piloted a similar scheme the previous year.⁵⁰⁹ The 10p admissions charge had been replaced in January 1973 with an 'almost-free' system whereby visitors donated an amount of their choosing. However, Ibsen's new policy was not publicised and did not result in an increase in the number of visitors; instead, there were 'instances of rough behaviour' from 'gangs of youths' who apparently took advantage of free access to a large building manned only by Ibsen and his secretary.⁵¹⁰ Serota's efforts to draw attention to the policy, by contrast, were rewarded with glowing notices like 'It's Different, It's New and It's Free,' driving attendance. Another press-friendly initiative was the sandwich board worn around the city centre by young café assistant Juliet Noble, also marking the 1974 reopening.⁵¹¹ [figs. 3.29-3.30] Having determined that 'one of the museums [sic] main problems is that it has failed to establish itself as a centre which contributes to the life of the

⁵⁰⁸ Serota, letter to Peter Bird, 14 September 1973.

⁵⁰⁹ See for instance Grimley, 'Modern Art Oxford's Future Secured'; Yates, 'It's Different, It's New and It's Free'.

⁵¹⁰ Minutes of the Meeting of the Council of Modern Art Oxford, 10 March 1973, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 1-7; 'Treasurer's Report' in Minutes of the 9th Meeting of the Council of Modern Art Oxford, 19 February 1973, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (2 of 7) fol. 'Museum of Modern Art Oxford Ltd. (Minutes)'.

⁵¹¹ 'Juliet and the Sandwich, Spreading the Word', *Oxford Mail*, (2 March 1974).

town,' these measures were a considered attempt to widen the museum's popular appeal.⁵¹² They altered MOMA's ambiance as a social space, and strengthened (in today's parlance) its institutional brand.

In renovating the museum building, Serota aimed to rectify its art-threatening propensity to leaks and damp,⁵¹³ but more than that, to make it aesthetically 'as pure as possible... basically it should be a space with four walls, top light, and a flat floor.' Although the building could not strictly be transformed into a white cube due to its highly irregular proportions, he aimed to make it a 'large roomy white shoe box' instead.⁵¹⁴ ('If one was converting the space now, starting from scratch, you would probably leave more of the warehouse present,' he acknowledges.⁵¹⁵) In seeking to minimise the eccentricities of the nineteenth-century brewery, Serota could be said to have moved against the curve at a time when the post-industrial art venue was finally gaining widespread credence, both in the UK and across the Atlantic. The following year, the Arnolfini would move to its present home in the large Grade II-listed warehouse, Bush House, on the Bristol harbour, a choice that could be said to follow MOMA's template; the Midland Group Gallery would follow shortly thereafter to a warehouse complex in the old Lacemarket (both had previously been sited, like the Demarco Gallery in Edinburgh, in townhouses, and

⁵¹² Serota, letter to Peter Bird, 14 September 1973.

⁵¹³ Grimley, 'Modern Art Oxford's Future Secured'.

⁵¹⁴ Serota, interview 2014.

⁵¹⁵ In fact, his position towards the idiosyncrasies of the museum building shifted even during his time as Director. He recalled that Dan Flavin was 'unbelievably dismissive' of the premises during a visit and that 'seeing him behave in that way made me value the eccentricities of the space. We invited Ulrich Ruckreim to make a piece which emphasised the irregularities of the space,' *ibid.*, interview 2014. It is not clear when Flavin's visit took place, but presumably in advance of Ruckreim's show, 25 April-30 May 1976.

both received substantial capital funding from the Arts Council to develop their new buildings.)⁵¹⁶ [fig. 3.31]

New York City's formerly industrial buildings, where artists had chosen to base their studios since the 1960s, were colonised by a number of new arts centres in the 1970s. Perhaps the most notable of these organisations were 112 Greene Street in Soho (1970), the Clocktower in Tribeca (1972), and P.S. 1 in Queens (1976), the second two under the aegis of Alanna Heiss' Institute for Art and Urban Resources.⁵¹⁷ Inspired by London's St. Katharine's Dock, IAUR sought to take advantage of the changing urban economy to 'cadge unused city buildings for exhibition, studio and performance spaces.'⁵¹⁸ In the 1970s, none of these organisations attempted to erase the patina of age from their premises: to the contrary, they revelled in the way of these idiosyncrasies could inflect the atmosphere of the exhibitions staged within. [fig. 3.32] In a manner that recalled and even amplified the mood of the 1960s MOMA, the unfinished and unpolished surfaces of these reclaimed buildings stressed their fundamental difference from stuffy museums and glossy commercial galleries. As the artist Martin Beck has argued:

⁵¹⁶ See William Feaver, 'Art: The Regional Canvas', *Vogue*, (September 1975), p. 36; Minutes of the 26th Council of Modern Art Oxford, 26 October 1975; for a brief history of the Arnolfini, see Phil Owen, 'Enjoy Yourself: An Introduction to Arnolfini's History', <<http://www.arnolfini.org.uk/blog/enjoy-yourself>>, [accessed 16 September 2015].

⁵¹⁷ 112 Greene Street was an important artists-run gallery and workshop in Soho's industrial cast-iron district, 1970-75: see Lauren Rosati, Mary Anne Staniszewski, and Exit Art, *Alternative Histories: New York Art Spaces, 1960 to 2010*, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2012), pp. 129-9.

⁵¹⁸ Nancy Foote, 'The Apotheosis of the Crummy Space', *Artforum*, vol. XV, no. 2, (October 1976), p. 28. IAUR was founded by Alanna Heiss in 1971. P.S. 1 is still in its original building (as MOMA PS1) and the Clocktower left its titular premises only in December 2013 and is still operating. 'Clocktower Productions: Mission + History', <<http://clocktower.org/about>>, [accessed 4 November 2014].

through this opposition, a distinction is constructed between the space of the establishment qualified as static, homogenous, and bourgeois and the space of the alternative as process oriented, experimental, and working class.⁵¹⁹

Whereas Serota sought to maximise Pembroke Street's 'purity' by minimising the spectator's awareness of the building's own history, the new Clocktower in Tribeca was described in language reminiscent of Oxford's galleries prior to Serota's makeover:

the Clocktower's quarters are too well worn to convey any sense of Minimal precision... punctuated by a rusty spiral staircase and, despite an artifying whitewash, annotated with the graffiti of age – peeling paint, cracked plaster, remnants of plumbing.⁵²⁰

Like the Clocktower, P.S. 1 occupied a disused municipal building, in this case a public school in a rundown industrial area, but its physical state was even worse; as with 112 Greene Street, even whitewash was initially considered taboo. In an *Artforum* 1976 cover story that announced 'The Apotheosis of the Crummy Space,' Nancy Foote admiringly described:

Disastrous conditions inside: buckling floorboards, fallen plaster and layer upon peeling layer of hideous pink, green and turquoise paint are held together, it seems, only by a pervasive dusty smell. The place is, to put it bluntly, a wreck... the Clocktower and 112 Greene Street... by comparison, look like MoMA and the Louvre.⁵²¹ [figs. 3.33-3.34]

Foote noted that avant-garde artists in New York were increasingly unhappy with the display trappings of 'glistening white walls and track lighting,' which they associated with outmoded modernism and a compromising preoccupation with sales.⁵²² Many of them seem to have found the 'crummy' dereliction of these

⁵¹⁹ Beck, 'Alternative: Space', p. 225.

⁵²⁰ Nancy Foote, 'Review: Michael Asher, The Clocktower', *Artforum*, vol. XIV, no. 10, (June 1976), p. 64.

⁵²¹ Ibid., 'The Apotheosis of the Crummy Space', p. 29. She referred, of course, to the New York MoMA.

⁵²² 'The [commercial] gallery's artifying aura – glistening white walls and track lighting – had made itself indispensable to the modernist esthetic... [but] wouldn't tolerate the kind of art that many artists wanted to make. Such art messed up the

abandoned 19th-century buildings liberating; for the inaugural exhibition, *Rooms*, more than fifty of the eighty participating artists (including a roster of famous names such as Gordon Matta-Clark, Joseph Kosuth, Daniel Buren, Carl Andre, Richard Serra, Patrick Ireland [a pseudonym of Brian O’Doherty] and Vito Acconci) ‘hacked, gouged, stripped, dug, poured and picked away’ at its structure to accentuate its ‘disaster-area ambience.’⁵²³ By the mid-1970s, these New York venues were receiving public funding from the National Endowment for the Arts: the raw exhibition spaces and the conceptual and post-minimalist artists associated with them had become ‘a highly visible – almost dominant – force in New York’s art world.’⁵²⁴

If, as Foote argued, ‘a space like P.S. 1, ravaged by time and use, offers a far richer lode from which to mine ideas than any clean, well-lighted space,’ why was Serota making efforts to eliminate the historic crumminess of Pembroke Street? Although *Artforum* declared the so-called ‘apotheosis’ three years after Oxford’s renovation – accompanied by Brian O’Doherty’s famous series of essays wryly unpicking the supposed neutrality of the white cube – the conditions for it were already laid.⁵²⁵

Artistic concerns with institutional critique, with site-specific installation, an

gallery; it wasn’t slick; above all, it wasn’t *saleable*... Unpurchaseability signified the new purity.’ Ibid., ‘The Apotheosis of the Crummy Space’, pp. 29-30.

⁵²³ Ibid., ‘The Apotheosis of the Crummy Space’, p. 30.

⁵²⁴ Beck, ‘Alternative: Space’, p. 259; for a critical account of the impact of NEA funding on the development of these institutions, see also Brian Wallis, ‘Public Funding and Alternative Spaces’, in *Alternative Art, New York, 1965-1985*, ed. by Julie Ault, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2002), pp. 161-181.

⁵²⁵ The three articles, originally published in series in *Artforum* in 1976, were reprinted in O’Doherty, *Inside the White Cube*. O’Doherty was closely connected to the P.S. 1, exhibiting in *Rooms* as Ireland, his artistic alter ego, and arranging a grant for it through his position as Director of the Visual Arts Program at the National Endowment for the Arts: see ‘Interview with Alanna Heiss,’ in Rosati, Staniszewski, and Exit Art, *Alternative Histories*, p. 66, and Wallis, ‘Public Funding and Alternative Spaces’, p. 171.

apparent disdain for visual effect and the desire to connect art with politics were all major themes on both sides of the Atlantic from the late 1960s, driving the emergence of these alternative spaces; they were key subjects of Ibsen's programme and would continue to be so for Serota.⁵²⁶ P.S. 1's *Rooms* might have been the spectacular culmination of the artistic interest in raw, reclaimed spaces, but they had been growing in popularity since the late 1960s on both sides of the Atlantic, in parallel to a broader artistic colonisation of post-industrial neighbourhoods as places to live and work.⁵²⁷

Serota explains the decision to smooth over the quirks of MOMA's building (within the limitations of a very small decoration budget) as an attempt to accommodate the wishes of artists.⁵²⁸ The wonky proportions of the galleries could not be resolved, but peeling paint, old fixtures and damp stains played no part in his vision for the museum. The improved whiteness and freshness of the 'shoe box' surfaces made them less distinctive, and perhaps seemed a way to allow an artist to dominate and

⁵²⁶ Ibsen also attempted to borrow MoMA's 1971 touring exhibition *Pier 18*, which documented site-specific works made on a seedy, abandoned pier in the Hudson River; the artists were a remarkable group of renowned conceptual and post-minimal names including Dan Graham, Jan Dibbets, Matta-Clark, Acconci, John Baldessari, Mel Bochner, Buren, Huebler, Robert Morris, Lawrence Weiner and others. He was unsuccessful because some of the artists refused permission for their work to be shown. Peter Ibsen, 'Museum Director's Report', [December] 1972, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 1-7; New York Museum of Modern Art, 'Projects: Pier 18 press release', July 1971, <https://www.moma.org/momaorg/shared/pdfs/docs/press_archives/4679/releases/MOMA_1971_0116_80.pdf?2010>, [accessed 29 October 2015].

⁵²⁷ For an overview of this phenomenon in New York City, see especially Rosati, Staniszewski, and Exit Art, *Alternative Histories*.

⁵²⁸ Serota, interview 2014. The concern to accommodate artists' wishes is typical of his curatorial ethos. When conceiving Tate Modern, Tate circulated in January 1994 a *Questionnaire to Artists* that inquired into the preferences of leading practitioners as to museum architecture. The consensus was that conversions were preferable to both traditional museums and new builds, especially where 'architectural intervention was minimal.' Caroline Donnellan, 'Establishing Tate Modern: Vision and Patronage', (PhD thesis, London School of Economics, 2013), pp. 185-6.

define the gallery spaces in a period when those spaces were subject to increasing intellectual scrutiny. The former brewery's historic form and surfaces were not purified beyond recognition, but nonetheless moved closer to the western institutional code for neutral décor, the generic white cube.

Serota's understanding of – and desire to conform to – the desires of artists can be interpreted with reference to the practices of institutional critique that were then pervading the avant-garde in Europe and North America. Artists such as Buren were contributing to artistic distrust of the work of museums and galleries as mediators of their work. Whereas it was taken for granted in the MOMA of the 1960s that the artwork would transform and transcend its physical contexts, conceptual artists tended to see the setting of art as a crucial part of its reception, capable of warping or obscuring its intended meanings. As Buren wrote in the catalogue essay for his MOMA exhibition *Daniel Buren: The Sanction of the Museum* (31 March-15 April 1973):

Everything that the Museum shows is only considered and produced in view of being set in it... [it is] an enclosure where art is born and buried, crushed by the very frame which presents and constitutes it.⁵²⁹ [figs. 3.13-3.14]

Even radically experimental exhibition organisers working outside of the frameworks of collecting and sales could inspire this kind of negative appraisal, as Harald Szeemann's *Documenta 5* (30 June-8 October 1972) demonstrated: his imaginative thematic groupings elicited indignant responses from many leading conceptualists who demanded the right to determine the manner in which their art

⁵²⁹ *Daniel Buren: Sanction of the Museum*, exh. cat., MOMA, 31 March-15 April 1973. When communicating with Ibsen on the telephone prior to the exhibition, Ibsen misheard 'function' as 'sanction', hence the title of the exhibition differed from that of Buren's essay. John Rolfe, video interview with Peter Ibsen and Daniel Buren, 2006, MAO Archive, fol. 'Buren 2006.'

was presented, grouped, and explained. LeWitt, Andre, Robert Morris, Donald Judd and Hans Haacke were among the prominent signatories to an advertisement placed in the June 1972 issue of *Artforum* declaring the ‘rights’ of the artist to control what they called ‘exhibition conditions’; Robert Smithson declared *Documenta* a ‘cultural prison’ and (in the exhibition catalogue, moreover) Buren attacked the thematic arrangements as ‘castrations’ which he felt reduced the artworks to mere illustrations of the organiser’s overweening vision and authorship.⁵³⁰ Serota visited *Documenta 5* and was surely aware of its controversies;⁵³¹ indeed, similar demands for artistic control over the artist selection process had accompanied *The New Art*.⁵³² An awareness of the increasing suspicion of institutional power may have underpinned his sense that the best way for a museum to accommodate this type of artistic practice (and therefore the preoccupation of certain forms of art with drawing attention to the potency of institutional structures) was to make the museum’s physical premises as generic and unobjectionable as possible.⁵³³ In the

⁵³⁰ Altshuler, *Biennials and Beyond: Exhibitions that Made Art History, 1962-2002*, p. 158, pp. 171-172.

⁵³¹ Serota, interview 2014

⁵³² See for example Gareth Jones, ‘Vote!’, *Studio International*, vol. 183, no. 940, (January 1972), p. 2. Jones denounces the selection process behind what would become *The New Art* but was then known as *The British Biennale* as ‘exclusive’ and undemocratic since ‘the show will be chosen solely by Anne Seymour, advised by Richard Hamilton, Bernard Cohen, Keith Milow, Adrian Heath and Victor Burgin.’ Jones was not alone in his frustration, but his proposed alternative for a series of ballots seems to inadvertently illustrate the unwieldy complications of direct democracy.

⁵³³ A similar argument has been made for New York MoMA’s influential 1970 *Information*, organised by Kynaston McShine and including many of the same artists shown in Oxford during this period. ‘At the *Information* show, the visibility of the institution’s relation to the exhibition design – and the curator’s role in its creation – was minimal... the gallery walls were painted white, and the Museum’s vast spaces were divided with huge wall partitions, angled symmetrically. The installation “furniture” consisted of white tables and pedestals, as well as white beanbag chairs... the galleries became a vast, white, seemingly neutral container for the artist-directed installations... The installation design, previously the responsibility of the Museum as an institution, was now incorporated within the

face of conceptual artists' demands to control the mechanisms of display (including not only exhibition design, but also interpretation and sometimes collecting).

MOMA's architecture underwent a formal retreat. Seeking to divert attention from the museum building may seem today a peculiar response to the kind of institutional-critical artwork that aimed precisely to *heighten* the visitor's awareness of the gallery's mediating architectural and ideological framework, but this contradiction may be traced to the thinking of conceptual artists like Buren rather than those who sought to exhibit their work.

MOMA's aesthetic 'purity' or lack thereof did not only relate to artistic debates over display taking place on the international stage. The museum's appearance was also an index (both real and apparent) of its financial and administrative health, at a time of local controversy over its relations with Bear Lane Gallery and of extreme economic difficulties for the UK. In a period of industrial unrest, the oil crisis, power cuts, spiralling inflation and high unemployment, the glossier and more affluent appearance of the repainted and redesigned MAO may have seemed far more desirable than that of a run-down disused warehouse, especially in view of the well-publicised years of 'crippling' financial distress which had culminated in the closure of the much-loved Bear Lane.⁵³⁴ 'It was about generating confidence,'

creative dimensions of the artists' pieces,' claims Mary Anne Staniszewski, *The Power of Display: A History of Exhibition Installations at the Museum of Modern Art*, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1998), pp. 270-76. One may not agree that MoMA truly abandoned the practice of installation design, for its 'neutral' white envelope, with pedestals and beanbags, represented its own set of mediating choices. Nonetheless, her observations resonate with Serota's practice in Oxford.

⁵³⁴ Details of MOMA's financial difficulties appeared even in national newspapers from 1972 onwards, as for example 'In a city not best known for its love of modern art, the position of the Oxford Museum of Modern Art is still difficult...its finances are cripplingly limited: £2000 a year doesn't go far for ten exhibitions... it seems a great waste. The trouble is partly that Arts Council grants are to some extent

explains Serota of the overhaul of the gallery's design, a signal of power and stability that marked a break from its years of organisational chaos and declared the institution strong enough to weather the economic storm.⁵³⁵ Headlines such as 'A Crisis of Survival Faces Oxford's Art Galleries' were replaced as early as January 1974 by those reading 'Modern Art Oxford's Future Secured': it was a shift in tone that reflected promising signs of growth but also the museum's adept repackaging.⁵³⁶

MOMA in the 1960s had cultivated an 'alternative,' outsider identity, but it is clear that marginality was not part of Serota's vision for the museum. Nonetheless, it was a considerable challenge to establish a national and international reputation for an organisation that was poorly subsidised, low-profile and sited in a small provincial city without a strong visual arts tradition; while Arts Council funding increased substantially over Serota's three years as Director, it continued to be less than half of that awarded to London's ICA, and was dwarfed by European and American equivalents (compare MOMA's £39,157 operating budget in 1975-6 to the

conditioned by the amount of financial support given by the local council – low in this case... surely the structure is not so rigid that exceptions cannot be made.' Caroline Tisdall, 'Watch My Line', *The Guardian*, (5 December 1972), p. 10. The £2000 she mentions (in a review of the exhibition [*Drawing*] to which she was a lender) referred to a calculation of what the gallery had to spend on exhibitions after deducting overhead expenses. Ibsen's letter after the review was published acknowledges the controversy it had generated: 'it would have been more tactful not to mention the £2,000 specifically but I am certainly not sorry that you did. Robin Campbell rang me yesterday to complain... after talking to Nick Serota again today I think your article is a valuable contribution towards getting the Arts Council to sponsor more international shows.' Ibsen, letter to Caroline Bozzola [Tisdall], 6 December 1972, MAO Archive, box 'MOMA Jan-Dec 1972' fol. 'Drawing'.

⁵³⁵ Serota, interview 2014.

⁵³⁶ Hutton, 'A Crisis of Survival Faces Oxford's Art Galleries'; Grimley, 'Modern Art Oxford's Future Secured'.

Eindhoven van Abbemuseum's £500,000.)⁵³⁷ If MOMA was to join the network of progressive European *Kunsthallen* and put on comparable exhibitions, as Serota hoped, such structural imbalances would have to be overcome through sheer ingenuity.⁵³⁸ To attract the right artists, critics and visitors, a museum environment was needed that not only declared style and solidity but that aligned it visually to other, longer-established and better-funded arts centres through the shared 'purity' of the white box, one that emphasised not Oxford's locality and specificity, but its wider connections. For Heiss, P.S. 1 was 'a chance to really challenge museum activity,'⁵³⁹ but unlike those creating alternative spaces in New York's derelict buildings at this time, Serota was not attempting to critique the practices of established art institutions, but to insert MOMA within their circuit.⁵⁴⁰ After all, many avant-garde artists of this period produced art that was critical of these structures of power, but were also manifestly eager to exhibit within them. And

⁵³⁷ Morris, 'The Museum of Modern Art in Oxford 1965-1975', p. 240; 'Report of the Directors', 8 June 1976, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 8-30.

⁵³⁸ Richard, 'Conversation with Sir Nicholas Serota', p. 462. The international scope of his ambitions was emphasised in interview, 2014 when he noted that he wanted MOMA 'to be an institution that operated like a *Kunsthalle* or *Kunstverein* in Germany, and which had a programme which had international participation, international reach, international collaboration, and yet was rooted in the United Kingdom.'

⁵³⁹ 'It was an anti-museum': 'Interview with Alanna Heiss,' in Rosati, Staniszewski, and Exit Art, *Alternative Histories*, p. 65.

⁵⁴⁰ This was successful, as the 'Director's Report 1974/5' reveals: 'increasingly major foreign museums and well-known British, European and American artists are approaching us with a view to showing their exhibitions or work.' For further discussion see Beck, 'Alternative: Space', which makes a comparable contrast between the aims of a space such as 112 Greene Street to mount a radical challenge to the conventional system of art promotion and spectatorship (which expressed itself in deliberately raw spaces), and the desire of the women artists behind the contemporary A.I.R. (from 1972) to challenge not the functioning of the system but their own exclusion from it. Although housed in post-industrial building, A.I.R. was renovated to create a peaceful interior space that echoed the white cube look of important museums and galleries. For those at a disadvantage, Beck argues that 'the aim to participate and to compete necessitates a presentational framework that appears comparable to those of the competitors,' p. 265.

while the Arts Council was supporting the move to monumental converted premises for the Midland Group and the Arnolfini, these buildings were – like MOMA – significantly cleaned up to project a professional image.⁵⁴¹

Finally, MOMA's eschewal of its 'crummy' past may be seen through the lens of audience engagement. Foote's article on P.S. 1 diagnoses the contemporary interest in derelict exhibition spaces as sign that 'the art community is looking inward... art is shunning the big audiences that so glamorised it in the '60s' by staging its shows at remote and/or off-putting venues; Heiss has agreed that the New York alternative spaces of the period were conceived for 'an audience of artists. There was no other audience that was even remotely interested.'⁵⁴² In Oxford, there was no tradition of big audiences to shun: to the contrary, it was vitally important to attract more visitors to the museum if the gallery was to sustain its public funding. Unable to move to the more salubrious and well-trafficked street in the city as earlier Directors had hoped, it was crucial to make the interior more inviting.

Contemporary responses point to the success of this approach: in place of the 'aesthetic mortuary' conjured up before, writers described 'a very human place, a

⁵⁴¹ 'A wallpaper store, an ex-Housing Department, various warehouses: the leading Arts Centres in this country are rarely purpose-built': for brief comparative discussions of the architecture of the different contemporary arts centres in Britain in 1975, see Feaver, 'Art: The Regional Canvas', p. 36. See also 'Arnolfini History', <<http://www.arnolfini.org.uk/pages/about/arnolfini-history>>, [accessed 11 May 2012].

⁵⁴² 'Interview with Alanna Heiss,' in Rosati, Staniszewski, and Exit Art, *Alternative Histories*, p. 62; Foote, 'The Apotheosis of the Crummy Space'. Foote's assessment is paired with the seemingly contrary claim that 'P.S. 1's disaster-area ambience made a lot of difficult art more accessible... by aligning itself to circumstances outside a 'pure' art context, it managed, in many cases, to be a lot more interesting.' The dialogue generated between the installations and the atmospherics of ruin that surrounded them may well have animated or even radicalised some of the art, but presumably it did so for a small number of people.

relaxed place, in which to look at modern art' suggesting that the renovations, and the addition of the bookshop and coffee shop, had made the museum more enticing.⁵⁴³ Another article, titled 'Peace, Quiet, Pictures and Coffee' describes the atmosphere as 'relaxed, and no-one minds whether one comes to see the exhibitions and stays to lunch, or comes for coffee and looks at the drawings... it is light fare, but enough to make one feel welcome': the increased physical comforts had mitigated the intimidating aura of the artworks on show on the upper floors.⁵⁴⁴ For *Vogue* magazine, moreover, MOMA was 'perhaps the most glamorous space of all' the art centres in the British regions.⁵⁴⁵ The conflict with Bear Lane Gallery and its enthusiasts had been resolved in favour of the museum by late 1973, but as the building's newfound comfort and style revealed, the criticisms levelled at the Pembroke Street site had not fallen on deaf ears. 'There would be few tears shed in Oxford,' commented Serota in a council meeting of May 1973, 'if the Oxford City Council were to say that the Museum was to close in one month's time... many more would be shed over BLG.'⁵⁴⁶ Instead of compromising the museum's core programming in favour of something more crowd-pleasing, he enhanced its amenities and visual appeal.

Exhibition Policy

Sandy Nairne was an undergraduate at Oxford University from 1971-1974. He

⁵⁴³ Marina Vaizey, 'Adventure Course', *Sunday Times*, (16 March 1975).

⁵⁴⁴ 'Peace, Quiet, Pictures and Coffee', *What's On in Oxford*, (20 October 1974). 1975's *Cherwell Guide* for Oxford students also described MOMA as 'relaxed and inviting.'

⁵⁴⁵ Feaver, 'Art: The Regional Canvas', p. 36.

⁵⁴⁶ Minutes of the Council of Modern Art Oxford, 5 May 1973, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 1-7.

became involved with MOMA as a volunteer and through his position as head of OSAC, the Oxford Students Arts Council, which occasionally collaborated with the museum.⁵⁴⁷ When Peter Ibsen resigned his position at MOMA to teach art in Banbury, its status appeared so precarious that he and a few of his fellow undergraduates seriously discussed the possibility of trying to run the museum as a consortium. ('Not that we were really being asked.') Upon hearing of Serota's appointment in the summer of 1973, the group was concerned. 'We were very worried, someone working at the Arts Council didn't sound right. [But] as soon as he arrived one realised that someone very, very different was there.'⁵⁴⁸

Indeed, any Arts Council expectations that the new Director would curtail the avant-gardism of Ibsen's exhibition programme were quickly disproved. Although a small show of Paul Nash's photography was open on the middle floor to visitors from February 1974, the whole building did not reopen until April. When it did so, it was with a splash: *Joseph Beuys: Drawings 1948-72: The Secret Block for a Secret Person in Ireland* filled every room in the museum with hundreds of works by an

⁵⁴⁷ Nairne studied History and Economics at University College. He became interested in contemporary art after meeting Richard (Ricky) Demarco in Oxford in the spring of 1972 and working closely with him as a student assistant to him at his gallery and Edinburgh Arts festival that summer. The following academic year, 1972-3, he ran OSAC, a student society dedicated to the contemporary arts including visual art, theatre, poetry, and music. OSAC had rented premises on Worcester Place over a garage, which it used to stage exhibitions and performances and host visiting speakers; it also published a self-titled magazine. The society became a remarkable breeding ground for future leaders in the arts and humanities, involving at this time not only Nairne, but also curators Lewis Biggs and Mark Francis, art historian Richard Thomson, Poet Laureate Andrew Motion and filmmaker John Bridcut. During Nairne's period as Director, OSAC collaborated with MOMA on, for example, an Anthony McCall performance and on the *Fluxshoe* exhibition. See L'Angelo Mysterioso, 'It's All Down Walton Street', *The Cherwell*, (12 October 1972), p. 9; Nairne, interview 2014; 'Oxford Students' Arts Council', *OSAC*, no. 3, (n.d. [December] 1972); Sandy Nairne, 'State of Flux', *The Cherwell*, (8 February 1973).

⁵⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, interview 2014.

artist with a huge international reputation for his creative and political activities. Not only had Beuys never had a major show in the UK, the drawings he was showing – the ‘Secret Block’ of the title – had not previously been shown anywhere.⁵⁴⁹ [fig. 3.35] As an ostensibly private cache of works that spanned Beuys’ career and promised an intimate glimpse of his complex metaphysical theories and creative processes, they were met with great curiosity if not a great deal of comprehension; the impact was heightened by an eight-hour seminar held towards the end of the exhibition during which Beuys filled blackboards with his characteristically illegible, multilingual scribbles before a packed audience in the museum. [figs. 3.36-3.37] Beuys’ performance-lecture was a sensation, attracting coachloads of artists and students from around the country (and even, according to the *Oxford Mail*, ‘New York and the continent’); the substantial catalogue had a sold-out print run of 4,000; and the exhibition attracted 2,500 visitors in its month’s duration.⁵⁵⁰ Catalogue sales and hiring fees for the exhibition’s tour across England, Scotland and Ireland brought nearly £10,000 into the museum’s accounts.⁵⁵¹ As an opening statement, it was ‘really ridiculously ambitious,’ and it set a new tone for the institution.⁵⁵² Accordingly, Serota’s foreword in the catalogue had the programmatic quality of a manifesto:

⁵⁴⁹ At least, the vast majority had not: of the 266 drawings in the show, only three had previously been exhibited. Caroline Tisdall, ‘The Secret Block for a Secret Person in Ireland’, in *Joseph Beuys: The Secret Block for a Secret Person in Ireland*, exh. cat., MOMA, 7 April-12 May 1974. Tisdall was a close associate of Beuys and involved in organising the exhibition.

⁵⁵⁰ ‘Oxford Seminar Packed’, *Oxford Mail*, (11 May 1974); Morris, ‘The Museum of Modern Art in Oxford 1965-1975’, p. 240; Serota, ‘Director’s Report’, May 1974.

⁵⁵¹ Catalogue sales in 1974/5 were £5200 and hiring fees £4290; while these figures are not broken down by exhibition, the fact that the estimated income for 1975/6 (a year without the Beuys exhibition) drops to £600 and £1000 respectively indicates the very strong financial return on this show: Budget 1975/6, spring 1975, Council of Management Papers 8-30.

⁵⁵² Serota, interview 2014.

In recent years contemporary exhibitions of such importance have rarely been seen in England... There have been few opportunities for artists and the interested public to see what is happening abroad. This exhibition, and the co-operation involved, may point to a more hopeful future.⁵⁵³

It was precisely the distinctiveness of the Beuys exhibition and those that followed that became the lynchpin of Serota's appeal for national funding. 'Given the absence of a similar space in England which is prepared to show the avant-garde, Nick Serota feels that he must make his programme international,' reports an Arts Council memorandum regarding MOMA's funding application for 1975/6.⁵⁵⁴ As Serota told *Southern Arts* magazine in spring 1974, "What matters is that we put on an exhibition programme in the next few years that is so clearly better than other regional arts galleries that the Arts Council will have to raise their grant considerably."⁵⁵⁵ In his pitch for 1975/6 funding, Serota drew attention to the fact that he was asking for a sum twice the size of the one accorded the previous year as a statement of his ambitions for the museum. In line with his statement to *Southern Arts*, the rationale for requesting an increase so far above inflation was direct: he 'asked the Committee to compare his proposed programme next year in terms of its art content with that of the other subsidised galleries' in the country.⁵⁵⁶

Serota must have known that a formal assessment of the gallery had been made the previous year with very favourable results. In January 1974 the Arts Council sent a

⁵⁵³ *Joseph Beuys: The Secret Block for a Secret Person in Ireland*, exh. cat.

⁵⁵⁴ Francis, 'Oxford, Museum of Modern Art', 27 January 1975.

⁵⁵⁵ Gleadowe, 'Modern Art Oxford', p. 9.

⁵⁵⁶ As the minutes note, this was a doubling of the amount originally offered, not including a supplementary grant of £2000 presumably given to offset rapid inflation. See Draft Minutes: 'Oxford Museum of Modern Art', 11 February 1975, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (1 of 7) fol. 'correspondence/minutes pre 1976 April'; 'Treasurer's Report', 25 March 1975, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 8-30.

party of inspectors (Tate Gallery's Michael Compton, painter Malcolm Hughes and critic Marina Vaizey) to compare the respective merits of MOMA, Bristol's Arnolfini, and Nottingham's Midland Group Gallery, with a view to determining future grants. The resulting report confirmed the view that these three were the most important contemporary arts centres in the British provinces and recommended substantial funding increases for all of them. Their unmitigated praise for Serota's forthcoming programme at MOMA singled it out as 'the most "pure" of the three, the most concerned to present the highest proportion of what we must still call the avant-garde.'⁵⁵⁷ The report contributed to the sharp increase in Oxford funding awarded for 1974/5; Serota was hoping for a similar outcome in 1975/6, with a scheduled programme that included major shows for Klaus Rinke, Robert Ryman, Richard Tuttle, Marcel Broodthaers, Carl Andre, and Art & Language.⁵⁵⁸ The Arts Council minutes from February 1975 record:

The committee said that the programme was adventurous and exciting and that Oxford was the only gallery in England attempting such a programme. They fully supported the request for a large increased subsidy.⁵⁵⁹

As Serota put it to *Studio International* later that year, the Arts Council "'are not prejudiced, just badly informed.'⁵⁶⁰

⁵⁵⁷ Marina Vaizey, Michael Compton, and Malcolm Hughes, 'Report on Visits to Nottingham, Bristol and Oxford', 7 January 1974, ACGB Archive, ACGB/29/38 (2 of 7) fol. 'Oxford: Museum of Modern Art 1969-74'.

⁵⁵⁸ The application listed the following exhibitions for 1975/76: *Marcel Broodthaers, *Klaus Rinke, Ansel Adams, *John Murphy, Carl Andre: Poems, Duncan Grant, **John Walker*, *Art & Language, *Robert Ryman*, **Moholy Nagy*, *Richard Tuttle*, *Peruvian Ground Drawings*, **American and European artists' films*, and *Howard Hodgkin. Asterisks were also picked out in the original to indicate those initiated by MOMA; some of the remainder, such as the Andre, were scheduled to tour to Oxford from a foreign country. I have italicised those that were not ultimately realised. Nicholas Serota, 'Provisional Exhibition Programme 1975/76', 1975, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 8-30.

⁵⁵⁹ Draft Minutes: 'Oxford Museum of Modern Art', 11 February 1975.

⁵⁶⁰ Morris, 'The Museum of Modern Art in Oxford 1965-1975', p. 241.

To what extent can the Arts Council's newfound support for conceptual art programming be attributed to a historical transition in addition to the influence of a new MOMA Director? After all, conceptual art showed no signs of diminishing in importance by the mid-1970s: to the contrary, it was increasingly collected by institutions both in the UK and abroad, where such artists were given major exhibitions at national museums, a fact that made Britain's conservatism conspicuous.⁵⁶¹ Certainly an adjustment in the Arts Council's position on the 'New Art' by mid-decade could be inferred from its attitude towards Birmingham's Ikon Gallery, whose funding was terminated in 1975 due to 'doubts as to the quality' of its exhibitions. 'Paul Neagu sticks out as the only conceptual artist in an otherwise "safe," mainly realist programme,' read one displeased memorandum, while another criticised the gallery's 'lessening... commitment to the avant-gard [sic].'⁵⁶² Ikon, which at the time was innovatively situated in the Birmingham Shopping Centre and directed by young American Simon Chapman, attracted very large numbers of visitors (hundreds, sometimes more than a thousand each day), but in spite of this the Arts Council was 'far from impressed' by a programme dominated by left-wing figurative painting and the fact that Ikon was, like Ibsen's MOMA, perpetually in

⁵⁶¹ Richard, *Unconcealed*, appendices 1.2 and 1.6.

⁵⁶² Quoted in Watkins, Chapman, and Ikon Gallery, *This Could Happen to You: Ikon in the 1970s*, pp. 27-28. The book notes the 'many' ACGB archive files detailing their displeasure with Ikon's finances under Chapman's directorship (1972-77). Chapman's own account closely recalls Ibsen's struggles to manage an arts centre without sufficient support of the Arts Council: "I had grossly underestimated the level of funds necessary to cover running costs. Finding additional support was the obvious solution and the Arts Council stressed the need to secure local authority funding... the level of underfunding obviously affected normal gallery business and resulted in us often opting for the least expensive solutions. We bought in very few services in preference to doing everything ourselves; everything from cleaning, maintenance, carpentry, decorating, the odd bit of framing, driving vans and so on," p. 27.

financial straits.⁵⁶³ Ikon's misfortunes could be interpreted as a sign that by 1975, conceptual art was better received by the Arts Council than it had been in the first part of the 1970s; they do not, however, demonstrate that the Arts Council had any particular enthusiasm for, or understanding of, these practices. It is peculiar, for instance, to classify Neagu's expressive work as straightforwardly 'conceptual' (his folk-art inflected show of figurative prints and sculptures staged at MOMA, for instance, was certainly among the most accessible of its headline offerings in 1975): it was a clearly a broad-stroke designation. [fig. 3.38] Judged on this account, the degree of avant-gardism that the Arts Council wished to see instituted in Birmingham was certainly lower than that practiced in Oxford, and MOMA's status was in any case predicated upon its exceptional position within the national provision. By the mid-1970s, the Arts Council had not belatedly become conceptual art partisans. MOMA and Ikon together mapped the upper and lower boundaries of the institutionalisation of the avant-garde, as sanctioned by the nation's tastemakers.

Peter Ibsen seems to have developed his exhibition programme improvisationally, filling MOMA's galleries based on his own interests, what was available, and what could be afforded. Grossly understaffed and pressed for time, decisions were often made at very short notice to fill looming holes in the schedule.⁵⁶⁴ To save money

⁵⁶³ Quoted in *This Could Happen to You: Ikon in the 1970s*, p. 27.

⁵⁶⁴ Minutes of the Council of Management meetings often record Ibsen's difficulties with his workload. In late 1972, he describes his recent problems in revealing detail, worth quoting at length: 'The most damaging effect of excessive pressure is the inability to plan ahead, especially on the exhibition programme. This became most evident over the summer when arrangements at short notice of a showing of Philip King's Sculpture fell through while I was on holiday. To fill the gap I returned from Paris with an exhibition of over 300 photographers (PIER 18) which I eventually could not show because I had not had time to look into the sources of the material which turned out to be potentially damaging. Fortunately the permanent collection was on hand though half of the best pieces were on show at Banbury Art School.'

and prioritise effort, exhibitions were often rented from the Victoria and Albert Museum (V&A) or Arts Council touring roster ('depending on your viewpoint, the exhibitions are either an important contribution to the level of regional exhibitions or an example of the Arts Council's paternalistic monopoly of the arts,' observed Lynda Morris, not herself an admirer.⁵⁶⁵) Fortunately for him, conceptual art exhibitions were usually cost-effective: aside from the intrinsic value of showing new work by emerging artists, the anti-retinal, text-based and ephemeral nature of much conceptual work kept transport and insurance costs low.⁵⁶⁶ The museum's galleries were used flexibly, according to the requirements of each group of shows.

By contrast, Serota's exhibition programme was schematically conceived, with a tripartite structure designed to cater to three different audiences across the museum's three floors. As he explained to *Southern Arts*' Teresa Gleadowe in a long interview that that reveals a very analytic approach to institutional leadership, he saw MOMA as operating simultaneously in local, national and international arenas and having responsibilities towards each. Financial dependencies were offered as a partial justification for this position: Oxford City and Education

Arrangements for the basement exhibitions (14 Big Prints) were started two weeks before it opened mainly due to confusion of the Cognition & Control project. The latter also suffered through an inevitable late application to Southern Arts for financial assistance for the outdoor project being turned down after the project was under way. Fortunately it has made the committee (now including myself) sympathetic towards supporting our showing of FLUXSHOE... in February': Ibsen, 'Museum Director's Report', [December] 1972. To save money, Ibsen was also transporting works for exhibition himself, carrying them to and from Paris in a suitcase or driving them by van, an endeavour which further minimised the time available for planning and research and which left the museum building without adequate supervision. See Minutes of the 6th Meeting of the Oxford Council for Modern Art, 11 November 1972, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 1-7; Peter Ibsen, letter to the Council of Management, 21 November 1971, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 1-7.

⁵⁶⁵ Morris, 'The Museum of Modern Art in Oxford 1965-1975', p. 241.

⁵⁶⁶ Serota, interview 2014.

authorities gave money in the expectation that the institution cater to a ‘local public,’ while the Arts Council’s subsidy meant that ‘one has to do something that has a national context.’ For Gleadowe and Serota both, the museum’s international ambitions were self-explanatory.⁵⁶⁷

These three concerns were mapped onto the building in a hierarchy both physical and symbolic. ‘The Upper Gallery, with its high, light space, will be used largely for contemporary art from abroad,’ she records:

In the middle gallery Nick Serota plans a number of historical shows which will in some sense justify the title of ‘Museum’ and which – apart from their intrinsic interest – may begin to provide a context for the contemporary work in the programme,⁵⁶⁸

and would draw from the touring circuit. Whereas other aspects of the programme would target supposedly less sophisticated local constituencies, ‘I wanted to make particular shows in the Upper Gallery that would register with a London audience and I would get them to come to openings on a Saturday evening,’ he says.⁵⁶⁹ The newly appointed ‘small gallery’ to the rear of the ground floor, where the office was previously situated, was intended primarily for shorter shows of prints and drawings. The basement cafe would host photography exhibitions, and be the setting for educational talks and discussions aimed at an Oxford crowd. In Grimley’s words, ‘the plans revolve around the idea of making parts of the building more clearly defined according to the services they provide.’⁵⁷⁰ [fig. 3.39]

Gleadowe recorded Serota’s plans at an early stage in his time at the museum and

⁵⁶⁷ Gleadowe, ‘Modern Art Oxford’, pp. 7-8.

⁵⁶⁸ Ibid., ‘Modern Art Oxford’, p. 8.

⁵⁶⁹ Serota, interview 2014.

⁵⁷⁰ Grimley, ‘Modern Art Oxford’s Future Secured’. The schema is a more refined version of that proposed in 1969 by the Council of Management, see chapter one.

the structure that she describes was adapted to suit the requirements of the individual exhibitions from the beginning, when *Joseph Beuys: The Secret Block for a Secret Person in Ireland*, the museum's hugely ambitious reopening statement, was allowed to fill the museum at all three levels (so did *The Young in Art*, an exhibition of work by local schools staged two years later). 'The most suitable spaces will of course always be used to show work to the best advantage,' she acknowledged.⁵⁷¹

Nonetheless, it proved mostly the case that the most uncompromisingly avant-garde art exhibitions were situated upstairs in the grandest of the galleries: *Bob Law: 10 Black Paintings 1965-70*; *Six Belgians: Charlier, Lohaus, Mees, Panamarenko, Roquet, Van Snick*; *John Hilliard 1969-74*; *Paul Neagu and His Generative Art Group*; *Bruce McLean: Early Works 1967-71*; *Carl Andre: Poems 1958-74*; *Alan Charlton*; *Andre Flavin Judd LeWitt: Sculptures, Prints and Drawings*; *Ulrich Ruckreim*, and *Donald Judd: Drawings* were all installed in this headline position; despite Gleadowe's assertion, some of the artists were British, although their reputations at the time were more established overseas. [fig. 3.40] These exhibitions, which were all either generated by MOMA or were on tour from or arranged with a foreign institution, often served as the artists' first public solo show in the UK; the 'special relationship' that Serota cultivated with certain likeminded continental museums and public galleries allowed it to share costs for shows arranged collaboratively, without forfeiting MOMA's unique status within the UK.⁵⁷² These artists occupied artistic territory classified as conceptual and/or post-

⁵⁷¹ Gleadowe, 'Modern Art Oxford', p. 8.

⁵⁷² For example, the Belgian exhibition was originally conceived by Yves Gavaert at the Palais des Beaux-Arts in Brussels, as was Hanne Darboven's; the Alan

minimal, and collectively the exhibitions are visually characterised by an interest in text, numbers, paper, aesthetic restraint, and monochrome colouration.

As well as dominating the top floor, similar cutting-edge monographic exhibitions often overflowed into the middle floor, too: Judd, Andre, Ruckreim and Rinke all had the Upper and middle galleries both, while *Barry Flanagan: Drawings 1966-1974*, *David Tremlett: Work Done in Australia and England*, *Marcel Broodthaers: Le Privilège de l'Art*, and *Art & Language 1966-75* were among those exhibitions of a related nature given both the middle gallery and the adjacent small gallery. [fig. 3.41] Smaller shows of works on paper occupied the small gallery alone, such as *Hamish Fulton*, *Kim Lim: Prints*, *John Murphy: Selected Works*, *Lesley Foxcroft*, and *Agnes Martin: On a Clear Day*. [fig. 3.42] The artists shown in the small gallery often had a lower profile than those in the middle and especially upper galleries; not coincidentally, it was the space usually allocated to women artists. Only four of the 61 artists with eponymous exhibitions staged by Serota in Oxford were female: Hanne Darboven, Agnes Martin, Lesley Foxcroft and Kim Lim. All four were shown on the ground floor, and all but one in the small back gallery.⁵⁷³ Although this itself was an improvement on the museum's record – only a single female artist had been granted a self-titled show in MOMA's first eight years – a

Charlton exhibition was organized in collaboration with Rudi Fuchs at the van Abbemuseum, Eindhoven; Marcel Broodthaers' show was based on one at the Nationalgalerie in Berlin earlier that year. Often these exhibitions were adapted for Oxford, with works added or subtracted. For the *Art & Language* retrospective, Serota wrote proposing collaboration to the Kunsthalle Bern; Palais des Beaux-Arts, Brussels; Kunsthalle Mainz; Kunstmuseum Luzern; Kunsthalle Basel; van Abbemuseum, Eindhoven; and Le musée d'art moderne et contemporain in Saint-Étienne, a good indication of institutions he perceived as comparable: see MAO Archive, box 'MOMA Sept-Oct 1975' fol. 'Art & Language.'

⁵⁷³ Darboven (30 June-4 August 1974, middle gallery), Martin (19 January-27 February 1975, small gallery), Foxcroft (27 July-7 September 1975, small gallery), Lim (2-23 November 1975, small gallery).

striking imbalance remained.⁵⁷⁴ In retrospect, the limits of the museum's much-vaunted internationalism are even more glaringly apparent than its gender inequality. While the Arts Council commended the museum for a policy that 'looks as much to the international avant-garde as to English artists,' the artists whose work was solicited were in fact a narrow group.⁵⁷⁵ In contrast to the museum's later efforts towards a more diverse, 'globalised' representation, the programme at this time consisted almost exclusively of white American and European men. This was true of all three floors and there is no archival evidence that it was ever subject to question.

Displays of new art in the middle gallery were interspersed with those that had a more historical bent (such as *The University of East Anglia Art Collection*, *Obmokhu 1921: Reconstructions of Russian Constructivist Sculpture*, or *Matisse Lithographs*) or that represented British artists working in traditional media: *Alfred Wallis: Paintings from the Collection of Kettles Yard*, *Bryan Pearce: Paintings, Watercolours & Drawings 1952-75*, and *Jeff Clarke: Prints and Drawings* serve as

⁵⁷⁴ She shared the exhibition with her husband: *Mary Martin and Kenneth Martin: Constructions*, an Arts Council touring exhibition, ran from 12-30 May 1970. The 1970s were a time of increasing feminist activism in art and art history, galvanised especially by the foundational essay in which Linda Nochlin called on women to 'take part in the creation of institutions in which clear thought—and true greatness—are challenges open to anyone, man or woman, courageous enough to take the necessary risk, the leap into the unknown': 'Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?', *ARTnews*, (January 1971), pp. 22-39. A trenchant critique of the exclusion of contemporary female artists within avant-garde displays was published in Britain by Lucy R. Lippard, 'Why Separate Women's Art?', *Art and Artists*, vol. 8, no. 7, (October 1973), pp. 8-9. Tisdall also noted the invisibility of women artists within supposedly cutting-edge circles in 1972, writing that 'two things are noticeable by their absence from current committedly avant-garde activity: women and colour': 'Avant-garde to All Intentions'.

⁵⁷⁵ Francis, 'Oxford, Museum of Modern Art', 27 January 1975.

examples of exhibitions that nodded to the Bear Lane Gallery tradition.⁵⁷⁶

Occasionally, this sort of show was of a scale to be situated in the Upper Gallery as well: *Duncan Grant: 90th Birthday Exhibition*, *Howard Hodgkin: 45 Paintings 1949-75*, and *Noel Forster*, for example, spanned both floors. [figs. 3.43-3.45]

The basement café, which was intended to appeal to local audiences, meanwhile, remained dominated by ‘lightweight’⁵⁷⁷ shows of contemporary and historical photography that mixed work made in an artistic or documentary tradition such as *Daniel Meadows: The Free Photographic Omnibus*, *Elliott Erwitt: Son of Bitch*, *Paddy Summerfield: Beneath the Dreaming Spires*, and *Ansel Adams* with those celebrating technical achievements such as *Pictures from Space*, an exhibition of NASA space photography; *Dr Harold E. Edgerton: Seeing the Unseen: High Speed Photography*; or *The Photographs of Eadweard Muybridge*. These were sometimes leavened with similarly accessible shows in other media, such as *Chinese Contemporary Posters*, or *Oxfordshire Young Artists 1975*. ‘It was a very subsidiary space,’ explains Nairne, ‘you wouldn’t have been able to say to the larger-name artists even in this experimental category, “oh, come to Oxford and you can have the basement café”... it was damp and dark.’⁵⁷⁸ Unlike the majority of the other exhibitions held at this time, these café shows are frequently not documented photographically in the archive.

⁵⁷⁶ Serota, interview 2014. ‘I think Bear Lane especially under Nick Waterlow but also to some extent under Conway [Lloyd Morgan] had the ambition of bringing to Oxford high quality work by British artists. I think we tried to take some of that into the programme at Modern Art Oxford and I suppose it would be true to say, I think it would be fair to say, that the programme I ran - I’m thinking of artists like Noel Forster... it had an awareness of here being a Bear Lane component, but it didn’t set out to be a place that was vigorously trying to sell works to individuals.’

⁵⁷⁷ Grimley, ‘Modern Art Oxford’s Future Secured’.

⁵⁷⁸ Nairne, interview 2014.

This approach to filling the lower gallery built upon a long-standing perception on the part of MOMA staff that photography was a crowd-pleaser for a local public ill-versed in art appreciation: as early as 1967, Trevor Green asserted that:

The international photography exhibition that is planned for June 1968 will bring into the museum for the first time large numbers of the working population of industrial Oxford who would never otherwise go near an art gallery.⁵⁷⁹

A 1972 'Publicity Report' produced by council members also noted that 'exhibitions of photographs and kinetics are much more successful in attracting public attendance.'⁵⁸⁰ The observation that certain kinds of photography appealed to Oxford audiences was not novel, then, but it had never before been seriously applied or consistently situated within the museum in an attempt to generate consistent visitor experiences.⁵⁸¹ The repetitive nature of the exhibition schema in conjunction with the intrinsic qualities of the spaces themselves, which ranged from grander to grubbier on a vertical axis, surely catered to existing patterns of perception but also contributed to the formation of new ones. The status of photography as a fine art was starting to be acknowledged in the 1970s, and while its frequent appearances at MOMA in some ways supported this newfound elevation (especially when included in upstairs shows by artists like McLean or

⁵⁷⁹ Green, 'Statement of Policy', 5 September 1967. The show in question was the touring *What is Man? World Photography Exhibition* (11-29 June 1968) organised by *Stern* magazine.

⁵⁸⁰ 'Publicity Report', 28 September 1972, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 1-7.

⁵⁸¹ MOMA did not take attendance figures for individual exhibitions, only for the museum as a whole, making it hard to discern which of a set of exhibitions attracted more visitors than others. However, it was recorded that 'the Compassionate Camera exhibition had, in particular, helped to bring people to the Museum', supporting the hypothesis that photography exhibitions were especially popular: Minutes of the 21st Meeting of the Council of Modern Art Oxford, 10 December 1974, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 8-30.

Rinke), the work of celebrated practitioners such as Muybridge or Adams was nonetheless relegated to the status of café decoration, which surely impacted the seriousness with which it was received.

Serota may not have strictly adhered to the three-part scheme he detailed to Gleadowe, but the idea is illuminating insofar as it exemplifies two innovations that he brought to MOMA: an analytic approach to the cultivation of the museum's public, and a preoccupation with balancing different kinds of art experience.

Whereas Peter Ibsen's exhibitions in 1973 had been almost unwaveringly dedicated to the kinds of contemporary art that were then so deeply unpopular (in April-May, he simultaneously presented shows by Sol LeWitt, Douglas Huebler and Ed Herring, for instance, an unremitting line-up that surely did not conspire at public ingratiation),⁵⁸² Serota's museum paired a primary commitment to conceptualism with tactical diversification. Five-week clusters of three to five shows were carefully calibrated to compliment one another and to muster maximum aggregate appeal. While MOMA's artistic priorities were not in doubt, a profile in the *Cherwell* explains that:

⁵⁸² Nor did it receive it. Although, as discussed, press coverage was scanty, two local papers made brief mention of the triad. Douglas Lee, who prefaces his review with the warning that 'The Museum of Modern Art can always be relied upon to provide the unusual,' provided half-hearted praise for two of the exhibitions, which he described as 'demanding': LeWitt's wall drawings were 'by no means banal,' while Huebler's 'theories of art are clearly defined by his work.' Herring was even less fortunate: 'suffice it to say that he requires a very specialised taste, and perhaps demands too much of the viewer': 'Spheres and Squares'. The conservative F.W.D. could not recommend – or even trouble himself to name – either LeWitt or Herring, advising visitors that they would likely find their work 'altogether too exoteric for their tastes, particularly if, as for myself, anything verging on the mathematical takes on the semblance of a visit to outer space.' Huebler, however, was 'enthusiastically' recommended; the critic, who seems to have misunderstood Huebler's working process, commended the formal qualities of 'textures and surface': F.W.D., 'Douglas Huebler'.

a constant worry is to provide enough variety at any one time. Although its not a question of saying 'if you don't like the difficult art, try the easy,' the Museum tries to provide for a wide variety of audiences.⁵⁸³

So it was that in November-December 1975, Alan Charlton's minimal canvases upstairs were contrasted with the naïve landscapes of Cornish painter Bryan Pearce in the middle and lower galleries, while the geometrical prints of lesser-known artist Kim Lim occupied the smallest room. The previous year, John Hilliard's photographic installations in the Upper Gallery could be seen with Barry Flanagan's drawings on the middle level and NASA space photography below ground, a juxtaposition that led to an unfortunate misunderstanding by one local reviewer who believed that 'Hilliard's impersonal photopix, however uplifting they are meant to be, gravitate naturally towards the *National Geographic*. (This Is Your Planet &c.).'⁵⁸⁴ [fig. 3.46]

In late spring 1975, *Bruce McLean: Early Works 1967-1971* in the Upper Gallery presented a performance and his wry photographic assemblages including the famous series *Pose Work for Plinths*, a parody of Henry Moore's reclining figures; *Marcel Broodthaers: Le Privilège de l'Art* in the middle and small galleries offered photocollages, assemblages, vitrines and slide projections that deconstructed the trappings of art; Muybridge's appealing motion studies in the cafe introduced a more straightforward, scientific variant on the photographic grid; and avant-garde dance group Strider did a two-day residency, drawing inspiration from Muybridge and McLean and working with school groups to perform in the galleries. [figs. 3.47-3.50]

⁵⁸³ P. A. Ewans, 'Egg in an Armpit! (But is it Art?)', *The Cherwell*, (29 January 1975), pp. 4-5.

⁵⁸⁴ Chris Sadler, '[untitled review]', *The Cherwell*, (23 October 1974).

Agnes Martin's recent monochrome grid prints *On a Clear Day* (1973) in January-February 1975 coincided with Matisse's 1920s lithographs on tour from the V&A in the middle and lower galleries – presenting contrasting uses of the print medium – and *Young British Photographers*. The latter two were explicitly 'designed to encourage local interest', according to Morris, and indeed were warmly received by the *Oxford Tributary* which enthused, 'in contrast to the cold intellectualism that has dominated recent shows of the Museum of Modern Art the two new exhibitions there... contain many works that are emotional and beautiful.'⁵⁸⁵ *Young British Photographers* was exceptional as a non-conceptual photography show for being permitted upstairs, while Agnes Martin occupied the small gallery. Yet even in the relatively accessible cycle that so delighted the *Tributary*, an element of radical practice was preserved.

'It was a hierarchy of a pretty straightforward kind,' comments Nairne of the exhibition programme, an assemblage of high and low whose lines were drawn in part by the fact that he, as the junior staff member, had no input into the main exhibition programme but was 'allowed to think of things that would go downstairs.'⁵⁸⁶ Disproportionately, these were national touring shows. Overreliance upon these was frowned upon by the Arts Council, but it was accepted that they would be used to fill in the less important gaps in what was, by today's standards, an extremely busy succession of more than twenty exhibitions a year, supplemented by music, dance and art performances, film screenings, educational events, and

⁵⁸⁵ Morris, 'The Museum of Modern Art in Oxford 1965-1975', p. 241; John Wyver, 'Photo Premiere at MOMA: Matisse Lithos', *Oxford Tributary*, (29 January 1975).

⁵⁸⁶ Nairne, interview 2014.

other programming.⁵⁸⁷ The sorts of combinations detailed above were sometimes considered ‘strange’⁵⁸⁸ but were intended to provide points of contrast and correlation whose ‘cross skeins’ could be inferred from the short descriptive paragraph given to each show in the newssheet.⁵⁸⁹ The older and/or more accessible artworks might, if intelligently juxtaposed, offer comparative ways of thinking about conceptualism that would highlight shared preoccupations with theme or medium, presenting the latter within a reassuring framework of historical continuity.

London and Oxford

Along with successful fundraising from local authorities and other sources, the decision to close Bear Lane after amalgamation had left MOMA with the budget for an Assistant Director, which helped to relieve the administrative pressures that had precipitated Ibsen’s resignation. With this additional appointment, the museum was afforded time to consider questions of publicity, building design and other branding considerations, while continuing to arrange the unusual conceptual art exhibitions that Ibsen had made Oxford’s signature and that Serota proposed as an essential contribution to the nation’s cultural provision. His vision of MOMA’s value inhering in a remedial programme of international avant-garde displays was expressed unambiguously not only to the Arts Council, but in press interviews too:

⁵⁸⁷ ‘Perhaps my one complaint is that the Museum does not do enough to initiate rather than merely house good exhibitions’: Grayson, memorandum to Peter Bird, 20 January 1970. Conversely, Serota wrote to the Arts Council, ‘a high proportion of these exhibitions will be initiated by the Museum,’ ‘Policy Statement 1975/76’, 1975, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 8-30.

⁵⁸⁸ Serota, interview 2014.

⁵⁸⁹ Gleadowe, ‘Modern Art Oxford’, p. 8.

At least in one respect MAO's will differ from other comparable galleries in Britain. 'I believe we ought to continue to provide space for artists from abroad whose work is too new for the Tate or Hayward Galleries, particularly since the Whitechapel Gallery seems to be concentrating very much on British art,' Mr. Serota said. He expects to be criticised for this policy by British artists, but is unrepentant...⁵⁹⁰

Serota's rhetoric drew on the damning criticisms of London art museums that had been repeatedly made by leading art critics since the early 1970s. Influential writers such as Morris, Gladowe, Tisdall and Richard Cork were outspoken in their belief that the capital's public galleries were failing to keep up with the avant-garde and with their overseas counterparts, leaving Britain a 'backwater of ignorance and insularity.'⁵⁹¹ In an article that connected her analysis of cultural provision to fears of national economic decline, Tisdall wrote:

This was the year in which the French predicted, with some glee, that within 10 years Britain, economically speaking, would be one of the most underdeveloped countries in Europe. The thought came to mind as I cast back over the major public exhibitions we've had this year... Even the politest of the gentle breed of European museum directors cannot hide a smirk at the idea of London as a centre of contemporary art... So why is it the public of, say, Krefeld is offered more in the way of exposure to contemporary art than that of London? How is it that the director of a museum in Eindhoven can get it together?⁵⁹²

Similarly in the *Evening Standard* in January 1975, Cork situated his praise of Serota's 'intelligent, progressive' work at MOMA within a background of a 'demoralised and indeed degenerate' nation that was 'cultivating a nostalgia for the past':

If 1974 was the year when England was inescapably confronted with its rapid decline as a major economic and political force in the world, the same falling-off was also noticeable in its dealings with art... The two principal subsidised outlets for surveys of modern art in England, the Hayward Gallery and the Tate, have increasingly withdrawn themselves from any

⁵⁹⁰ Grimley, 'Modern Art Oxford's Future Secured'. The same case was made to Gladowe and to Lynda Morris in their profiles.

⁵⁹¹ Richard Cork, 'The Hole in the London Canvas', *Evening Standard*, (1975), MAO Archive, press clippings file.

⁵⁹² Tisdall, '[untitled]'.

commitment to new ideas and on-going activities... the track records of places like the Whitechapel Art Gallery and the ICA, which at one time showed the unorthodox with conspicuous elan, have been whittled away by uncertainty and financial cut-backs.⁵⁹³

Although other kinds of art were also shown at MOMA, Serota's programme was seen as 'quite hard-core conceptual' in part because the exhibitions MOMA was producing were highly unusual within the UK.⁵⁹⁴ Within a broader context, they were much less so: 'it was a view of what was happening internationally that you could see in the pages of *Studio International*' and *Artforum*, and one that journalists had agreed was no longer really 'new' even at the time of *The New Art*.⁵⁹⁵ In her catalogue essay for that exhibition, Seymour argued that it was already time for 'a backward look,' albeit one that would be novel for British audiences:

Although this kind of thing has long been featured in art magazines and things have snowballed in the field of written and photographed information since 1969... in Britain we have actually *seen* very little of it.⁵⁹⁶

This was true despite the fact that many of these artists (and all of those in the Hayward exhibition) were British themselves. What was acknowledged to be an established international phenomenon was defined and defended in terms of its necessity for a specifically *national* public.

But if there was, as Cork argued, a 'Hole in the London Canvas,' how was an Oxford museum to fill it? MOMA's geographical proximity to London was part of the answer, for it was easily reached by train or car ('It is not without amusement that one watches the 4.05 Paddington to Oxford fill with art supporters on the

⁵⁹³ Cork, 'The Hole in the London Canvas'.

⁵⁹⁴ Nairne, interview 2014.

⁵⁹⁵ Ibid., interview 2014.

⁵⁹⁶ In seeking to generate a British audience for these artists she also invoked a discourse of national identity, arguing that there was something 'very specifically British in their [the artists'] eschewal of aesthetic mumbo-jumbo.' Seymour, *The New Art*, exh. cat., p. 5.

Saturdays when the exhibitions open,' wrote Morris.⁵⁹⁷) Serota reasoned to the museum's managing council that given the lack of exhibitions elsewhere in the country showing what he called the 'truly contemporary':

Even if the local public for that work was small... a large number of students and other people generally interested in the contemporary visual arts would visit Oxford especially to see these exhibitions.⁵⁹⁸

To the Arts Council, similarly, he claimed that MOMA's exhibition policy as a whole 'could be seen in London or Oxford where the museum was after all in the centre of a University town but that it might not be acceptable further from London' where one could not rely on the capital's educated cognoscenti to make the journey.⁵⁹⁹

In a 2005 interview, Serota discussed the significance of the university audience to the reception of the museum, observing that there were natural affinities between conceptual art and the intellectual environment of the city. 'Although we're not talking about large numbers,' he remembered, '...the art that was dealing with ideas was immediately engaging to philosophers and thinkers'; moreover, among the youthful student population, he believed, were many who had 'no preconceptions about what art should be... they didn't come with the expectation that art would be oil painting on canvas.'⁶⁰⁰ Like Deighton, he felt that the city was ill-served by the 'contemporary visual arts' at that time: despite its large student population, MOMA's 1975/6 'Policy Statement' asserted, 'there is no department of art, or even

⁵⁹⁷ Morris, 'The Museum of Modern Art in Oxford 1965-1975', p. 343.

⁵⁹⁸ Minutes of the 14th Meeting of the Council of Modern Art Oxford, 18 September 1973.

⁵⁹⁹ The minutes go on to record, 'He pointed out that he had shown several "popular" exhibitions during the year citing Matisse Lithographs and the Compassionate Camera amongst others.' Draft Minutes: 'Oxford Museum of Modern Art', 11 February 1975.

⁶⁰⁰ Richard, 'Conversation with Sir Nicholas Serota', p. 464.

history of art in Oxford. The Ruskin is ailing, the Polytechnic department has virtually closed.⁶⁰¹ An Artist-in-Residence scheme, inaugurated in 1975 with Noel Forster at Balliol College, was among the most direct initiatives aimed at connecting MOMA with the life of the university undergraduate: it placed an artist in an Oxford college for one academic year.⁶⁰²

Oxford is not only a city of undergraduates and academics, however, but one with considerable diversity of classes, tastes, ethnicities, and educational backgrounds among its inhabitants. Some awareness of this surely underlay Deighton's question in 1973 as to how well Serota's programme for MOMA would work 'as a provincial gallery,' asking 'if he would be prepared to put on exhibitions which perhaps he did not think were very good.' Serota's reply, which expressed an understanding that 'exhibitions should not always reflect his own taste,' was an indirect assent.⁶⁰³ While exhibitions were no longer structured around university terms as they had been in the museum's first years, students were still the core local audience; the education programme, which MOMA had largely inherited from Bear Lane and which was administered by Nairne, focused its efforts on schoolchildren rather than on working-class or otherwise culturally marginalised communities.⁶⁰⁴

⁶⁰¹ Serota, 'Policy Statement 1975/76', 1975.

⁶⁰² Following Forster, Howard Hodgkin was at Brasenose 1976-77, and John Walker at St. Catherine's 1977-78. Hodgkin's account of his residency was published as Howard Hodgkin, 'An Artist in Residence', *Oxford Art Journal*, vol. 1, no. 1, (1978), pp. 36-7. A solo show at MOMA was part of the arrangement.

⁶⁰³ She noted, 'that though the people in Oxford were reputed to take to avant garde [sic] music this was not the case with visual arts.' 'Minutes of the Extraordinary General Meeting', 8 December 1973, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 8-30.

⁶⁰⁴ Bear Lane Gallery had a strong tradition of working with children whereas MOMA's education programme had consisted largely of periodic lectures and film screenings, often in partnership with OUAC. After the merger, some of this transferred to MOMA as it had better spaces for events. Ibsen was unable to

[figs. 3.51-3.52] ‘I don't think that the Museum of Modern Art Oxford ever really set out to capture an audience from Cowley,’ acknowledges Serota.⁶⁰⁵ An account of Joseph Beuys’ performance lecture published in the *Birmingham Post*, complaining that the artist’s communications were unnecessarily obscure, was premised upon the assumption that MOMA’s public and the East Oxford working classes were separated by a wide gulf:

His failure to make his meaning clear to the audience at the Museum of Modern Art makes one wonder how he would have coped with an audience of car workers at Cowley.⁶⁰⁶

organise much singlehandedly but performances of contemporary music, frequently supported by Southern Arts and organised by Serota’s sister Judith (then working at the Arnolfini) often came to Oxford (these included Steve Reich, Alvin Lucier, and the Howard Riley Trio), see MAO Archive, box 010, fols. ‘Experimental Projects: Music 1972/3’ and ‘Music 1971/3’ and box ‘Education 1970s on,’ fol. ‘Music 1972/3.’ MOMA also organised occasional children’s art workshops. Bear Lane, meanwhile, was organising more frequent children’s workshops, operated a slide library of 20th-century art and circulating print collections available for loan to Oxfordshire schools. Both sometimes arranged exhibitions of the work of local children, a practice which was continued by Nairne at MOMA and culminated in an unprecedented three-floor extravaganza, *The Young in Art* (22 February-6 March 1976) which attracted an extraordinary 7,500 visitors over two weeks and was ‘certainly the most successful [exhibition] the Museum has ever organised’ in terms of attendance: Nicholas Serota, letter to Jack Townsend, Oxfordshire County Council, 7 April 1976, MAO Archive, box ‘MOMA Jan-April 1976’ fol. ‘The Young in Art’. After the closure of Bear Lane, MOMA took over its slide library and circulating collection and expanded the provision for schools, organising children’s workshops for certain exhibitions and offering guided group visits. Contemporary artists’ films were shown weekly and talks began to be tailored to specific exhibitions. Contemporary music and dance performances were intermittently put on. MOMA received education funding from Oxford City Council and Oxfordshire County Council. See MAO Archive, box ‘Education 1970s on’ fol. ‘Serota director’s papers: Education 1974/5.’ In mid-1976, shortly before his departure to work at the Tate, Nairne introduced educational worksheets: see MAO Archive, box ‘Education 1970s on’ fol. ‘Education Questionnaires 1976-80.’

⁶⁰⁵ Serota, interview 2014.

⁶⁰⁶ Terry Grimley, ‘The Eccentricities of Joseph Beuys’, *Birmingham Post*, (April 1974). An article about the city published the same year by the University Professor of Poetry records an ‘apartheid’ between central and east Oxford: ‘I know people who have lived in Oxford for forty years and never set eyes on Cowley or its attendant housing area, Blackbird Leys.’ He contrasts the ‘clay-cold unresponsiveness of the local yokels’ with ‘a certain kind of fluting North Oxford voice [which] always freezes me.’ John Wain, ‘Oxford’, *Southern Arts*, (July/August 1974), p. 23.

Serota's approach, as we have seen, was a policy of diversification weighted towards the radical, in the hope of both driving attendance figures and encouraging a fruitful cross-pollination of audiences. Feaver was correct in 1975 when he described MOMA as 'calculatingly Thames Valley in its appeal,' precisely in its meticulous combinations of the popular, the middle-generation and the avant-garde.⁶⁰⁷ When Serota wrote to Carl Andre in 1976 that his understanding of the responsibility of artists invited to exhibit was:

to make with us a good show of their work not to design a show for either initiates or non-believers or for those who have seen one, two, three or more of their works before,

his purported indifference to issues of public response was disingenuous.⁶⁰⁸ What MOMA produced during these years was a programme judiciously crafted to appeal to local families, university scholars, and London art aficionados collectively and in turn, and it was – by all accounts – very successful in so doing.

What the Arts Council had taken for eccentricity in Ibsen was successfully recast as a unique contribution to the British institutional landscape. When the national value of conceptual exhibitions was carefully articulated and situated within a professionalised institution and a shrewdly pluralistic programme, the Arts Council

⁶⁰⁷ Feaver, 'Art: The Regional Canvas', p. 36.

⁶⁰⁸ Nicholas Serota, letter to Carl Andre, 30 January 1976, MAO Archive, box 'MOMA Apr-Jul 75' fol. 'MOMA Jun-Jul '75 Andre Adams Murphy'. Serota's letter was in response to a testy letter from Andre complaining about Lynda Morris' article on MOMA, in which she criticised Andre's show as having failed to 'fully understand the rôle of the gallery and the knowledge people have of the work,' because he had not spent enough time in Oxford, p. 242. Serota further remarked, 'As far as roll [sic] is concerned I do not know what Lynda conceives of our roll [sic]. Certainly she ignored important aspects of our work – with schools and with the local community – (no art world cache [sic]). At times she seems to think our roll [sic] is to upstage London, at times to fall into her neat international circuit.'

proved willing to provide the generous financial backing that was essential to the future of the museum.

Navigating Commercial Terrain

It has been argued above that in the mutual struggle for existence, the Bear Lane Gallery and the Museum of Modern Art were effectively polarised over the issue of commerce, with Bear Lane defending the concurrence of sales with state sponsorship while MOMA took a purist stance, refusing to contemplate a 'marketable' programme. Serota's position echoed those of Green and Ibsen. He explained to the Council during a dispute over the future of Bear Lane in November 1973 that 'he personally felt a great commitment to the propagation of ideas rather than the sale of work' and that the priority should be public education.⁶⁰⁹ There is an irony, however, that in combatting pressure to arrange more commercial displays, MOMA came to be closely aligned with a certain breed of new private galleries in London.

Serota's claims that there was nowhere in London showing the avant-garde in the early to mid-1970s were based on contemporary published assessments of institutions such as the Tate, Serpentine, Whitechapel and Hayward. Articles such as those cited above created a climate that allowed Serota's provocative programme to attract funding and publicity through his intelligent explication of its singularity. Despite these claims, however, there were indeed spaces showing very much the

⁶⁰⁹ Minutes of the 15th Council of Modern Art Oxford, 13 November 1973.

sorts of international avant-garde artists favoured by Ibsen and Serota: the city's commercial galleries. As Tisdall observed:

In London galleries like Nigel Greenwood, the Lisson, Jack Wendler, Situation and the non-commercial Royal College Gallery... are in effect doing for the art public here what the museums do in Europe.⁶¹⁰

If MOMA under Serota became, as Morris described it, 'England's link in the chain of progressive public spaces which help determine European art,' that chain of *Kunsthallen* was itself part of a wider conceptual art network in which dealers played a very important role, in London even more than further afield.⁶¹¹ Rather than any of its regional or metropolitan public peers, in other words, MOMA's closest counterparts in the UK were perhaps this small number of new London commercial spaces which alone were regularly offering British exhibitions to the new generation of conceptual artists including Buren, Broodthaers, LeWitt, Charlton, Art & Language, and many others.⁶¹² [figs. 3.53-3.55] These gallery exhibitions were free to the public, publishing catalogues and receiving critical reviews much in the same way as public venues; correspondingly, MOMA (like other public organisations) sometimes acted as a private dealer, negotiating sales of the artists in their shows and taking a percentage of the price.⁶¹³ Furthermore, private galleries often offered financial and practical support for particular public exhibitions, and also sometimes arranged for a show by the same artist to run simultaneously in their own premises. In her article on MOMA, Morris drew attention to a number of recent instances of this practice, which she said Serota

⁶¹⁰ Tisdall, '[untitled]'.

⁶¹¹ Morris, 'The Museum of Modern Art in Oxford 1965-1975', p. 240.

⁶¹² Richard, *Unconcealed*: see especially Database 3.b, 'Chronological list of exhibitions of Conceptual artists in dealer galleries and public institutions,' pp. 302-313.

⁶¹³ For instance, the Tate purchased three works from the Marcel Broodthaers exhibition with Serota acting as agent: MAO Archive, box 'MOMA Apr-Jul '75' fol. 'MOMA Apr-Jun '75 Broodthaers McLean Muybridge.'

found ‘embarrassing’ and unwelcome.⁶¹⁴ Coming on the heels of her exhibition review of *Carl Andre: Poems* which had appeared in the previous month’s issue of *Studio International*, this prompted a blistering letter from Andre to Serota which inquired as to why Morris had imputed to him and the Lisson:

a grossly commercial motive in my showing more of the abhorred poems simultaneously at an unnamed London gallery... poor Nicholas Logsdail’s not more or less engaged in trade than Nigel Greenwood or Konrad Fischer - his misfortune is to be commercially less successful... No commercial dealer would willingly become involved in placing a show like mine at your museum,

finished Andre, alluding to the uncommercial nature of his concrete poetry.⁶¹⁵ In his reply, Serota denied prompting any of the criticisms of Andre’s show and asserted that Morris had misquoted him on a number of points:

In conversation with Lynda I did say that I thought simultaneous museum/gallery shows (and not yours alone) could be misinterpreted by those wishing to knock Nicholas or myself but she made something out of this which seems to me unjustifiable and crude... So little for Lynda.⁶¹⁶

In fact, because conceptual art was so often considered inherently uncommercial, the galleries promoting it occupied a liminal position, situated ambiguously between business and philanthropy. As Serota comments in retrospect, although such galleries were ostensibly for-profit enterprises, they were ‘much less commercial than they would be today... many of the shows they made were not made with

⁶¹⁴ Morris, ‘The Museum of Modern Art in Oxford 1965-1975’, p. 242. This practice on the part of commercial galleries predated Serota’s period, and instances included the Lisson’s LeWitt wall drawings and Huebler and Buren at Wendler in 1973, Flanagan at the Rowan Gallery in 1974 and the Carl Andre *Poems* at Lisson in 1975, all timed to coincide with MOMA.

⁶¹⁵ Carl Andre, letter to Nicholas Serota, 26 December 1975, MAO Archive, box ‘MOMA Apr-Jul 75’ fol. ‘MOMA Jun-Jul ‘75 Andre Adams Murphy’. The offending review had described Andre as a ‘denim-bound encyclopaedia’ with a ‘nasal intonation somewhere between Vincent Price and Orson Welles’ who ‘plays specialist games with the art market’ and whose concrete poetry she found ‘tiring.’ Lynda Morris, ‘Carl Andre Poems 1958-1974’, *Studio International*, (September/October 1975).

⁶¹⁶ Serota, letter to Carl Andre, 30 January 1976.

much expectation that they would sell. There was a different frame of mind.’⁶¹⁷ The Lisson Gallery in 1975, in other words, bore little resemblance to the formidable business operation it is today; if Serota was primarily committed to ‘the propagation of ideas rather than the sale of work,’ something similar might be said for certain of the London galleries as well. The often-blurred line between dealing, displaying and collecting conceptual art in the contemporary British context was exemplified by wealthy American Jack Wendler, whose eponymous gallery (1971-74) presented artists such as Huebler, Broodthaers, Buren, John Baldessari, Mario Merz and Laurence Weiner to a London public, and which sold works primarily into his own collection.⁶¹⁸

Whether or not a commercial gallery opted to stage a London counterpart to an Oxford exhibition, there was surely a danger at this point that visitors – especially those travelling up from London – might find the shows at MOMA redundant when there were private galleries producing comparable exhibitions in the capital, also without charge. While Bear Lane’s closure had confirmed the commercial limitations of conceptual art in the provinces in this period (at least as far as Oxfordshire was concerned), it is clear that MOMA was relying heavily upon the travelling art aficionada to fill its galleries. Even if the number of commercial organisations active in this field was low, how was the museum to differentiate itself?

⁶¹⁷ Ibid., interview 2014.

⁶¹⁸ Martin Herbert, ‘Dematerialised: Jack Wendler Gallery 1971-1974’, *Art Monthly*, vol. 327, (2009).

One answer was to focus on those within the pool of internationally renowned conceptual artists who had not yet received much London gallery exposure. Asked in 2005 why Gilbert & George were among the few prominent British conceptual artists of this generation not offered an exhibition, Serota answered that ‘they were showing very frequently at Nigel Greenwood and at the Situation Gallery... I wanted to show the work of artists who weren’t that present.’⁶¹⁹ A second strategy lay not in the choice of artists but in the way that their shows were staged, aiming for ‘a different frame[work] in the institution than you would find in the gallery.’⁶²⁰ This was achieved partly through temporal considerations. Just as the MOMA programme as a whole was inclined to juxtapose new and old, so too did individual exhibitions: instead of presenting only the newest work as galleries often did, the museum tended to add value by offering a longer view of an artist’s development. The retrospective aspect was conveyed through exhibition titles such as *Art and Language 1966-75* or *Bob Law: 10 Black Paintings 1965-1970*, which imparted a museological flavour and which cast the artists in a flattering historical light. Similarly, it was intended that visitors would gradually accumulate the free catalogues and newsletters so as to preserve memories of each show, in the hope that they would bring these references to bear on their understanding of subsequent exhibitions.⁶²¹ However, the provision of interpretive text remained very minimal, and it seems likely that to most visitors the difference between MOMA and one of London’s avant-garde galleries lay less in the particulars of a specific conceptual exhibition than in the placement of that exhibition within a diversified programme

⁶¹⁹ Richard, *Unconcealed*, p. 464.

⁶²⁰ Serota, interview 2014.

⁶²¹ Gleadowe, ‘Modern Art Oxford’, p. 8.

and in the relative variety (and quantity) of fellow visitors. After all, the private galleries were very poorly attended.⁶²²

Ascetic Aesthetics

Serota had sought to transform MOMA from a run-down warehouse to an ‘institution with weight,’ but what kind of experiences did that weightiness impress upon its viewing subjects?⁶²³ Within the logic of the museum-as-garden, the connotations of labour carried by the brewery building had helped to present spectators with a physicalized ideal of the art experience; as a setting for conceptual art, its echoes of working life resonated instead with the painstaking intellectual toil of the university library. Tables were a recurrent feature of the gallery installations, topped with books, drawings or other documents and frequently provided with desk chairs, presenting the viewer with a scholarly picture of the art encounter and accommodating prolonged study. ‘We are in the black-and-white world of the classroom or laboratory,’ wrote Gosling unhappily in his review of *The New Art*,⁶²⁴ and while that may befit the informational character of the works and the academic character of the city of Oxford, few classrooms have been as rigorously aestheticised as the MOMA galleries.

⁶²² In his review of *The New Art*, Overy takes up Seymour’s claim in the catalogue that the artists in the show hadn’t been seen in Britain, noting that in fact ‘most of the artists included have previously exhibited their work at three small dealers’ galleries which consistently show “avant-garde” work in London- the Lisson, Nigel Greenwood and Situations. Although I suppose it could be argued – as Donald Davie once argued that poetry published in little magazines and by small limited edition presses wasn’t really published at all, because so few people read these publications – that work shown in these small, inaccessible private galleries isn’t really “seen.” Overy, ‘Stimulating or Just Infuriating?’, p. 5.

⁶²³ Serota, interview 2014.

⁶²⁴ Gosling, ‘British Brain-Bashers’, p. 30.

Conceptual art ostensibly disregarded visual considerations, but nonetheless the museum's exhibitions from 1973-6 are united by an austere formalism. Seen in installation views, these artists' interventions into the galleries appear minimal, even bare: the monochrome works that typically resulted from the concerted use of text, photograph and diagram were precisely arranged by Serota on clean white walls, with a great deal of space set between them. These exhibitions were documented for the museum archives in black and white photographs resolutely empty of human presence, neatly printed with white borders. [fig. 3.56] They are not easily distinguished. Some of Ibsen's exhibitions celebrated works that were restrained almost to the point of invisibility – LeWitt's pencil wall drawings come to mind – but in the grimy and haphazard qualities of the building at the time, their aesthetic qualities were perhaps less striking than their conceptual basis. [fig. 3.57] By contrast, the purified and spotless spaces of the renovated MOMA echoed and amplified the colourless restraint of its conceptual artworks, its meticulous hangs reprising their ubiquitous grid motifs, the galleries themselves rendered as immaculate and sober designs.⁶²⁵ [figs. 3.58-3.60] They were, as the *Oxford Mail* described Ruckreim's show, 'stark and stern.'⁶²⁶ Writing of Joseph Kosuth's installation at the Leo Castelli Gallery in New York in 1972 – an installation that, with its tables, open books, neat chairs, and numbered paragraphs of dense wall

⁶²⁵ It is difficult to find avant-garde artists exhibiting at MOMA between 1973 and 1976 who did *not* prominently deploy grid formats in their exhibitions. This multitude included Hilliard, Darboven, McLean, Tremlett, Andre, LeWitt, Judd, Martin, Christopher Watts, Rinke, Neagu, Lim, Charlton, Foxcroft, Art and Language and Broodthaers. This recurrence was not unusual among this generation of advanced artists; the classic analysis of the 20th-century ubiquity of the grid is Rosalind Krauss, 'The Originality of the Avant-Garde: A Postmodernist Repetition', *October*, vol. 18, (Autumn 1981), pp. 53-8.

⁶²⁶ Judy Brundin, 'Stark and Stern', *Oxford Mail*, (18 May 1976).

text, strongly resembled MOMA's 1975 Art and Language retrospective –

O'Doherty offers an apt description of the museum's atmospherics:

It is not a looking room, it is a reading room. The ceremony of informality is deceptive. Here is the aura of Wittgenstein's study... or is it a schoolroom? Bare, essential, even puritanical, it cancels as well as draws on the special cloister of aesthetics that the gallery is.⁶²⁷ [figs. 3.61-3.62]

The taut stylisation that united the galleries and the museum's other adroit branding efforts pervaded even those exhibitions of work that did not share this minimal orientation. Jeff Clarke, stalwart Bear Lane supporter and veteran of its exhibitions, who was surprised to be invited to display his etchings and drawings in the small gallery (26 November-14 December 1975), remembers the process of its assemblage. The hang that he and Nairne had initially arranged was vetoed: 'Serota did one of his minimal jobs,' removing 'two-thirds' of his works from the walls to visually realign the gallery with the museum's relentlessly spare aesthetic; Clarke acknowledges that the intervention improved the appearance of his show considerably.⁶²⁸ Like the supposedly anti-retinal conceptual art it championed, MOMA's elliptical elegance was marked by refusal: like that art, it became identifiable – and assimilable – as style.

Critics often commended the 'fastidious,' 'stylish,' 'beautiful' and 'coolly disciplined' mounting of MOMA's exhibitions at this time,⁶²⁹ and reviews –

⁶²⁷ O'Doherty, *Inside the White Cube*, p. 64.

⁶²⁸ Clarke, interview 2014.

⁶²⁹ Of exhibition, local critic F.W.D. commended 'the fastidious quality of the presentation of this exhibition, in terms of stylish mounting': 'Museum of Modern Art', *Oxford Times*, (20 December 1974). For another, Hilliard's show was 'as one might expect, beautifully mounted in the Upper Gallery space': Charles Stephens, 'Oh MOMA', *Isis*, (1974), MAO Archive, press clippings file. Beuys' drawings, meanwhile, were 'presented without comment in a coolly disciplined format which

especially in the national press – commonly singled out the organisation as a whole for special praise with specific reference to the capital:

More number sequences, this time at the Museum of Modern Art, Oxford, which is courageously continuing with a programme of the kind of contemporary art that has yet to find a platform in London,

wrote Tisdall; Overy anointed MOMA ‘the best contemporary gallery outside London... (And it does not, I think, have a rival in London either)’; Cork called for the Arts Council to model its contemporary exhibitions on Serota’s ‘intelligent, progressive programme.’⁶³⁰ While there was overwhelming critical acclaim for MOMA as an institution during Serota’s directorship, however, reviews of individual exhibitions continued to be very mixed. While the daring and international character of the programme and the attractive building were regularly admired, such praise was often set against bewilderment or distaste for the conceptual art itself. Misunderstanding, fatigue, and suspicion characterise much of the published response, as they had during Ibsen’s tenure: many of these art writers, after all, were those who had so reviled *The New Art* and *Survey of the Avant-Garde in Britain* not long before, and it is clear from what can be discovered about unpublished responses that they were often of a similar character. Much of the difference lay in the respective quantity of reviews, as Serota’s improved funding and publicity efforts attracted the consistent attention of national papers and magazines.

heightens the potency of the images by insistent repeat’: J.A.B., ‘Company of Quiet Horrors’, *Oxford Mail*, (30 April 1974).

⁶³⁰ Cork, ‘The Hole in the London Canvas’, p. 36; Tisdall, ‘European Artists in Oxford’, *The Guardian*, (6 July 1974), p. 8; Overy, ‘Oxford Rings the Changes’, *The Times*, (11 February 1975), p. 7.

While positive reviews tended to differentiate an artist's work from those of others, celebrating its individual qualities, negative reviews employed repetitive tropes. Throughout the period 1971-76, MOMA's critics frequently mentioned that they found the conceptual art exhibitions physically and mentally exhausting. For Overy in the *Times*, for example, Beuys' drawings 'required some considerable stamina', primarily because of the ungainly size of the show.⁶³¹ Complaints of fatigue more often pertained to text-based work, however, as with Herring's 'Notework,' of which the *Oxford Times* opined, 'one must question an exhibition that requires so much concentration from the spectator standing up... presenting such ideas on walls demands a lot of physical endurance from even the most ardent spectator.'⁶³² These complaints were not confined to conservative-leaning critics, either: 'It is tiring to read typing pasted flat on gallery walls,' wrote Morris, who found Andre's poems hard work.⁶³³ But local newspapers were typically the most resistant to displays of conceptual art, and often denigrated them as 'mathematical' or 'esoteric,' or at best damned them with faint praise ('if the exhibition gives a certain impression of inspirational diffuseness it is by no means unworthy of study,' assured the *Oxford Times* of Andre's exhibition).⁶³⁴ By contrast, photography and painting exhibitions received much warmer welcome.

As they had with the London shows in 1972, reviewers found frequent source for aggravation in a perceived absence of meaning. Even a critic as sympathetic to conceptual art as Tisdall found Darboven's mathematical sequences 'low on

⁶³¹ Ibid., 'Mystery and Mystification', *The Times*, (10 April 1974), p. 13.

⁶³² Brundin, 'Artists Put Ideas First...'

⁶³³ Morris, 'Carl Andre Poems 1958-1974'.

⁶³⁴ F.W.D., 'Carl Andre: MOMA', *Oxford Times*, (1975), MAO Archive, press clippings file; Ibid., 'Lesley Foxcroft: MOMA', *Oxford Times*, (1975), MAO Archive, press clippings file.

communication,’ while a less generous Overy determined Art & Language to be ‘pure illiterate gobbledygook... as the veil of mystification drops, so the emperor is revealed as not only nude but a eunuch too.’⁶³⁵ Beuys’ drawings, which excited an unusual volume of commentary, were considered especially incomprehensible despite being figurative: whether or not they liked it overall, *Studio International*, *Southern Arts*, the *Birmingham Post*, *Isis*, the *Times* and the *Oxford Times* all agreed that it was difficult to discern Beuys’ concepts and cosmology from looking at the drawings in the show. For an artist whose work is so engaged with social questions, many felt, ‘very few actually do communicate.’⁶³⁶ For David Briers in *Art and Artists*:

Le Gac’s piece-copies of a small booklet entitled ‘Imitation of Jean le Gac’ piled on a table – nothing else – was off-putting, so introverted and playing so hard to get that one thought ‘Why bother?’⁶³⁷

A tone of mockery permeates many of the reviews, expressing discomfort with the direction of contemporary art. Terms like ‘mumbo jumbo’ are used even by upmarket publications like the *Times* and *Studio International*,⁶³⁸ though Overy determined MOMA itself to be ‘without self-indulgent fashionableness,’ its

⁶³⁵ Overy, ‘Paul Klee: The Gift of Visual Thinking’, *The Times*, (1 October 1975), p. 9; Tisdall, ‘European Artists in Oxford’.

⁶³⁶ Graham Knight, ‘The Secret Block for a Secret Person in Ireland: Joseph Beuys Drawings 1948-72’, *Southern Arts*, no. 3, (May 1974). See also Overy, ‘Mystery and Mystification’, p. 13; Grimley, ‘The Eccentricities of Joseph Beuys’; Mark Francis, ‘Honey and Hare’s Blood’, *Isis*, (May 1974); John A. Walker, ‘Joseph Beuys: Secret Block for a Secret Person in Ireland (exhibition review)’, *Studio International*, vol. 187, no. 967, (June 1974); ‘Joseph Beuys: Museum of Modern Art’, *Oxford Times*, (26 April 1974).

⁶³⁷ ‘... Whether the artist would have liked it or not, what MOMA should have done was to cover just one wall with Xeroxed copies of the artist’s previous activities, in English.’ Le Gac’s exhibition coincided with Boltanski’s (2 June-1 July 1973) as one of Ibsen’s last efforts. The review is quoted in Gleadowe, ‘Modern Art Oxford’, p. 8. The original could not be found.

⁶³⁸ Overy, ‘Paul Klee’; Walker, ‘Joseph Beuys: Secret Block for a Secret Person in Ireland (exhibition review)’.

exhibitions by McLean and Art & Language did not escape this scathing designation.⁶³⁹ At times a note of outright derision breaks out: of the Beuys exhibition's future tour to Ireland, Timothy O'Keefe writes in *Studio International*, 'If the IRA or the UFA will smear themselves with honey and beeswax for him then my name is O'Shaughnessy.'⁶⁴⁰ A long review of Charlton's minimal grey paintings in *Envisage* satirises, not without some ambivalence, the profundity that the reviewer feels is expected of his gallery experience:

During my visit, and as I sit here writing, some people turned back on the stairway having in one glance devoured the immensity of that universe which lightly touched the canvas of these seven grey paintings. How large are they? Not as large as the universe, not perhaps as profound either ... Steadily I walked one pace at a time from the other side of the room as the immense cosmic greyness filled my vision, blotting the white and multifarious world outside, leading me inside, inside deeper into my own mind ... But suddenly, about three feet away I jumped out of my skin, my metaphorical skin, and converged back to reality: for, suspended between those two hemispheres of my imagination and these mere outward façade of greyness, a spider hung...⁶⁴¹

Connected with the scepticism, it appears, was a degree of anxiety among the public that modern artists were making a fool of them by only *pretending* to make art. Here we might recall the sentiment that that the *Birmingham Post* captured in its coverage of *Popa at Moma*:

The uncommitted visitor to exhibitions of modern art must have been aware occasionally of a sneaking feeling that the artists responsible ... are having a little fun at his expense; that the harder he tries to get the message which he wrongly supposes to be there, the more delighted his tormentors must be...⁶⁴²

⁶³⁹ Overy, 'Oxford Rings the Changes', p. 7; Ibid., 'Irony at Oxford', *The Times*, (13 May 1975), p. 13.

⁶⁴⁰ 'The Secret Block for a Secret Person in Ireland: Drawings by Joseph Beuys', *Studio International*, vol. 188, no. 969, (September 1974).

⁶⁴¹ Anthony Lipmann, 'Grey Paintings', *Envisage*, (December 1975).

⁶⁴² 'Over-involved'.

This was described by Nairne in 1975 as a genuine obstacle for the museum's educational agenda: 'though attitudes to modern art are changing (Obscenity, is it art?, etc.) people are still worried about being conned. The present exhibition of Matisse is reassuring in this respect.'⁶⁴³ The widespread fear of an avant-garde 'con' was raised again in a tongue-in-cheek commentary on *Andre Flavin Judd LeWitt* (11 January-8 February 1976) that ran in the *Oxford Mail* in March. [fig. 3.63] The exhibition of American minimalists was drawn from British collections and put together at short notice by Serota. As the article's title implies – 'When Those Bricks Were Displayed In Oxford' – the exhibition included a version of the Tate Gallery's Andre brick assemblage, *Equivalent VIII*, which became suddenly notorious in February that year as a locus of journalistic outrage over public funding for contemporary art.⁶⁴⁴ The *Oxford Mail* explained:

The bricks that the American sculptor, Carl Andre, sold so dearly to the Tate symbolise all that the public fears about art. It's not just the bricks. It's boxes stuck on walls, pipes laid out on the floor, white canvasses with bits cut out. The layman finds it hard not to believe in a gigantic conspiracy between artists, galleries and critics.⁶⁴⁵

Serota, who was interviewed for the piece, politely denied the idea that minimalist and conceptual art represents an elaborate hoax:

I don't think many artists make money on cons; on the whole other artists see that they don't. It is possible to perpetuate a con on one work but not when you are working in a serious manner.

⁶⁴³ Ewans, 'Egg in an Armpit! (But is it Art?)'.

⁶⁴⁴ The work had been purchased for the collection in 1972 and exhibited previously without attracting such an outcry. Tate responded to the sudden controversy by putting the work back on public display until a member of the public threw dye over it and it had to be withdrawn for restoration. The literature on this episode is large: for a contemporary overview, see especially Our Arts Reporter, 'Tate Gallery Defends Purchase of Bricks', *The Times*, (17 February 1976), p. 3; 'Editorial', *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. 118, no. 877, (April 1976), pp. 187-88; and Richard Morphet, 'Carl Andre's Bricks', *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. 118, no. 884, (November 1976), pp. 762-65.

⁶⁴⁵ Peter McIntyre, 'When Those Bricks Were Displayed In Oxford', *Oxford Mail*, (9 March 1976).

He suggested that in the furore over bricks, the Tate might have erred in showing only a single Andre work, divorcing *Equivalents VIII* from the artist's 'lines of development.' The writer also records Serota's suggestion that an appreciation for the work results from patience and an open mind; 'younger children responded well to the exhibition but... older children, who had begun to develop formal ideas of art, were sceptical.'⁶⁴⁶ Nairne, whose responsibility for museum education and his physical placement behind the desk at the entrance meant that he fielded public questioning and displeasure, recalls that during *Andre Flavin Judd LeWitt* especially, 'lots of people would come in and be outraged, "this wasn't art."⁶⁴⁷ The *Oxford Times* concluded in apparent incredulity that MOMA's showing 'passed off without riots.' It advised the reader that (contrary to his or her presumed inclinations) 'next time you see a conceptual artist at work, try not to pour blue dye over him.'⁶⁴⁸

A persistent current of straightforward misunderstanding courses through not only the press coverage of the Oxford exhibitions (as in the conflation of Hilliard's work with NASA photography) but also animates recorded anecdotes. In Pollen's account of the 1973 J. C. Blake exhibition *Glass is a rigid liquid: 5 Glass Panes 'Permutations' Broken/Not Broken 1971*, the 'paintings on just ordinary builder's glass, propped up on the wainscoting all round the top gallery' were so visually unexceptional that 'we had to stop our cleaner from sweeping up some of the things.'⁶⁴⁹ When the Oxford-based artist and Ruskin tutor Helen Ganly visited

⁶⁴⁶ Ibid., 'When Those Bricks Were Displayed In Oxford'.

⁶⁴⁷ Nairne, interview 2014.

⁶⁴⁸ McIntyre, 'When Those Bricks Were Displayed In Oxford'.

⁶⁴⁹ Pollen, interview 2013.

MOMA in 1975, she mistook John Murphy's exhibition (pinned white sheets of paper marked with pencil lines) for an installation in progress.⁶⁵⁰ [fig. 3.64] Bob Law's black paintings reveal delicate tonal variations upon close inspection but, as both Serota and Pollen recollect, these subtleties were not well appreciated by the museum's public which failed to pick up on any nuances in the black.⁶⁵¹ [fig. 3.65] Conversely, the Law catalogue was criticised by artist Gerald Newman in *Studio International* for what he interpreted as the technical failings of the illustrations. 'They are of such poor quality – again, black rectangles on white – as to make one wonder why an attempt at reproduction was even considered let alone made.'⁶⁵² The idea that the apparently pointless repetition might have been a deliberate commentary of some kind on the nature of reproduction and of artistic singularity evidently did not occur to him.

Provocation and Guidance

MOMA Oxford may have become an institution of renown between 1973 and 1976, but it was still bedevilled by popular hostility and confusion towards the avant-garde. Although the museum had unquestionably succeeded in putting conceptual art in front of increasing numbers of people, it is clear that appreciation and

⁶⁵⁰ Helen Ganly interview, (Oxford, 9 April 2014).

⁶⁵¹ Pollen, interview 2013; Serota, interview 2014. Serota described it as a 'a very beautiful show which completely failed... [The public] found it literally incomprehensible. Very few of them were prepared to give up the time where when you actually look at those paintings the imminent colour, saturated colour comes through.'

⁶⁵² Gerald Newman, "'Ten Black Paintings" by Bob Law (exhibition review)', *Studio International*, vol. 188, no. 969, (September 1974), n.p.

comprehension did not automatically follow.⁶⁵³ Part of Nairne's role was to 'say why was it art, why was it important, why was it interesting, why were we showing it,' but with very little explanatory text, catalogues conceived of largely as freestanding works of art, and with education programming mostly directed at those of school age, the museum may have been enjoyed by some visitors more for its ambience and sophistication than from a position of genuine understanding.⁶⁵⁴ [figs. 3.66-3.67] Reservations about MOMA's effectiveness as a centre for learning rather than mere experience inspired Serota, as it had Ibsen before him, to return to the notion of a museum collection.

In December 1975, shortly before Serota's resignation in March 1976, the council of management approved a proposal entitled 'A Loan Collection.' The scheme, due to begin the following autumn, sought to borrow important recent art works for a period of eighteen months to two years, to complement and contextualise the exhibition programme.⁶⁵⁵ Serota knew some important British collectors of art post-1960, such as Wendler and Alan Power, whose collections were often in storage and who seemed likely to lend for defined periods of time.⁶⁵⁶ The short-term nature of the collection had practical advantages: it would ensure that, unlike its predecessor,

⁶⁵³ This is not to say that no-one gained appreciation and comprehension from MOMA's activities: indeed, it is likely that among the increased number of visitors were those who were deeply influenced by their experiences. This may be especially true for those – artists and others in the art world in particular – who came equipped with the intellectual tools to best engage with this material.

⁶⁵⁴ Nairne, interview 2014.

⁶⁵⁵ Serota, 'A Loan Collection', December 1975.

⁶⁵⁶ Wendler and Power were mentioned by Serota in interview 2014. The council minutes do not mention anyone by name but records that he 'had already discussed his proposal at some length with two private collectors and both had confidence in the success of such a scheme.' Artists and dealers had also agreed in principle to lend. Minutes of the 26th Meeting of the Council of Modern Art Oxford, 13 December 1975, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 8-30.

it would remain relevant to contemporary interests, and it would also facilitate the representation of major works of art. Serota believed that a collection would enhance the museum's reputation and also relieve the financial pressures associated with running three or four temporary exhibitions simultaneously,⁶⁵⁷ but at least as important were the pedagogic implications. A collection would have the advantage of presenting the current exhibition in a wider artistic context, and it would allow for more flexible and imaginative presentations than the monographic format that dominated the current programme, including (it was specified) one-day events and artistic projects arranged off-site. In particular, it would offer instructive 'opportunities for juxtapositions of works which could otherwise be shown together only in an exhibition based on a theme or mixed group.' Artists, he had found, were reluctant to take part in group shows: they 'may dislike showing with others who they regard as weaker artists or may justifiably question the "box" into which their work has been put.' As part of a museum collection, however, they accepted the necessity of being shown with others. Moreover, the scheme would free up staff time to engage in educational enterprises: instead of pressing on with organising the next exhibitions behind the scenes, he argued he and Nairne would be able to give the 'provocation and guidance' that he believed visitors and journalists were

⁶⁵⁷ 'In the current economic situation it seems unlikely that we could long continue to mount the present number of shows (in 1975/6 there will be 11 one or two floor shows and 9 smaller exhibitions) even if we could afford the additional member of staff that is now required...' In contrast to the roughly twenty £600 exhibitions then scheduled per year, Serota proposed having only seven, with the cost of storage and conservation to the collection estimated at an annual £1500-2000. Serota, 'A Loan Collection', December 1975.

presently lacking.⁶⁵⁸ The project was suspended following Serota's departure and never brought to fruition.⁶⁵⁹

Conclusion

The Romanian conceptual artist Andre Cadere took himself and his *Round Bar of Wood* to the opening of the *Six Belgians* exhibition in Oxford on 29 June 1974. [fig. 3.68] Cadere and his striped stick offered a form of live institutional critique, circulating together within the social spaces of cutting-edge European and American art. They cheerfully inserted themselves uninvited into other people's exhibitions and recast their private views as elaborate performances ripe for scrutiny.⁶⁶⁰ The artist's appearances at MOMA in 1974 and again in 1975 registered the museum's swift emergence as a major player in the international avant-garde under Serota's direction. It was a decade of profound change both in art and in arts management, and this chapter tells a success story of museum branding and professionalization. As such, it is rich with ironies and compromises, most importantly in the fact that the principal British venue for anti-establishment, institution-critical conceptual art should have found its public through a canny alliance with the Arts Council, and that art which operated on an ostensibly cerebral level should have been conveyed through a shrewd attention to stylish design and publicity. Other factors, such as the

⁶⁵⁸ Ibid., 'A Loan Collection', December 1975.

⁶⁵⁹ Following Serota's departure in summer 1976 the project seems to have lost momentum, although there is a passing reference to the idea in 1977: Peter Bird, 'Housing the Arts' memorandum, 26 August 1977, ACGB Archive, ACGB/84/214 'HTA 159 Oxford – Museum Modern'.

⁶⁶⁰ Lynda Morris, ed., *Documenting Cadere, 1972-1978* (Cologne: Walther König, 2013), p. 50. He returned the following year for the Andre opening, 7 June 1975, p. 80.

growth of the education programme, and the judiciously varied line-ups of exhibitions, only cemented the museum's newly popular form of address.

The concept – and indeed, the industry – of museum branding has developed, controversially, over the last two decades.⁶⁶¹ It too has become the subject of sustained interrogation, as in Julian Stallabrass' provocative recent article 'The Branding of the Museum', which criticized the transformation of 'Tate' under Serota into one of the most powerful and influential brands in the world. For Stallabrass, it is not just that branding strategies come directly from business that renders them suspect: he maintains that the formation of a brand, as a positive and coherent image, is antithetical to practices of institutional critique and sabotages any possible oppositional role for art in society.⁶⁶² His criticisms of the current Tate (especially Tate Modern) as a spectacular and commercialised arena are often persuasive; but his analysis conflates the contemporary plight of the British public institution with the activity of branding itself.⁶⁶³ Insofar as Serota's work in Oxford could be seen as an exercise in effective branding, such branding need not be connected with attracting corporate sponsorship, with populist art spectacles, with merchandising or with the instructions of professional branding consultancies. None of these, after all, characterised the MOMA of the 1970s. At its core, the construction of a museological brand entails the careful consideration of the needs of a particular public through the development of a coherent and coordinated

⁶⁶¹ See especially Angus Hyland, ed., *C/ID: Visual Identity and Branding for the Arts* (London: Laurence King, 2006).

⁶⁶² Julian Stallabrass, 'The Branding of the Museum', *Art History*, vol. 37, no. 1, (February 2014), pp. 148-165.

⁶⁶³ The plight referred to here is the contemporary neoliberal expectation that museums should generate a very large proportion of their costs through commercial ventures and private sponsorship, and prioritise high attendance numbers, in order to justify public subsidy.

answering narrative of cultural value. Such considerations are particularly important when attempting to generate an audience for the avant-garde: emerging artists cannot rely on their famous names to attract visitors. Instead, an astutely crafted institutional image may serve to legitimate and give value to even the most unfamiliar or apparently inaccessible of artistic enterprises.

CHAPTER FOUR

Into Production and Out of Myth: Demystifying Culture, 1976-1982

Introduction

During David Elliott's lengthy directorship (1976-1996), the Museum of Modern Art built on the professionalising and institutionalising trajectory of the previous three years, but its programme went in a very different direction. Under his twenty years of management, MOMA cemented its position as a pillar of the British art establishment, and also became known for a newfound and uncommon artistic diversity. Whereas Serota had overseen a tightly edited series of exhibitions that championed European and American conceptualism, Elliott pushed the gallery to reach beyond contemporary Western art. MOMA showed works from increasingly disparate geographic regions and aesthetic traditions across the twentieth century, and it prominently incorporated craft, film, outsider art, and ephemera into its programme alongside more the conventional 'fine' art media. MOMA's reorientation towards the global, the historical and the pedagogic required a complete reconceptualization of the responsibility of the gallery towards its audiences, and the development of new institutional signatures. These emerged progressively over the course of the late 1970s and early 1980s and were in full flower by 1982, a year Elliott identified as 'decisive' in the museum's development and during which MOMA was recognised with a national award: the Sotheby's Prize for Excellence in the Visual Arts.⁶⁶⁴

⁶⁶⁴ David Elliott, 'Director's Report 1st April 1982-31st March 1983', 15 July 1983, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 50-64.

These first six years form the core of this chapter, which considers them as a transitional period in the development of transcultural contemporary curating. In particular, it examines the motivations and meanings that can be ascribed to the gallery's growing exhibitionary diversity. Although the beginning of the 'global turn' in curatorial practice has been placed in 1989⁶⁶⁵ – and the interest in global modernisms has flourished still more recently – many aspects of these trends were addressed by MOMA in its 'pioneering' exhibitions of the early 1980s, a fact of which Elliott is rightly proud.⁶⁶⁶ The museum's contribution to the formation of these ideas, however, has thus far escaped scholarly attention. Rather than consider Oxford's innovative programming entirely 'before its time,' I aim to resituate its display of 'world art' within the context of the wider programme and as part of contemporary discourses around decolonisation, nascent postmodernism, and the cultural Cold War. This was a period when the gallery's reach was expanding both literally and metaphorically. Following a long capital campaign, MOMA opened a renovated premises in May 1981 that included a new designated education room, a refurbished coffee bar, and expanded the galleries north from the Upper Gallery, into those rooms now designated Middle One, Middle Two, and the large, vaulted

⁶⁶⁵ See for instance Lucy Steeds, ed., *Making Art Modern (Part 2): 'Magiciens de la Terre' 1989* (London: Afterall Books, 2013); Rachel Weiss, ed., *Making Art Global (Part 1): The Third Habana Biennial 1989* (London: Afterall Books, 2011); and the ZKM Karlsruhe's exhibition *The Global Contemporary: Art Worlds After 1989* (17 September 2011-2 May 2012).

⁶⁶⁶ 'From the beginning of the 1980s he formulated a series of pioneering exhibitions in one of the first programs anywhere to integrate non-western, particularly Asian art, with western contemporary art,' David Elliott, 'Curriculum Vitae', 2012, <<http://www.resartis2012tokyo.com/en/spekers/img/DavidElliott.pdf>>, [accessed 6 August 2015].

‘John Piper Gallery.’⁶⁶⁷ [figs. 4.1-4.3] Attendance numbers continued to rise dramatically, and the exhibitions were canvassing hugely various visual materials. What conception(s) of the visiting public united these different strands?⁶⁶⁸

This chapter revolves around two kinds of museum programming, united by their international focus but defined by very different geopolitical relationships. The first section asks how we can understand Elliott’s unusual championing of Soviet art in Oxford during the Cold War. The second looks at the museum’s efforts to combat Eurocentric approaches to art with a focus on 1982’s suite of exhibitions devoted to contemporary India. The conclusion returns attention to the local context, exploring what ‘educational’ programming might have meant. Although each of these threads in the programme may be understood as interventions in specific cultural discourses, they find common ground through a rhetoric of demystification and a humanist, left-wing sensibility.

I: Into Production! Soviet Art in Oxford

When Elliott assumed position as Director of MOMA in summer 1976, he did not have a history of working on Russian art.⁶⁶⁹ By June the following year, however,

⁶⁶⁷ As part of the expansion the museum took over the tower and created new offices and a workshop. Ibid., ‘Director’s Report, 1981-1982’, 22 June 1982, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 31-49. The museum raised £130,000 between 1979 and 1982 through public appeal. Ibid., ‘The Art of MOMA’, *Southern Arts*, (November 1982), p. 5.

⁶⁶⁸ While attendance was recorded at 37,000 in 1975/6, it more than doubled to 80,000 in 1982/3; Arts Council funding rose from £32,500 to £121,000, as part of a total operating budget of £235,832: See ‘Annual Report 1982/3’, 1983, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 50-64.

⁶⁶⁹ Elliott read History at Durham University (1967-70) and completed a Courtauld MA in 19th-century French painting: D. S. Elliott, ‘Brittany and the Concept of

he had opened *El Lissitzky 1890-1941* (12 June-10 July 1977), the first of a hugely ambitious series of Russian and Soviet art shows. Collectively, they established a reputation for MOMA as an international centre for art from the USSR.

Much scholarly literature has recently emerged to debate the relationship between contemporary art and globalisation, often drawing powerful distinctions between what influential Cuban writer Gerardo Mosquera has termed Western hegemonic ‘curating cultures’ and the subordinate ‘curated cultures’ of developing countries, which are seldom given the opportunity to shape their own national or subnational representations.⁶⁷⁰ These discussions about the international circulation of art are rightly characterised by questions of centre versus periphery, cultural authenticity and the relation of knowledge to power.⁶⁷¹ Although instructive, these paradigms were formulated to describe the condition of the art world after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the rise of the global hegemony of capitalism: they relate to a world becoming ever more interconnected, yet remaining culturally and economically dominated by the old centres of influence.

Primitivism in France during the Nineteenth Century’, (MA thesis, Courtauld Institute, University of London, 1973).

⁶⁷⁰ Gerardo Mosquera, ‘Some Problems in Transcultural Curating’, in *Global Visions: Towards a New Internationalism in the Visual Arts*, ed. by Jean Fisher, (London: Kala Press, 1994), pp. 133-139.

⁶⁷¹ The literature here is extensive. See for example, Chin-Tao Wu, ‘Biennials Without Borders’, *Tate Papers*, no. 12, (Autumn 2009), n.p.; Gerardo Mosquera, ‘Alien-Own/Own-Alien: Globalisation and Cultural Difference’, *boundary 2*, vol. 29, no. 3, (Fall 2002), pp. 163-73; Jo-Anne Birnie Danzker, ‘Organisational Apartheid’, *Third Text*, vol. 5, no. 13, (1991), pp. 85-95; Rasheed Araeen, ‘Magicians of the Earth: On ‘Magiciens de la Terre’ [1989]’, in *Exhibition*, ed. by Lucy Steeds, (London: Whitechapel Gallery, 2014), pp. 129-135; Hal Foster, ‘The “Primitive” Unconscious of Modern Art’, *October*, vol. 34, (1985), pp. 45-70; Charles A. Wright Jr., ‘The Mythology of Difference: Vulgar Identity Politics at the Whitney [1993]’, in *Art, Activism & Oppositionality: Essays from Afterimage*, ed. by Grant H. Kester, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998), pp. 76-93.

MOMA's Russian exhibitions of the 1970s and 1980s invite very different considerations. In addition to *El Lissitzky, Alexander Rodchenko 1891-1956* (11 February-25 March 1979), *Vladimir Mayakovsky: Twenty Years of Work and Early Soviet Photographers* (both 7 March-2 May 1982) were all major shows originated by the gallery during a period when the political landscape was divided not only by economic inequality but by the contending interests and ideologies of two superpowers. *Lubetkin and Tecton: Architectural and Social Commitment* (17 January-28 February 1982), an Arts Council-organised view of the work of Russian-born architect Berthold Lubetkin (1901-1990), added yet another Russian component to MOMA's programme, and several of the afore-mentioned exhibitions were buttressed by ambitious seasons of Soviet film.

In an article titled 'The Logic of Soviet Cultural Diplomacy,' former British diplomat Nigel Gould-Davies describes the Cold War as 'at heart a contest of ideologies', with cultural exchange conceived as a 'zero-sum contest' of maximising influence and minimising exposure.⁶⁷² Elliott himself could be equally sceptical, portraying cultural exchange between East and West in a c. 1989 article as 'an intercontinental ballistic missile of the soul' that 'downgraded the artworks involved to little more than tokens of the political systems which sent them.'⁶⁷³ He was certainly well-placed to comment on these activities, given not only his work at Oxford to bring art across the Iron Curtain but also his close connections with the British Council from 1978. Yet Elliott's critical tone stands at odds with his own

⁶⁷² Nigel Gould-Davies, 'The Logic of Soviet Cultural Diplomacy', *Diplomatic History*, vol. 27, no. 2, (April 2003), p. 196, p. 213.

⁶⁷³ David Elliott, 'Art and Chess', *The Insider*, (c. 1989), MAO Archive, box 'David Elliott Correspondence' fol. 'A1/6/6 DE Published Essays'. The article in its published form could not be located.

leading role in the arena of Cold War cultural diplomacy.⁶⁷⁴ If he was – as he claims – no ‘Cold War warrior,’ what was at stake for the museum in navigating this intensely politicised field during a time that saw the transition from détente to intensified international hostilities?⁶⁷⁵

Parting the Iron Curtain

Part of the appeal of showing 20th-century Russian art in Britain must have been precisely its practical difficulty. Holdings in UK public collections were scarce and relevant exhibitions few and far between. Moreover, attempts to borrow materials from the USSR were bedevilled not merely by diplomatic tensions but also by that body’s peculiar relationship to its own artistic history. Russia had been a formidable centre of artistic experiment before the 1917 Revolution, and the early years of the Soviet Union were marked by an efflorescence of state-sponsored modernist creativity designed to usher in a utopian new era. However, Stalin’s rise to power and the altered political climate in the mid-1920s saw a deep shift in cultural policy. Abstraction, especially in the fine arts, was denounced as formalist and thus ill-suited to communicate socialist ideals to the masses; an official doctrine of Socialist Realism was introduced to remedy its deficiencies. While the crudely propagandistic excesses of Stalinist art were themselves repudiated in the 1950s

⁶⁷⁴ The British Council is the international cultural diplomacy organisation affiliated with the British government, organising and sponsoring the arts and education abroad in areas of strategic foreign policy importance. Elliott’s connections with the British Council were intimate: from 1978 he used British Council grants to travel to the USSR, and from 1979-1996 was a member of the Visual Arts Advisory Committee which oversaw exhibitions of British art overseas and of foreign art in Britain. From 1981-87, he was a member of the Grants to Artists Sub-Committee, and from 1982-96, of the Purchasing Sub-Committee collecting British art. *Ibid.*, ‘Curriculum Vitae’.

⁶⁷⁵ *Ibid.* interview, (Modern Art Oxford, 16 July 2014).

after Stalin's death, 'official' art remained stylistically conservative, yoked to the promotion of state ideology; modernist works, however famous internationally, remained out of sight in Russian museums.⁶⁷⁶ International loans were also tightly restricted, as the USSR sought to maintain control of its cultural presence overseas.⁶⁷⁷

Elliott had visited the last major show of Soviet art in Britain at the Hayward Gallery in 1971, the Arts Council's *Art in Revolution: Soviet Art and Design Since 1917* (26 February-18 April) which had made a deep impression on him.⁶⁷⁸ Yet this too was fraught with conflict and public controversy. Since it relied on loans from the Russian authorities, they were able to exercise control over the exhibition's contents and to ensure that histories of artistic censorship and suppression were euphemistically treated in the catalogue.⁶⁷⁹ Despite long negotiations, permission to

⁶⁷⁶ This is a very brief summary, and there is of course an extensive literature on Soviet art and cultural policy. For an introduction, see Boris Groys, *The Total Art of Stalinism: Avant-Garde, Aesthetic Dictatorship, and Beyond*, trans. Charles Rougle, (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1992); Brandon Taylor, *Art and Literature Under the Bolsheviks Vol. 1: The Crisis of Renewal 1917-1924*, (London: Pluto Press, 1991) and *Art and Literature Under the Bolsheviks Vol. 2: Authority and Revolution 1924-1932*, (London: Pluto Press, 1992); Victor Tupitsyn, *The Museological Unconscious: Communal (Post)Modernism in Russia*, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2009); and Suman Gupta, 'Conceptualising the Art of Communist Times', *Third Text*, vol. 24, no. 5, (September 2010), pp. 571-82. For Elliott's later accounts, see especially *New Worlds: Russian Art and Society, 1900-1937*, (London: Thames & Hudson, 1986) and *100 Years of Russian Art 1989-1989: From Private Collections in the USSR*, exh. cat., MOMA, 30 July-17 September 1989.

⁶⁷⁷ For example, the USSR and the Metropolitan Museum in New York had a series of exhibition exchanges in the late 1970s. *Russian and Soviet Painting* was a particularly problematic effort as the American organisers, presumably under duress, kept abstraction to a bare minimum (*Russian and Soviet Painting: An Exhibition from the Museums of the USSR*, exh. cat., Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1977).

⁶⁷⁸ Elliott, interview 2014.

⁶⁷⁹ Arts Council of Great Britain and Ministry of Culture of the USSR, *Art in Revolution: Soviet Art and Design Since 1917*, exh. cat., Hayward Gallery, 26 February-18 April 1971.

show certain modernist works was withdrawn at the last minute. The most conspicuous absence was El Lissitzky's pioneering abstract installation *Proun Room* (1923). [fig. 4.4] The Hayward could not de-install it prior to the opening and was forced to keep this section locked and even to paint over the entrance in an attempt to conceal its presence. The British press, finding Lissitzky's sealed room a potent metaphor for artistic repression and the loss of national sovereignty over its own exhibitions, was indignant.⁶⁸⁰

This diplomatic debacle seems likely to have compounded existing problems of travel and the lack of English-language literature to chasten the interest of UK exhibition-makers in Russian modernism, for MOMA had the field more or less to itself until the mid-1980s.⁶⁸¹ Indeed, the European-wide scale of the neglect is indicated by the fact that although Elliott had begun his programme in 1977, Alexander Tolnay of the Galerie der Stadt in Esslingen was still considered both 'communist agent' and 'visionary pioneer' for exhibiting Eastern European art in West Germany beginning in 1984.⁶⁸²

⁶⁸⁰ See especially Overy, 'The Light That Failed', *Financial Times*, (2 March 1971), p. 3; Bernard Levin, 'Keeping an Exhibition Ideologically Germ-Free', *The Times*, (2 March 1971), p. 14.

⁶⁸¹ Tolnay attributes the lack of interest in Eastern European art from Western European public galleries in the 1980s to 'a lack of information, deeply-rooted prejudices, clichés and a certain arrogance... together with a laziness which preferred to avoid tackling the bureaucratic difficulties involved in discovering these works and making them readily accessible.' 'East/West Artistic Exchange in a Changing Europe', *Kunst & Museumjournaal*, vol. 4, no. 2, (1992), p. 35.

⁶⁸² Tolnay, 'East/West Artistic Exchange in a Changing Europe', p. 36. Interestingly, Tolnay identifies both Elliott and also 'Andrew Nairne in Glasgow' as the other European curators working in this area. Andrew Nairne, younger brother of Sandy, was later MOMA Director (2001-8) and worked at the Centre for Contemporary Arts in Glasgow from 1986-1992, placing his earliest work in this area almost a full decade after Elliott began, *Ibid.*, 'East/West Artistic Exchange in a Changing Europe' p. 34; 'Andrew Nairne Esq, Authorised Biography',

Mindful perhaps of the difficulties of 1971, Elliott's first Russian art show – and his first major historical exhibition, a harbinger of the museum's new direction – was accomplished without Russian cooperation. *El Lissitzky 1900-1941* was drawn entirely from European collections, especially those of the Van Abbemuseum, Eindhoven, and included the notorious *Proun Room* reconstruction.⁶⁸³ [fig. 4.5] Emboldened by success, Elliott began to plan the Rodchenko exhibition in autumn 1977. He had been tipped off that the surviving Rodchenko family still lived in the artist's studio and had a large, little-known private collection.⁶⁸⁴ Under the sponsorship of the Anglo-Soviet Cultural Exchange programme administered by the British Council, he visited Moscow to visit public collections, meet officials, and consult with the artist's surviving family.⁶⁸⁵ A visit to the Tretyakov Gallery was not fruitful, as a succession of implausible excuses were provided as to why Elliott could view Rodchenko drawings and prints, but not paintings.⁶⁸⁶ However, the

<<http://www.debretts.com/people-of-today/profile/36565/Andrew-NAIRNE>>, [accessed 8 September 2015].

⁶⁸³ *El Lissitzky 1890-1941*, exh. cat., MOMA, 12 June-10 July 1977.

⁶⁸⁴ David King had discovered the existence of the collection during his time as Art Editor of the *Sunday Times Magazine* (1965-1975): David King interview, (London, 5 January 2016).

⁶⁸⁵ Detailed literature on the practice of Cold War cultural exchange is limited and often focuses on the US and on the early period of the 1950s and 1960s. Some helpful general sources are David Caute, *The Dancer Defects: The Struggle for Cultural Supremacy During the Cold War*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); Yale Richmond, *Cultural Exchange and the Cold War: Raising the Iron Curtain*, (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003); and Giles Scott-Smith, Peter Romjin, and Joes Segal, eds., *Divided Dreamworlds? The Cultural Cold War in East and West* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2012). For British participation in this sphere, see especially Sarah Davies, 'The Soft Power of Anglia: British Cold War Cultural Diplomacy in the USSR', *Contemporary British History*, vol. 27, no. 3, (2013), pp. 297-323.

⁶⁸⁶ Elliott's report on his 1978 visit also reveals the strategies of evasion deployed by cultural officials to thwart foreign loans of modernist works considered inappropriate for public consumption. 'All of the Museums I visited, except for the Mayakovsky Museum, were under the authority of the Ministry of Culture, and I

artist's daughter and granddaughter proved enthusiastic and although for them 'any showing of Rodchenko's work is a major exercise with beds having to be moved, carpets rolled up and various acrobatic feats,' they gave their blessing to an exhibition shaped around their little-known holdings.⁶⁸⁷ While private loans were still subject to approval by the Ministry of Culture, this nonetheless avoided negotiations with state museums and proved a canny way of circumventing at least some measure of bureaucratic obstruction. As the episode with the Tretyakov (and the earlier experience of the Hayward Gallery) illustrates, the Ministry of Culture was willing under pressure to approve foreign loans of modernist *design*, but inclined to deny loans of fine art (especially painting) by the same creators.⁶⁸⁸

had the distinct impression that the Ministry had issued a directive to the officials concerning what I should be told. My experience at the Tretyakov Gallery bears this out: the Gallery has a fine collection of abstract canvasses by Rodchenko which I hoped to see during my appointment with Mr Manin, the Assistant Director. I arrived at the agreed time and was told... that he had just gone to Japan. He said that he could show me the drawings and prints by Rodchenko but that it would be difficult to show me the paintings as they were being restored. I saw the drawings and asked again whether it would be at all possible to see the paintings – he said he would have to telephone the Ministry of Culture; he did this and said that it would be very difficult that day owing to staff shortages.' At the Ministry of Culture, moreover, a Mrs. Vetrogradova 'thanked me for my interest but added that all the work by Rodchenko in Russian museums was committed for loan to the Moscow/Paris/London exhibition to be held at the Beaubourg in Paris in 1979... Subsequently, she mentioned that the list of loans from Russia to Paris had not yet been finalised.' David Elliott, 'Visit to Moscow/Leningrad 15-22 April 1978' [report to the British Council], 1978, MAO Archive, Box 'MOMA Feb-Mar 1979 Rodch. 8' fol. [unlabelled]. His account dovetails with the recollection of a Tretyakov research assistant that during the preparation of the aforementioned Pompidou exhibition, 1979's *Paris-Moscou 1900-1930*, the Deputy Director attempted to avert undesirable requests for loan of works by artists such as Kandinsky by claiming that were in need of restoration: Cauter, *The Dancer Defects: The Struggle for Cultural Supremacy During the Cold War*, p. 608.

⁶⁸⁷ David Elliott, letter to Gail Harrison, 2 May 1978, MAO Archive, box 'MOMA Rodchenko Feb-March 1979 5' fol. 'Rodchenko Feb-March 1979'.

⁶⁸⁸ This could be true even if the organisers knew that loans of this type would be included from other sources. In the case of *Rodchenko*, paintings were borrowed from elsewhere, but in 1971's *Art in Revolution* the fact that the *Proun Room* was loaned by the Van Abbemuseum did not stop the USSR from demanding its

Having secured the blessing of Rodchenko's daughter and grandson to borrow freely from their collection of fine art and design, Elliott felt by summer 1978 that 'certainly we will be able to get something out with the permission of the Ministry of Culture although perhaps not abstract oil paintings.'⁶⁸⁹ These had to be sourced from western collections – and although Soviet hedging required Elliott to hurry to Moscow four days before the opening to beg for the final release of the Rodchenko works ('A last-minute flight to Moscow by the director of the Museum of Modern Art, Oxford, has rescued one of the most important exhibitions in the gallery's history,' declared the *Oxford Mail*) – the exhibition proved an extraordinary success.⁶⁹⁰

During preparations for *Rodchenko*, Elliott was already making plans for subsequent exhibitions along the same lines. A scheduled show of the work of Constructivist Gustav Klutis, again to be borrowed from the artist's family in Russia, was foiled by deteriorating international relations in the wake of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in December 1979.⁶⁹¹ The British Council suspended all 'official high level cultural relations' with the USSR at the same time, a freeze that

exclusion: Christiane Berndes, 'Replicas and Reconstructions in Twentieth-Century Art', *Tate Papers*, (Autumn 2007), n.p.

⁶⁸⁹ David Elliott, letter to John Milner, 6 July 1978, MAO Archive, box 'Rodchenko Feb-Mar 4' fol. 'Feb-March 79 Rodchenko cat M-Z'.

⁶⁹⁰ 'Moscow Trip Saves Art Show', *Oxford Mail*, (10 February 1979).

⁶⁹¹ Elliott began planning the Klutis show in summer 1978, after being approached by West German art historian Hubertus Gassner about collaborating on a tour with the Frankfurter Kunstverein. Plans faltered in summer 1980 when Elliott wrote to Gassner that 'considering the current political climate am fearing the worst' noting that Soviet ambassador to the BRD, Vladimir Semenov, had recently withdrawn a planned Malevich exhibition as retaliation for the German boycott of the 1980 Olympic Games in Moscow, itself a response to the crisis in Afghanistan. See MAO Archive, box 'MOMA Rodchenko Feb-Mar 1979 6', fol. 'Rodchenko Gustav Klutis file.'

lasted until 1986.⁶⁹² However, Elliott did not permit this to disrupt his plans for a major Mayakovsky exhibition, the core of which was lent to Oxford from the State Literary Museum in Moscow. He hosted *Vladimir Mayakovsky: Twenty Years of Work* in 1982 as an independent initiative, technically outside of the Anglo-Soviet Cultural Agreement, although in fact supported by both the British Council and the USSR Ministry of Culture.⁶⁹³

The accompanying exhibition, *Early Soviet Photographers*, was assembled under circumstances more complicated still. The photographs in the exhibition were drawn from the personal collection of Czech photo-historians Daniela Mrázková and Vladimír Remeš and had previously been exhibited in Prague, their home city. John Hoole, MOMA's Assistant Director (1978-1982), wrote to the Ministry of Culture of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic (CSSR) and to the Czech embassy in London, asking permission to bring the photographs to Britain for exhibition. Unsuccessful in getting permission to export the works legally, and under the influence of 'a lot of Slivovice,' Hoole smuggled the entire exhibition from Prague in his briefcase in October 1981.⁶⁹⁴ Mrázková constructed a carefully worded letter for the museum's records that referred elliptically to 'the collection of 190 photographs that are in the Museum's care,' and the catalogue was silent on the matter of the works' ownership and provenance.⁶⁹⁵ MOMA had been denied

⁶⁹² Elliott, 'Art and Chess'.

⁶⁹³ See letters between Elliott and K. L. Pearson of the Visiting Arts Unit, British Council, March 1981. MAO Archive, box BOX 'May-May 82 Mayakovsky 4,' fol. 'Mayakovsky finance + sponsorship.'

⁶⁹⁴ John Hoole interview, (Oxford, 13 December 2013). 'I remember going to Prague over a weekend... At the end of it I said, what shall we do about getting this stuff back to London? They said, just put it in your briefcase.'

⁶⁹⁵ Daniela Mrázková, letter to David Elliott, 26 October 1981, MAO Archive, box 'Early Soviet 1 Mar-May 82' fol. [unlabelled]; Daniela Mrázková and Vladimír

permission to export precisely the exhibition that it went on to display shortly thereafter – and indeed, to tour widely across the UK, Europe and the United States in subsequent years – but ‘I never heard that there was any comeback on that,’ says Hoole.⁶⁹⁶ Although the CSSR was part of the Eastern Bloc and *Early Soviet Photographers* was a pendant to the Mayakovsky exhibition, the product of almost four years’ diplomatic negotiations with Moscow authorities, the conspicuously extra-diplomatic strategies deployed to bring about *Early Soviet Photographers* met with no adverse consequences. The supposedly totalitarian control of culture in the east proved, in this case, less than total.⁶⁹⁷ Iara Boubnova has noted that the precise mechanisms of cultural exchange in the Cold War have rarely been explored in detail, with exhibitions and other manifestations treated broadly as ‘collateral evidence for more general political processes’ such as détente, rather than as multifaceted, conflicted and singular efforts with sometimes ambiguous relationships to macro-political currents.⁶⁹⁸ As each of these Oxford exhibitions organised across the Iron Curtain confirms, personal contacts, semi-official

Remeš, *Early Soviet Photographers*, exh. cat., MOMA, 7 March-2 May 1982. The photographers included were Max Alpert, Dmitri Dyebabov, Semyon Fridlyand, Boris Ignatovich, Yelisaveta Ignatovich, Yakov Khalip, Georgi Lipskerov, Moisei Nappelbaum, Georgi Petrusov, Alexander Rodchenko, Galina Sanyko, Arkadi Shaikhet, Abram Shterenberg, Viktor Tomin, Solomon Tules and Georgi Zelma.

⁶⁹⁶ Hoole, interview 2013. Hoole left MOMA that year to work for the new Barbican Centre in London where he stayed for many years.

⁶⁹⁷ This dovetails with critiques of the ‘totalitarian model’ that understood the Soviet Union in terms of absolute social control, which emerged in western scholarship in the 1970s and 1980s: ‘the totalitarian model suggested that the Party and the bureaucracy enjoyed between them a total monopoly on power; it suggested that the most important decisions were made by the top people in the Party, guided by ideology, and imposed on a largely passive population... matters were not so simple.’ Abbott Gleason, ‘“Totalitarianism” in 1984’, *Russian Review*, vol. 43, no. 2, (1984), p. 153.

⁶⁹⁸ Iara Boubnova, [untitled], in *The Manifesta Decade*, ed. by Barbara Vanderlinden and Elena Filipovic, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005), p. 136.

initiatives, persuasion and compromise were able to achieve much in the face of official resistance.

While the precise nature of the transaction was not always public knowledge, the acknowledged difficulty in making Russian revolutionary art available to British audiences was what made MOMA's exhibitions so unique; it prompted abundant publicity and high audience figures.⁶⁹⁹ So determined was the museum to maximise the buzz around *Rodchenko* and *Mayakovsky* in particular, that it very unusually opted to 'trailer' these exhibitions with prominent notices in the previous season's newsletters, marking them out as more ambitious and exciting than its usual fare; the programme guides also received one-off redesigns to coordinate stylistically with the show and its publicity. [figs. 4.6-4.7] *Rodchenko* was also the only the second exhibition in the museum's history (after Joseph Beuys, 1974) to be accompanied by a book-length catalogue publication, both a signifier of the museum's growing financial resources and a gamble that paid off richly in sales.⁷⁰⁰ Accordingly, handsome colour catalogues also attended *Mayakovksy* and *Early Soviet Photographers*. Like that for *Rodchenko*, these achieved commercial success not only through sales to local visitors but as freestanding publications in a market deprived of up-to-date material on Russian art; they also benefited from the extensive international tours upon which these three exhibitions were launched.

Rodchenko was hired out in the first instance to the Van Abbemuseum, Eindhoven

⁶⁹⁹ 16,5000 visitors for *Rodchenko* (out of 72,000 in 1978/9), 15,632 for *Mayakovsky* and *Early Soviet Photographers* (out of 80,000 for 1982/3). See Minutes of the 41st Meeting of the Council of Management, 21 April 1979, Elliott, 'Director's Report 1st April 1982-31st March 1983', 15 July 1983. 1977 visitor figures could not be located.

⁷⁰⁰ The catalogue, originally printed by Twentieth Century Press in the UK, was reprinted in New York by Pantheon Books as *Rodchenko and the Arts of Revolutionary Russia*.

and to the Musée d'Art Contemporain in Montreal. Further perambulations were thwarted by the necessity of returning the loans to Moscow, but remarkably, photographs from the exhibition were still being toured by MOMA a decade later.⁷⁰¹ *Mayakovsky* visited the Fruitmarket Gallery, Edinburgh, the Graves Art Gallery, Sheffield, and Riverside Studios in London before having to return to Russia, while *Early Soviet Photographers* remained in global circulation until 1986, travelling across Europe and North America. As Assistant Director Marco Livingstone (1982-86) noted of the latter in 1983, 'the real money in the tour lies not in the hire fee (£250) but in the stipulation that each venue purchase 200 catalogues @ £3.95 (£790).'⁷⁰² The exceptional nature of these projects in the years before *glasnost* brought not only acclaim and attention to the MOMA, but also valuable financial recompense to offset their high production costs.⁷⁰³

⁷⁰¹ David Elliott, *Rodchenko as Photographer: Works from the Collection of the Museum of Modern Art, Oxford: National Art Gallery Touring Exhibition 1988-89*, (Wellington, New Zealand, 1988). The Rodchenko family donated certain prints to the museum, where they still reside.

⁷⁰² Marco Livingstone, letter to David Elliott, 27 September 1983, MAO Archive, box 'Early Soviet 1 Mar-May 82' fol. 'Early Sov. Photography 2'.

⁷⁰³ The ongoing public relations value of this exceptionalism is indicated by the c. 1990 promotional poster series produced in collaboration with the SouthEast rail network, under the slogan, 'Every exhibition is the same. *Different.*' One addressed the 1989 exhibition *100 Years of Russian Art*, stating, 'Not so long ago, ideologically suspect Russian paintings were more likely to attract dust than public attention. Because private owners with a survival instinct kept them under wraps. Even, believe it or not, under beds. It wasn't until 1989 that the paintings saw the light of an art gallery. Glasnost made it possible. But The Museum of Modern Art made it happen. By beating other Western galleries to the punch and bringing the paintings West... for 25 years the Museum has been hitting people right between the eyes. By looking for inspiration in the most unexpected places': MAO Archive, poster collection.

A Battlefield of Conflicting Ideologies

In addition to these pragmatic advantages, MOMA's Russian exhibitions were born out of Elliott's deep-seated belief in programmatic diversity.⁷⁰⁴ He repeatedly asserted that the 'modern' in the museum's title did not for him denote any commitment to modernism per se, especially the arch-formalist version associated with American criticism: rather, he intended it to be read as 'a neutral term encompassing art made anywhere since the turn of the century.'⁷⁰⁵ Instead of taking sides, he argued in 1980, a museum director ought to occupy a non-partisan position as 'arbiter in a battlefield of conflicting ideologies.'⁷⁰⁶ Although it is difficult not to see ideological imperatives at work in MOMA's programme during this period, there was certainly an aesthetic catholicity as well. This commitment to visual pluralism led to both a greater component of historical material from the beginning of his time at the gallery, and to an increasingly wide geographic range.⁷⁰⁷ Retrospective views of early Soviet artists satisfied both imperatives.

⁷⁰⁴ Burchardi concurs with this interpretation, although her focus is on exhibitions of the 1990s. Julie Burchardi, 'Modernism – The Contested Terrain: An historical examination of the Museum of Modern Art in Oxford', (MA thesis, Courtauld Institute, University of London, 1997), p. 31.

⁷⁰⁵ Elliott, 'The Art of MOMA', p. 4. A very similar sentiment was expressed in 'The Development and Current Policies of the Museum of Modern Art, Oxford', c. 1990, MAO Archive, box 'David Elliott correspondence' fol. 'A1/6/6 DE Published essays': 'A fundamental point of its policy is that it is not a Museum of Modernist art which implies specific progressions, values and views of history. 'Modern' in the sense it is employed here is a neutral term describing the period covered by this century. It implies no ethnocentric bias.'

⁷⁰⁶ Ibid., 'The Function of a Museum of Modern Art', lecture text for Paris Biennale, 1980, MAO Archive box 001 'MOMA History'.

⁷⁰⁷ *El Lissitzky* was described as 'the first of a series of major historical shows to be organised by the Museum.' Ibid., 'Director's Report 1977-8' March 1978, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 31-49.

Bringing early twentieth-century art to Oxford was envisioned as a pedagogic exercise. It was intended to ‘place contemporary developments within the context of the past’ so as to situate what Elliott parodically termed the ‘unholy conspiracies of blank canvases, bricks and nappies’ of recent art within a trajectory of distinguished avant-garde experiment.⁷⁰⁸ Along with a constant stream of films, talks and seminars, it was instructive, designed to ‘provide more points of contact with new work for the interested observer.’⁷⁰⁹ With the appointment in September 1976 of a full-time museum educator, Christine Newton, and the new Education Room that opened in 1981, the museum was paying more attention than ever to its education programme, and an expanded historical programme was an extension of those aims, the past pressed into service as ‘an armature for experiencing and understanding the present.’⁷¹⁰ Russian Constructivism was therefore also of interest because of its capacity to cast the still-unpopular art of minimalism in a new light; productivist art of the 1920s, with its insistence on merging art and life, might inform understandings of the political side of conceptual practice.⁷¹¹ [fig. 4.8]

⁷⁰⁸ Ibid., ‘The Art of MOMA’, p. 4.

⁷⁰⁹ Ibid., ‘The Museum of Modern Art’, *Oxford Art Journal*, vol. 1, no. 1, (1978), p. 57.

⁷¹⁰ Ibid., ‘The Art of MOMA’, p. 5. See also Christine Newton, ‘Modern Art: New Problems. The Education Programme at M.O.M.A’, *Oxford Art Journal*, vol. 2, no. 3, (October 1979), p. 28: ‘During the past three years the Museum has come to view itself primarily as an educational establishment in the broadest sense and this has been reflected in the quality and breadth of the exhibition programme which has examined various historical developments in the visual arts since the beginning of this century.’

⁷¹¹ Elliott, interview 2014. A letter from Hans Haacke about the *Rodchenko* exhibition, which he saw on tour in Eindhoven, suggests that he too saw the parallels to contemporary practice: ‘I was... overwhelmed by the reconstructed sculptures. From the photographs I was never able to deduce that these works were so close to minimalist, serial things of the 60s. I also liked to see the workers club, a bit uncomfortable sitting, and the graphic work. I used the catalogue, very well done, in one of my classes at Cooper Union.’ Letter to David Elliott, 5 October 1979, MAO Archive, Box ‘MOMA Nov-Dec 1978’.

The shifts in artistic fashion at the end of the 1970s intensified Elliott's determination to give space to neglected visual material. For him, 'there was a kind of unseemly haste' about the sudden transition in contemporary art-world trends from dry and self-critical conceptualism to the renewed celebration of tradition, spirituality and painterly quality; it gave him a distrust of the narrow orthodoxies of current taste.⁷¹² A 1979 exhibition of neo-expressionist painter Georg Baselitz in Eindhoven precipitated a revelation: if Baselitz was a 'great artist,' why was his work of the 1960s only belatedly being recognised, he wondered.⁷¹³ 'It is distasteful to be deafened by the splashing of those who are rapidly changing horses in midstream,' wrote Elliott in a letter of 1981, but he drew from the experience not a resolution to be more rigidly consistent, but to seek out the under-valued and overlooked.⁷¹⁴ Like Trevor Green before him, he resolved to make MOMA a corrective to the caprices and limitations of the marketplace, and the Russian avant-garde, which 'we weren't exactly being flooded with [...] in Britain,' was among the immediate beneficiaries.⁷¹⁵

If MOMA was identified as a place to show the unfamiliar, inspiring visitors to 'the review and reassessment of values relating to art which originated both inside and outside our culture,' not all of those values were aesthetic.⁷¹⁶ Elliott was profoundly interested in the interaction of art and politics, especially 'at moments of extreme

⁷¹² Ibid., 'Art, Power and Curatorial Practise', in *Stopping the Process? Contemporary Views on Art and Exhibitions*, (Helsinki: Nordic Institute for Contemporary Art, 1998), p. 209.

⁷¹³ Ibid., 'Art, Power and Curatorial Practise,' p. 209.

⁷¹⁴ Ibid., letter to James Faure-Walker, Artscribe, n.d. [January] 1981, MAO Archive, box 001 'MOMA History'.

⁷¹⁵ Ibid., interview 2014.

⁷¹⁶ Ibid., 'The Development and Current Policies of the Museum of Modern Art, Oxford', c. 1990, n.p.

social rupture, revolution and change.’⁷¹⁷ His first exhibition was *Germany in Ferment*, organised in Durham while still an undergraduate, which considered culture between 1900 and 1933 and was accompanied by films, talks and performances.⁷¹⁸ As Elliott later argued, Russia was a natural extension of his student fascinations: ‘from early twentieth century Berlin or Munich it took only a relatively short conceptual hop to land in the equally important visual centres of Moscow and Petrograd’ during the same volatile timespan.⁷¹⁹ Moreover, communism had hatched a cultural revolution in Russia whose influence had spread across the west, and it was also the west’s primary political opponent: re-examining and contextualising this art was a project of real contemporary import.

Looking at the list of Russian exhibitions at MOMA in this period, it is striking that they all centre upon the same period: the 1910s to 1930s, with an especial focus on the early 1920s. Despite his stated belief in exhibitionary diversity, bringing material across the Iron Curtain was not enough for Elliott: what he was interested in showing at this time was not contemporary Russian art, nor that of mid-century, but the products of the immediately pre-revolutionary period and the early Soviet state.⁷²⁰ Elliott describes these exhibitions as a project of ‘recuperation.’ By

⁷¹⁷ Ibid., ‘A View of Russia from a British Museum’, 31 March 1996, lecture script, MAO Archive, box ‘David Elliott Correspondence’ fol. ‘David Elliott lectures and conferences general A3/1’.

⁷¹⁸ Ibid., *Germany in Ferment*, exh. cat., G. Bailes & Son Ltd., 16 October-6 November 1970; Ibid., ‘A View of Russia from a British Museum’, 31 March 1996.

⁷¹⁹ Ibid., ‘A View of Russia from a British Museum’, 31 March 1996.

⁷²⁰ This position changed over time, with *Jiří Kolář: Diary 1968* (7 October-2 December 1984), *History Painting: Komar and Melamid* and *Pilgrims: Markéta Luskáčová* (both 6 October-1 December 1985) representing exiled contemporary artists from the USSR and CSSR respectively, and *Tradition and Renewal: Contemporary Art in the German Democratic Republic* (3 June-29 July 1984), *Another Russia: Unofficial Contemporary Photography from the Soviet Union* (13 December-14 February 1987), *Art at the Edge: Contemporary Art from Poland* (18

returning to a pre-Stalinist era, ‘when there was at least some kind of multiplicity of view about society and culture’ he intended to draw attention to the possibilities for a vibrant and open culture under socialism, in spite of the USSR’s subsequent failings.⁷²¹

Modernism in early Soviet Russia was not only profoundly innovative and forward-looking, but it was also explicitly political; many sought to bring art directly to the service of the new society by merging fine art with applied arts and mass culture. Conventional divisions between painting, design, poetry, advertising, cinema, architecture and other media seemed less relevant than the ability of these media to communicate the excitement of the new ideals as widely as possible. These social ambitions were highlighted at MOMA: rather than prioritise painting or sculpture, the exhibitions included a wide range of material from high to low, including Lissitzky’s magazine designs, Rodchenko’s sweet wrappers and workers’ furniture, Mayakovsky’s books and advertising slogans (‘Want a sun/to shine at night?/Buy bulbs at GUM –/cheap and bright’), maps and timelines for Lubetkin, and agitational photography. [figs. 4.9-4.10] The core of the Mayakovsky exhibition, which had been composed by the poet himself shortly before his death in 1930 and posthumously preserved, even included newspaper clippings and letters on scraps of paper. Above these materials, rousing slogans in the artists’ own words such as ‘WORK for LIFE and not for PALACES, TEMPLES, CEMETARIES and MUSEUMS!’ (Rodchenko) and ‘We don’t live in the past. We actively participate

July-30 August 1988) and *100 Years of Russian Art* (30 July-17 September 1989) offering more recent material from behind the iron curtain. Elliott does not regret showing so little contemporary Russian art during this time, describing the ‘so-called nonconformist art’ as often ‘quite dull’: interview 2014.

⁷²¹ Ibid., interview 2014.

in the building of Socialism' (Mayakovsky) were prominently emblazoned on the walls of the galleries. [fig. 4.11]

In the late seventies and early eighties, the notion of an avant-garde that combined artistic vitality with left-wing political activism was one that had lost currency for many in the west. Modernist formalism had gone out of fashion in favour of the self-referential, self-critical art of minimalism and conceptualism, and a nascent artistic postmodernism was felt by some to be promoting subjectivity, irony, and appropriation rather than sincere social commitment. For Elliott among others, the institutionalisation of institutional critique and the successful marketing of dematerialised practice had led to a loss of faith in the ability of art to resist capital or to engage with the world around it.⁷²² As he wrote:

By the mid 1970s the development of the European and North American avant-garde seemed to have reached an impasse. Minimalism, conceptualism, 'dematerialisation' and 'deconstruction' were approaching their predictable limits [because] ...art was discussed, viewed (and limited) purely within its own terms of reference without acknowledgement of values external to it. Art had become a specialism with its own critical jargon which had to be studied intensively if it were to be understood.⁷²³

Yet he was wary of the return to the bourgeois values of 'richness maybe even opulence' – which even Serota was championing in the Royal Academy of Arts' *A New Spirit in Painting* by 1981 – and still more so of the creed of art as centralised state propaganda.⁷²⁴ To those who believed, as he did, that art should express

⁷²² Transcripts of a 1977 ICA debate on British art between leading artists, critics and museum staff reveal a widespread sense of 'crisis': 'The State of British Art: Special Issue', *Studio International*, vol. 194, no. 989, (February 1978).

⁷²³ Elliott, 'The Development and Current Policies of the Museum of Modern Art, Oxford', c. 1990.

⁷²⁴ *Ibid.*, letter to James Faure-Walker, *Artscribe*, n.d. [January] 1981; Christos M. Joachimides, Norman Rosenthal, and Nicholas Serota, *A New Spirit in Painting*, exh. cat., Royal Academy of Arts, 15 January-18 March 1981.

individual freedom and also ‘somehow be a reflection of and vehicle for broader social change,’ the experiments of the early Soviet artists provided a salutary example.⁷²⁵ In the work of Rodchenko, Lissitzky and Mayakovsky, it seemed, was great art that actively served left-wing politics, art that was allowed to be visually radical without compromise of social principle, and that resisted at all costs the sort of kitschy agitprop that had driven a young and Trotskyist Clement Greenberg to embrace art for art’s sake.⁷²⁶ Recuperating the Russian avant-garde was a way to give the British public ‘a view of life in the Soviet Union in the 1920s – the years before Stalin took firm control – which is very different from our current perspective’ of communist culture.⁷²⁷ This was unabashedly a political project, and despite Elliott’s close dealings with the British Council, it was not one in lockstep with the antagonistic agenda of Cold War foreign policy. As an arm of the government, the British Council at the time sought to use the arts to ‘reach the hearts and minds of individuals in a way which no other activity can, and provide a unique means of influencing those personal opinions and attitudes,’ emphasising the role of artistic exports to counteract post-colonial Britain’s ‘diminished prestige’ on the international stage.⁷²⁸ MOMA, conversely, was using its official channels to

⁷²⁵ Elliott, ‘The Function of a Museum of Modern Art’, lecture text for Paris Biennale, 1980.

⁷²⁶ Clement Greenberg, ‘The Late Thirties in New York [1957]’, in *Art and Culture: Critical Essays*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1961), p. 230.

⁷²⁷ Elliott’s apologia came as part of a letter of passionate complaint to the editor of the *Oxford Times* over the brevity and lateness of its Mayakovsky exhibition review, beginning ‘Is it possible for a newspaper to insult the work of a dead artist and poet?’: letter to the editor, *Oxford Times*, 19 March 1982, MAO Archive, box ‘MOMA Mayakovsky 1’ fol. ‘Mayakovsky publicity’.

⁷²⁸ These aims were tabulated in an internal document prepared by the Arts Division in 1979 in response to threatened funding cuts from Thatcher’s new Conservative government, and circulated to the Fine Arts Advisory Committee (FAAC) of which Elliott had recently become a member. The document warned that if the British Council was cut, ‘our economic and political competitors... would be quick to exploit the vacuum’: British Council Arts Division, ‘Public Expenditure Cuts: The

busily *import* culture from the UK's leading geopolitical adversary. ('I guess it's what I did instead of throwing cobblestones at the American Embassy in Grosvenor Square,' Elliott wrote in 1998.)⁷²⁹

It is arguable that *Rodchenko* and its counterparts were also an attempt to resuscitate the beleaguered ideal of avant-gardism within artistic communities. Whereas in the west the market had so often in previous decades assimilated oppositional impulses as style, Russian artists (whether patronised by the state or working 'underground') were not dependent on the Greenbergian umbilical cord of gold.⁷³⁰ To the contrary, the suppression and persecution of avant-garde artists in the USSR – particularly under Stalin but even as recently as 1974's so-called 'bulldozer exhibition' – offered opportunities to heroic dissidence.⁷³¹ The argument that Soviet opposition helped to maintain the allure of the avant-garde in both Russia and the west has been made by a number of scholars.⁷³² Vaizey's review of *Mayakovsky* for the *Sunday Times* likewise argued that recent western interest in the Russian avant-garde was a response to 'a need for heroes.'⁷³³ This appetite for aesthetic martyrdom was richly exemplified by the ICA's *Unofficial Art from the Soviet Union*, a 1977

British Council's Work in the Arts', 1979, MAO Archive, box 008 fol. 'British Council general 1979/-83 A7/8/2A'. The emphasis on export over import meant that British Council support for Elliott's research visits to the USSR were contingent upon him agreeing to lecture on recent British art and to make proposals for British art exhibitions for Russia: see correspondence with Jane King in MAO Archive, box 'MOMA Feb-Mar 1979 Rodch. 8', fol. [unlabelled].

⁷²⁹ Elliott, 'Art, Power and Curatorial Practise', p. 207.

⁷³⁰ Greenberg, 'Avant Garde and Kitsch [1939]' in *Art and Culture*, p. 8.

⁷³¹ Richmond, *Cultural Exchange and the Cold War: Raising the Iron Curtain*, p. 604.

⁷³² See for instance Henry Meyric Hughes, 'When East was East and West was West: Art Attitudes in the Cold War', in *The Manifesta Decade*, ed. by Barbara Vanderlinden and Elena Filipovic, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005), pp. 133-152.

⁷³³ Marina Vaizey, 'Inside a Factory of the Human Spirit', *Sunday Times*, (24 January 1982).

exhibition of recent Russian works whose catalogue moved Roland Penrose to particularly hagiographic prose. He interpreted the exhibition as a ‘*crisis de coeur*’ from artists for whom ‘the acid test of persecution has proved their merit as human beings and intensified their message, an imperative demand for liberty of the spirit.’⁷³⁴ Although MOMA’s exchange exhibitions could not explicitly praise the artists’ political resistance, it is clear that they were presenting Russian artists as role models. ‘Mayakovsky fervently believed in making art which could be understood and appreciated by a mass audience. There are still many lessons we can learn from his example,’ advised Elliott in his catalogue introduction; these exhibitions could be understood in part as attempts to galvanise a disenchanted Thatcherite generation to renewed social engagement.⁷³⁵

Oxford’s Russian programming was directed at diverse audiences, including left-wing thinkers, artists, contemporary art sceptics in need of historical tutoring, and academics, for whom the exhibition catalogues (especially from 1979) were conceived as dense sourcebooks for future scholarship, filled with rare primary texts, newly commissioned essays and bibliographies in four languages (‘not for those with weak eyes,’ deplored the *Times Literary Supplement* on the typically miniscule font in the Mayakovsky catalogue).⁷³⁶ Unusually, however, an important

⁷³⁴ ‘Introduction,’ in Igor Golomshtok and Alexander Glezer, *Unofficial Art from the Soviet Union*, Secker and Warburg, 1977, p. xiii, p. xvi. Penrose’s Elephant Trust generously supported the Rodchenko catalogue, *Alexander Rodchenko 1891-1956*, exh. cat., MOMA, 10 February-25 March 1979, p. 136.

⁷³⁵ *Mayakovsky: Twenty Years of Work*, exh. cat., MOMA, 6 March-2 May 1982, p. 6.

⁷³⁶ Edwin Morgan, ‘Some Classical Ephemera’, *Times Literary Supplement*, no. 4114, (5 February 1982), p. 133. The Lissitzky catalogue was slimmer but still contained an essay by Elliott and four translations of texts by the artist. In addition to copious illustrations, the Rodchenko and Mayakovsky catalogues both contained critical essays, numerous primary sources in translation, an extensive chronology

segment of their intended public was long-distance. Among the key targets of the attempt to rehabilitate the Russian avant-garde were the Russians themselves: Elliott's correspondence suggests he hoped that the state apparatus might be susceptible to foreign persuasion and liberalise its policies. The Soviet government controlled not just the display and circulation of historical objects, after all, but also the working lives of contemporary artists in the USSR, whose ability to exhibit unofficial or dissident art was restricted. In the context of an ideological struggle such as the Cold War, international admiration for Soviet art – of any kind – was valuable soft power.

It is unclear what domestic impact the western interest in early Soviet art may ultimately have had. In 1979, Moscow television produced a one-hour documentary on Rodchenko, including footage from the Oxford exhibition, a move which Elliott hailed as a 'major breakthrough.' Also considered a 'breakthrough' was the visit to the exhibition by Prime Minister Kosygin's son-in-law, the head of the All Soviet Institute of Design.⁷³⁷ 1979 also saw the opening of the landmark *Paris-Moscou 1900-1930* (31 May-5 November 1979) exhibition at the Centre Pompidou in Paris, the outcome of years of negotiations between the French and the Russians, which celebrated the mutual influence of Paris and Moscow in the shared production of

and bibliography (although in response to censorship some of the Mayakovsky texts had to be moved to a second publication, see below.) Rodchenko catalogue's bibliography contained works in English, Russian, French and German.

⁷³⁷ Elliott, letter to Hubertus Gassner, 5 December 1979, MAO Archive, box 'MOMA Rodchenko Feb-March 1979 5', fol. 'Rodchenko Feb-March 1979'; Elliott, letter to Paul Overy, 23 March 1979, MAO Archive, box 'MOMA Feb-Mar 1979 Rodch. 8' fol. [unlabelled].

artistic modernism in the early twentieth century.⁷³⁸ [fig. 4.12] Coming the same year as Oxford's *Rodchenko* exhibition, and in conjunction with the western publication of a Soviet monograph on the same artist, the show was taken by some western scholars as 'striking' evidence that Russia's avant-garde was undergoing political rehabilitation.⁷³⁹ Even considering the prolonged conflicts behind the scenes at the Pompidou, however, the difference between what the Soviet Union was willing to display abroad and what was permitted domestically proved considerable. When that exhibition toured to Moscow in 1981, the Pompidou Director boycotted the opening in protest at the changes that had been imposed for domestic consumption.⁷⁴⁰ Meaningful change for modern and contemporary artists in the USSR did not take place until the late 1980s.

Interpretation

'WE
STRUGGLED
We didn't
sit around
Comrades
it's up to you
TO REINFORCE
THE EXHIBITION',⁷⁴¹

⁷³⁸ Ministère de la Culture de L'URSS (Moscou) and Centre National de l'Art et de Culture Georges Pompidou (Paris), *Paris-Moscou 1900-1930*, exh. cat., 31 May-5 November 1979.

⁷³⁹ Peter Vergo, '[reviews]', *Journal of Russian Studies*, no. 39, (1980), p. 58.

⁷⁴⁰ Mathilde Poupée, 'Exhibition Paris-Moscow, 1900-1930: Paper prepared for the Second Euroacademia International Conference, Reinventing Eastern Europe', 2013, <http://euroacademia.eu/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Mathilde_Poupée_Exhibition_Paris-Moscow_1900-1930.pdf>, [accessed 17 August 2015].

⁷⁴¹ This was among the slogans displayed in the Mayakovsky show.

Rodchenko, Lissitsky, Mayakovsky and the ‘Early Soviet Photographers’ were committed communists and it was made amply clear to visitors to the museum that their art was intended to promote and perpetuate the new state. These exhibitions and the supplementary posters, leaflets and catalogues emulated the styles of early Soviet design, communicating sympathy between art and institution. The extensive graphic materials for *Rodchenko, Mayakovsky, Early Soviet Photographers*, and *Lubetkin & Tecton* were commissioned from David King, and executed in screaming yellows, reds, and blacks, with capitalised sans-serif fonts, slicing diagonal lines, and heavy black rules to divide texts and frame images [figs. 4.13-4.15].⁷⁴² Both a committed Trotskyist and a serious collector of twentieth-century Russian graphics, King also designed the format and displays for the *Lubetkin* show [fig. 4.16] and lent from his personal collection to *Lissitzky, Rodchenko*, and to 1983’s *Blood and Laughter: Caricatures from the Revolution of 1905*, originally scheduled for 1982; the Mayakovsky wall panels were designed by King’s associate Judy Groves to coordinate with his style.⁷⁴³ [fig. 4.17] The colour palette, compositions and rhetorical tenor closely reprised that of the Russian Constructivists he was advertising, but to a contemporary audience they would also bring to mind the body of work for which King was then best known: his protest posters, pasted around London in their hundreds of thousands in the late 1970s and early 1980s.⁷⁴⁴ [figs. 4.18-4.20] His unpaid work for a range of left-wing issues such as the Anti-Nazi League and Anti-Apartheid Movement saw him create what has been called ‘probably the most powerful and graphically distinctive body of

⁷⁴² *El Lissitzky’s* poster and catalogue were by Richard Hollis, another distinguished British designer who did intermittent work for MOMA between 1979 and 1992.

⁷⁴³ King, interview 2016.

⁷⁴⁴ According to King, interview 2016, the first group of five posters made for the Anti-Nazi League c. 1978 had a collective print run of 750,000: they literally papered the city.

protest posters ever to be produced in Britain,' in what he has referred to as a deliberate attempt to create a unifying visual style for the left.⁷⁴⁵ King's instantly recognisable work brought connotations of 1980s radical politics to Oxford's Soviet exhibitions, lending them a certain contemporary edge and urgency, and adding visual continuity to a recurrent feature of the programme.

Like the punchy graphic design, the exhibitions were saturated with 'slashing reds and fuliginous blacks,'⁷⁴⁶ addressing visitors as fellow Soviets to be dazzled by the palette of communist tones, electrified by the bold geometries, and exhorted by posters and the insurrectionary slogans reproduced above the displays. For *Rodchenko*, MOMA worked with art historian John Milner to recreate the artist's iconic 1925 Workers' Club furniture designs, with a chess station and reading table and chairs refabricated to invite visitors to sit, play, learn and imagine themselves as members of the uplifted proletariat.⁷⁴⁷ [figs. 4.21-4.22]

All the exhibitions were intense experiences, but MOMA's Soviet fervour reached a celebratory peak in 1982 with *Mayakovsky*. The core of the exhibition was the artist-poet's own autobiographical display from 1930, but his reconstructed assemblage of images and texts had been more recently supplemented by its custodians, the State Museum of Literature,⁷⁴⁸ with a quantity of dramatic life-size

⁷⁴⁵ Rick Poynor, 'Spirit of Independence', in *Communicate: Independent British Graphic Design since the Sixties*, ed. by Rick Poynor, (London: Barbican Art Gallery, 2004) p. 24; Christopher Wilson, 'Reputations: David King', *Eye Magazine*, no. 48, (Summer 2003), n.p.

⁷⁴⁶ John Russell, 'Rodchenko: "Everything for Everyone!"', *New York Times*, (23 September 1979), p. D31.

⁷⁴⁷ *Alexander Rodchenko 1891-1956*, exh. cat.

⁷⁴⁸ A. P. Efimova, 'Twenty Years of Work,' in *Mayakovsky: Twenty Years of Work*, exh. cat., p. 11.

photographs of the artist ‘set about so that, wherever you glance, the man seems to be there and glaring back.’⁷⁴⁹ [fig. 4.23] MOMA added a second exhibition around the exhibition, comprising an introductory area with interpretative texts and photographs in English, a performance area for poetry readings and plays to take place, and an audio-visual tape/slide biography, all prepared by Elliott. [fig. 4.24] Not content with the images already added to the reconstruction, MOMA opened the interpretation area with a high-contrast cropped photograph of Mayakovsky’s face that was several feet high.⁷⁵⁰ [fig. 4.25] A daunting further quantity of broodingly handsome photographic portraits dominated the gallery, the poster, the invitation card and various catalogue covers. [fig. 4.26-4.29] The catalogue itself, at a mere 104 pages, contained 45 such photographs, many full-page or even double-page: it includes two images of his cadaver, but not those of his driver, statue, or grave monument.⁷⁵¹ This reverential treatment attracted little comment; only left-wing listings magazine *City Limits* (admitting the exhibition ‘excellent’) was uncomfortable with the ‘overkill of designer-supercharged black and white photos’: ‘fetishism edged into necrophilia.’⁷⁵²

The theatricalisation of Mayakovsky’s suicide continued in the exhibition’s texts, and in its design. Elliott at one point intended the exhibition to ‘end with the announcement of Mayakovsky’s death and a large blow up of the study in which he

⁷⁴⁹ Neal Ascherson, ‘Journey into a Tormented Ego’, *Observer Supplement*, (7 March 1982).

⁷⁵⁰ Some of the photographs of Mayakovsky in the exhibition were taken by Rodchenko and are of art-historical significance in their own right, but the majority were either anonymous or credited to obscure figures, as in this case, and are primarily of biographical value.

⁷⁵¹ *Mayakovsky: Twenty Years of Work*, exh. cat.

⁷⁵² *City Limits*, 23-29 July 1982, referring to the Riverside Studios incarnation of the exhibition. The covers of *City Limits* were also designed by David King at this time.

shot himself. A tape of a Mayakovsky reading will be running in this part.⁷⁵³

Although it is unclear whether this was included in the final version of the exhibition, Elliott's interpretation section was unafraid to tug at the heartstrings of the public. The last wall plaque in the interpretation section, ironically headed 'MAYAKOVSKY-DO NOT THE MASSES UNDERSTAND YOU?', was simply inscribed 'on 14 April 1930 at 10.15 a.m. Mayakovsky shot himself in his study at Lubyansky Proezd. At his funeral crowds thronged the Moscow streets.' It was accompanied by an aerial view of the horde of mourning admirers. [fig. 4.30]

The museum's supplementary texts continued to foster a romantic stereotype of genius, using superlatives to convey the artist's importance ('a titanic figure,' 'a twentieth century legend'⁷⁵⁴) MOMA sold badges bearing Mayakovsky's face, and reprinted without irony in the newsletter the artist's statements of self-mythologising braccadocio, such as:

Comrades, heirs and descendents!
 My verse will reach
 over the peaks of eras,
 Far over the heads
 of poets and governments...⁷⁵⁵

Topping off the triumphalism, 'Your word Comrade Mauser!', a famous line of Mayakovsky's poetry urging an end to debate and the onset of gunfire, was enlarged and painted prominently in red and black on a wall of the exhibition. [fig. 4.31]

⁷⁵³ Elliott, letter to Julian Spalding, 14 July 1981, MAO Archive, box 'MOMA Mayakovsky 3' fol. 'Mayakovsky Sheffield Arts Council.'

⁷⁵⁴ Elliott, 'Vladimir Mayakovsky Twenty Years Of Work,' press release, n.d., and 'Invitation to press lunch,' n.d., both MAO Archive, box 'MOMA Mayakovsky 1' fol. 'Mayakovsky publicity'.

⁷⁵⁵ Newsletter, March-May 1982, MAO Archive.

It is clear that presenting an exhibition about a man better known for his words than his images could pose considerable interpretative challenges. This is particularly true when dealing with a controversial figure such as Mayakovsky, who had been first celebrated as a revolutionary, then reviled as an elitist, then rehabilitated posthumously by Stalin. The exhibition did not discuss his posthumous reception (save in photographs suggesting mass adulation) and downplayed possible reasons for his suicide, if not the suicide itself, but it failed to take a critical perspective on his highly cultivated artistic persona.⁷⁵⁶ Instead, MOMA's exhibition became a shrine to the cult of Mayakovsky's personality, shrouding the artist in a haze of mythology and invoking masculine stereotypes of the tragic artist and his passionate self-expression. How did Cold War audiences in Oxford respond to these immersive, high-octane displays that combined unfiltered melodrama with celebrations of proletarian revolution?

'Red, Rough and Ready': Critical Reception

Perhaps it is surprising, given the controversial and sometimes bombastic nature of the contents, that acclaim for MOMA's Soviet shows was copious and came from virtually all quarters, with the same critical tropes appearing again and again over the years. As the first UK public retrospectives for Mayakovsky and El Lissitzky, and the first for Rodchenko anywhere in the west, the exhibitions were hailed for their originality and the quality of the loans ('the "studio sweepings" characteristic of so many recent exhibitions of Russian revolutionary art' were nowhere to be

⁷⁵⁶ Whatever the true motivations, it was in the USSR's interest to minimise any suggestion that Mayakovsky killed himself as a result of political disfavour (the suicide was omitted entirely from the Pompidou exhibition, along with those of others, as Poupée notes, p. 6) and MOMA was obliged to work to its terms.

found, wrote *Art Monthly*, finding *Rodchenko* a ‘rather extraordinary feat’⁷⁵⁷). There was a consensus that these were stirring exhibitions: Lissitzky was ‘sizzling,’⁷⁵⁸ Rodchenko ‘heady,’⁷⁵⁹ ‘red, rough and ready,’⁷⁶⁰ the photographs ‘exhilarating,’⁷⁶¹ and Mayakovsky ‘extraordinary,’⁷⁶² ‘overwhelming,’⁷⁶³ a ‘ranting, roaring anthology.’⁷⁶⁴ But while critical approval was almost unanimous, interpretation was more varied and contradictory, depending on the perspective and allegiances of the critic in question.

Some critics hailed these exhibitions for presenting a compelling synthesis of art and left-wing activism. Describing the Lissitzky show, Judy Brundin for *Arts Review* described ‘a phenomenal moment in the history of societies’ in which ‘artists worked with the authorities in a united, benign didactic purpose and with a vitality, invention and freedom which has not been experienced since.’⁷⁶⁵ The *Socialist Press* admired the ‘direct unity between the new Soviet power and their work.’⁷⁶⁶ Other writers, especially conservative voices, argued precisely the reverse: Soviet artists had failed to live up to their ideals, and are better appreciated now for their formal innovations than their ideological agenda. Tisdall in the *Guardian* was

⁷⁵⁷ Roland Hunt, ‘Rodchenko: A Major Exhibition at Oxford’, *Art Monthly*, (March 1979).

⁷⁵⁸ Marina Vaizey, ‘Russia’s Golden Egg’, *Sunday Times*, (26 June 1977).

⁷⁵⁹ Ian Mayes, ‘Rodchenko... at the Museum of Modern Art, Oxford’, *Birmingham Post*, (20 February 1979).

⁷⁶⁰ ‘Rodchenko: Red, Rough and Ready’, *Oxford Mail*, (17 February 1979).

⁷⁶¹ Sarah Kent, ‘Visual Arts’, *Time Out*, (25 March 1982).

⁷⁶² Andrew Marr, ‘Extraordinary Work of a Revolutionary Artist’, *Scotsman*, (18 January 1982). This review and the following two relate to the showing at the Fruit Market Gallery in Edinburgh, which for practical reasons became the first venue of *Twenty Years*. The design and contents were the same.

⁷⁶³ Clare Henry, ‘Vladimir Mayakovsky’, *Glasgow Herald*, (20 January 1982).

⁷⁶⁴ Felix McCullough, ‘Edinburgh Reviews’, *Arts Review*, (29 January 1982).

⁷⁶⁵ Judy Brundin, ‘El Lissitzky’, *Arts Review*, (24 June 1977).

⁷⁶⁶ ‘Forging the Link Between Art and Revolution’, *Socialist Press*, (28 February 1979), p. 8.

sympathetic but struck an elegiac note for a state-directed socialist art, noting that the ‘inspiring’ quality of Rodchenko’s work could only have been produced in ‘the brief period when such things still seemed possible.’⁷⁶⁷ Some were antagonised: Feaver for the *Observer* described Rodchenko’s work as ‘thinking up dynamic ways of telling lies,’ but claims that its abstract quality transcends any misdirected zealotry: ‘A strictly formalistic attitude comes in handy,’ he advised:

It enables one to thrill to the fervid layouts, enjoy the constant visual attacks, without having to feel obliged to worry whether or not, for example, ‘USSR in Construction,’ a prestige-enhancement periodical to which Rodchenko contributed occasionally between 1933 and 1940, contains the whole truth or anything like the truth... the Rodchenko artwork is the most convincing thing about them.⁷⁶⁸

The *Oxford Art Journal*, similarly, argued that ‘dogma’ was not the right way to approach Rodchenko’s ‘refreshing’ art, while the *Oxford Times* critic assured readers that ‘I do not propose to enter here into any abstruse discussion of the political aspect’ of the exhibition.⁷⁶⁹ The Lubetkin show’s subtitle, ‘Architecture and Social Commitment,’ seemed ‘strident and forbidding,’ to the *Oxford Star*, which begged the public not to be put off.⁷⁷⁰ This emphasis on visual qualities in isolation stands in a tradition of western scholarship dating back to Alfred Barr that depicts the Russian avant-garde as the contribution of a handful of brilliant individuals to the stylistic development of modernist abstraction in Paris and New

⁷⁶⁷ Caroline Tisdall, ‘The Image-Maker Who Sold A Revolution’, *The Guardian*, (16 February 1979), p. 12.

⁷⁶⁸ William Feaver, ‘Blazing Away in Red’, *The Observer*, (18 February 1979), p. 14.

⁷⁶⁹ ‘Alexander Rodchenko’, *Oxford Times*, (March 1979); Jonathan Mills, ‘Rodchenko at M.O.M.A.’, *Oxford Art Journal*, vol. 2, (1 April 1979).

⁷⁷⁰ Mark Robson, ‘Four-Tier Wedding Cake and A Gorilla that Made Lubetkin Leave’, *Oxford Star*, (21 January 1982).

York; it is sustained, as Feaver acknowledges, only through radical de-contextualisation.⁷⁷¹

Soviet officials in the late 1970s and early 1980s were more comfortable looking at modernism expressed in the applied arts, but the reverse was often true for British critics. Sarah Kent in *Time Out* found it ‘ludicrous’ that Rodchenko should have spent time on ‘bad design’ rather than exercising his ‘refined’ sensibility on painting and sculpture, and was relieved that El Lissitzky’s spatial designs ‘were never put into practice and we can enjoy them as they work best – on paper as superb and subtle fantasies.’⁷⁷² *Isis*, similarly, felt that Lubetkin’s architecture ‘may be alright for zoos but it must be hell to live in.’⁷⁷³ Particular censure attached to Rodchenko’s furniture as an emblem of the practical and ideological failures of socialism: the chairs designed for the workers were ‘horribly constricting and uncomfortable,’ as several critics pointedly observed.⁷⁷⁴

It seems clear that the Soviet interest in this sort of cultural exchange programme was due in part to its public relations role as a demonstration of liberal tolerance, and perhaps also the subversive value of placing adamantly pro-socialist art before western audiences. While socialist realist painting attracted perennial scorn in western art circles, artists such as Rodchenko and Mayakovsky, much appreciated internationally, could possibly be reintegrated into foreign perspectives of Soviet

⁷⁷¹ Taylor, *Art and Literature Under the Bolsheviks Vol. 1: The Crisis of Renewal 1917-1924*, p. xi.

⁷⁷² Sarah Kent, ‘Visual Arts: Exhibitions’, *Time Out*, (16-22 March 1979); *Ibid.*, ‘Red Concrete Dream’, *Time Out*, (1 July 1977).

⁷⁷³ Paul Wastell, ‘Exhibits: Arts’, *Isis*, (21 January 1982).

⁷⁷⁴ Kent, ‘Visual Arts: Exhibitions’; see also Hugh Adams, ‘Alexander Rodchenko: The Simple and the Commonplace’, *Artforum*, (Summer 1979).

cultural achievement in order to mitigate western chauvinism.⁷⁷⁵ To be successful, however, this required close collaboration with foreign institutions, such as MOMA, to control the manner of presentation: emphasising these artists' communist agendas, their excellence in applied fields of architecture, posters, and other mass design, and suppressing allusions to their past and present disfavour.

Attempts by the USSR to present a seamless narrative of artistic modernity in 20th-century Russia, unscarred by reversals and censorship, were matched by the determined efforts of many western critics to draw attention to later Soviet repression. Nearly all the reviews of the Rodchenko, Lissitzky and Mayakovsky exhibitions mentioned the artists' loss of fortune; many echoed MOMA's heroising language while repositioning the artists as tragic martyrs to their art. 'What it cost [Rodchenko] to survive, we cannot tell,' mused the *New York Times*; Waldemar Januszczak's somewhat sensationalist *Guardian* review blamed the state squarely for Mayakovsky's death: 'the tragedy of contradictions killed Vladimir Mayakovsky as surely as the bullet hit his heart,' because the government had 'hindered' and 'hounded' him.⁷⁷⁶ The insistence on presenting these artists as victims and rebels was an important corrective to the omissions of Soviet art history, but it was also a means of reclaiming them for western understanding and appreciation. To those hostile to the Soviet Union and keen to have their views

⁷⁷⁵ When Elliott attended the Cultural Forum of the 1985 Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) as an official British delegate, he was briefed that 'countries in the region show themselves (eg in press articles) to be particularly aware of the political benefits which accrue to their image by sending star performers of all kinds, exhibitions etc. abroad.' 'Note on the Eastern Approach to Culture', n.d. [September 1985], MAO Archive, box 034 'CSCE Conferences 1985, 1991', fol. 'United Kingdom Delegation to the CSCE: Cultural Forum-Budapest: 15 October-25 November, 1985.'

⁷⁷⁶ Russell, 'Rodchenko: "Everything for Everyone!"; Waldemar Januszczak, 'Foghorn of the Revolution', *The Guardian*, (10 March 1982), p. 14.

confirmed, it was preferable to applaud artists as dissenters than as propagandists for the enemy.⁷⁷⁷ In fact, this response had long been anticipated. The 1930 memorial issue of the Moscow *Literary Gazette* published after Mayakovsky's death was republished in translation for the 1982 exhibition. It included, among its statements of shock and grief, the claim that 'the mercenary bourgeois Western press, avid for scandal, has tried to use the poet's tragic fate as a convenient pretext for the usual slanderous campaign against the USSR.'⁷⁷⁸

The most sophisticated responses to these exhibitions assessed their value as contributions to both western and eastern historiographies; again, these analyses came from multiple directions. American historian Victor Margolin praised MOMA for its un-Soviet dramatisation of individual achievement and biography. His review compared the Oxford *Rodchenko* catalogue with Russian scholar German Karginov's recent monograph on the same artist, asserting that MOMA's publication was 'excellent' while Karginov's 'suffers from an ideological foundation that restricts the free exploration of Rodchenko's personality.'⁷⁷⁹ By contrast, *Art Monthly*'s Roland Hunt criticised the monographic and chronological structure of the Rodchenko show as inappropriate to its subject. For him, MOMA's focus on the artist's personal development emphasised internal coherence at the expense of historical rupture and took 'a bourgeois art historical concept (of artistic

⁷⁷⁷ In his review of MOMA's 1985 exhibition for the exiled Soviet pair Komar & Melamid, Brandon Taylor noted the public's keen appetite for having long-standing Cold War stereotypes apparently vindicated by the work of exiled Soviet artists: especially in America, he argues, they were 'greeted everywhere as "dissident" artists and feted accordingly; particularly if they said and wrote the sorts of things which dissident artists are supposed to say and write.' 'Komar and Melamid', *Art Monthly*, no. 91, (September 1985), p. 5.

⁷⁷⁸ *Литературная газета*, Mayakovsky memorial edition [reprint], 17 April 1930, MOMA, 1982.

⁷⁷⁹ Victor Margolin, 'Rodchenko', *New Art Examiner*, (February 1980).

unity) into an area in which it simply creates confusion,' the collectivist, collaborative ethos of socialist art production ill-served by western constructions of autonomy.⁷⁸⁰ In a similar vein, *City Limits* reviewer Stanley Mitchell suggested that not enough had been done enough to counter western formalist interpretations of Mayakovsky's deeply ideological output: although 'the devotion of the Museum of Modern Art... is not in doubt,' he argued, 'it is so easy to place Mayakovsky on a harmless island of modernist experiment.'⁷⁸¹

While certain writers felt MOMA's approach was too emphatically western, others perceived subservience to Russian control. As with 1971's *Art in Revolution* (in which the British were accused of adopting a 'meek' and 'emasculated' approach to foreign demands) and 1977's *Russian and Soviet Painting: An Exhibition from the Museums of the USSR* at the Metropolitan Museum in New York (described by Hilton Kramer as 'a corruption of the museum'), Russian art exhibitions aroused anxieties that – due to a lack of stout resistance on the part of the western organisers – audiences were to be subjected to unfiltered displays of enemy propaganda.⁷⁸²

The suspicion that the Oxford exhibitions were subject to influence from the USSR – or, as the *Times*' Bernard Levin phrased it in 1971, 'doctored to suit their ideological tastes' – was obviously correct: they were generated from a sometimes

⁷⁸⁰ Hunt, 'Rodchenko: A Major Exhibition at Oxford'.

⁷⁸¹ Stanley Mitchell, 'The Man Who Shook the World', *City Limits*, (5-11 March 1982).

⁷⁸² Levin, 'Keeping an Exhibition Ideologically Germ-Free', p. 14; Hilton Kramer, 'Détente Yields a Dismal Show', *New York Times*, (24 April 1977), p. D25. As Kramer asked, 'Why should a great art museum in a free, democratic country go to immense trouble and expense to bring before its public a large exhibition consisting, for the most part, of mediocre (or worse than mediocre) paintings, many of which were deliberately designed to serve a malevolent political purpose in their country of origin?'

uncomfortable process of negotiation, censorship, and self-censorship.⁷⁸³ Part of the reason for the preponderance of smouldering portraits in the *Mayakovsky* catalogue, for example, was that last-minute telexes from Moscow withdrew permission for any western scholarship to be included, or even mentioned.⁷⁸⁴ Although the catalogue included an article by an employee of the Russian State Museum of Literature, three commissioned academic essays, a scholarly bibliography and a detailed biography all had to be removed. They were shunted into a parallel publication, *Mayakovsky: Three Views*, which Elliott asked colleagues not to mention to anyone living in the Soviet Union.⁷⁸⁵ These evasions were noticed by Vaizey, who described the tone of the primary catalogue as like ‘walking on eggshells’; she was critical too of the exhibition itself, which she likened to ‘a mock-up of a 1930 avant-garde book store’ which ‘neatly plays down... some of Mayakovsky’s ideological difficulties and the reasons for his suicide.’⁷⁸⁶ Indeed, although the artist’s death was highly romanticised in the exhibition, potential reasons for that death were not explored. Elliott’s audio-visual display treated his change in critical fortunes euphemistically, largely avoiding comment except to quote Viktor Shklovsky’s gnomic account, ‘He found himself in still water, surrounded by prohibitions and quotations... I went to the [1930 Mayakovsky]

⁷⁸³ Levin, ‘Keeping an Exhibition Ideologically Germ-Free’, p. 14.

⁷⁸⁴ See especially S. S. Ivanko, telex to David Elliott, 27 November 1981, MAO Archive, box ‘March-May 82 Mayakovsky + Early Soviet’ fol. ‘Mar-May Mayakovsky’.

⁷⁸⁵ Elliott, letter to Christiane Bauermeister, 13 July 1982, MAO Archive, box ‘Mayakovsky 2’ fol ‘Mayakovsky general corresp.’

⁷⁸⁶ Vaizey, ‘Inside a Factory of the Human Spirit’. She was not alone in drawing attention to Soviet influence on the Mayakovsky catalogue: in the *Kaleidoscope* programme’s segment on the exhibition, Frank Williams described himself as ‘very disappointed’ in the catalogue, which he found excessively full of ‘memoir’ and Efimova’s essay not ‘a faithful picture.’ ‘Twenty Years of Work: Vladimir Mayakovsky’, *Kaleidoscope* (Radio 4) transcript, 26 January 1982, MAO Archive, box ‘Mar-May 82 Mayakovsky + Early Soviet’ fol. ‘Mar-May 82 Early Soviet Photography’.

exhibition and learned that poets did not go to it.⁷⁸⁷ This equivocation stands in some contrast to Elliott's assertion to the British Council in March 1981 that he would insist on writing the interpretative material himself:

Mayakovsky was a severe critic of the monolithic state and unbending bureaucracy which even in the late 1920s had become a characteristic of the Stalin period. This exhibition would make these points clear.⁷⁸⁸

Although MOMA did indeed produce its own extensive text panels, the museum was concerned to maintain a precarious balance between the expectations of the British public and those of Soviet bureaucracy.⁷⁸⁹

Similar awkward compromises were remarked upon in the other exhibitions. An irate academic from the University of Glasgow demanded why the name of Leon Trotsky had been inked out in all British copies of the Rodchenko catalogue ('the public... have a right to know.') Elliott had done so on the request of the artist's family in Moscow to spare them anticipated reprisals ('blacking out names is hardly an activity I relish much'), and explained that he would prefer to discuss the matter on the telephone.⁷⁹⁰ While the smuggled provenance of the work in *Early Soviet*

⁷⁸⁷ Typescript, n.d., MAO Archive, Box 'Mayakovsky 3' fol. 'Mayakovsky exhib. panel texts & AV'.

⁷⁸⁸ Elliott, letter to K. L. Pearson, Visiting Arts Unit, 17 March 1981, MAO Archive, box 'May-May 82 Mayakovsky 4' fol. 'Mayakovsky finance + sponsorship'.

⁷⁸⁹ The MAO archive does not contain the texts of the Mayakovsky wall panels, although they are visible in certain images, and they were not reprinted in the catalogues or inserts.

⁷⁹⁰ Gus Fagan, letter to Elliott, 8 March 1979; Elliott, letter to Fagan, 23 March 1979, both MAO Archive, box 'MOMA Feb-Mar 1979 Rodch. 8', fol. [unlabelled]. Elliott also observed that it was only in a 1923 photomontage caption on page 73 that Trotsky's name had been deleted; its appearance elsewhere in the catalogue was allowed to remain. As he did not point out, however, both the photomontage and caption were cut out of copies sent to the USSR. He notified the British Council and the British Embassy cultural attaché in Moscow of his actions. Letter to Roland Smith, 15 February 1979, MAO Archive, box 'MOMA Feb-Mar 1979 Rodch. 8', fol. [unlabelled]. Elliott's reluctance to discuss the matter with Fagan on paper

Photographers escaped public scrutiny, the exhibition's subject matter did not. Perhaps reflecting the especially tense political climate in the US, American critics were the most censorious: moral doubts were expressed over the lack of 'truth' and 'honesty' in the photographs, and one even declared the exhibition to have been 'organised and sanctioned by a Soviet governmental agency,' a statement false on multiple grounds.⁷⁹¹ Although independent actors, Mrázková and Remeš had thematically arranged *Early Soviet Photographers* under upbeat headings such as 'Motherland of Many Nations' and 'The New Life Needs New Forms of Expression.' In the manner of mainstream Soviet art history, they de-emphasised the role of the individual, presenting photography as a collective social enterprise.⁷⁹² In conjunction with the didactic tone of the labels, this made the show the least acclaimed of the series. In a nuanced review for the English journal *Creative Camera*, John Willett described the 'programmatic chapter headings' as disingenuous, evoking 'a competent Soviet propaganda display, vintage circa 1939'.⁷⁹³ Evidently stung, Elliott's private reply acknowledged the interpretative

shows that MOMA's self-censorship extended to its own archives. This practice of strategic concealment is clearly evident in the records of *Early Soviet Photographers* and raises questions about what else may have been deliberately and strategically obscured.

⁷⁹¹ Ken Johnson, 'Images from After the Revolution', *Bureau's*, (29 August 1985); Steve Farley, 'Soviet Photographs - The World According to The State', *The Advocate*, (18 September 1985); David Langston, 'Early Soviet Photographers', *Berkshire Eagle*, (12 September 1985). Like Langston, Farley also saw the exhibition's motives as seditious ('the Moscow – oops, I mean Williams College – Museum of Art... seems quite committed to revealing the socioaesthetic development of the U.S.S.R.')

⁷⁹² Mrázková and Remeš, *Early Soviet Photographers*, exh. cat. Their framework was deemed inappropriate for the catalogue, which was rearranged around individual practitioners with their thematic texts included on an insert sheet.

⁷⁹³ 'Of course the essence of Soviet photography, from 1917 on, was propaganda, and the very notion of an 'unpolitical' show of Soviet photographs would be nonsense. But there is a lot of difference between tackling the history of Soviet photography from the photographs *out*, as it were – i.e. seeing how, and under what conditions, and using what pictorial methods, it did its propagandist job – and

compromises implicit in borrowing artworks from the east, even when done illicitly.

‘You must have been aware of the difficulty of taking an analytical, critical view of the subject matter in an exhibition which originated from behind the iron curtain,’

he retorted:

Obviously there are huge gaps, we all know the reason why. But I don’t want to feel responsible for Mrazkova and Remes having to take a long train journey to Novo Sibirsk.⁷⁹⁴

Soviet Art: Conclusion

‘The truth of the matter is simply this, that in Western countries we have one idea of culture, in socialist countries there is another. Let me make this crystal clear. The Western idea of culture is essentially one based on the freedom, liberty and autonomy of the individual... what hope can there be of an engagement with an idea of culture – the socialist one – that is anti-individualist, centred on society, and regards culture as a reflection of economics?’⁷⁹⁵

According to Gould-Davies’ analysis of cultural exchange, official parties in both east and west sought to promote their own cultural values and products to publics

approaching it from such banal propaganda themes *in.*’ John Willett, ‘Early Soviet Photographers’, *Creative Camera*, no. 209, (May 1982), p. 510.

⁷⁹⁴ Novosibirsk is a city in Siberia, an area that was known for its forced-labour camps. Elliott went on to explain, ‘it was for this very reason that the exhibition was called Early Soviet Photographers and not Early Soviet Photography which it patently isn’t, as is clear in the catalogue. We can only hope to show part of the work of a limited group of photographers. There is a very good exhibition which we could do, and probably will sometime, about the photography of the early years and the birth of the documentary movement in the Soviet Union. However, we will not be borrowing work for this either from the Soviet Union or Czechoslovakia.’ Letter to Willett, 11 May 1982, MAO Archive, BOX March-May 82 Mayakovsky + Early Soviet, fol. Mayakovsky (events)’. Willett’s reply demurred (‘I’m not suggesting that you should have had a large signed photo of Trotsky (thought doubtless David King might)’ but reiterated that the museum ought to have introduced its own, more rigorous interpretative framework: letter to Elliott, 14 May 1982, MAO Archive, box ‘Early Soviet 1 Mar-May 82’ fol. [unlabelled].

⁷⁹⁵ ‘Opening Statement by Norman St John-Stevas,’ 1985, in Foreign and Commonwealth Office Great Britain, *CSCE, Cultural Forum: Budapest, 1985*, (London: Foreign and Commonwealth Office, 1986).

on the other side of the Iron Curtain, while restricting opportunities for their opponents to do the same. Although using the mechanisms of the British Council to fund and facilitate exchange, MOMA was – by contrast – actively seeking to trouble the boundaries between east and west by bringing early Soviet art to the UK. Rather than participating in a ‘zero-sum’ struggle for supremacy, or serving passively as an index of détente, Oxford’s Russian exhibitions sought to destabilise conventional political oppositions for the benefit of those on both sides, without offending the sensibilities of either. They were widely admired, a fact that speaks not only to the energy and originality of their content, but also the complexities and ambivalences of Cold War cultural politics in which the early Soviet avant-garde could be recuperated by those at many different points on the ideological spectrum.

II: Myth and Reality: Challenging Ethnocentrism

Isn’t it good to know that for one gallery at least, the ‘Art World’ has no frontiers?⁷⁹⁶

During Elliott’s directorship, MOMA became renowned for the geographical diversity of the art it displayed (‘looking for inspiration in the most unexpected areas. From Japan to Czechoslovakia, from Poland to Mexico, from East Africa to Scandinavia,’ as a promotional poster from the early 1990s declared)⁷⁹⁷ and it did so prior to what has been christened art’s ‘global turn’ around 1989. Although the museum’s commitment to Soviet art was pioneering in its own right, other exhibitions expanded its scope still further: they moved beyond the capitalist West and the communist East alike, drawing upon the cultural output of what was then known as the Third World. With a very few exceptions, MOMA had exhibited only

⁷⁹⁶ MOMA promotional poster, c. 1990, MAO Archive, poster collection.

⁷⁹⁷ Ibid.

European and American artists since its opening; indeed, Serota's inclusion of conceptual artists from western Europe was considered a significant diversification of what had been a heavily British programme in MOMA's first years.⁷⁹⁸ This southward expansion, however, did not take place until some years after Elliott assumed direction of the museum, a shift first signalled by the major exhibition *Orozco! 1883-1949* (9 November 1980-4 January 1981). It found its fullest expression in 1982's series of five consecutive exhibitions collectively entitled *India: Myth and Reality*. Although this marked a shift in policy for MOMA, which heralded it as 'the first in a series which will examine the contemporary arts in the developing world,' the scale of this extravaganza remains unique within the history of MOMA as the most ambitious attempt to represent a national culture staged in the gallery's five decades.⁷⁹⁹ How did this cluster of events negotiate the complex politics of displaying non-Western contemporary art in a period when such activity was still highly unusual?

Oxford, London, India: 1982

Oxford's *Myth and Reality* had its roots in the Festival of India that took place in London between March and November 1982. The Festival, which was conceived

⁷⁹⁸ These exceptions included the small touring show of recent paintings, *CUBA!* (7 November-2 December 1967), organised by the Cuban embassy; *Music in Indian Painting: Miniatures from the V&A Museum* (27 April-15 May 1971); and *Pattern in Islamic Art: Photographs, Graphic Analyses & Projected Colour Slides* (9 January-5 February 1972): all were small and none were originated by the museum. *Kim Lim: Prints* (2-23 November 1975), also small, was the only solo show dedicated to an artist of non-western birth before 1980's posthumous Orozco retrospective; the Singaporean-born Lim lived and was trained as an artist in London. Remarkably, a woman of colour did not receive a solo show at MOMA again until Shirazeh Houshiari (6 November 1988-15 January 1989).

⁷⁹⁹ Elliott, 'Director's Report 1st April 1982-31st March 1983', 15 July 1983.

and organized by committees appointed by both the British and Indian governments, consisted of nineteen exhibitions and myriad accompanying lectures, seminars and performances throughout the capital. It included not only various displays of material culture but also of the country's scientific and technological achievements. It was 'the most ambitious projection of Indian civilization ever made in the context of international cultural exchanges,'⁸⁰⁰ intended to strengthen diplomatic and trade links between the two countries through what was described as a 'mutual celebration of India's culture.'⁸⁰¹ The initial proposal for a survey exhibition of Indian art through the ages mutated, under pressure from British critics and Indira Gandhi (Indian Prime Minister and, with Thatcher, joint patron of the Festival), into an enormous enterprise. It was designed to allow Britain to 'display not only India's glorious past but also its dynamic present, and its hopeful future,' in a manner determined in close collaboration with Indian historians and diplomats.⁸⁰² [fig. 4.32]

Despite India's insistence upon its own modernity, however, the planned coverage of contemporary art remained 'rather thin' in the eyes of organizing committee member Ebrahim Alkazi.⁸⁰³ By 1981, Alkazi was a celebrated Indian theatre director in his late fifties who had founded Delhi's Art Heritage Gallery to promote

⁸⁰⁰ Niranjana Desai, 'The Festival of India in Britain, 1982', *The Round Table: The Commonwealth Journal of International Affairs*, vol. 72, no. 287, (July 1983), p. 287. Desai offers an official perspective drawn from his role as Minister for Press and Information in India's High Commission during the Festival.

⁸⁰¹ 'Gala Opening', *Festival Review*, no. 1, (March 1982), p. 1. For discussion of the political objectives of the Festival, see Desai, 'The Festival of India in Britain, 1982'; Brian Durrans, 'Handicrafts, Ideology and the Festival of India', *South Asia Research*, vol. 2, no. 1, (May 1982), p. 13-22; and Ibid., 'Competitive Pragmatism: Organising the 1982 Festival of India in Britain', *History and Anthropology*, vol. 6, no. 1, (1992), pp. 23-45.

⁸⁰² Desai, 'The Festival of India in Britain, 1982', p. 286.

⁸⁰³ Ebrahim Alkazi, letter to Victor Musgrave, 14 May 1981, MAO Archive, box 'MOMA May-Oct India + Phillips', fol. 'May-Aug 82 India Parts 1, 2 & 3 + film info'.

the country's modern art. He wrote to London dealer Victor Musgrave to express his dissatisfaction with the Festival's contemporary representation and to suggest working together on a proposed six or seven supplementary shows, including group exhibitions devoted to graphics, photography and painting and a retrospective of the work of painter Francis Newton Souza. Musgrave, who had shown Indian art since the 1950s and had been among those complaining to the Arts Council and the art press about the lack of contemporary art in the Festival schedule,⁸⁰⁴ contacted Elliott with Alkazi's idea, promising 'the most comprehensive exhibition of modern Indian art ever held in the West,' with 'the very best artists,' 'a large public' and a 'a short trip to India (not strictly essential as I know all the artists)... at Air India's expense,' should MOMA agree to serve as host institution.⁸⁰⁵ Elliott assented. By July 1981 Alkazi sent him and Musgrave a meticulously detailed eight-page outline for four Oxford exhibitions and a comprehensive accompanying catalogue; by October, he was running what he called 'four cells' in Delhi and Bombay, each dedicated to researching and organizing different aspects of the project under the joint aegis of MOMA and Alkazi's own Kuwaiti-based private foundation, ALFALAK.⁸⁰⁶ Although approved by Elliott, the final programme was devised and

⁸⁰⁴ An initial group letter in the correspondence section of *Art Monthly*'s November 1980 issue saw follow-up debate from Musgrave and others until January 1981. Along with Araeen and Musgrave, the signatories were Guy Brett, Avinash Chandra, David Coxhead, Avtarjeet Dhanjal, Susan Hiller, Balraj Khanna, Tim Scott, and Caroline Tisdall: Rasheed Araeen et al., 'Does India Have No Present?', *Art Monthly*, no. 40, (November 1980), p. 22.

⁸⁰⁵ Victor Musgrave, letter to David Elliott, 10 June 1981, MAO Archive, box 'MOMA May-Oct India + Phillips', fol. 'May-Aug 82 India Parts 1, 2 & 3 + film info'.

⁸⁰⁶ Ebrahim Alkazi, letter to David Elliott, 15 October 1981, and *Ibid.*, proposal copied to David Elliott, 19 July 1981, both MAO Archive, box 'MOMA May-Oct India + Phillips', fol. 'May-Aug 82 India Parts 1, 2 & 3 + film info'. Alkazi was eager to avoid accusations of a conflict of interest, stressing the 'purely cultural and educational' function of the exhibitions, at which no work was to be for sale. 'ART HERITAGE is in no way connected with this venture. Whatever assistance is

arranged almost entirely by Alkazi and his team of friends and relatives; in addition to local knowledge and connections with artists and politicians, he and his brother provided very generous financial support.⁸⁰⁷

In May 1982, the first segment of the tripartite Indian season opened at MOMA.

Gods of the Byways: Wayside Shrines of Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat (9 May-20 June) dominated the galleries of the ground floor and was supported by *Screen Idols: Indian Film Posters from the 1950s to the Present* (a small additional exhibition, *People of Rajasthan: Photographs by Elizabeth Simpson*, was arranged separately and installed in the Education Room as stimulus for children's workshops).⁸⁰⁸ [fig. 4.33] From 27 June through 8 August, the headline painting and sculpture exhibition, *Aspects of Modern Indian Art*, took over the Upper and Middle Galleries, paired with a display of popular religious prints, *The Indian Calendar*. *The Other India: Seven Contemporary Photographers* (15 August-3 October) formed the final instalment. [fig. 4.34] Throughout, as with the Soviet exhibition, a series of film screenings presented Oxford audiences with accompanying cinema and documentaries.

Still more striking than the scope of the Oxford project is the sheer heterogeneity of its picture of contemporary India. Rather than attempting to encapsulate the spirit of the nation in a single and inevitably reductive exhibition, MOMA and Alkazi took a

required will be from ALFALAK, Kuwait... of which I am the Managing Director... the main function of ALFALAK is to explore and project the art of the Third World, and to study the clash of the traditional cultures of these regions with the West,' Ibid., proposal copied to David Elliott, 19 July 1981.

⁸⁰⁷ Ibid., letter to David Elliott, 8 January 1982, MAO Archive, box 'MOMA India Jun-Aug 1982 3' fol. 'Indian Myth + Reality pt2 Jun-Aug 1982'.

⁸⁰⁸ MOMA newsletter May-June, 1982, MAO Archive, box 'News sheets 1981-95' fol. '1982'.

multifaceted approach; as the list above details, modernist painting and sculpture were juxtaposed with traditional rural sacred objects, mass-produced prints of both religious and secular character, documentary photography, and various kinds of film, in ways that resisted reductive cultural simplifications. It also called into question traditional Western art-historical hierarchies of genre and medium, inviting visitors to reconsider conventional distinctions between art and artefact, high and low, new and old, avant-garde and kitsch. The title of perhaps the most orthodox exhibition, *Aspects of Modern Indian Art*, was phrased to avoid any totalising claims about the foreign culture under consideration – the kinds of claims that have rightly been the object of postcolonial critique.⁸⁰⁹ MOMA's kaleidoscopic treatment of India's identity was strikingly sophisticated compared with the standard format of the national survey show, but the concept of showing a cluster of exhibitions and events over a period of months was also adopted by the Festival of India, which took place at the same time. In the capital, exhibitions and performances were organised on a dizzying array of topics, including Mughal court culture, urban life in antiquity, weaving, contemporary scientific achievements, bibliography, music and dance. Two exhibitions (the Serpentine's *The Living Arts of India* and the Barbican's *Aditi: A Celebration of Life*) presented Indian craftspeople performing their trade as live exhibits, and the undisputed centrepiece was the Hayward Gallery's *In the Image of*

⁸⁰⁹ Edward W. Said, *Orientalism*, (London: Penguin Classics, 2003). Said's pioneering concept of Orientalism defines the western acquisition of knowledge and cultural representations of foreign, especially Middle Eastern countries as a process of projection and mastery that stresses the foreign cultures' difference, their essential homogeneity, and their inferiority in ways that ultimately perpetuate colonial domination. His analysis rested heavily on literary analysis and concerned itself largely with British and French representations of countries where they had long-standing colonial interests, including India. No mention of Said's work could be found in the archival records of the Oxford India exhibitions. However, it was first published in England in 1978 and seems likely to have been at least indirectly influential.

Man: The Indian Perception of the Universe through 2000 Years of Painting and Sculpture. Compared with this ‘great galaxy,’ the diversity at MOMA seems more limited; but while London aimed to canvas all of India’s history and achievements through manifestations scattered across every significant public museum in the city, Elliott and Alkazi brought different views of contemporary India together within a single, regional modern art gallery. MOMA made a much greater commitment and a more concerted statement than any single London organisation, and moreover did so about postcolonial India exclusively. Not only was India’s modernity strongly emphasised, but the pluralistic format of the displays showed it to be irreducible to any singular form of visual expression.

Indeed, MOMA’s project was conceptualised as representing culture produced since Independence from Britain was secured in 1947.⁸¹⁰ While the exhibitions’ consciously postcolonial identity was not emphasised in the museum’s publicity and publications, the framework nonetheless supported a politicised analysis of India’s culture and the position of the British spectator that contrasted with a tradition of displaying the art of the developing world that stressed decorative splendour and obscured power relations. For Elliott, the complex and fraught imperial history that united Britain and India was no deterrent in taking on the project; to the contrary, the loaded context of colonialism and its aftermath was precisely what, in his view, made it so relevant to MOMA’s audiences. More specifically, he wanted to correct the absence of a contemporary India in the British public imagination:

⁸¹⁰ David Elliott, letter of invitation to artists, 8 January 1982, MAO Archive, box ‘MOMA May-Jun 82 India 2’ fol. ‘Jun-Aug India part 2 Myth + Reality’.

All people thought about India was old art, the kind of Raj and all of this kind of thing... Why is the folk art so easy to like? ... the modern art, why was it much more difficult, much more painful?⁸¹¹

The Orientalising tendency to see India as timeless and mystical rather than modern and politicised was the main driver behind the critique of the Festival's organisation led by Rasheed Araeen in the pages of *Art Monthly*: 'What we question here is the way in which Indian art is associated only with the past, with the "glorious heritage" referred to again and again in the press releases.'⁸¹² For him and his co-signatories (including Musgrave), the erasure of contemporary culture in the official Festival was a form of colonialism, 'a way of keeping people in their place and preserving the status quo.'⁸¹³

By the time the Festival was staged, its coverage of Indian modernism had been substantially increased by the addition of Geeta Kapur's two-part show at the Royal Academy titled *Indian Contemporary Art* (18 September-31 October, fig. 4.35) and the expansion of the Tate Gallery's small showing from four to *Six Indian Painters* (7 April-23 May), moves that may be partially attributed to interventions such as Araeen's. Rebecca M. Brown's recent detailed analysis of the follow-up 1985-6 Festival of India held in the United States argues that it was the absence of similarly sophisticated cultural criticism in the US that allowed its contemporary art showings to remain narrow in scope, exoticising, introductory in tone, and peripheral to the

⁸¹¹ Ibid., interview 2014.

⁸¹² Araeen et al., 'Does India Have No Present?', p. 22.

⁸¹³ Rasheed Araeen et al., '[Correspondence]', *Art Monthly*, no. 41, (December 1980-January 1981), p. 30. Araeen's argument about the political implications of the under-representation of non-western modernisms and modernities is one he has continued to pursue, notably in his famous critique of 1989's *Magiciens de la Terre* exhibition at the Centre Georges Pompidou: Araeen, 'Magicians of the Earth: On 'Magiciens de la Terre' [1989]', pp. 129-135.

festival at large.⁸¹⁴ Given Musgrave's involvement in the *Art Monthly* debate, it is clear that the Oxford organisers were aware of these postcolonial critiques and that they played a part in the final form of *India: Myth and Reality*.

Aspects of Modern Indian Art

Brown praises *Aspects of Modern Indian Art* for its diversity and its thematic organisation, suggesting that it 'makes the American exhibitions of 1985 look unidimensional, (male) artist-driven, formally focused, and painting-centered.'⁸¹⁵ [figs. 4.36-4.39] In fact, of its twenty artists, only two were female (Nalini Malani and Mrinalini Mukherjee), while a mere three showed sculpture instead of painting (Mukherjee, K. G. Subramanyan, and Anish Kapoor), ratios which are impressive only by comparison with their U.S. counterparts. The Oxford show was thematically organised under headings such as 'Nature as pictorial metaphor: forest mountain river' and 'The urban scene: strangers in the city.' Brown identifies these arrangements as supporting social and political readings and thus situating the artists within an appropriate framework of emergent Indian modernity, rather than formalist interpretations that position the artists as stylistically indebted to the

⁸¹⁴ 'The presence of this critical discourse, accompanied by close ties to colleagues and artists in India, lent Britain's contemporary exhibitions cutting-edge criticism and scholarship that challenged the essentializing priority given to historical and living traditions found in Festival exhibitions... The United States lacked the focused, organized, and localized discussion that took place within Britain's art community.' Rebecca M. Brown, 'A Distant Contemporary: Indian Twentieth-Century Art in the Festival of India', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 96, no. 3, (2014), p. 345.

⁸¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 'A Distant Contemporary', p. 344. The artists were M.F. Husain, F.N. Souza, Akbar Padamsee, Tyeb Mehta, S.H. Raza, Mohan Samant, Ram Kumar, Satish Gujral, Krishen Khanna, A. Ramchandran, Gieve Patel, Bikash Bhattacharjee, Jogen Chowdhury, Nalini Malani, Sudhir Patwardhan, Ranbir Kaleka, K.G. Subramanyan, Mrinalini Mukherjee, Rameshwar Broota and Anish Kapoor.

West.⁸¹⁶ However, Oxford's groupings were very loose, and each artist was represented by a number of works within a single category, allowing the exhibition and catalogue to be experienced as a series of monographic clusters. The catalogue, especially, celebrates the individuality of these artists through detailed prose biographies, black-and-white photographic portraits, and quotations or short descriptive blurbs about their work.⁸¹⁷

This form of presentation may be understood in the light of Alkazi's stated ambition to insert Indian artists into the western canon. Writing to Elliott and Musgrave, he framed the Oxford project within a wider polemical enterprise:

What I am concerned with is the art of the Third World, its neglect, its misinterpretation and misevaluation, its innate significance, and its relevance not only to its own societies, but to the world as a whole.⁸¹⁸

To accomplish this goal, Alkazi and his collaborators appropriated the trappings of the 'great' western artist to canonise their Indian interlopers.⁸¹⁹ This tendency continues in the catalogue's introductory essay, which adopts the language of post-Romantic western art history to carve out a role for the Indian artist as heroic, tormented and self-expressive. These are works of art, it claims, which 'writhe with a sense of humiliation, despair and anger'; they have a 'searing sense of honesty'; they reflect the 'the anguish and doubts of the dislocated Indian persona and seek[]

⁸¹⁶ Ibid., 'A Distant Contemporary', p. 343.

⁸¹⁷ David Elliott, Ebrahim Alkazi, and Victor Musgrave, *Aspects of Modern Indian Art*, exh. cat., MOMA, 27 June-8 August 1982.

⁸¹⁸ Alkazi, proposal copied to David Elliott, 19 July 1981.

⁸¹⁹ Struggles over the right of black and ethnic minority artists to artistic individuality marked 1980s debates, with those from marginalized groups often complaining that they are assigned to 'job-lot' ethnic survey shows rather than the solo shows that would highlight the unique aspects of their practices. See for instance Eddie Chambers, 'Black Artists White Institutions: Mainstream Capers', *Artrage: Intercultural Arts Magazine*, no. 14, (Autumn 1986), pp. 31-34, and Peter Dormer, 'Mistaken Identities', *Art Monthly*, no. 35, (1980), p. 28.

to tear off its illusions.’ Admittedly, such heady emotion is identified with ‘the rawness of the times’ rather than a timeless, existential struggle, and there is a curious uniformity ascribed to these artists’ ‘aspiration towards the seeking of truth within the tangled wreckage of contemporary society’: art is not presented as something so personal as to be divorced from society. Nonetheless, the aggression repeatedly ascribed to these artists, who ‘tear,’ ‘sear,’ ‘hammer’ and ‘expose,’ recalls the comfortably masculinist, individualist tropes of the western modernist (recently revived by 1981’s *A New Spirit of Painting*) as much it raises the threatening spectre of collective colonial insurrection.⁸²⁰

Similar contradictions and ambivalences mark the exhibition’s relationship to questions of national identity. One of Araeen’s *Art Monthly* letters pounced on Arts Council Director of Art Joanna Drew’s mention of ‘the essential nature of Indian art and culture’ as evidence of the reductive nature of the Festival’s endeavour, and this scepticism towards essence was often echoed in Oxford.⁸²¹ Visitors to the entrance of *Aspects* were confronted by the words of modernist Indian writer and artist Rabindranath Tagore (1861-1941) emblazoned on the wall. In lines taken from his 1926 lecture ‘The Meaning of Art,’ it read ‘I strongly urge our artists vehemently to deny their obligation to produce something that can be labelled as Indian art’; instead of being preoccupied by India’s past, artists should be ‘exploring unknown shrines of reality.’⁸²² The inclusion and placement of Tagore’s words must be read as an institutional intervention in the visitor experience, one that frames the works

⁸²⁰ ‘Introduction,’ in Elliott, Alkazi, and Musgrave, *Aspects of Modern Indian Art*, exh. cat.; Joachimides, Rosenthal, and Serota, *A New Spirit in Painting*, exh. cat.

⁸²¹ Araeen et al., ‘[Correspondence]’, p. 30.

⁸²² Jim Robinson, ‘Indian Tensions’, *Oxford Star*, (1-2 July 1982), p. 17; Harland Walshaw, ‘[review]’, *Artscribe*, (August 1982).

of art within discourses of innovation and experiment rather than national tradition. In a western art-historical context in which non-western modernisms have repeatedly been dismissed as weakly derivative, *Aspects* was the centrepiece of a concerted attempt to destabilise the perceived opposition between India and modernism.⁸²³ The stakes were spelled out by Alkazi in his July 1981 proposal:

The series will strive to show that Indian talent in these fields is alive to contemporary issues; that it gains strength from, or by opposition to, its vast hinterland of traditional arts; that it is creative and original in its own right.⁸²⁴

The introduction to the *Aspects* catalogue reiterated this argument, asserting that ‘contemporary Indian art is not a second-hand reworking of tendencies in the West, nor is it a withdrawal into a Romantic past.’⁸²⁵ In addressing stereotypical notions that modern Indian art is always either unoriginal or culturally inauthentic or both, Oxford’s exhibitions confronted decades of debate and discussion on the role of national tradition both internationally and – as artist K. G. Subramanyan’s catalogue essay powerfully describes – within Indian cultural circles as well.⁸²⁶

⁸²³ ‘Modern’ was the term most often used in Oxford, but Brown’s discussion of the difficulties faced by the American organisers in 1985/6 in reconciling India with notions of the contemporary addresses the same central dilemma, p. 339.

⁸²⁴ Alkazi, proposal copied to David Elliott, 19 July 1981.

⁸²⁵ ‘Introduction,’ in Elliott, Alkazi, and Musgrave, *Aspects of Modern Indian Art*, exh. cat., p. 3.

⁸²⁶ The notion that non-western art can be modern or traditional, but not both, plagues practitioners from many parts of the world and not just India. For a discussion of the problem in the Indian context, see especially Partha Mitter, ‘Decentering Modernism: Art History and Avant-Garde Art from the Periphery’, *Art Bulletin*, vol. 90, no. 4, (December 2008), pp. 531-548, and Catherine King, ‘Rabindranath Tagore: Making Modern Art in India before Independence,’ and Rasheed Araeen, ‘The Artist as a Post-colonial Subject and this Individual’s Journey towards “the Centre,”’ in Catherine King, ed., *Views of Difference: Different Views of Art* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999). K. G. Subramanyan’s essay ‘The contemporary situation in Indian art’ describes the sense of dualism within Indian culture: ‘The modernisation of India is, unfortunately, caught within this confrontation of “Westernisation” on the one hand and its corrective opposite, “Indianisation” on the other... this confrontation has ingrained itself into the mind of every Indian driving him into a sort of cultural

Critical Reaction

If visitors were thereby intended to disregard considerations of Indian national 'essence', however, most did not comply. Critics of *Aspects of Modern Indian Art* remained preoccupied with questions of authenticity, staging the gallery as a battleground between new and old. Across the pages of local, national and Indian publications, including both art magazines and newspapers, critics asked themselves whether the artists had succeeded or failed in coming up with a convincing resolution of the presumed 'conflict between their Eastern heritage and Western influences,' usually understood formally as a 'problem of style.'⁸²⁷ Some, like *Artscribe's* Harland Walshaw, felt they had clearly failed the test of Indianness; Orientalist scholar Philip Rawson of *Art Monthly* went so far as to declare that 'it doesn't really seem to work for Indian artists to rig themselves out à l'Européenne': the artists failed to make interesting work because they were caught between their native 'sensuality and savagery' and the 'personal frustrations and class hatred' that he associates with the sexless West, producing a failed compromise that sat awkwardly on artists, he implied, like a form of unconvincing drag.⁸²⁸ Waldemar

schizophrenia.' Elliott, Alkazi, and Musgrave, *Aspects of Modern Indian Art*, exh. cat., p. 49.

⁸²⁷ Walshaw, '[review]'.

⁸²⁸ Philip Rawson, 'Indian Art in London and Oxford', *Art Monthly*, no. 59, (September 1982), pp. 3-7. Rawson, a scholar and enthusiast of Tantra culture, was equally unhappy with the Hayward Gallery's India showing. Although his review typified a certain kind of complaint, it was also unusual in pinning down explicitly what he identified as the fundamental nature of Indian visual culture: eroticism. In a remarkably bald statement of fetishistic essentialism, he declared that 'nowhere at the Hayward or in Oxford was any real indication given that Indian art is all about delight. It sets out to re-invoke your own personal experiences of pleasure and joy. And they [sic] begin at the level of bodily and sexual contact, the stroking of

Januszcak in *The Guardian* reprised the trope. He predicted of the Royal Academy's show that 'it will be interesting to see how contemporary Indian artists stand up to all the antiquity on show elsewhere and if Western influences have begun to kill off the native tradition, grey squirrel-style, as they usually do.'⁸²⁹ Perhaps unsurprisingly, he found his preconceptions of the Darwinian triumph of western art confirmed in Oxford ('much of the artistic energy is spent fighting off Western influences') although Anish Kapoor, the only artist of the group working in Britain, was singled out for his 'unique artistic fusions.'⁸³⁰

Other critics articulated their praise for *Aspects of Modern Indian Art* through the same paradigm of struggle and reconciliation, often comparing it favourably to the contemporary offerings in the London Festival.⁸³¹ For the *Oxford Mail*, although 'new forces are at work' in the exhibition's paintings, they have 'lost none of their [Indian] feeling for colour, texture, or form.'⁸³² The *Oxford Star* adopted a slightly confused biological metaphor, stating that 'the seeds planted by Tagore...have germinated through the post-war years of Western influence to produce a mature and variegated tree.'⁸³³ Marina Vaizey reached for a different natural metaphor in the *Sunday Times*' rave review:

smooth skin and appreciation of roundnesses.' See also Philip S. Rawson, *Tantra*, (London: Hayward Gallery, 1972, second edn.).

⁸²⁹ Waldemar Januszcak, 'A Guide to the Festival of India Art Shows', *The Guardian*, (24 March 1982), p. 9. He did not review the Royal Academy show when it came out.

⁸³⁰ Ibid., 'Galleries Briefing', *The Guardian*, (7 July 1982), p. 9.

⁸³¹ These assessments were perhaps unfair since the major contemporary show of the Festival, *Contemporary Indian Art* at the Royal Academy, had not yet opened. The comparison pertains then to the Tate's exhibition and to the overall centrality – or otherwise – of contemporary art to the discourses around the Festival.

⁸³² 'Art on Show', *Oxford Mail Extra*, (26 June 1982), p. 3.

⁸³³ Robinson, 'Indian Tensions'.

With high intelligence and verve, Indian artists are now using both their own traditions and those of the West to produce an idiomatic art about India today which is something of its own. Far from being a mongrel art, it is a new species.⁸³⁴

Her language, which recalls and reverses Januszczak's grey squirrel analogy, posits Indian modernists as active agents of artistic cross-breeding.⁸³⁵ The persistent agonism of the descriptions from those on both sides of the argument, with their recourse to metaphors of evolutionary struggle and mongrelisation, is not directly traceable to MOMA's own framings. These repeatedly characterised the relationship between East and West as a productive one of dialogue and transmutation ('The relationship between outside influence and indigenous tradition in modern Indian art is far from simple... outside influences are absorbed and transmuted, producing work which is substantially different from what it might appear to be at first sight' cautions the opening line of the June-August newsletter, a warning which writers blithely ignored.)⁸³⁶ The museum also held a large show of British artist Peter Kinley's Indian-inspired paintings to coincide with the Indian exhibitions, an act that further refuted conventional unidirectional understandings of influence from centre to periphery in favour of a more nuanced model of mutual exchange.⁸³⁷

⁸³⁴ Marina Vaizey, 'Secrets of the Workshop', *Sunday Times*, (25 July 1982).

⁸³⁵ The notion of hybridity, which has become widely used in postcolonial cultural studies following its exegesis by Homi K. Bhabha in the 1990s, also derived from the natural world, but is plant- and not animal-based and lacks the racist associations with eugenics and anti-miscegenation rhetoric.

⁸³⁶ MOMA newsletter June-August, 1982, MAO Archive, box 'Newssheets 1981-95' fol. '1982'.

⁸³⁷ The gesture was a subtle one, but made explicit by a section in the newsletter which notes that 'Kinley has been particularly influenced by Oriental, particularly Indian art, an art in which surface information is more important than perspective and in which mood is carefully evoked in pose, accessory and colour.' MOMA newsletter May-June, 1982.

The critical response could be understood as the result of the inexperience of British art-goers with non-western modernisms, and the paucity of conceptual frameworks then available to understand processes of intercultural interaction, despite the best efforts of the Oxford organisers. Many of the reviews of the contemporary Indian exhibitions in London, after all, were shaped by the same underlying assumptions.⁸³⁸ But the reviewers' preoccupation with notions of contending artistic nationalisms may also have been partially rooted in a certain inconsistency at MOMA which allowed for the repeated invocation of Indian essence in its supporting texts. While on the one hand MOMA pointed out that *Aspects* brought together 'three generations who have become established since Independence and who all, in very different ways, have had to come to terms with their own surroundings, cultural history, and tradition,' the writings in the catalogue and newsletter are also awash with generalisations about Indian art and experience, whether it be the artists' 'direct and often raw relationship with society,' their

⁸³⁸ William Feaver at *The Observer* conformed to template, suggesting the Royal Academy exhibition had a 'vaguely Parisian accent' and that most of the work looked 'lost': 'Leaves from India', *The Observer*, (26 September 1982), p. 32. *The Times* review took the same tack, despite its title. Describing the exhibition as 'a lively jumble, like an oriental bazaar,' critic John Russell Taylor claims that 'the most modern' Indian painting is 'the most westward-looking' and that therefore 'what one often looks for in vain is any distinguishing feature which seems necessarily Indian.' Like Januszczak, he favoured artists who had emigrated to the West over those remaining in their native country: 'When the attention is seized... reference to the catalogue seems to disclose residence outside India,' 'Tradition Remaining Strong and Rich', *The Times*, (28 September 1982), p. 8. *The Spectator* reviewed the Barbican's *Between Two Cultures*, a display of 'contemporary Indian artists working in Britain but, to their annoyance, overlooked by the organisers of the Festival of India': 'It is difficult not to feel sorry for them because the work all too convincingly illustrates the predicament implied,' John McEwen, 'Through the Ages', *The Spectator*, (14 August 1982), pp. 25-6.

‘specifically Indian sensibility,’ their ‘anguish,’ or the ‘persistent call of their homeland.’⁸³⁹

These nationalist characterisations were not confined to *Aspects*, moreover, but coloured the whole of the Indian season in Oxford, including its title, *Myth and Reality*. Unlike in the West, ‘the concepts of myth and reality are often indivisible in modern India,’ claimed the texts that were reprised throughout.⁸⁴⁰ The exhibitions did not purport to help the British visitor *discriminate* between myth and reality, in other words, but introduced them to a supposedly ‘Indian’ mentality in which such distinctions are irrelevant. Although intended to be celebratory, the unifying concept of myth played into longstanding clichés of Indian spirituality and exoticism,⁸⁴¹ underlining cultural difference by suggesting that Indians shared an entirely different worldview to those from elsewhere.

There is a long and problematic history of British attempts to encapsulate the ‘essence’ of Indian identity for display, and imperial pavilions dedicated to India served as the spectacular highlights of British world fairs in the 19th and 20th centuries alike.⁸⁴² The politicised nature of national exhibitions did not change with decolonisation: instead, as scholars have often noted, these periods of national formation offered vital opportunities to project coherent *postcolonial* identities

⁸³⁹ MOMA newsletter June-August, 1982; ‘Introduction,’ in Elliott, Alkazi, and Musgrave, *Aspects of Modern Indian Art*, exh. cat., p. 3.

⁸⁴⁰ See for instance MOMA newsletter June-August, 1982.

⁸⁴¹ Brown, ‘A Distant Contemporary’.

⁸⁴² See for example Carol A. Breckenridge, ‘The Aesthetics and Politics of Colonial Collecting: India at World Fairs’, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 31, no. 2, (1989), pp. 195-216; Burton Benedict, ‘International Exhibitions and National Identity’, *Anthropology Today*, vol. 7, no. 3, (June 1991), pp. 5-9.

suitable for the world stage.⁸⁴³ Assertions of national unity, Indian or otherwise, were an urgent political issue for postcolonial elites, and MOMA's presentation of 'Indianness' must be understood in this context. Although many of the generalisations chime with certain Orientalist tropes, there is no indication that these interpretations came from the British side alone.⁸⁴⁴ To the contrary, Alkazi wrote about his aspiration for the Oxford shows, and in particular *The Other India*, to 'give us an insight into the mind, the way of life, and the tribulations of the Indian people,' conceived as a singular and indivisible group.⁸⁴⁵ Indian art critics made recourse to the same discourse of national authenticity in praising MOMA's exhibitions: the *Economic Times* review praised Kapoor for sculptures that 'resonate an Indianness as arresting as the wayside shrines' of *Gods of the Byways*, and Raza for having 'retained the vigour and resonance of his native environment' despite both artists living abroad.⁸⁴⁶

In the case of the Festival of India, a similar Indian concern to project a consistent national identity for itself made itself present. At the Hayward, for example, while

⁸⁴³ Academic discussions of the Indian objectives in realising Festivals of India in London and the United States may be found in Brian Wallis, 'Selling Nations: International Exhibitions and Cultural Diplomacy', in *Museum Culture: Histories, Discourses, Spectacles*, ed. by Irit Rogoff and Daniel J. Sherman, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), pp. 265-281, and Durrans, 'Competitive Pragmatism: Organising the 1982 Festival of India in Britain'.

⁸⁴⁴ In his analysis of the 1985/6 Festival of India in the U.S., Wallis suggests that Indians cultivated the stereotypic exoticism of their national identity strategically for foreign appeal: 'a country that had been subjected to Orientalist characterisations in the late nineteenth century by British colonialists was now forced to adopt what might be called a "self-Orientalising" mode,' p. 271.

⁸⁴⁵ Alkazi, proposal copied to David Elliott, 19 July 1981. Conversely, Elliott's catalogue introduction conceded that 'just as there is no one India, so there can be no other India,' an ambiguous stance given that this remained the title of the exhibition. *The Other India: Seven Contemporary Photographers*, MOMA, 15 August-3 October 1982.

⁸⁴⁶ Shanta Serbjeet Singh, 'Aspects of Indian Art Singh', *Economic Times*, (1 August 1982).

the British organisers wanted to arrange the exhibition along chronological lines, the Indian committee members were determined that it be thematically arranged to ‘revolve around the fundamentals of the Indian world-view.’⁸⁴⁷ As determined by the Indian organisers, the overall theme of the Festival was to be ‘continuity and change,’ a happy synthesis of tradition and modernity. Officials sought to communicate that – contrary to popular western belief – India ‘is not a convalescent, moth-eaten, cobweb-ridden, “wounded” society stuck in the past nor has it been uprooted from its moorings.’⁸⁴⁸ Yet attempts to provide a positive and uncontroversial corrective were inevitably simplistic, glossing over antagonisms internal to India as well as the barbarism of colonial history.

In Oxford, too, the political urge to assert the image of unified Indian citizenry sat uneasily with the organisers’ innovative attempts to highlight the country’s cultural multiplicity. This is nowhere more striking than in *Myth and Reality*’s expurgation of religious tensions. The first section of *Aspects of Modern Indian Art* was entitled ‘The hinterland of myth: Indian and Christian,’ a phrasing that sets India and Christianity in opposition; the section’s contents conflate Indianness with Hinduism, erasing the country’s marginalised Muslim and Sikh populations and recent decades of violent religious conflict. The denial of religious diversity is rendered most boldly by *The Indian Calendar*, the show of mass-produced Hindu imagery that was described as ‘transcending all [India’s cultural] boundaries.’⁸⁴⁹

[fig. 4.40] MOMA had made a point of foregrounding Indian voices in the

⁸⁴⁷ Kapila Vatsayan, ‘India Presented on its Own Terms’, *Museum*, vol. XXXIV, no. 4, (1982), p. 205.

⁸⁴⁸ Desai, ‘The Festival of India in Britain, 1982’, p. 291.

⁸⁴⁹ ‘Folk art within the Indian subcontinent is by definition localised, belonging to particular groups, tribes or states. The religious calendar, however, transcends all such boundaries,’ MOMA newsletter June-August, 1982.

catalogue and working with Indian experts on the selection and interpretation of works, the design of the shows, and the publications, a way of proceeding that responded to postcolonial calls for control over cultural mediation.⁸⁵⁰ Although an important and salutary step – and one that is often still neglected today – this could not in itself, however, resolve the many problems of national representation.

Gods of the Byways

After *Aspects*, the most ambitious statement on India made in Oxford was *Gods of the Byways*, another exhibition with religious content, albeit one engaging with rural variations on the Hindu pantheon rather than orthodox practice. Occupying the entirety of the gallery's ground floor, the exhibition proved the most popular of Oxford's India season.⁸⁵¹ Bright colour photographs of shrines and ceremonies taken by Vivek Anand and anthropologist Jyotindra Jain were accompanied by original ritual objects imported from India (many from Haku Shah's collection in

⁸⁵⁰ See for example Mosquera, 'Some Problems in Transcultural Curating', pp. 133-139. Elliott strategically drew attention to the native influence over the MOMA shows in his letter to Pupul Jayakar, chair of the Indian National Advisory Committee for the Festival, asking for support: 'in all cases, Indian specialists in each particular discipline are being employed': letter to Pupul Jayakar, 1981, MAO Archive, box 'MOMA May-Aug 82 India 1' fol. 'India: Myth and Reality pt1 Gods of the Byways May-June 82 2' Moreover, the Indian contributors to the *Aspects* and *Gods of the Byways* catalogues significantly outnumbered the British.

⁸⁵¹ Christine Newton, Education Report, 5 January 1983, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 50-64. In fact, the India shows were not popular successes compared to the other exhibitions that year. Newton's observation that *Gods of the Byways* was the most popular Indian display must be based on first-hand experience, because MOMA recorded total visitors to the building rather than attendance at individual exhibitions. In 1982/83 there were approximately 80,000 visitors, of which 7,500 were for *Gods of the Byways*, *Screen Idols* and *Peter Kinley*; 6,500 for *Aspects* and *The Indian Calendar*; and 10,000 for *The Other India* with its accompanying *Peter Phillips: retroVISION* and *Ex-Libris Japan* exhibitions. The slot filled solely by Indian shows, *Aspects* and *The Indian Calendar*, was in fact the most poorly attended of the entire financial year both in total visitor numbers and weekly averages: 'Annual Report 1982/3', 1983.

Ahmedabad) and informational texts by Alkazi's associate Fatima Al-Talib.⁸⁵² The exhibition was composed around a series of tableaux in which artefacts or clusters of artefacts were arranged in shrine-like formations with pertinent images and texts describing their use, each relating to a different deity or folk hero. Larger works, like the pair of life-size horses bedecked in ornamental regalia, or the trees bound together with ropes and hung with baskets, occupied the centres of the galleries. [figs. 4.41-4.42] Smaller objects were placed upon rough plywood and *papier mâché* bases washed with brown paint and sometimes ornamented with simple white paint borders and motifs. These were conceived by New Delhi graphic designer Satish Sud to 'give an effect of mud so that the entire exhibition gives a flavour of rural setting,' and were flanked by bamboos, ropes, cloth hangings and other rustic accoutrements.⁸⁵³ [fig. 4.43] An 'eerie' soundtrack of sung Indian music played throughout, further disrupting the conventional gallery atmosphere.⁸⁵⁴ A glimpse of modernity appeared in the form of the painted wristwatch on the icon of the virility god Jasol, and a taste for the curious was well catered to by the diminutive gourd-like form of Mataji, a fertility goddess, and a photograph of pilgrims whirling through the air, all three of which were chosen to illustrate the newsheet. [fig. 4.33] Unlike *Aspects*, the goal here was not to convert these objects into aesthetic treasures for the western gaze, but to allow the visitor to undertake a fictive pilgrimage before a series of altars; the exhibition was intended to convey

⁸⁵² David Elliott and Julia Elliott, *Gods of the Byways: Wayside Shrines of Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat*, exh. cat., MOMA, 9 May-20 June 1982.

⁸⁵³ Satish Sud, letter to David Elliott, 16 March 1982, MAO Archive, box 'MOMA May-Aug 82 India 1' fol. 'India: Myth and Reality pt1 Gods of the Byways May-June 82 2'.

⁸⁵⁴ The music is not mentioned in the exhibition files but was much remarked upon in the letters and poems from visiting schoolchildren, who described it variously as 'eerie and weird/with no harmony,' 'pleasantly different,' 'twan[g]y' and 'lovely.' MAO Archive, box 015, fol. 'Gods of the byways letters from children and exhib of work.'

not only visual appeal but social and religious experience, theatrically presented in order to imaginatively translocate the Oxford spectator to the remote hills of Rajasthan, Gujarat, and Madhya Pradesh. Even the private view invitation augured a ritual experience. The details were printed on the plain brown front of a card which opened dramatically between two flaps to reveal a full-page photograph of a Bhilwada shrine printed in luminous colour; it signalled that rare treasures were to be discovered hidden behind humble trappings, and promised the visitor privileged access to sacred spaces.⁸⁵⁵ [figs. 4.44-4.45] In his presentation to the Council of Management in December 1981, Elliott explained that the appeal of *Gods of the Byways* lay partly in the novelty of its content (these material cultures ‘had never been properly documented’) and also in its ability to challenge simplistic understandings of the modern, being ‘both contemporary but also unchanged for hundreds of years.’⁸⁵⁶

As with *Aspects*, however, the bold and imaginative presentation of the exhibition’s contents was not always matched by the supplementary texts. The exhibition’s catalogue repeatedly invokes myths of primitivism in describing these works’ appeal: ‘the power of the primitive in art lies exactly here: in the immediate communication between cosmic forces and their correspondence in the genetic memory of the human race’ is the statement that opens Uma Anand’s introduction, and she goes on to describe how ‘the artist of an evolved social order... turns to

⁸⁵⁵ Alkazi was not pleased with the design of the invitation, writing: ‘i. every second invitation to a wedding in India is designed in this fashion ii. the type used for the title of the exhibition is too small to have an impact.’ He also disapproved of the images chosen for postcards as ‘not aesthetically pleasing,’ letter to David Elliott, 24 April 1982, MAO Archive, box ‘MOMA May-Aug 82 India 1’ fol. ‘India: Myth and Reality pt1 Gods of the Byways May-June 82 1’.

⁸⁵⁶ Minutes of the 55th Meeting of the Council of Management, 1981, MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 50-64.

arcane forms in order to replenish the sources from where all his efforts flow.’⁸⁵⁷

Sitting alongside thoughtful essays by Komal Kothari and Haku Shah was the anthropologist Stephen Fuchs’ essay on the Bhil people, who he describes as ‘unsophisticated’ but who are celebrated for their supposedly primal instincts, for ‘the tribal of India is a more complete personality than modern man, who... allows his creative and artistic abilities to atrophy and decay.’⁸⁵⁸ This fetishistic invocation of the ‘noble savage’ trope found echoes, perhaps, in Sud’s primitivist ‘mud effect’ display strategies, and reminds us that India’s metropolitan elites have been just as susceptible as foreign intelligentsia to exoticising narratives of cultures not their own. Once again, the image of a shared Indian ‘mind’ and ‘way of life’ found itself riven with internal contradictions.

Despite these problems, a comparison of *Gods of the Byways* with the Festival of India’s parallel attempts to represent contemporary Indian folk culture casts the exhibition in a much more positive light. The Serpentine Gallery’s *The Living Arts of India: Craftsmen working in the classical and folk traditions* (8-31 May, fig. 4.46) and the Barbican Gallery’s *Aditi: Celebration of Life* (July-August) both opted to display the vitality of Indian craft by making live performances by Indian artisans the subject of the exhibitions. *Aditi* attracted particular attention as ‘easily the most successful event at the Festival,’⁸⁵⁹ luring an estimated 80,000 visitors to ‘its whirling melange of 35 craftsmen and performers... its acrobats, jugglers,

⁸⁵⁷ ‘Introduction: Ritual Arts at Wayside Shrines, A Note,’ in Elliott and Elliott, *Gods of the Byways: Wayside Shrines of Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat*, exh. cat.

⁸⁵⁸ ‘The Bhils: People of the Bow: An Aboriginal Tribe of Western North-India,’ in *Ibid.*, *Gods of the Byways: Wayside Shrines of Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat*, exh. cat.

⁸⁵⁹ Desai, ‘The Festival of India in Britain, 1982’, p. 287.

musicians and balladeers.’⁸⁶⁰ The insistence in London on transforming not just Indian wares but Indian workers into objects of spectacle brought together a 19th-century imperial tradition of displaying native peoples at world exhibitions with a 20th-century desire to foster tourism: ‘for the visitor to India,’ explained the Serpentine exhibition brochure, ‘there is one enthralling (and free) exhibition which virtually never closes. Daily, in full view of prospective buyers and users, men and women work by the roadside...’⁸⁶¹

‘The idea of exposing the London audiences to Indian villagers sounds good, but making them sit round pretending they were in Rajasthan is ridiculous... human beings implanted into the middle of an exhibition hall as objects not only lose their creativity but also their dignity,

commented *City Limits*’ Mahmood Jamal about *Aditi*, a rare voice of critical disapproval.⁸⁶² Oxford’s *Gods of the Byways* differed starkly from such crassly populist undertakings, an ambitious display of little-studied materials that would have been innovative in an ethnographic museum let alone a contemporary arts centre outside the capital.

There is also evidence that the exhibition was a successful means of introducing new audiences to the museum. Whereas MOMA had previously tended to conceptualise audiences as a mass differentiated only by age, Education Officer Christine Newton devised targeted programmes to attract particular demographics, from the anthropologists who attended the academic symposium ‘Art and Ritual in Rajasthan’ to the members of Oxford’s Asian communities who came in for

⁸⁶⁰ ‘Aditi: A Resounding Success’, *India Today*, (30 September 1982), p. 142.

⁸⁶¹ ‘The Living Arts of India’ brochure, 1982, MAO Archive, box ‘MOMA May-Aug 82 India 1’ fol. ‘India: Myth and Reality pt1 Gods of the Byways May-June 82 1’. Although M. F. Husain spent a couple of days painting at MOMA during opening hours, he was not himself presented as the work of art.

⁸⁶² Mahmood Jamal, ‘Visual Arts’, *City Limits*, (23-29 July 1982).

workshops on Indian folk stories and on the making and wearing of Indian textiles. [figs. 4.47-4.48] More than 400 schoolchildren attended *Gods of the Byways* with their teachers, drawing pictures, trying on saris, filling in worksheets and listening to stories, often led by visiting instructors of Indian origin.⁸⁶³ Poems written about the exhibition by primary-school children from nearby Wantage Junior School reveal exceptional enthusiasm; they are a rare insight into how the work was received outside of published reviews. Again and again they record the sensory excitement brought on by the vivid colours and glittering textures of the material, praising their beauty and ‘realistic’ figuration. ‘I never thought that a museum could be so bright/With dazzling sounds and sparkling sights’ exclaimed Sarah, and Mark felt ‘The materials were amazing, exotic and patterned/The background music was pleasantly different.’ ‘We have all made our pictures brighter,’ Elaine tells Newton of the influence of the show on the artwork of her fellow students, and Venetia ‘wouldn’t mind living there myself/All the colour, all the style,/What a nice life to live.’⁸⁶⁴ Their animated personal accounts underscore how crucial *Gods of the Byways* was to *Myth and Reality*’s efforts to revolutionise India’s cultural image and celebrate its plural modernities for an ethnically diverse British public.

Indian Art: Conclusion

⁸⁶³ The five ‘Folk Stories from Rajasthan’ sessions was jointly led by Chinta Kallie under the sacred tree, and the ‘Textile Workshops with Elizabeth Simpson’ offered children aged 12-15 the chance to try on saris and turbans as demonstrated by ‘members of the community.’ See MAO Archive, box 015, fol. ‘Gods of the byways exhib storytelling session.’

⁸⁶⁴ MAO Archive, box 015, fol. ‘Gods of the byways letters from children and exhib of work.’

Six years into Elliott's twenty-year directorship of the museum, the season of Indian art in 1982 was the first great statement of the interest in the visual culture of the global south that would come to characterise both MOMA and his own professional identity, and which he would later codify as 'a form of "aesthetic anthropology" which tries not to discriminate in its approach between work made in Manhattan or Maputo.'⁸⁶⁵ Although the concept of a season of exhibitions and events pertaining to a particular country was repeated at intervals, with Japan in 1985 and China in 1993, the scale and ambition of 1982 was never reprised. Instead, MOMA witnessed a stream of more conventional national survey shows such as *Tradition and Renewal: Contemporary Art in the German Democratic Republic* (3 June-29 July 1984), *Art at the Edge: Contemporary Art from Poland* (18 July-30 August 1988) or *Art from South Africa* (17 June-23 September 1990) that displaced the tensions and equivocations at work in *India: Myth and Reality* in favour of less challenging and complex models of representation.

Context and Conclusion: *A Clearer Picture*⁸⁶⁶

People are blind, and they are conditioned to be blind. Actually, I think the role of the museum is to counteract that conditioning of blindness.⁸⁶⁷

So far, this chapter has focussed tightly on two kinds of exhibitions mounted between 1976 and 1982. However, many of the themes I have identified were also reflected in other aspects of the museum's programming at that time. In this final

⁸⁶⁵ Elliott, 'The Development and Current Policies of the Museum of Modern Art, Oxford', c. 1990.

⁸⁶⁶ *A Clearer Picture* (29 August-23 September 1979) was an exhibition of work made by school children in the museum's education programmes 1976-79.

⁸⁶⁷ Elliott, interview 2014.

section, I aim to show, more briefly, how changes in MOMA's physical space, graphic design, and education programming were shaped by the rhetoric of revisionism and revelation identified in the case studies above. These characteristics can also be seen in other types of display mounted in the period: alongside the internationalism of MOMA's programme in these years and the consequent opportunities to reshape representations of the cultural 'other,' there was a continued engagement with the local context. Indeed, the ways in which the museum sought to challenge contemporary social problems may, perhaps, be identified more clearly when shorn of the complexities of transnational difference.

In 1978, American artist Hans Haacke was invited to hold a large show across the top two floors of the museum (*Hans Haacke: Works 1970-78*, 19 November-24 December), an invitation that included a new commission, for which Haacke produced *A Breed Apart*, a seven-panel work on paper that responded directly to the politics of the city. [fig. 4.49] The work explores the connections of the British Leyland corporation, then owned by the UK government and Oxford's largest employer, with South African apartheid. The panels take the form of parodic pseudo-advertisements, composed of images and texts culled from British Leyland's advertising and public statements and from parliamentary and United Nations reports. The assemblages are cleverly constructed, deliberately harrowing, and polemical in thrust. In one panel, an image of white South African soldiers in British Leyland Land Rovers is placed above a quotation from a 1977 UN Security Council resolution banning the sale of arms and related material to South Africa, next to the corporate logo and the slogan 'British Leyland. Nothing can stop us now.' The title, *A Breed Apart*, was taken from contemporary advertisements for

Jaguar, another brand in the corporate portfolio, here appropriated to suggest reckless profiteering and a disregard for international law, as well as the racism of apartheid. A similar composition was produced in poster format; it was intended to be posted, unattributed, all around the city as a public art work that was also a political awareness campaign.⁸⁶⁸ [fig. 4.50] Haacke's damning visual essay on the ethics and legality of the company's sale of police and military vehicles to the apartheid government is close to a form of investigative journalism; in its black-and-white, found-image format it reprises visual qualities typical of conceptual art, but its argumentative clarity and political agitation differs sharply from the work of artists of the same generation such as Art & Language. In this, it was typical of the kind of socially-conscious late conceptualism often shown at MOMA in the late 1970s; although sharing certain formal similarities with the often dry and diagrammatic conceptual works shown by Ibsen and Serota, content-driven exhibitions such as *Darcy Lange: Work Studies in Schools* (22 March-9 April 1977), *Mary Kelly: Post-Partum Document* (27 November 1977-8 January 1978), *Victor Burgin: Work 1976-78* (26 February?-2 April 1978) and *Stephen Willats: Living Within Contained Conditions* (21 May-25 June 1978) had recognisably different concerns. Haacke's *A Breed Apart* may be the clearest expression of the activist strand in MOMA's programme, one that supposed the audience to be in need of targeted demystification.

⁸⁶⁸ According to Hoole, the posters were Elliott's idea, but MOMA never figured out how to distribute them: 'It's because we never put up any posters that there are still copies in the archive. They were intended to go up on the streets. We never did it, we never actually thought about how on earth we would do this... We didn't forget about them, they stayed as a painful reminder that we'd made a complete Horlicks of the whole operation.' Hoole, interview 2013.

In this case, Haacke and Elliott had very specific targets in mind: the members of the powerful British Leyland workers' union. An invitation was issued to workers to attend an 'open meeting' to be held on Sunday 3rd December, intended to attract labour attention to the exhibition and prompt discussion of its 'implications.'

Unfortunately, this did not succeed: not a single person came forward to participate, a failure attributed at the time to the alienating environment of the gallery itself and in retrospect by Elliott to pervasive racism within British unions at this time.⁸⁶⁹

Further problems dogged the project: local newspaper strikes meant very little press coverage, the *Oxford Mail* refused to accept the exhibition's advertisement for what appeared to be political reasons, and MOMA consulted a lawyer who advised that Haacke's piece was very likely to elicit a lawsuit for defamation and copyright infringement. (In the event, perhaps wisely, British Leyland did not sue.)⁸⁷⁰

However, MOMA arranged a successful tour of *A Breed Apart* around Britain, in which the first venue was St. Luke's Church in Cowley: not coincidentally, the church was next door to the Leyland works and represented a further attempt to incite employees to action.⁸⁷¹

⁸⁶⁹ [David Elliott], draft text, n.d., MAO Archive, box 'Box MOMA Nov-Dec 1978'; Elliott, interview 2014, interview 2014.

⁸⁷⁰ Ibid., draft text; Adrian Barr-Smith, letter to John Hoole, 17 November 1978, MAO Archive, box 'Box MOMA Nov-Dec 1978'.

⁸⁷¹ [Elliott], draft text. Unusually, the tour consisted of the single work rather than the entire exhibition (which went to Eindhoven) and it was confined to the UK, visiting in addition to St. Luke's the Arnolfini, Bristol; Spectro Arts Workshop, Newcastle; New 57 Gallery, Edinburgh; South Hill Park Arts Centre, Brackwell; Midland Group, Nottingham; and South Yorkshire Photography Projects, Sheffield. Bradford University and Southampton Art Gallery declined to show the work for reasons of political distaste. Explaining why it was due to travel the UK rather than join the rest of the retrospective in the Netherlands, Hoole explained that he felt it a work 'of prime interest to the people of Oxford as well as the British public but which loses its poignancy and, subsequently, its significance when displayed outside the context of the British public and its acute awareness of the apartheid question.' Letter to Liz Ogborn, 21 November 1978, MAO Archive, box 'Box MOMA Nov-Dec 1978'.

Haacke's show brought together a number of themes that permeate the exhibitions discussed above. Alongside the new politicisation of art and exhibition practice is a subtle reconceptualisation of the identity of the museum's audience. Rather than worrying – or not worrying – about total numbers of audience figures, Elliott's MOMA used exhibitions to target specifically underserved demographics such as local working-class or British Asian communities, whose absence from the art gallery had historically been taken for granted.⁸⁷² As Newton put it, she was concerned to 'dispel the belief that contemporary art is simply an elitist concern,' and her education events were programmed to address many different constituencies.⁸⁷³ [fig. 4.51]

Hand-in-hand with the new diversity of audience was the diversity of exhibition material: MOMA's programme in these years brought together a multitude of forms of visual culture from many parts of the world, challenging traditional hierarchies

⁸⁷² The previous unconcern about visitor diversity has been noted throughout the thesis and had proved remarkably impervious to successive waves of institutional critique. However, the shift at the museum also echoed wider changes in late 1970s art. Serota has argued that 'in the later 1970s there was a renewed interest in art that had a social purpose. So, for instance, an artist like Steve Willats or Hans Haacke': Richard, 'Conversation with Sir Nicholas Serota', p. 465. Willats also did an extended project in East Oxford for MOMA and Victor Burgin was at least approached about doing so. These activities seem to have been encouraged as a form of community-based education. The minutes of the 37th meeting of the Council of Management, 24 June 1978, record that 'Victor Burgin was very keen to work with the Museum on a project in Cowley. It was hoped that this would take the form of a book which would examine and question traditional representations of working people in Cowley,' ideally with the sponsorship of British Leyland: MAO Archive, Council of Management Papers 31-49. The classic sociological analysis of class and the museum experience, first published in French in 1969, is Pierre Bourdieu and Alain Darbel, *The Love of Art: European Art Museums and their Public*, trans. Caroline Beattie and Nick Merriman, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991).

⁸⁷³ Christine Newton, 'The Educational Art of MOMA', *Southern Arts*, (November 1982), p. 9.

and preconceptions.⁸⁷⁴ The increased sensitivity to questions of class and geography, and the heterogeneity of the exhibitions that paired fine art, folk art and mass culture, seem recognisably contemporary, perhaps even a form of postmodern pluralism. It is clear that Elliott did not consider himself a modernist, after all: his assertions that the term ‘modern art’ need mean nothing more than the art of the 20th century suggest an avowedly neutral position and reflect his expressed desire to avoid value judgements.⁸⁷⁵

Yet in other ways MOMA remained attached to many distinctively modernist ideals. In spite of a multiculturalist programme that moved beyond frameworks such as ‘high’ and ‘low,’ and ‘us’ and ‘other,’ Elliott remained a staunch defender of the concept of artistic ‘quality’ (‘the morality in terms of the aesthetics’), of which the museum was to be the arbiter, and he was also wedded to romantic tropes of heroic artistic individuality in order to substantiate these qualitative claims.⁸⁷⁶ Both the museum and its artists were charged with providing revelatory art in the service of social revelation, transmitted to a public seen as diverse, but invariably in need of both instruction and enlightenment.

⁸⁷⁴ In light of this, British critic Eddie Chambers’ 1989 assertion that MOMA feeds ‘a non-stop diet of white art to a white audience’ seems exceptionally unfounded, although his complaints about the underrepresentation of black British artists in Elliott’s programme were more justified. The statement was made as part of a controversial *Art Monthly* review of MOMA’s *Makonde: Wooden Sculpture from East Africa*, reprinted as ‘Makonde’ in Tawadros and Clarke, eds., *Run Through the Jungle: Selected Writings by Eddie Chambers*, p. 44. See also Elliott’s response, David Elliott, ‘Correspondence: On Misrepresenting Makonde’, *Art Monthly*, no. 131, (November 1989), p. 29.

⁸⁷⁵ Elliott, ‘The Art of MOMA’, p. 4.

⁸⁷⁶ The phrases ‘true expression of what the artist wants but doesn’t yet know’ and ‘authentic process’ were also used by Elliott, interview 2014. Elliott’s belief in the contested concept of ‘quality’ was first proclaimed in ‘Gallery Policies: Oxford’, *Art Monthly*, (December 1976-January 1977): ‘the public... must not be shown second-rate work,’ and continues to the present day.

Similarly, the redevelopment of the Pembroke Street building in 1980-81 reflected a very different set of institutional priorities to those that had prevailed under earlier management. The new permanent education room situated Newton's workshops at the heart of the museum's activities, and Elliott's expansive taste in world art was matched by expanded gallery spaces. Moreover, the Upper Gallery was often subdivided with partitions and its south windows walled over, the room's uniquely elegant proportions sacrificed to make space for yet more art on display, its *Kunsthalle* spaciousness more densely filled with treasures. [fig. 4.52] The building had maintained a white-painted interior since 1966, one that was rather whiter since Serota's refreshments, but the gallery extensions broke up the lofty pallor with dark-painted beam and columns and, in the Piper Gallery, a dark wood ceiling with lacquered floors. [figs. 4.3, 4.53] Although Elliott had abandoned the concept of the permanent collection, MOMA's exhibition policies and design choices in this period established a tone that edged closer to that of the archetypal historical museum.⁸⁷⁷

⁸⁷⁷ I refer here to the 19th-century western museum traditions of urbane, princely interiors with dark walls, of dense hangs and tightly-filled vitrines, of didactic interpretation and unapologetic ambitions towards comprehensive representation and public improvement. MOMA of course was importantly different from these (often national) post-Enlightenment institutions, but in its visual and written style and its scope of materials, it came much closer to such models than it had in previous years. See especially chapter two in Duncan, *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*, pp. 21-46; and chapter one, Charlotte Klonk, *Spaces of Experience: Art Gallery Interiors from 1800-2000*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), pp. 19-47.

The museum's graphic design echoed this maximalist ethos. While David King designed only for MOMA's Soviet shows,⁸⁷⁸ the museum's published material, including invitations, newsletters, posters and books, transitioned towards an increasingly lavish and generous aesthetic. In place of a rigorously branded monochrome minimalism, MOMA's identity from the late 1980s was expressed with rich colour, bold asymmetry, and imaginative fonts, customised for each exhibition. In late 1978, just in time for the Hans Haacke exhibition, the museum's logo was revamped. The new design replaced Peter Miller's unassuming British Rail Alphabet with a declarative bold-face all-caps font: the legend 'MUSEUM OF MODERN ART OXFORD.' appears inside a large square of colour, terminating with a forceful, rectangular full stop. On the newsheet, the name runs across the bottom in the same dramatic lettering and ends in the same unequivocal punctuation. [figs. 4.54-55] MOMA's emphatic brand presentation matches its increasingly instructive and museological mode; it added a weighty character that reinforced the expository and authoritative qualities of the museum's public address.

Many of the exhibitions discussed in this chapter offered a critique of identity and representation (whether coming from the artist or the organiser) that may be associated with postmodern tendencies in art and art history. However, they also sought to proffer new certainties to supplant the older ones, a didactic approach that is what most clearly separates the activities of the museum in this period from what has become prevailing curatorial practice today. In 1982, Elliott declared that 'it is only through knowledge that one can break down barriers where they exist and give

⁸⁷⁸ The exception was 1985's *Tierra y Libertad: Photographs of Mexico 1900-1935 from the Casasola Archive*.

people confidence to think, see and feel for themselves – to evaluate what they see,’ endorsing a philosophy of liberal educational exhibition-making with a long tradition behind it.⁸⁷⁹ If in practice MOMA sometimes erred on the side of interpretive over-confidence, it did so in the service of admirable ideals.

⁸⁷⁹ Elliott, ‘The Art of MOMA’, p. 5; Nicholas Serota, *Experience or Interpretation: The Dilemma of Museums of Modern Art*, (London: Thames and Hudson, 1996).

Conclusion

For the public there is a continuing difficulty in defining a consistency within a constantly changing scenario; inevitably the question arises ‘What holds it all together?’⁸⁸⁰

Across the dynamic period of this study, certain fundamental factors were in constant operation at the Museum of Modern Art (and indeed remain so to the present day.) The gallery's audience is in large part determined by the fact that it is located in Oxford, a medieval university city outside London. Oxford is renowned for its intellectual achievements, but not for its modernity or its commitment to the visual arts; it is a city that is dominated by the ancient university but is socially diverse, that is outside of the capital but easily accessible to Londoners by train. Historically, it has been able to profit from a certain experimental license often granted to non-metropolitan institutions, while also benefiting from its proximity to London as an artistic centre. A persistent national strand to the exhibitions, which maintained a steady presence of British art throughout the 1960s-1980s even as the representation of artists from abroad increased, reflected MOMA's UK position. The museum's presentation of art has also been consistently mediated through its premises, which have been expanded and renovated at intervals but whose idiosyncratic, post-industrial character has influenced the creation and reception of the programme since 1966. Financial pressures were ever-present, along with a sense of avant-gardism: both receptive to intellectual fashion and at a remove from mainstream culture, it was intended to serve as a harbinger of social and artistic directions to come.

Such a description, however, does not add up to a very meaningful assessment of

⁸⁸⁰ Elliott, speaking of MOMA, in ‘The Art of MOMA’, p. 4.

the gallery's identity or its relationship to the public. The period under consideration in this thesis was culturally volatile and MOMA changed a great deal within it. Even the noted points of continuity had their own developments: the significance of the brewery building, or the kind of British art promoted in the galleries, for example, could change very quickly. Local and national publics were consistently recognised, but understood and engaged in diverse ways over the years; the pursuit of different kinds of funding at different times meant adapting to a variety of external priorities. More than any stable and singular identity, MOMA has been defined by a tradition of innovation and strategic reinvention. This responsiveness contributed to the broad transformation of the gallery's conception of its audience. Between the 1960s and the 1980s, the attention paid both to MOMA's attendance figures and to the identity and diversity of those visitors substantially increased. This was accompanied by the transition from an amateur to a highly professionalised institution, as it became accepted across the sector that specialist training was necessary to deliver cultural value.

MOMA's discontinuities are not merely historical, either. As I have argued, it is difficult to locate 'what holds together' an institution at any given time; this is especially true, perhaps, of non-collecting organisations whose exhibitions and events are in perpetual transition. Museums and galleries are fluid and polymorphous entities, holding in suspension a plurality of conflicting aspirations. The relationship between an art institution and its public – the subject of this thesis – is shaped by ideologies, but at MOMA these ideologies did not often find consistent and coherent expression, and the public reaction has invariably been diverse. One of the aims of this study has been to tease out and examine some of

these complexities.

While my research has sought to illuminate some underexplored aspects of British cultural history, it opens up many more avenues of possible inquiry. Most obviously, the thirty-three years of activity at MOMA between 1982 and 2015 beckon the historian. Within the period of current consideration, many case studies could have been treated in far greater detail, or entirely different ones could have been chosen. In particular, the gallery's imaginative education programming deserves closer attention and would make a rewarding project when the necessary cataloguing and conservation work is complete. Nonetheless, the case studies I have chosen indicate some of the directions that future work might pursue.

The history of MOMA also invites further comparative analysis. With the early decades of this gallery now better understood, it would be rewarding to explore some of the contemporary art institutions in more depth. It would be useful to have a greater understanding of close comparators such as the Whitechapel or Arnolfini, short-lived alternative spaces such as the Arts Lab or Gallery House, and the presiding powers of the Arts Council itself; such research could either focus again on a single institution, or pick up thematic links from the present study. The contributions of private galleries and of magazines and journals to the circulation of British contemporary art might also be better appreciated.

We benefit at the present moment from a climate of new interest in institutional histories, often (as in this case) driven by the institutions themselves; this is particularly true of exhibition histories from the 1960s and 1970s. The recent

growth of collaborative doctoral awards, of archive galleries and archive curators, and of exhibition and performance restagings, constitutes a flurry of movement in this long-neglected field. During the course of my doctorate, I took advantage of this interest on the part of MAO to propose new displays drawn from my historical research. Small shows on Archigram, Roelof Louw, Christian Boltanski and on exhibition posters provided opportunities for the public dissemination of material that would otherwise have a narrow readership, and they gave me a practical perspective on exhibition-making that influenced my reading of archival sources. For MAO, these displays offered an alternative to the recent works on show elsewhere in the galleries, and its selective borrowing from the past reinforced an institutional identity crafted for the present moment. As a contemporary art centre working with emerging artists, MAO benefits from its reputation as a cutting-edge international tastemaker, especially when seeking to attract audiences and funding; as such, it is unsurprising that the histories MAO and other organisations tell about themselves often dwell heavily on artists and activities that have become celebrated. These autobiographical displays are valuable, for the archives can provide fresh and often site-specific ways of looking at established artists, and they open up productive dialogues between older ideas and new ones. While it may be important for galleries to highlight material that appeals to contemporary aesthetic and institutional values, however, these same priorities need not guide the historian. To the contrary: the value of historical research often resides in the challenges that it can pose to current orthodoxies of practice and criticism, and I hope that this thesis may contribute to a wider process of questioning and re-engagement.

A thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

**The Museum of Modern Art, Oxford (1965-
1982): Exhibitions, Spectatorship and Social
Change**

Volume Two

Hilary Tyndall Floe

St. Cross College
University of Oxford
Michaelmas Term 2015

List of Illustrations

Introduction

Figs. 0.1-0.2: The main archive in Modern Art Oxford in 2015, photographs by the author.

Fig. 0.3: Invitation card, *Platform 73*, 14 July-12 August 1973, MAO Archive.

Fig. 0.4: *Tim Scott: New Sculpture*, 4 March-12 April 1969, installation view, MAO Archive.

Fig. 0.5: An education session for mentally handicapped children during *Richard Long*, 11 November-29 December 1979, MAO Archive.

Chapter One

Fig. 1.1: MOMA façade, 1968, MAO Archive.

Fig. 1.2: Maurice Agis and Peter Jones, *Space Place*, 28 November-24 December 1966, exhibition poster, MAO archive.

Fig. 1.3: Trevor Green illustrated in 'Museum of Modern Art Oxford', *Arts Review*, (August 1966).

Fig. 1.4: *Tim Scott: New Sculpture*, 12 April-4 May 1969, installation view, MAO Archive.

Fig. 1.5: *Patrick Heron: 48 Works 1957-68*, 21 May-15 June 1968, installation view, MAO Archive.

Fig. 1.6-1.7: *Derek Southall: Recent Paintings*, 27 February-23 March 1968, installation view, MAO Archive.

Fig. 1.8: Dennis Crompton, John Bowstead, and Clive Latimer, *Light/Sound Workshop*, 28 November-23 December 1967, exhibition poster, MAO Archive.

Fig. 1.9: John Dugger, *The Biomass/Canalisation of Psychic Energy in Pioneers of Part-Art: Popa at MOMA*, 14-28 February 1971, installation view, photograph courtesy John Dugger.

Fig 1.10: Eventstructure Research Group (Jeffrey Shaw, Theo Botschuiiver, Sean Wellesley-Miller), *Pneu Show*, 19 November-22 December 1968, installation view, photograph courtesy Jeffrey Shaw.

Fig. 1.11: Maurice Agis and Peter Jones, *Space Place*, 28 November-24 December 1966, installation view, MAO Archive.

Fig. 1.12-1.13: *Gandalf's Garden*, no. 1, (May 1968), front and back cover.

Fig 1.14: Archigram, *Beyond Architecture: An Extension of Pop Culture and Technology*, 22 February-[?] 1967, exhibition poster, MAO Archive.

Fig. 1.15: Archigram (Ron Herron), *Tuned Suburb*, 1968, photomontage, 204 x 255 mm, Archigram Archival Project.

Fig. 1.16: Warren Chalk, Archigram 4 cover image, spring-summer 1964, Archigram Archival Project.

Fig. 1.17: *CASSA (Centre for the Advanced Study of Science in Art)*, 4 March-1 April 1968, installation view, MAO Archive.

Fig. 1.18: Upper Gallery illustrated in Alfred Barnard, *Noted Breweries of Great Britain and Ireland*, vol. 3 (London: Sir Joseph Causton & Sons, 1889-91), p. 449.

Fig. 1.19-1.20: *Museum of Modern Art Oxford: Stage II*, leaflet 1967, MAO Archive [details].

- Fig. 1.21:** Beaumont Street façade of The Ashmolean Museum of Art and Archaeology, Oxford, 1839-45, via creative commons.
- Fig. 1.22:** Hanley's City Brewery seen looking south from Queen Street c. 1889, illustrated in Alfred Barnard, *Noted Breweries of Great Britain and Ireland*, vol. 3 (London: Sir Joseph Causton & Sons, 1889-91), p. 440.
- Fig. 1.23:** Trevor Green in the Upper Gallery during renovations, summer 1966, photograph courtesy Oxford Mail and Times Archive.
- Fig. 1.24:** Stuart Lewis, lower ground floor before renovations, 1966, photograph courtesy Stuart Lewis.
- Fig. 1.25:** Lower ground floor during Derek Southall exhibition, 1968, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 1.26:** Upper Gallery during Derek Southall exhibition, 1968, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 1.27:** Façade, c. 1966, photograph annotated c. 1970, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 1.28:** *Roelof Louw: Location*, 7 October-5 November 1969, installation view, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 1.29:** Façade, c. 1973, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 1.30:** *The Black Box*, 6-10 May 1970, exhibition poster, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 1.31:** Façade of Signals Gallery at 39 Wigmore Street, London, 1966, via tate.org.uk.
- Fig. 1.32:** Arts Lab logo, 1967, via luxonline.org.uk.
- Fig. 1.33:** *New Generation*, 18 October-19 November 1966, installation view, illustrated in 'Modern Art Shown to Best Advantage', *Oxford Times*, (21 October 1966).
- Fig. 1.34:** Roelof Louw, *Location*, 7 October-5 November 1969, installation view, illustrated in A.H., 'A Tourniquet for the Eyeballs,' *Oxford Mail*, 11 October 1969.
- Fig. 1.35:** Platform 70, 14 July-15 August 1970, illustrated in Andrew Hutton, 'Students' Work Goes on Show', *Oxford Mail*, (31 July 1970).
- Figs. 1.36-1.37:** Maurice Agis and Peter Jones, *Space Place*, 28 November-24 December 1966, installation view, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 1.38:** 'Unclassified Advertisements', *International Times*, vol. 1, no. 4, (28 November-11 December 1966), p. 11.
- Fig. 1.39:** Maurice Agis and Peter Jones, *Space Place*, 28 November-24 December 1966, exhibition poster, MAO archive, poster collection.
- Fig. 1.40:** Maurice Agis and Peter Jones, *Space Place* promotional image, 1967, illustrated in David Mellor, *The Sixties Art Scene in London*, (Barbican Gallery, 1993), p. 198.
- Fig. 1.41:** Victor Pasmore, Richard Hamilton and Lawrence Alloway, *An Exhibit*, 1957, invitation card, Institute of Contemporary Arts, via ica.org.uk.
- Fig. 1.42:** Illustration to Maurice Agis and Peter Jones, 'Theo van Doesburg is of Today', *Form*, no. 9, (April 1969), pp. 14-17.
- Fig. 1.43:** Archigram, *Beyond Architecture: An Extension of Pop Culture and Technology*, 22 February-? 1967, exhibition poster, verso, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 1.44:** *Light/Sound Workshop*, 28 November-23 December 1967, invitation card, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 1.45:** Tony Rickaby and Ron Sutherland, installation, 1967, in *Light/Sound Workshop*, 28 November-23 December 1967, installation view, photograph courtesy Tony Rickaby.
- Fig. 1.46:** Stuart Brisley and Bill Culbert, *Neon Cube*, 1967, in *Light/Sound Workshop*, 28 November-23 December 1967, installation view, via stuartbrisley.com.

Figs. 1.47-1.48: Eventstructure Research Group (Jeffrey Shaw, Theo Botschuijver, Sean Wellesley-Miller), *Pneu Show*, 19 November-22 December, installation views, photographs courtesy Jeffrey Shaw.

Fig. 1.49: Frances Filson, 'Come Into the Fog, Man and Grab a Handful of Art', *Oxford Mail*, (20 November 1968).

Fig. 1.50: Jeffrey Shaw, Theo Botschuijver, Sean Wellesley-Miller and Tjebbe van Tijen, *Moviemovie*, 'Air structure/mixed-media event', installation view, 1967, 4th International Experimental Film Festival, Knokke-le-Zoute, via jeffrey-shaw.net.

Fig. 1.51: Stephen Willats, *Visual Automatics and Visual Transmitters*, 22 October-16 November 1968, installation view, MAO Archive.

Fig. 1.52: Stephen Willats, *Visual Automatics and Visual Transmitters*, 22 October-16 November 1968, exh. cat., MAO Archive.

Figs. 1.53-54: Stills from BBC *Tomorrow's World*, 'Plastic Grass', 3 mins, broadcast 10 April 1968, hosted by James Burke, via www.bbc.co.uk/archive.

Fig. 1.55: *Unlimited Art: Multiples, the art of the future?*, 16 April-10 May 1969, exh. cat./poster, MAO Archive.

Fig. 1.56: *Inflatable Furniture*, 3-22 December 1968, installation view, MAO Archive.

Fig 1.57: *Kinetics and Multiples from Galerie Denise René*, 9 January-6 February 1971, installation view, illustrated in Andrew Hutton, 'Multiple Machinations,' *Oxford Mail*, 11 January 1971, original in MAO Archive.

Fig. 1.58: *Pioneers of Participation Art: Popa at Moma*, 14-28 February 1971, private view card: recto and verso, MAO Archive.

Fig. 1.59: *Pioneers of Participation Art: Popa at Moma*, 14-28 February 1971, poster: recto and verso, MAO Archive.

Fig. 1.60: Works by Lygia Clark and Helio Oiticica in *Pioneers of Participation Art: Popa at Moma*, 14-28 February 1971, installation view, MAO Archive.

Fig. 1.61: Li Yuan-Chia, installation, in *Pioneers of Participation Art: Popa at Moma*, 14-28 February 1971, installation view, MAO Archive.

Fig. 1.62: 'Visitors Wreck Modern Art Show', *Birmingham Post*, (15 February 1971).

Fig. 1.63: The Exploding Galaxy performance of *Orange and Black*, June 1968, during *What is Man? World Photography Exhibition*, 11-29 June 1968, MAO Archive.

Fig. 1.64: Front desk, c. 1968, MAO Archive.

Chapter Two

Fig. 2.1: Trevor Green with the PSF David Hockney loan at the King Edward Street premises, February 1966, photograph courtesy of Oxford Mail/The Oxford Times (Newsquest Oxfordshire).

Fig. 2.2: Touring catalogue for *New Generation* with MOMA slipcover: Peter Stuyvesant Foundation, Whitechapel Art Gallery, and Robert Hughes, *The New Generation: 1966* exhibition catalogue, (London: Whitechapel Art Gallery, 1966).

Fig. 2.3: *New Generation*, private view card, MAO Archive.

Fig. 2.4: The Dutch Peter Stuyvesant factory with its pioneering art collection, 1963: illustration from Charles Spencer, 'The Peter Stuyvesant Collection: Paintings While You Work', *The Studio*, vol. 165, no. 837, (January 1963), pp. 18-21.

Fig. 2.5: Peter Stuyvesant advertisement placed in *Apollo*, December 1964, black and white rpr. in Simon Faulkner, 'Art, Cigarettes and Visual Culture in the Sixties:

the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation and the 'New Generation' Exhibitions, 1964-66', *Visual Culture in Britain*, vol. 1, no. 1, (2000), pp. 65-87.

Fig. 2.6: *Young Contemporaries*, Tate Gallery, (27 January-19 February 1967)

Fig. 2.7: *Recent British Painting: Peter Stuyvesant Foundation Collection*, Tate Gallery, (15 November-22 December 1967), installation view, photograph courtesy Tate Archive and Alpha Press.

Fig. 2.8: *Recent British Painting: From the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation*, (London: Tate Gallery, 15 November-22 December 1967), (rpr. Lund Humphries, 1968), cover design [detail]. Design anonymous.

Figs. 2.9-2.10: Peter Stuyvesant Foundation advertisements placed on the inside covers of *Studio International*. June 1966, October 1966 and March 1967.

Figs. 2.11-2.12: Peter Stuyvesant Foundation advertisements placed on the inside cover of *Studio International*. February and June 1967; March 1966.

Fig. 2.13: Peter Stuyvesant Foundation advertisement placed on the inside cover of *Studio International*, May 1966.

Fig. 2.14: 1986 advertisement placed by the American Association of Advertising Agencies, rpr. in William M. O'Barr, "'Subliminal' Advertising", *Advertising and Society Review* vol. 13, no. 4, (2013), Project Muse.

Fig. 2.15: Joe Tilson, *Vox Box*, (1963), acquired by the PSF in 1966, sold to the Tate in 1976.

Fig. 2.16: Bridget Riley, *Crest*, (1964), acquired by the PSF by 1966, sold to the British Council through Waddington Galleries in 1976.

Figs. 2.17: A Peter Stuyvesant advertisement placed in art magazines such as *Apollo* in 1965, photograph courtesy Alamy.

Fig. 2.18: Illustration from Derick Grigs, 'Museum of Modern Art in New Home', *Oxford Mail*, (19 October 1966).

Fig. 2.19: Detail from photograph published to illustrate 'Warehouse Becomes a Museum', *Oxford Mail*, (8 February 1966), courtesy of Oxford Mail/The Oxford Times (Newsquest Oxfordshire).

Fig. 2.20: Nick Davies, 'Margaret meets the Mods and Rockers', *Daily Mirror*, (10 April 1964), p. 3.

Fig. 2.21: Façade, c. 1968, MAO Archive.

Fig. 2.22: Collection display, c. 1970, installation view, private collection. [Left to right] Harold Cohen, *Conclave*; Stephen Gilbert, *Structure 44B*; Derek Southall, *Palindrome*; unidentified work; and Cohen, *Choose Two*.

Fig. 2.23: Collection display, c. 1970, installation view, private collection. [Left to right] unidentified painting, Tess Jaray, *Early Entrance*; unidentified painting; Trevor Bell, *Light Resisting Dark*; Harold Cohen, *Sentinel*; Anthony Benjamin, *On the Gentle Edge*.

Fig. 2.24: Anthony Caro, *Aroma*, displayed c. 1970, installation view, private collection.

Fig. 2.25: A list of artists in the initial 'permanent' collection at the Museum of Modern Art, c. 1966, MAO Archive.

Fig. 2.26: Mike Cooper's museum furniture: chairs, tables and screens in the basement, 1968, installation view, private collection.

Fig. 2.27: *Summer Show: Contemporary British Painting and Sculpture* (5-31 August 1969), installation view, MAO Archive.

Chapter Three

Fig. 3.1: Richard Long, 9-23 December 1971, installation view, private collection.

Fig. 3.2: Richard Long, *Three Circles of Stones* (1972) in *The New Art*, Hayward Gallery, 17 August-24 September 1972, via *Sculpture Journal*, vol. 21, no. 2, (2012).

Fig. 3.3: David Medalla, *A Stitch in Time*, installation view, in *A Survey of the Avant-Garde in Britain*, Gallery House Press, 27 July-28 October 1972, via *Mousse Magazine*.

Fig. 3.4: Stuart Brisley *And for today... nothing*, in *A Survey of the Avant-Garde in Britain*, Gallery House Press, 27 July-28 October 1972, via www.stuartbrisley.com.

Fig. 3.5: David Tremlett: *Work done in Australia and England*, 3 December 1974-12 January 1975, installation view, MAO Archive.

Fig. 3.6-3.7: Interior and exterior of Bear Lane Gallery, c. 1962, MAO Archive.

Fig. 3.8: Nick Waterlow at Bear Lane Gallery, illustration from Andrew Hutton, 'A Crisis of Survival Faces Oxford's Art Galleries', *Oxford Mail*, (November 1971).

Fig. 3.9: Nick Waterlow, telegram to Peter Ibsen, 1972, MAO Archive.

Fig. 3.10: Press release, 1972, MAO Archive.

Fig. 3.11: Bear Lane Gallery, 1962, MAO Archive.

Fig. 3.12: *Elizabeth Frink*, Bear Lane Gallery, 1971, installation view, photograph courtesy John Parke.

Fig. 3.13: *Daniel Buren: The Sanction of the Museum*, 31 March-15 April 1973, installation view, MAO Archive.

Fig. 3.14: *Daniel Buren: The Sanction of the Museum*, 31 March-15 April 1973, exhibition catalogue cover, MAO Archive.

Fig. 3.15: Illustration from Andrew Hutton, 'Gallery Shuts: What Next?', *Oxford Mail*, (9 January 1974).

Fig. 3.16: *Dorothy*, Bear Lane Gallery, 30 May-20 June 1970, exh. cat., cover.

Fig. 3.17: *Dorothy*, Bear Lane Gallery, 30 May-20 June 1970, installation view, photograph courtesy John Parke.

Fig. 3.18: MOMA façade, spring 1974, MAO Archive.

Fig. 3.19: MOMA façade, c. 1977, MAO Archive.

Fig. 3.20: Entrance to MOMA, spring 1974, MAO Archive.

Fig. 3.21: Angela Serota washes the floors of the Upper Gallery during the renovation, winter 1973-4, photograph courtesy of Oxford Mail/The Oxford Times (Newsquest Oxfordshire).

Fig. 3.22: Middle gallery during *David Tremlett: Work done in Australia and England*, 3 December 1974-12 January 1975, installation view, MAO Archive.

Fig. 3.23: Bookstall, spring 1974, MAO Archive.

Fig. 3.24: Basement café during *The Photographs of Eadweard Muybridge*, 22 April-1 June 1975, installation view, MAO Archive.

Fig. 3.25: Peter Ibsen, exhibition poster, April-May 1973, MAO Archive.

Fig. 3.26: Peter Ibsen, programme guide, April-May 1973, MAO Archive.

Fig. 3.27: Peter Miller, folding programme guide, April-May 1976, MAO Archive.

Fig. 3.28: A selection of MOMA posters, 1974-76, MAO Archive.

Figs. 3.29-3.30: Juliet Noble with the MOMA sandwich board, March 1974, photograph courtesy of Oxford Mail/The Oxford Times (Newsquest Oxfordshire).

Fig. 3.31: Arnolfini Gallery, programme cover, autumn 1975, via www.arnolfini.org.uk.

- Fig. 3.32:** Jene Highstein, *Two Horizontals*, 1974, in 112 Greene St, New York, via www.brooklynrail.org.
- Fig. 3.33:** Tina Girouard, *Moving Out – Moving in = A Statement About People, Place and Energy*, in *Rooms*, P.S. 1, 9–26 June 1976, via www.eflux.com.
- Fig. 3.34:** *Rooms*, P.S. 1, 9–26 June 1976, exhibition catalogue cover.
- Fig. 3.35:** *Joseph Beuys: The Secret Block for a Secret Person in Ireland: Drawings 1948-72*, 7 April-12 May 1974, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 3.36-3.37:** Joseph Beuys lecture, 10 May, during *Joseph Beuys: The Secret Block for a Secret Person in Ireland: Drawings 1948-72*, 7 April-12 May 1974, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 3.38:** *Paul Neagu and his Generative Art Group: Horizontal Seed*, 2 March-13 April 1975, installation view, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 3.39:** *Carl Andre: Poems*, exhibition floorplan, c. May 1975, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 3.40:** *Ulrich Ruckreim*, 25 April-30 May 1976, installation view, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 3.41:** *Marcel Broodthaers: Le Privilège de l'Art*, 26 April-1 June 1975, installation view, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 3.42:** *Kim Lim: Prints*, 2-23 November 1975, installation view, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 3.43:** *Gustav Klutskis, Sculpture with Pulleys (1922) in Obmokhu 1921: Reconstructions of Russian Constructivist Sculpture*, 21 May-23 June 1974, installation view via www.artandarchitecture.org.uk.
- Figs. 3.44-3.45:** *Howard Hodgkin: 45 Paintings 1949-75*, 14 March-18 April 1976, installation view, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 3.46:** *John Hilliard 1969-74*, 20 October-24 November 1974, installation view, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 3.47:** *Marcel Broodthaers: Le Privilège de l'Art*, 26 April-1 June 1975, invitation card, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 3.48:** *Bruce McLean: Early Works 1967-1971*, 22 April-1 June 1975, invitation card, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 3.49:** Strider performance, 16-17 May 1975, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 3.50:** *The Photographs of Eadweard Muybridge*, 22 April-1 June 1975, installation view, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 3.51:** Education event for *Jasper Johns: Drawings*, 7 September-13 October 1974, photograph courtesy of Oxford Mail/The Oxford Times (Newsquest Oxfordshire).
- Fig. 3.52:** *The Young in Art*, 22 February-7 March 1976, installation view, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 3.53:** *Sol LeWitt, Wall Drawing*, Lisson Gallery, spring 1973, installation view, via Lisson Gallery.
- Fig. 3.54:** *Daniel Buren*, Lisson Gallery, 1976, via Lisson Gallery.
- Fig. 3.55:** *John Baldessari*, invitation card, n.d., Jack Wendler Gallery, via www.chelseaspace.org.
- Fig. 3.56:** *Hanne Darboven*, 30 June-4 August 1974, installation view, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 3.57:** *Sol Lewitt: Wall Drawing*, 28 April-27 May 1973, installation view, photograph courtesy Lisson Gallery.
- Fig. 3.58:** *Carl Andre: Poems 1958-74*, 8 June-20 July 1975, installation view, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 3.59:** *Six Belgians, Charlier, Lohaus, Mees, Panamarenko, Roquet, Van Snick*, 30 June-4 August 1974, installation view, MAO Archive.

- Fig. 3.60:** Alan Charlton: *Paintings from a Series begun in 1970*, 2 November-14 December, installation view, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 3.61:** Joseph Kosuth, *The Ninth Investigation, Proposition One*, November 4 – 25, 1972, Leo Castelli Gallery, New York, installation view, via www.castelligallery.com.
- Fig. 3.62:** *Art and Language 1966-75*, 21 September-26 October 1975, installation view, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 3.63:** Andre Flavin Judd LeWitt, 11 January-8 February 1976, installation view, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 3.64:** John Murphy: *Selected Works*, 8 June-20 July 1975, installation view, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 3.65:** Daniel Meadows, *Bob Law: 10 Black Paintings 1965-1970*, 21 May-23 June 1974, installation view, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 3.66:** Marcel Broodthaers: *Le Privilège de l'Art*, 26 April-1 June 1975, exh. cat. cover, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 3.67:** Ulrich Ruckreim, 25 April-30 May 1976, exh. cat. [detail], MAO Archive.
- Fig. 3.68:** Andre Cadere with his *Round Bar of Wood* at the opening of *Six Belgians: Charlier, Lohaus, Mees, Panamarenko, Roquet, Van Snick*, 30 June-4 August 1974, photograph courtesy Lynda Morris.

Chapter Four

- Fig. 4.1:** Coffee bar, 1982, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 4.2:** Piper Gallery, 1982, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 4.3:** Piper Gallery during refurbishment, c. 1980, photograph courtesy of Oxford Mail/The Oxford Times (Newsquest Oxfordshire).
- Fig. 4.4:** El Lissitzky, *Proun Room* (1923), 1971 reconstruction, painted wood, collection of the Van Abbemuseum, Eindhoven, via vanabbemuseum.nl.
- Fig. 4.5:** Richard Hollis, *El Lissitzky 1890-1941*, 12 June-10 July 1977, exhibition poster, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 4.6:** David King, newssheet, February-March 1979, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 4.7:** *Alexander Rodchenko 1891-1956*, 11 February-25 March 1979, installation view, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 4.8:** David King, *Alexander Rodchenko 1891-1956*, 11 February-25 March 1979, catalogue insert, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 4.9-4.11** *Vladimir Mayakovsky: Twenty Years of Work*, 7 March-2 May 1982, installation view, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 4.12:** *Paris-Moscou 1900-1930*, Centre Pompidou, 31 May-5 November 1979, installation view taken by Jacques Faujour, via Bibliothèque Kandinsky, MNAM-CCI.
- Figs. 4.13-4.15:** David King, exhibition posters for *Alexander Rodchenko 1891-1956*, 11 February-25 March 1979; *Lubetkin and Tecton: Architecture and Social Commitment*, 17 January-28 February 1982; and *Vladimir Mayakovsky: Twenty Years of Work*, 7 March-2 May 1982, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 4.16:** *Lubetkin and Tecton: Architecture and Social Commitment*, 17 January-28 February 1982, installation view, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 4.17:** *Vladimir Mayakovsky: Twenty Years of Work*, 7 March-2 May 1982, installation view, MAO Archive.
- Fig. 4.18:** David King, newssheet, March-May 1982, MAO Archive.

Figs. 4.19-4.20: David King, protest posters c. 1978, Victoria and Albert Museum, via www.vam.ac.uk.

Figs. 4.21-4.22 *Alexander Rodchenko 1891-1956*, 11 February-25 March 1979, installation view, MAO Archive.

Figs. 4.23-4.26: *Vladimir Mayakovsky: Twenty Years of Work*, 7 March-2 May 1982, installation views, MAO Archive.

Fig. 4.27: David King, *Mayakovsky: Twenty Years of Work*, 7 March-2 May 1982, private view card, recto and verso, 1982, MAO Archive.

Fig. 4.28: David King, *Vladimir Mayakovsky: Three Views*, cover, (Oxford: Prometheus Press, 1982).

Fig. 4.29: David King, *Vladimir Mayakovsky: Twenty Years of Work*, 7 March-2 May 1982, catalogue insert, MAO Archive.

Fig. 4.30: *Vladimir Mayakovsky: Twenty Years of Work*, 7 March-2 May 1982, text panel design, colour transparency, MAO Archive.

Fig. 4.31: *Vladimir Mayakovsky: Twenty Years of Work*, 7 March-2 May 1982, installation view, MAO Archive.

Fig. 4.32: Festival of India, programme of events [detail], 1982, MAO Archive.

Fig. 4.33: Newsheet, May-June 1982, MAO Archive.

Fig. 4.34: *The Other India*, 15 August-3 October 1982, installation view, MAO Archive.

Fig. 4.35: *Indian Contemporary Art*, Royal Academy of Arts, London, 16 September-31 October 1982, installation view, Asia Art Archive.

Fig. 4.36: M. F. Husain at work during *Aspects of Modern Indian Art*, 27 June-8 August 1982, installation view, MAO Archive.

Figs. 4.37-9: *Aspects of Modern Indian Art*, 27 June-8 August 1982, installation views, MAO Archive.

Fig. 4.40: *The Indian Calendar*, 27 June-8 August 1982, invitation card, MAO Archive.

Figs. 4.41-4.43: *Gods of the Byways*, 9 May-20 June 1982, installation view, MAO Archive.

Figs. 4.44-4.45: *Gods of the Byways*, 9 May-20 June 1982, private view card, MAO Archive: closed and open.

Fig. 4.46: *The Living Arts of India*, Serpentine Gallery, brochure 1982, MAO Archive.

Fig. 4.47: Textile workshop for *Gods of the Byways*, 27 and 28 May 1982, MAO Archive.

Fig. 4.48: Storytelling workshop for *Gods of the Byways*, 1982, MAO Archive.

Fig. 4.49: *Hans Haacke: Works 1970-78*, 19 November-24 December 1978, installation view, MAO Archive.

Fig. 4.50: Hans Haacke, poster for Oxford campaign, 1978, MAO Archive.

Fig. 4.51: Children's education event during *Frank Stella: Aluminium Reliefs 1976-77*, 24 April-29 May 1977, MAO Archive.

Fig. 4.52: The Upper Gallery partitioned during *Tolly Cobbold: Eastern Arts Fourth National Exhibition*, 7 August-18 September 1983, installation view, MAO Archive.

Fig. 4.53: Middle One gallery during *Leon Kossoff: Paintings from a Decade 1970-1980*, 24 May-5 July 1981, installation view, MAO Archive.

Fig. 4.54: Newsletter [detail], November-December 1978, MAO Archive.

Fig. 4.55: Newsletter, November-December 1978, MAO Archive.

Illustrations

[Dispensation from consultation]

Bibliography

Archives

ACGB Archive, Blythe House
 MAO Archive, Modern Art Oxford
 MOMA Papers
 Bear Lane Gallery Papers
 Oxford Mail & Times Archive, Oxford
 Tate Archive, Tate Britain:
 ICA Papers
 Fluxshoe Collection
 John Piper Collection
 Tate Gallery Papers
 Whitechapel Art Gallery Archive, Whitechapel Art Gallery

Interviews

Armitage, Eileen, interview, (London, 7 March 2013)
 Clarke, Jeff, interview, (Oxford, 5 March 2014)
 Cooper, Michael, interview, (Modern Art Oxford, 13 February 2013)
 Crompton, Dennis, interview, (Modern Art Oxford, 22 May 2013)
 Elliott, David, interview, (Modern Art Oxford, 16 July 2014)
 Ganly, Helen, interview, (Oxford, 9 April 2014)
 Green, Trevor, interview, (London, 7 March 2013)
 Hoole, John, interview, (Oxford, 13 December 2013)
 Ibsen, Antoinette, interview, (Modern Art Oxford, 19 April 2012)
 ———, interview, (Oxford, 17 March 2014)
 King, David, interview, (London, 5 January 2016)
 Lane, Barry, interview, (Modern Art Oxford, 29 March 2013)
 Legge, Rupert, interview, (Bath, 16 November 2012)
 Lewis, Stuart, and Marya Lewis, interview, (Wootton, Oxfordshire, 24 September 2012)
 Nairne, Sandy, interview, (London, 20 May 2014)
 Pollen, Katharine, interview, (Bath, 5 December 2013)
 Rickaby, Tony, interview, (Institute of Contemporary Arts, 8 December 2011)
 Serota, Nicholas, interview, (Tate Britain, 7 July 2014)
 Stevens, Graham, interview, (Tate Britain, 28 January 2013)
 Walton, Andy, interview, (Oxford, 9 April 2014)

Published Materials

‘Whitechapel Gallery: Exhibitions 1950-Present’,
 <<http://www.whitechapelgallery.org/about-us/history/exhibitions-1950-present>>,
 [accessed 22 January 2012].
 ‘Tate Learn Online: Artist Placement Group’,
 <<http://www.tate.org.uk/learning/artistsinfocus/apg/>>, [accessed 15 March 2012].
 ‘Dating Bush House’, *Looking at Buildings*, 26 January 2009

- <<http://www.lookingatbuildings.org.uk/cities/bristol/bush-house/dating-bush-house.html>>, [accessed 11 May 2012].
- ‘Arnolfini Arts Centre Conversion’, *Looking at Buildings*, 26 January 2009
<<http://www.lookingatbuildings.org.uk/cities/bristol/bush-house/arnolfini-arts-centre-conversion.html>>, [accessed 11 May 2012].
- ‘Arnolfini History’, <<http://www.arnolfini.org.uk/pages/about/arnolfini-history>>, [accessed 11 May 2012].
- Central Advisory Council for Education (England), ‘Children and their Primary Schools: A Report’, (London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1967), *The History of Education in England*,
<<http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/plowden/plowden1967-1.html>> [accessed 2 September 2012].
- ‘Twiggy: A Biography’, <<http://www.twiggylawson.co.uk/biography.html>>, [accessed 10 December 2012].
- ‘British Pavilion in Venice: Timeline’, <<http://venicebiennale.britishcouncil.org/timeline>>, [accessed 23 July 2013].
- ‘Sir Nicholas Serota, CH Authorised Biography’, *Debrett’s People of Today*, <<http://www.debretts.com/people-of-today/profile/3380/Nicholas-Andrew-SEROTA>>, [accessed 29 August 2014].
- ‘Clocktower Productions: Mission + History’, <<http://clocktower.org/about>>, [accessed 4 November 2014].
- ‘Andrew Nairne Esq, Authorised Biography’, *Debrett’s People of Today*, <<http://www.debretts.com/people-of-today/profile/36565/Andrew-NAIRNE>>, [accessed 8 September 2015].
- ‘Plastic Grass’, *Tomorrow’s World*, BBC, 3 mins., (10 April 1968)
<<http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p0154mpj>> [accessed 10 September 2015].
- Forty Years of Modern Art: A Selection from British Collections, 1907-1947*, exh. cat., ICA, 10 February-6 March 1948.
- This is Tomorrow*, exh. cat., Whitechapel Art Gallery, 9 August-9 September 1956.
- Smoking and Health: A Report of The Royal College of Physicians on Smoking in Relation to Cancer of the Lung and Other Diseases*, (London: Royal College of Physicians 1962).
- Peter Stuyvesant Collectie*, exh. cat., Stedelijk Museum, 18 January-12 February 1962.
- ‘In the Picture’, *The Observer*, (22 December 1963).
- ‘Painters of the Urban World’, *The Times*, (2 April 1964), p. 16.
- Painting and Sculpture of a Decade ‘54-‘64*, exh. cat., Tate Gallery, April-June 1964.
- ‘Museum for the Visual Arts to Open Soon’, *Oxford Times*, (12 November 1965).
- ‘A Policy for the Arts: The First Steps’, Presented to Parliament by the Prime Minister by Command of Her Majesty, February 1965, (London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1965), House of Commons Parliamentary Papers Online, [accessed 14 May 2012.]
- ‘Industry as Art Patron’, *The Times*, (1 December 1965), p. 15.
- New Sculpture 1966*, exh. cat., MOMA, 1966.
- ‘Modern Art Shown to Best Advantage’, *Oxford Times*, (21 October 1966).
- ‘Warehouse Becomes a Museum’, *Oxford Mail*, (8 February 1966).
- ‘Bold Venture’, *Oxford Mail*, (19 October 1966).
- ‘Museum of Modern Art Oxford’, *Arts Review*, (August 1966).
- ‘Ono-Woman Show’, *International Times* vol. 1, no. 1, (14-27 October 1966) p. 3.
- ‘Unclassified Advertisements’, *International Times* vol. 1, no. 4, (28 November-11 December 1966), p. 11.

- 'Whitechapel's Good Idea Gone Stale', *The Times*, (20 July 1966), p. 6.
- 'Patronising - Who Cares?', *The Observer*, (20 February 1966), p. 23.
- British Pavilion XXXIII Venice Biennale 1966: 5 Young British Artists*, exh. cat., British Council, 1966.
- Archigram: Beyond Architecture*, exh. cat./poster, MOMA, 22 February-[?] 1967.
- Contemporary Italian art*, exh. cat., MOMA, 1967.
- Edition Art*, exh. cat., MOMA, 17 January-11 February 1967.
- Ventures*, exh. cat., Arts Council of Great Britain, 1967.
- CUBA!*, exh. cat., MOMA, 7 November-2 December 1967.
- Cuba! First London Exhibition of Contemporary Cuban Art*, exh. cat., Ewan Philipps Gallery (London), 1967.
- 'Modern Cuban Art', *The Times*, (13 September 1967).
- Light/Sound Workshop*, exh. cat./poster, MOMA, 28 November-23 December 1967.
- 'Exhibition by the Light/Sound Workshop at the Museum of Modern Art', *Politec*, (December 1967).
- British Weekly*, (15 February 1967).
- 'This Page is Part of Your Environment - Now Read On', *International Times* vol. 1, no. 10, (13-26 March 1967), pp. 7-10.
- Peter Stuyvesant Foundation presents its collection of Josef Herman Drawings*, exh. cat., Oxford University Press, Ely House, 29 June-29 September 1967.
- Recent British Painting from the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation*, exh. cat., Tate Gallery, 15 November-22 December 1967.
- Transatlantic Graphics 1960-67*, exh. cat., MOMA, 1968.
- CASSA: Fundamental Research at the Centre for Advanced Study of Science in Art*, exh. cat., MOMA, 4 March-1 April 1968.
- Stephen Willats: Visual Automatics and Visual Transmitters*, exh. cat., MOMA, 22 October-16 November 1968.
- 'Inflated PCV environment to be shown', *Oxford Times*, (11 October 1968).
- 'Showing It Off', *Cherwell* (6 November 1968).
- New Generation: Interim*, exh. cat., Whitechapel Art Gallery, April-May 1968.
- 'British Art Consultant to Visit College', *Wilmington News-Journal*, (2 March 1968), p. 5.
- 'Hornsey: The Flower Breaks the Concrete', *International Times* vol. 1, no. 34, (28 June 1968), n.p.
- 'Underground Voices: Jim Haynes, David Medalla, Jack H. Moore', *Circuit*, no. 5, (Winter 1968).
- Cherwell: The University Guide to Oxford 1969-70*, (Oxford: Oxford Student Publications, 1969).
- 'Other Scenes', *Oz*, ('& Other Scenes' special issue 1969), p. 3.
- Unlimited Art*, exh. cat./poster, MOMA, 16 April-10 May 1969.
- 'Art Preview', *Isis*, (19 January 1970).
- 'Modern Art', *Oxford Times*, (20 November 1970).
- 'Art Preview Ends in an Uproar', *The Observer*, (14 February 1971), p. 3.
- 'Over-involved', *Birmingham Post*, (15 February 1971).
- MULTIPLES and Kinetics*, exh. cat., MOMA and Bear Lane Gallery, 9 January-7 February 1971.
- Robert Morris*, exh. cat., Tate Gallery, 28 April-6 June 1971.
- 'Visitors Wreck Modern Art Show', *Birmingham Post*, (15 February 1971).
- 'POPA AT MOMA: What's On Off?? - Shall I Review the Preview or Preview the Show?', *What's On*, (February 1971).
- 'Important Idea', *Oxford Mail*, (16 February 1971).

- 'Gallery House', *Studio International* vol. 183, no. 943, (April 1972), p. 145.
- 'Visual Machinery', *The Cherwell*, (19 October 1972), p. 7.
- 'Oxford Students' Arts Council', *OSAC*, no. 3, (n.d. [December] 1972), p. 2.
- 'Letters to the Editor: When is a Conceptual Artist not an Artist?', *The Guardian*, (23 August 1972), p. 10.
- Seven Exhibitions*, exh. cat., Tate Gallery, 24 February-23 March 1972.
- 'Chairman MAO for Oxford', *The Guardian*, (29 April 1972), p. 11.
- 'Chairman Nick', *Oxford Mail*, (5 May 1972).
- Systems*, exh. cat., Arts Council of Great Britain, 1972-3.
- 'A Place of Many Parts', *The Cherwell*, (1 February 1973).
- Daniel Buren: Sanction of the Museum*, exh. cat., MOMA, 31 March-15 April 1973.
- 'Joseph Beuys at the Institute of Contemporary Arts', *Audio Arts* vol. 2, no. 1 side B, (November 1974).
- 'Chris Sadler reviews', *The Cherwell*, (23 October 1974).
- 'Peace, Quiet, Pictures and Coffee', *What's On in Oxford*, (20 October 1974).
- 'Memories of Threadbare Lane', *Southern Arts*, (March 1974).
- 'Juliet and the Sandwich, Spreading the Word', *Oxford Mail*, (2 March 1974).
- Joseph Beuys: The Secret Block for a Secret Person in Ireland*, exh. cat., MOMA, 7 April-12 May 1974.
- 'Joseph Beuys: Museum of Modern Art', *Oxford Times*, (26 April 1974).
- 'New Angle on Art', *Oxford Mail*, (21 October 1974).
- 'Oxford Seminar Packed', *Oxford Mail*, (11 May 1974).
- Cherwell Guide*, (Oxford, 1975).
- A Directory of Arts Centres in England, Scotland and Wales*, (London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1976).
- Klaus Rinke: Ex-hi-bi-tion*, exh. cat., MOMA, 11 January-15 February 1976.
- 'Editorial', *The Burlington Magazine* vol. 118, no. 877, (April 1976), pp. 187-88.
- Russian and Soviet Painting: An Exhibition from the Museums of the USSR*, exh. cat., Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1977.
- Jo Baer: Paintings 1962-1974*, exh. cat., MOMA, 16 October-20 November 1977.
- El Lissitzky 1890-1941*, exh. cat., MOMA, 12 June-10 July 1977.
- Sol LeWitt*, exh. cat., Museum of Modern Art (New York), 1978.
- The Inner Eye: Work Made in Psychiatric Hospitals*, exh. cat., MOMA, 15 January-19 February 1978.
- 'The State of British Art: Special Issue', *Studio International* vol. 194, no. 989, (February 1978).
- 'Rodchenko: Red, Rough and Ready', *Oxford Mail*, (17 February 1979).
- 'Moscow Trip Saves Art Show', *Oxford Mail*, (10 February 1979).
- Paul Neagu - Sculpture*, exh. cat., ICA, 6 July-5 August 1979.
- Alexander Rodchenko 1891-1956*, exh. cat., MOMA, 10 February-25 March 1979.
- 'Alexander Rodchenko', *Oxford Times*, (March 1979).
- 'Rodchenko: Red, Rough and Ready', *Oxford Mail*, (17 February 1979).
- 'Forging the Link Between Art and Revolution', *Socialist Press*, (28 February 1979), p. 8.
- Women's Images of Men*, exh. cat., ICA, 4-26 October 1980.
- Art of the Avant-Garde in Russia: Selections from the George Costakis Collection*, exh. cat., The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, September 1981.
- 'Museum of the Year Award Winners', *Illustrated London News*, (31 July 1982), p. 22.
- Mayakovsky: Twenty Years of Work*, exh. cat., MOMA, 6 March-2 May 1982.
- 'Anti-Racist or Multi-Cultural Education', *Festival Extra*, (November 1982) p. 1.
- 'Gala Opening', *Festival Review*, no. 1, (March 1982).

- Six Indian Painters*, exh. cat., Tate Gallery, 7 April-23 May 1982.
- 'Art on Show', *Oxford Mail Extra*, (26 June 1982), p. 3.
- 'Aditi: A Resounding Success', *India Today*, (30 September 1982), p. 142.
- The Other India: Seven Contemporary Photographers*, MOMA, 15 August-3 October 1982.
- Литературная газета*, Mayakovsky memorial edition [reprint], 17 April 1930, MOMA, 1982.
- Beyond Image: Boyle Family*, exh. cat., Hayward Gallery, 1 November 1986-25 January 1987.
- 'The Curators', *Artline*, (13 May 1988).
- 100 Years of Russian Art 1989-1989: From Private Collections in the USSR*, exh. cat., MOMA, 30 July-17 September 1989.
- Reconstitution: Christian Boltanski*, (London: Whitechapel Gallery, 1990).
- 'Introduction', in *Thinking About Exhibitions*, ed. by Reesa Greenberg, Bruce W. Ferguson and Sandy Nairne, (London: Routledge, 1996).
- 'A Dialogue Between David Sylvester and Michael Compton', *Tate Magazine*, no. 12, (Spring 1997).
- Joseph Beuys: The Secret Block for a Secret Person in Ireland*, exh. cat., Royal Academy of Arts, 22 July-16 September 1999.
- The Whitechapel Art Gallery Centenary Review*, (London: Whitechapel Art Gallery, 2001).
- Justin Knowles*, (Prague: National Technical Museum, 2002).
- Richard Long: Walking and Marking*, (Edinburgh: National Galleries of Scotland, 2007).
- Nought to Sixty*, exh. cat., ICA, May-November 2008.
- A Manual for the 21st Century Art Institution*, (London: Whitechapel Art Gallery, 2009).
- 'Tate Shots - UBS Openings - Long Weekend 2009 - Robert Morris', 1 June 2009, <<http://www.tate.org.uk/context-comment/video/long-weekend-09-robert-morris>>, [accessed 25 July 2014].
- 'Obituary: Nick Waterlow', *The Telegraph*, (25 November 2009).
- Bauhaus 1919-1933: Workshops for Modernity*, exh. cat., MoMA, November 8 2009-January 25 2010.
- 'David Curtis & Bidy Peppin and The London Arts Lab', conference paper, 2011, <<https://vimeo.com/38641665>>, [accessed 9 November 2015].
- Light Years: Conceptual Art and the Photograph*, exh. cat., Art Institute of Chicago, 13 December 2011-11 March 2012.
- The Individual and the Organisation: Artist Placement Group 1966-1979*, exh. cat., Raven Row, 27 September-16 December 2012.
- 'In Conversation: Rosalind Krauss with Yve-Alain Bois', *The Brooklyn Rail*, (February 2013) n.p.
- Light Show*, exh. cat., Hayward Gallery, 30 January-6 May 2013.
- 'Editorial: Cultural Revolution', *N+1*, no. 16, (April 2013), n.p.
- A.H. (Andrew Hutton), 'New World Takes Over Gallery', *Oxford Mail*, (9 December 1969).
- Adams, Hugh, 'Alexander Rodchenko: The Simple and the Commonplace', *Artforum*, (Summer 1979).
- Agis, Maurice, and Peter Jones, *Space Place*, exh. cat., MOMA, 28 November-24 December 1966.
- , *Spaceplace*, exh. cat., Stedelijk Museum, 23 September-15 October 1967.
- , 'Theo van Doesburg is of Today', *Form*, no. 9, (April 1969) pp. 14-17.
- , 'Spaceplace', *Studio International* vol. 183, no. 940, (January 1972) pp. 34-7.
- Alberro, Alexander 'The Turning of the Screw: The Sixth Guggenheim International Exhibition, Daniel Buren, and the New Cultural Conservatism' (MA thesis,

- University of British Columbia, 1990).
- Alberro, Alexander, 'The Turn of the Screw: Daniel Buren, Dan Flavin, and the Sixth Guggenheim International Exhibition', *October* vol. 80, (1997) pp. 57-84.
- , *Conceptual Art and the Politics of Publicity*, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press 2003).
- Altshuler, Bruce, *The Avant-garde in Exhibition: New Art in the 20th Century*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).
- , *Biennials and Beyond: Exhibitions that Made Art History, 1962-2002*, (London: Phaidon, 2013).
- Amaya, Mario, 'The Stuyvesant Contribution', *Financial Times*, (21 November 1967), p. 36.
- , 'Britain's New Generation', *New Republic*, (29 June 1968).
- Anderson, Simon, 'FLUXUS, FLUXION, FLUXSHOE: THE 1970s', in *Fluxus Reader*, ed. by Ken Friedman, (London: Academy Editions, 1998).
- Anthony, Evan, 'Independence Declaration', *The Spectator*, (8 May 1971), p. 639.
- Araeen, Rasheed, 'Postscript [1989]', in *Art and Its Histories: A Reader*, ed. by Steve Edwards, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999).
- , 'Dak'art 1992-2002', *Third Text* vol. 17, no. 1, (2003), pp. 93-106.
- , 'A New Beginning: Beyond Postcolonial Cultural Theory and Identity Politics', *Third Text* vol. 14, no. 50, (19 June 2008), pp. 3-20.
- , 'Magicians of the Earth: On 'Magiciens de la Terre' [1989]', in *Exhibition*, ed. by Lucy Steeds, (London: Whitechapel Gallery, 2014), pp. 129-135.
- Araeen, Rasheed, Guy Brett, Avinash Chandra, David Coxhead, Avtarjeet Dhanjal, Susan Hiller, Balraj Khanna, and Tim Scott, '[Correspondence]', *Art Monthly*, no. 41, (December 1980-January 1981) p. 30.
- Araeen, Rasheed, Guy Brett, Avinash Chandra, David Coxhead, Avtarjeet Dhanjal, Susan Hiller, Balraj Khanna, Tim Scott, and Caroline Tisdall, 'Does India Have No Present?', *Art Monthly*, no. 40, (November 1980), p. 22.
- Archer, Michael, *Art Since 1960*, (London: Thames and Hudson, 1997).
- Armistead, Claire, 'The Inner Eye', *Isis*, (2 February 1978).
- Arts Council of Great Britain, *Jackson Pollock: Drawing Into Painting*, exh. cat., MOMA, 1 April-13 May 1979.
- Arts Council of Great Britain, and Ministry of Culture of the USSR, *Art in Revolution: Soviet Art and Design Since 1917*, exh. cat., Hayward Gallery, 26 February-18 April 1971.
- Ascherson, Neal, 'Journey into a Tormented Ego', *Observer Supplement*, (7 March 1982).
- Ault, Julie, 'For the Record', in *Alternative Art, New York, 1965-1985*, ed. by Julie Ault, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002).
- Bainbridge, David, 'Art: MOMA', *Isis*, (6 February 1974).
- Bakhtin, Mikhail, 'Popular-Festive Forms and Images in Rabelais [excerpt]', in *(Mis)reading Masquerade*, ed. by Iberia Perez and Frederique Bergholtz, (Berlin: Revolver, 2010).
- Banham, Reyner, 'It was SRO - And a Disaster', *New York Times*, (23 May 1971), p. D28.
- Barker, Dennis, 'Tate: Where the Action Was', *The Guardian*, (4 May 1971), p. 1.
- Barnard, Alfred, *Noted Breweries of Great Britain and Ireland*. vol. 3, (London: Sir Joseph Causton & Sons, 1889-91).
- Bazarov, Konstantin, 'A Versatile Pioneer', *Art and Artists*, (April 1979).
- Beck, Martin, 'Alternative: Space', in *Alternative Art New York 1965-1985*, ed. by Julie Ault, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2002), pp. 249-279.
- Beechey, James, 'Mark Glazebrook obituary', *The Guardian*, (22 December 2009).
- Bell, David A., 'A World Connecting, Reviewed: Historians Overuse the Network

- Metaphor', *New Republic*, (25 October 2013), n.p.
- Belting, Hans, Andrea Buddensieg, and Peter Weibel, eds., *The Global Contemporary and the Rise of New Art Worlds* (Karlsruhe, Germany: ZKM, Center for Art and Media, 2013).
- Benedict, Burton, 'International Exhibitions and National Identity', *Anthropology Today* vol. 7, no. 3, (June 1991), pp. 5-9.
- Benthall, Jonathan, 'Varieties of Industrial Experience', *Studio International* vol. 183, no. 940, (January 1972), p. 8.
- Berger, Maurice, *Labyrinths: Robert Morris, Minimalism, and the 1960s*, (New York: Harper & Row, 1989).
- Berndes, Christiane, 'Replicas and Reconstructions in Twentieth-Century Art', *Tate Papers*, (Autumn 2007), n.p.
- Betz, Margaret Bridget, '[Reviews]', *Art Journal* vol. 40, no. 1/2, (Autumn-Winter 1980), pp. 417-21.
- Bhabha, Homi, 'Contemporary Indian Art at the Festival of India', *Art Monthly*, no. 61, (November 1982).
- Bhabha, Homi, and Sutapa Biswas, 'The Wrong Story', in *Art and Its Histories: A Reader*, ed. by Steve Edwards, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).
- Bhutto, Benazir, 'China Revisited', *The Cherwell*, (6 February 1974 1974), p. 4.
- Bijvoet, Marga, 'How Intimate can Art and Technology really be? A Survey of the Art and Technology Movement of the Sixties', in *Culture, Technology and Creativity in the Late Twentieth Century*, ed. by Philip Hayward, (London: Libbey, 1990), pp. 15-37.
- Bird, Jon, 'Minding the Body: Robert Morris' 1971 Tate Gallery Retrospective', in *Rewriting Conceptual Art*, ed. by Michael Newman and Jon Bird, (Chicago: Reaktion Books, 1999), pp. 88-106.
- Bishop, Claire, 'Art of the Encounter: Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics', *Circa*, no. 114, (Winter 2005), pp. 32-35.
- , 'But Is It Installation Art?', *Tate Etc.*, (1 January 2005), n.p.
- , *Installation Art: A Critical History*, (London: Tate, 2005).
- , 'Introduction: Viewers as Producers', in *Participation*, ed. by Claire Bishop, (London: Whitechapel Art Gallery, 2006).
- , 'Rate of Return', *Artforum* vol. 49, no. 2, (1 October 2010).
- , 'Shows of Force', *Artforum* vol. 52, no. 7, (March 2014), pp. 77-78.
- Blee, Michael, 'Cybernetic Serendipity – the computer and the arts; at the Institute of Contemporary Arts until October 20', *Studio International* vol. 176, no. 903, (September 1968).
- Bois, Yve-Alain, 'Force Fields: Phases of the Kinetic', *Artforum* vol. 39, no. 3, (November 2000).
- Boltanski, Christian, and Catherine Grenier, *The Possible Life of Christian Boltanski*, trans. Marc Lowenthal, (Boston: MFA Publications, 2009).
- Bolton, Richard, 'Enlightened Self-Interest: The Avant-Garde in the '80s', [1989] in *Art, Activism & Oppositionality: Essays from Afterimage*, ed. by Grant H. Kester, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998), pp. 23-50.
- Bonhams, *British Paintings of the 50's and 60's: The Property of The Peter Stuyvesant Foundation*, auction catalogue, 29 July 1989.
- Bosmelet, Robert de, 'Time You Started Living', *Cherwell*, (1 March 1967).
- Boubnova, Iara, '[untitled]', in *The Manifesta Decade*, ed. by Barbara Vanderlinden and Elena Filipovic, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005).
- Bourdieu, Pierre, and Alain Darbel, *The Love of Art: European Art Museums and their Public*, trans. Caroline Beattie and Nick Merriman, (Cambridge: Polity

- Press, 1991).
- Bowen, Denis, 'Space Place... Mayrice Agis [sic] and Peter Jones', *Arts Review*, (10 December 1966).
- Boyle, Mark, 'Background to a Series of Events at the ICA', *ICA Bulletin*, no. 147, (May 1965), p. 6.
- Brake, Mike, *Comparative Youth Culture: The Sociology of Youth Cultures and Youth Subcultures in America, Britain, and Canada*, (London; Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985).
- Breckenridge, Carol A., 'The Aesthetics and Politics of Colonial Collecting: India at World Fairs', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* vol. 31, no. 2, (1989), pp. 195-216.
- Brett, Guy, *Kinetic Art*, (London: Studio-Vista, 1968).
- , 'Modern Art at Oxford', *The Times*, (27 March 1968), p. 14.
- , 'Mixed Metaphors', *The Times*, (9 June 1970), p. 8.
- , 'Just a Few Hours of Participation', *The Times*, (16 February 1971), p. 10.
- , 'Heavy Weights', *The Times*, (28 April 1971), p. 10.
- , 'Channelling Energy', *The Times*, (11 May 1971), p. 11.
- , 'The Revolutionary Leap into Space', *The Times*, (26 February 1971), p. 11.
- , 'Forward with the Avant-Garde', *The Times*, (29 August 1972), p. 6.
- , 'The Sixties Art Scene in London (review)', *Third Text* vol. 7, no. 23, (1993) pp. 121-23.
- , *Exploding Galaxies: The Art of David Medalla*, (London: Kala Press, 1995).
- , 'Helio Oiticica', *Tate Papers*, (Autumn 2007), n.p.
- , 'Recollection', in *Oiticica in London*, ed. by Guy Brett and Luciano Figueiredo, (London: Tate Publishing, 2007).
- , '1 + 1 = 0: the painting of Yi Yuan-Chia', *Studio International*, (July-August, 1969).
- Brisley, Stuart, 'And For Today... Nothing',
<http://www.stuartbrisley.com/pages/27/70s/Works/And_for_today___nothing/page:7>, [accessed 11 December 2014].
- , 'Environments', *Studio International* vol. 177, no. 912, (June 1969) pp. 266-8.
- British American Tobacco (South Africa), 'Our History', 9 May 2013
<http://www.batsa.co.za/group/sites/BAT_7N3ML8.nsf/vwPagesWebLive/DO7N5JZ4?opendocument&SKN=1>, [accessed 23 July 2013].
- Brittain, David, *Creative Camera: Thirty Years of Writing*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999).
- Brivati, Brian, 'Goodman, Arnold Abraham, Baron Goodman (1913–1995)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press.
- Brougher, Kerry, and Michael Tarantino, *Enclosed and Enchanted*, exh. cat., Museum of Modern Art Oxford, 16 July-8 October 2000.
- Brown, Lizzie, 'Yard Space: An Architectural Study of an Oxford Art Box' (BA thesis, University of Oxford, 2012).
- Brown, Rebecca M., 'A Distant Contemporary: Indian Twentieth-Century Art in the Festival of India', *The Art Bulletin* vol. 96, no. 3, (2014) pp. 338-56.
- Brundin, Judy, 'Artists Put Ideas First...', *Oxford Mail*, (23 May 1973).
- , 'Stark and Stern', *Oxford Mail*, (18 May 1976).
- , 'El Lissitzky', *Arts Review*, (24 June 1977).
- , 'Therapy as Art', *Oxford Mail*, (24 January 1978).
- Bryan-Wilson, Julia, 'Robert Morris' Art Strike (2009)', ed. by Julia Bryan-Wilson, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2013).

- Buchanan, Tom, *East Wind: China and the British Left, 1925-1976*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
- Buchloh, Benjamin H. D., 'Allegorical Procedures: Appropriation and Montage in Contemporary Art', *Artforum* vol. XXI, no. 1, (September 1982), pp. 43-56.
- , 'Conceptual Art 1962-1969: From the Aesthetic of Administration to the Critique of Institutions', *October* vol. 55, (1990), pp. 105-43.
- , 'Gerhard Richter's "Atlas": The Anomic Archive', *October* vol. 88, (Spring 1999), pp. 117-45.
- Buchloh, Benjamin H. D., Rosalind Krauss, and Annette Michelson, 'Joseph Beuys at the Guggenheim', *October* vol. 12, (1980), pp. 3-21.
- Budge, Gavin, 'Poverty and the Picture Gallery: The Whitechapel Exhibitions and the Social Project of Ruskinian Aesthetics', *Visual Culture in Britain* vol. 1 no. 2, (2000), pp. 43-56.
- Bull, Malcolm, 'Green Cabinet, White Cube', *New Left Review*, (March-April 2010), pp. 84-97.
- Burchardi, Julie, 'Modernism – The Contested Terrain: An historical examination of the Museum of Modern Art in Oxford' (MA thesis, Courtauld Institute, University of London, 1997).
- Buren, Daniel, 'Function of Architecture: Notes on Work in Connection with the Places Where it is Installed Taken between 1967 and 1976, Some of Which are Specially Summarised Here [1975]', in *Thinking About Exhibitions*, ed. by Reesa Greenberg, Bruce W. Ferguson and Sandy Nairne, (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 313-319.
- Burnham, Jack, 'Art and Technology: The Panacea That Failed', in *Myths of Information: Technology and Postindustrial Culture*, ed. by Kathleen Woodward, (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, 1980).
- Burroughs, William S., 'the invisible generation', *International Times* vol. 1, no. 3, (14-17 November 1966).
- Butler, Judith, 'Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory', *Theatre Journal* vol. 40, no. 4, (December 1988) pp. 519-31.
- , *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, (New York: Routledge, 1990).
- C., R., '[untitled]', *The Cherwell*, (5 November 1974).
- Calderoni, Irene, 'Creating Shows: Some Notes on Exhibition Aesthetics at the End of the Sixties', in *Curating Subjects* ed. by Paul O'Neill, (London: Open Editions, 2011), pp. 63-79.
- Caute, David, *The Dancer Defects: The Struggle for Cultural Supremacy During the Cold War*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).
- Celant, Germano, *When Attitudes Become Form: Bern 1969/Venice 2013*, exh. cat., Fondazione Prada, 1 June-3 November 2013.
- Chaitkin, Bill, 'Rodchenko in Oxford and Magritte in Paris', *Architectural Design*, no. 7, (1979).
- Chambers, Eddie, 'Black Artists White Institutions: Mainstream Capers', *Artrage: Intercultural Arts Magazine*, no. 14, (Autumn 1986), pp. 31-34.
- Chalk, Warren, 'Architecture as Consumer Product', *Archigram Archival Project*, 1965, <<http://archigram.westminster.ac.uk/essay.php?id=281>>, [accessed 5 April 2013].
- Chapman, Simon, *Great Expectations: Advertising and the Tobacco Industry*, (London: Comedia Publishing Group, 1986).
- Clark, T. J., *Image of the People: Gustave Courbet and the 1848 Revolution*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973).
- , 'Farewell to an Idea [2001]', in *Art of the Twentieth Century: A Reader*, ed. by

- Paul Wood and Jason Gaiger, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003).
- Clark, T. J., Christopher Gray, Donald Nicholson-Smith, and Charles Radcliffe, *The Revolution of Modern Art and the Modern Art of Revolution [1967]*, (London: Chronos Publications, 2003).
- Clarke, Jeff, 'Bear Lane's Troubles', *Studio International* vol. 182, no. 983, (November 1971).
- Cohen, Jean-Louis, *The Future of Architecture Since 1889*, (London: Phaidon, 2012).
- Cole, Ian, *Enclosed and Enchanted: Exhibition Guide*, (Oxford: Museum of Modern Art, 2000).
- Coleman, Terry, 'Egotrips for Editors', *The Guardian*, (25 May 1968), p. 7.
- Colomina, Beatriz, *Clip, Stamp, Fold: The Radical Architecture of Little Magazines 196x 197x*, (Barcelona: ACTAR Publishers, 2010).
- Compton, Michael, 'My Part in the Development and Work of Tate Education', *Tate Encounters*, 2009, <<http://process.tateencounters.org/?p=170>>, [accessed 23 October 2014].
- Compton, Susan P., Edwin Morgan, and Edward Braun, *Vladimir Mayakovsky: Three Views*, (Oxford: Prometheus Press, 1982).
- Cook, Peter, 'Zoom and 'Real' Architecture', in *ARCHIGRAM* ed. by Peter Cook and Archigram Group, (New York: Praeger, 1973).
- Cook, Peter, and Archigram Group, eds., *ARCHIGRAM* (New York: Praeger, 1973).
- Coonan, Rory, 'Paul Nash: Photographs, Museum of Modern Art', *The Cherwell*, (6 March 1974).
- Corse, Edward, *Battle for Neutral Europe: British Cultural Propaganda During the Second World War*, (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013).
- Cotter, Suzanne, *Daniel Buren: Intervention II Works in Situ*, exh. cat., MAO, 4 November-28 January 2007.
- Cotterell, David, 'Squaring the Circle: Examining Cultural Value through a Re-evaluation of Arts Lab', 2014, <<https://culturalvalueproject.wordpress.com/2014/07/25/david-cotterell-squaring-the-circle-examining-cultural-value-through-a-re-evaluation-of-arts-lab/>>, [accessed 16 September 2015].
- Cranfield, Ben, 'Students, Artists and the ICA: The Revolution Within', in *Sixties Radicalism and Social Movement Activism: Retreat or Resurgence?*, ed. by Bryn Jones and Mike O'Donnell, 2010).
- , 'Between Consensus and Anxiety: Curating Transparency at the ICA of the 1950s', *Journal of Curatorial Studies* vol. 1, no. 1, (2012), pp. 83-100.
- , "'Not Another Museum': The Search for Contemporary Connection", *Journal of Visual Culture* vol. 12, no. 313, (August 2013), pp. 313-31.
- Cranfield, Ben, Sebastian Boyle, Jessica Morgan, Louise Hojer, Ricarda Vidal, and Marko Daniel, 'Fun and Games: The Gallery as Adult Play Centre', conference recording, 2008, <<https://www.ica.org.uk/whats-on/fun-and-games-gallery-adult-play-centre>>, [accessed 1 April 2013].
- Crimp, Douglas, 'On the Museum's Ruins', *October* vol. 13, (Summer 1980) pp. 41-57.
- Crow, Thomas E., *The Rise of the Sixties: American and European Art in the Era of Dissent*, (London: Laurence King, 2004).
- Cullinane, John, 'Real World Comes to Oxford Shock: Co-Residence', *The Cherwell*, (5 November 1974).
- Curtis, Penelope and Keith Wilson, *Modern British Sculpture*, (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2011).
- D.E.G., 'First, There was a "Ping"', *Oxford Times*, (23 December 1966).
- , 'Paintings from Two Communist Schools', *Oxford Mail*, (8 November 1967).

- , ‘Contrasting Styles’, *Oxford Mail*, (11 May 1968).
- Danzker, Jo-Anne Birnie, ‘Organisational Apartheid’, *Third Text* vol. 5, no. 13, (1991), pp. 85-95.
- Davies, Nick, ‘Margaret meets the Mods and Rockers’, *Daily Mirror*, (10 April 1964), p. 3.
- Davies, Sarah, ‘The Soft Power of Anglia: British Cold War Cultural Diplomacy in the USSR’, *Contemporary British History* vol. 27, no. 3, (2013), pp. 297-323.
- Davis, Colin, ‘Hauntology, Spectres and Phantoms’, *French Studies* vol. 59, no. 3, (2005), pp. 373-79.
- de Bosmelet, Robert, ‘A Gallery for Everyone: The Museum of Modern Art’, *Cherwell*, (26 October 1966).
- de Bruyn, Eric C. H., ‘Ghost Story’, *Artforum*, (September 2012).
- Debord, Guy, *The Society of the Spectacle*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. 11th edn., (New York: Zone Books, 2012).
- Deighton, Elizabeth, ‘A Lesson to be Learned from the Death of Bear Lane’, *Oxford Mail*, (14 January 1974).
- Demarco, Richard, ‘A Rare Kind of Madness in Edinburgh’, *Art and Artists* vol. 10, (January 1969), pp. 25-7.
- Demarco, Richard, Alexander Maris, and Susan Maris, *Friday 8 May*, (Edinburgh: Morning Star, 2003).
- Demos, T. J., ‘The Tate Effect’, in *The Global Art World: Audiences, Markets and Museums*, ed. by Hans Belting, Andrea Buddensieg and Peter Weibel, (Karlsruhe, Germany: ZKM, Center for Art and Media, 2009), pp. 78-87.
- DeRoo, Rebecca J., ‘Christian Boltanski’s Memory Images: Remaking French Museums in the Aftermath of ‘68’, *Oxford Art Journal* vol. 27, no. 2, (2004), pp. 221-38.
- Desai, Anita, ‘The Rage for the Raj: How the Festival of India Lost India’, *New Republic* vol. 193, no. 22, (25 November 1985), pp. 26-30.
- Desai, Niranjana, ‘The Festival of India in Britain, 1982’, *The Round Table: The Commonwealth Journal of International Affairs* vol. 72, no. 287, (July 1983), pp. 286-91.
- Descartes, Rene, ‘Meditations 1 and 2’, John Cottingham, Robert Stoothoff and Dugald Murdoch, in *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1641).
- Dessauce, Marc, ed., *The Inflatable Moment* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1999).
- Dezeuze, Anna, ‘“Do-it-yourself Artworks”: A User’s Guide’, in *Dead History, Live Art? Spectacle, Subjectivity and Subversion in Visual Culture since the 1960s*, ed. by Jonathan Harris, (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2007).
- , ed., *The ‘Do-it-Yourself’ Artwork: Participation from Fluxus to New Media, Rethinking Art’s Histories* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010).
- di Lecce, Claudia, ‘Avant-garde Marketing: ‘When Attitudes Become Form’ and Philip Morris’s Sponsorship’, in *Exhibiting the New Art: ‘Op Losse Schroeven’ and ‘When Attitudes Become Form’ 1969*, ed. by Christian Rattemeyer, (London: Afterall, 2010), pp. 220-9.
- Digby, Simon, ‘Indian Summer: A Review of Some Exhibitions Held as Part of the Festival of India’, *Oxford Art Journal* vol. 5, no. 1, (1982), pp. 68-70.
- Digby-Firth, Chris, ‘Art’, *Cherwell*, ([November/December] 1968).
- Donnellan, Caroline, ‘Establishing Tate Modern: Vision and Patronage’ (PhD thesis, London School of Economics, 2013).
- Dormer, Peter, ‘Mistaken Identities’, *Art Monthly*, no. 35, (1980), p. 28.
- Drower, Jill, ‘The Exploding Galaxy’, *Third Text* vol. 22, no. 2, (March 2008) pp. 229-36.

- , *99 Balls Pond Road: The Story of the Exploding Galaxy*, (London: Scrudge Books, 2014).
- Dugger, John, and N. P. James, 'John Dugger: Ergonic Sculpture and Other Works', (2011), *Cv/Visual Arts Research Series*,
<https://books.google.co.uk/books/about/John_Dugger_Ergonic_Sculpture_and_others.html?id=J8N0VvPD5CoC&hl=en>, [accessed 14 November 2015].
- Dumble, Rosemary, 'Secret Block for a Secret Person', *The Cherwell*, (1 May 1974).
- Duncan, Carol, *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*, (London; New York: Routledge, 1995).
- Durgnat, Raymond, 'Watch this Space-Place', *International Times* vol. 1, no. 5, (12-15 December 1966), p. 10.
- Durrans, Brian, 'Handicrafts, Ideology and the Festival of India', *South Asia Research* vol. 2, no. 1, (May 1982), pp. 13-22.
- , 'Competitive Pragmatism: Organising the 1982 Festival of India in Britain', *History and Anthropology* vol. 6, no. 1, (1992), pp. 23-45.
- Eagleton, Terry, and Drew Milne, *Marxist Literary Theory: A Reader*, (Oxford: Blackwell 1996).
- Edelman, Lee, 'The Future Is Kid Stuff: Queer Theory, Disidentification, and the Death Drive', *Narrative* vol. 6, no. 1, (January 1998), pp. 18-30.
- Ehrenzweig, Anton, *The Hidden Order of Art: A Study in the Psychology of Artistic Imagination*, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1967).
- Elliott, David, *Germany in Ferment*, exh. cat., G. Bailes & Son Ltd., 16 October-6 November 1970.
- , 'Gallery Policies: Oxford', *Art Monthly*, (December 1976-January 1977).
- , 'The Museum of Modern Art', *Oxford Art Journal* vol. 1, no. 1, (1978).
- , 'The Art of MOMA', *Southern Arts*, (November 1982) pp. 4-5.
- , *New Worlds: Russian Art and Society, 1900-1937*, (London: Thames & Hudson, 1986).
- , 'Medium for What?', *Museums Journal* vol. 87, no. 2, (September 1987) pp. 79-80.
- , *Rodchenko as Photographer: Works from the Collection of the Museum of Modern Art, Oxford: National Art Gallery Touring Exhibition 1988-89*, (Wellington, New Zealand, 1988).
- , 'Correspondence: On Misrepresenting Makonde', *Art Monthly*, no. 131, (November 1989).
- , 'MOMA Twenty Five Years On', in *Arts Review Yearbook*, (London: Gainsborough Ralston, 1991).
- , 'Waiting for Muzot', *Kunst & Museumjournaal* vol. 2, no. 5, (1991).
- , 'Framing the Frontiers: Museum as Mediator', *Kunst & Museumjournaal* vol. 4, no. 2, (1992), pp. 45-48.
- , 'Framing the Frontiers: Definitions of Modern and Modernist Art', in *Art, Anthropology and the Modes of Re-presentation: Museums and Contemporary Non-western Art*, ed. by Harrie Leyten and Bibi Damen, (Amsterdam: Royal Tropical Institute of the Netherlands, 1993).
- , 'Art, Power and Curatorial Practise', in *Stopping the Process? Contemporary Views on Art and Exhibitions*, (Helsinki: Nordic Institute for Contemporary Art, 1998).
- , 'Still Waiting for Muzot', conference paper, 17 May 2008,
<http://www.aaa.org.hk/shiftingsites/download/David_Elliott_eng.pdf>, [accessed 1 April 2015].
- , 'Curriculum Vitae', 2012,

- <<http://www.resartis2012tokyo.com/en/spekers/img/DavidElliott.pdf>>, [accessed 6 August 2015].
- Elliott, David, Ebrahim Alkazi, and Victor Musgrave, *Aspects of Modern Indian Art*, exh. cat., MOMA, 27 June-8 August 1982.
- Elliott, David, and Julia Elliott, *Gods of the Byways: Wayside Shrines of Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat*, exh. cat., MOMA, 9 May-20 June 1982.
- Elliott, D. S., 'Brittany and the Concept of Primitivism in France during the Nineteenth Century' (MA thesis, Courtauld Institute, University of London, 1973).
- Esche, Charles, 'Making Art Global: A Good Place or a No Place?', in *Making Art Global (Part 1): The Third Havana Biennial 1989*, ed. by Rachel Weiss, (London: Afterall, 2011).
- Eshun, Ekow, Pamela Jahn and Martha Pym, *How Soon is Now: 60 Years of the Institute of Contemporary Arts*, (London: ICA, 2008).
- Everitt, Anthony, 'Multiples and Kinetics from Galerie Denise Rene', *Arts Review*, (30 January 1970).
- , 'Now It's Spectator Participation...', *Birmingham Post*, (13 February 1971).
- , 'Popa at Moma: Pioneers of Part-Art', *Birmingham Post*, (15 February 1971).
- , 'Report from the Midlands', *Studio International* vol. 183, no. 941, (February 1972).
- Evvett, David, "'Paradice's Only Map": The "Topos" of the "Locus Amoenus" and the Structure of Marvell's "Upon Appleton House"', *PMLA* vol. 85, no. 3, (1970), pp. 504-13.
- Ewans, P. A., 'Egg in an Armpit! (But is it Art?)', *The Cherwell*, (29 January 1975), pp. 4-5.
- F.W.D., 'Modern Art Museum's Exhibition Plans', *Oxford Times*, (13 October 1967).
- , 'Light and Sound Workshop', *Oxford Times*, (8 December 1967).
- , 'Douglas Huebler', *Oxford Times*, (11 May 1973).
- , 'Museum of Modern Art', *Oxford Times*, (20 December 1974).
- , 'Photographs and Lithographs', *Oxford Times*, (24 January 1975).
- Fabre, Gladys C., and Doris Wintgens Høette, *Van Doesburg & The International Avant-Garde: Constructing A New World*, exh. cat., Tate, 4 February-16 May 2009.
- Farley, Steve, 'Soviet Photographs - The World According to The State', *The Advocate*, (18 September 1985).
- Farquharson, Alex, 'Bureaux de Change', *Frieze*, no. 101, (September 2006).
- Faulkner, Simon, 'Art, Cigarettes and Visual Culture in the Sixties: the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation and the 'New Generation' Exhibitions, 1964-66', *Visual Culture in Britain* vol. 1, no. 1, (2000), pp. 65-87.
- Fawcett, Anthony, 'Oxford Art Museum', *Studio International* vol. 172, no. 881, (September 1966) p. 114.
- , 'Regeneration', *Isis*, (26 October 1966).
- , 'Communist Art in Oxford', *Isis*, (15 November 1967).
- , 'Art: New Ideas Reach Oxford', *Isis*, (29 November 1967).
- Fay, Stephen, 'The Eye of the Beholder', *The Independent*, (28 November 1993).
- Feaver, William, 'London Letter: Summer', *Art International* vol. XVI, no. 9, (November 1972).
- , 'Art: The Regional Canvas', *Vogue*, (September 1975), p. 36.
- , 'Blazing Away in Red', *The Observer*, (18 February 1979), p. 14.
- , 'Leaves from India', *The Observer*, (26 September 1982), p. 32.
- , 'Stepping on the Throttle', *The Observer* 1982), p. 32.
- , 'Oxford Blues: A Parable of Memorable Surprises', *Vogue* vol. 154, no. 4, (April 1990).

- Ferguson, William, 'Propaganda at its Stodgiest', *Times Educational Supplement*, (22 January 1982).
- Fernández, María, 'Detached from HiStory: Jasia Reichardt and Cybernetic Serendipity', *Art Journal* vol. 67, no. 3, (2008).
- Field, Simon, 'Robert Morris-Sculpturestar', *Time Out*, (7-13 May 1971).
- Filson, Frances, 'Come Into the Fog, Man and Grab a Handful of Art', *Oxford Mail*, (20 November 1968).
- Fitzpatrick, Sheila, 'A Spy in the Archives', *London Review of Books* vol. 32, no. 2, (December 2010), pp. 3-8.
- Floe, Hilary, 'Are You Afraid of the Light?' *Spectacular Aesthetics at the Museum of Modern Art Oxford 1967-1968*, (Oxford: MAO, 2013).
- , "'Everything Was Getting Smashed": Three Case Studies of Play and Participation, 1965-71', *Tate Papers*, no. 22, (Autumn 2014), n.p.
- Foet, Cees, and Sotheby's Amsterdam, "'A Fifty-Year Adventure in Art": Sotheby's to Sell 'The Former Peter Stuyvesant Collection' 1960-2010', press release, 16 December 2009, <http://www.batartventure.com/uk/download/persbericht_15.pdf>, [accessed 25 February 2013].
- Follin, Frances, *Embodied Visions: Bridget Riley, Op Art and the Sixties* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2004).
- Foote, Nancy, 'Review: Michael Asher, The Clocktower', *Artforum* vol. XIV, no. 10, (June 1976) pp. 64-5.
- , 'The Apotheosis of the Crummy Space', *Artforum* vol. XV, no. 2, (October 1976) pp. 28-37.
- Forrest, Andrew, 'Popa at Moma', *Art and Artists* vol. 6, no. 3, (June 1971).
- Foster, Hal, 'The "Primitive" Unconscious of Modern Art', *October* vol. 34, (1985) pp. 45-70.
- , *The Return of the Real: The Avant-Garde at the End of the Century*, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1996).
- , 'Design and Crime', in *Design and Crime*, (London: Verso, 2002).
- , 'An Archival Impulse', *October* vol. 110, (Autumn 2004), pp. 3-22.
- Foulkes, Nicholas, 'Show of Strength', *Financial Times*, (9 March 2002).
- Fox, Danielle, 'Art', in *Culture Works: The Political Economy of Culture*, ed. by Richard Maxwell, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001), pp. 22-59.
- Francis, Mark, 'Honey and Hare's Blood', *Isis*, (May 1974).
- Fraser, Andrea, 'From the Critique of Institutions to an Institution of Critique', *Artforum* vol. 44, no. 1, (2005), pp. 278-83.
- Fried, Michael, 'Art and Objecthood', *Artforum* vol. 5, no. 10, (June 1967), pp. 12-23.
- Fuller, Peter, 'Troubles with British Art Now', *Artforum* vol. XV, no. 8, (April 1977), pp. 42-47.
- , 'Plus ca change...', *Art Monthly*, no. 59, (September 1982) pp. 7-11.
- , 'Black Artists: Don't Forget Europe [1989]', in *Art and Its Histories: A Reader*, ed. by Steve Edwards, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999).
- Gaiger, Jason, 'Dismantling the Frame: Site-Specific Art and Aesthetic Autonomy', *The British Journal of Aesthetics* vol. 49, no. 1, (January 2009), pp. 43-58.
- Gaiger, Jason, and Paul Wood, eds., *Art of the Twentieth Century: A Reader* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003).
- Gallery House, *A Survey of the Avant-Garde in Britain*, exh. cat., Gallery House Press, 27 July-28 October 1972.
- Game, Amanda, 'Joan Crossley-Holland, obituary', *The Independent*, (20 January 2005).
- Garb, Tamar, 'Gauguin and the Opacity of the Other: The Case of Martinique', in *Gauguin*:

- Maker of Myth*, (London: Tate, 2010).
- Garb, Tamar, Didier Semin, and Donald Kuspit, *Christian Boltanski*, (London: Phaidon, 1997).
- Gardner, Anthony, and Huw Hallam, 'On the Contemporary – and Contemporary Art History', *Journal of Art Historiography*, (2011), pp. 1-9.
- Gay, Bernard, and Camden Arts Centre, *De Stijl: A Camden Festival exhibition, the Camden Arts Centre*, (London: Camden Arts Centre, 1967).
- Gevaert, Yves, and Michael Baudson, 'Aspects of the Avant-Garde in Belgium', *Studio International* vol. 188, no. 970, (October 1974).
- Glazebrook, Elizabeth, 'Lilianne Lijn: Sculptor of Light', *The Times*, (20 January 1969), p. 5.
- Glazebrook, Mark, 'The Whitechapel's Future', *Studio International* vol. 177, no. 908, (February 1969), pp. 59-60.
- Gleadell, Colin, 'Peter Stuyvesant Collection to be Sold', *The Telegraph*, (1 March 2010).
- Gleadowe, Teresa, 'Modern Art Oxford: Interview with Nicholas Serota', *Southern Arts* vol. 1, no. 2, (April 1974), pp. 7-9.
- Gleason, Abbott, "'Totalitarianism" in 1984', *Russian Review* vol. 43, no. 2, (1984), pp. 145-59.
- Glew, Adrian, and Jon Hendricks, *Fluxbritannica: Aspects of the Fluxus Movement, 1962-73*, (London: Tate Gallery, 1994).
- Goldstein, Ann, Anne Rorimer, and Museum of Contemporary Art (LA), *Reconsidering the Object of Art: 1965-1975*, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995).
- Golomshtok, Igor, and Alexander Glezer, *Unofficial Art from the Soviet Union*, Secker and Warburg, 1977.
- González, Jennifer, 'Installation Art', *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*, Oxford Art Online <<http://www.oxfordartonline.com/subscriber/article/opr/t234/e0291>>, [accessed 11 January 2013].
- Gooding, Mel, 'Robertson, Bryan Charles Francis (1925–2002)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press.
- Gosling, Nigel, 'Creaming Off the World's Best', *The Observer*, (19 November 1967), p. 24.
- , 'The "Have-a-Go" Show', *The Observer*, (2 May 1971), p. 29.
- , 'British Brain-Bashers', *The Observer*, (20 August 1972), p. 30.
- Goswamy, B. N., 'Another Past, Another Context: Exhibiting Indian Art Abroad', in *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, ed. by Ivan Karp and Steven D. Lavine, (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991).
- Gould-Davies, Nigel, 'The Logic of Soviet Cultural Diplomacy', *Diplomatic History* vol. 27, no. 2, (April 2003), pp. 193-214.
- Grasskamp, Walter, 'For Example, *Documenta*, Or, How is Art History Produced?', in *Thinking About Exhibitions* ed. by Reesa Greenberg, Bruce W. Ferguson and Sandy Nairne, (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 64-78.
- Great Britain, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, *CSCE, Cultural Forum: Budapest, 1985*, (London: Foreign and Commonwealth Office, 1986).
- Greenberg, Clement, 'The Late Thirties in New York [1957]', in *Art and Culture: Critical Essays*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1961).
- , 'Avant Garde and Kitsch [1939]', in *Art and Culture: Critical Essays*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1961).
- , 'Modernist Painting [1960]', in *The Collected Essays and Criticism*, ed. by John O'Brian, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993).
- Greenberg, Reesa, 'The Exhibited Redistributed: A Case for Reassessing Space', in

- Thinking about Exhibitions*, ed. by Reesa Greenberg, Sandy Nairne and Bruce W. Ferguson, (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 349-367.
- , “‘Remembering Exhibitions’: From Point to Line to Web”, *Tate Papers*, no. 12, (Autumn 2009), n.p.
- Grieg, Noel, ‘Brighton’s Combinations’, *International Times* vol. 1, no. 71, (14-28 January 1970), p. 9.
- Grigs, Derick, ‘Museum of Modern Art in New Home’, *Oxford Mail*, (19 October 1966).
- , ‘Putting Space on Display’, *Oxford Mail*, (3 December 1966).
- , ‘Need - As Seen by Children’, *Oxford Mail*, (15 February 1967).
- Grimley, Terry, ‘The Eccentricities of Joseph Beuys’, *Birmingham Post*, (April 1974).
- Grisdale, John, ‘Letter to the Editor: Exhibition of Psychotic Art’, *Oxford Times*, (20 February 1978).
- Groys, Boris, *The Total Art of Stalinism: Avant-Garde, Aesthetic Dictatorship, and Beyond*, trans. Charles Rougle, (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1992).
- , ‘The Logic of Equal Aesthetic Rights’, in *Art Power*, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008).
- Grunenberg, Christoph, and Jonathan Harris, eds., *Summer of Love: Psychedelic Art, Social Crisis and Counterculture in the 1960s* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005).
- Gupta, Suman, ‘Conceptualising the Art of Communist Times’, *Third Text* vol. 24, no. 5, (September 2010), pp. 571-82.
- Harris, Jonathan, ‘Cultured into Crisis: the Arts Council of Great Britain’, in *Art Apart: Art Institutions and Ideology across England and North America* ed. by Marcia Pointon, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), pp. 177-191.
- , ‘Abstraction and Empathy: Psychedelic Distortion and the Meanings of the 1960s’, in *Summer of Love: Psychedelic Art, Social Crisis and Counterculture in the 1960s*, ed. by Christoph Grunenberg and Jonathan Harris, (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005), pp. 9-17.
- Harris, Rita, ‘Stephen Willats’, *Arts Review*, (23 November 1968).
- Harrison, Charles, ‘Roelof Louw’s Sculpture’, *Studio International* vol. 178, no. 915, (October 1969).
- , ‘Virgin Soils and Old Land’, *Studio International* vol. 181, no. 933, Special Issue: The British Avant-Garde, (May 1971) pp. 201-5.
- , ‘Richard Long at the Whitechapel 9 November - 21 November’, *Studio International* vol. 183, no. 940, (January 1972) pp. 33-34.
- , ‘Art & Language Press’, *Studio International* vol. 183, no. 945, (June 1972).
- , *Essays on Art and Language*, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001).
- , ‘Feeling the Earth Move’, in *Since 1950: Art and Its Criticism*, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009), pp. 127-46.
- Harrison, Charles, and Paul Wood, eds., *Art in Theory, 1900-2000: An Anthology of Changing Ideas* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2009).
- Harten, Jürgen, ‘‘Documenta 5’ at Kassel’, *Studio International* vol. 183, no. 945, (1972).
- Haynes, Jim, ‘The Arts Lab Drury Lane’, *Unfinished Histories: Recording the History of Alternative Theatre*, <<http://www.unfinishedhistories.com/interviews/interviewees/jim-haynes/>>, [accessed 18 November 2012].
- , ‘What is an Arts Lab anyway?’, *International Times* vol. 1, no. 66, (10 October 1969), p. 16.
- Heeks, Alan, ‘Flashes in the Grey’, *Cherwell*, (15 November 1967).
- Henry, Clare, ‘Vladimir Mayakovsky’, *Glasgow Herald*, (20 January 1982).

- Herbert, Martin, 'Dematerialised: Jack Wendler Gallery 1971-1974', *Art Monthly* vol. 327, (2009).
- Hewison, Robert, *Too Much: Art and Society in the Sixties, 1960-75*, (London: Methuen, 1986).
- Hill, Andrew, 'Performance: La Bohème, the Garden and the Ending of the Sixties', *Visual Culture in Britain* vol. 3, no. 1, (2002), pp. 23-36.
- Hills, Helen, 'The Fetishised Past: Post-Industrial Manchester and Interstitial Spaces', *Visual Culture in Britain* vol. 3, no. 2, (2002), pp. 103-18.
- Hodgkin, Howard, 'An Artist in Residence', *Oxford Art Journal* vol. 1, no. 1, (1978), pp. 36-37.
- Holmes, Richard, 'Just How Serious Are You?', *The Times*, (28 March 1970), p. 14.
- Home, Stewart, 'Voices Green and Purple: Psychedelic Bad Crazy and the Revenge of the Avant-Garde', in *Summer of Love: Psychedelic Art, Social Crisis and Counterculture in the 1960s*, ed. by Jonathan Harris and Christoph Grunenberg, (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005).
- Hopkirk, Peter, 'Russians Censor Room Full of Art', *The Times*, (26 February 1971), p. 2.
- Hudson, Kenneth, *The Good Museums Guide*, (London: Macmillan, 1982).
- Hughes, Gareth, "'The Least Possible Object": Letter to the editor', *Studio International* vol. 718, no. 915, (October 1969).
- Hughes, Henry Meyric, 'When East was East and West was West: Art Attitudes in the Cold War', in *The Manifesta Decade*, ed. by Barbara Vanderlinden and Elena Filipovic, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005), pp. 133-152.
- Hughes, Robert, 'The Stuyvesant Scholarships', *Studio International* vol. 172, no. 880, (August 1966).
- Huizinga, Johan, *Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play Element in Culture*, (London: Temple Smith, 1949).
- Hunt, Roland, 'Rodchenko: A Major Exhibition at Oxford', *Art Monthly*, (March 1979).
- Hunter, Sam, *The Museum of Modern Art, New York: The History and the Collection*, (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1984).
- Hutchence, Keith, ed., *An Approach to Oxford: The Cherwell Guide for Freshmen*, 1974).
- Hutchinson, Robert, ed., *The Politics of the Arts Council* (London: Sinclair Brown, 1982).
- Hutchison, Robert, *The Politics of the Arts Council*, (London: Sinclair Browne, 1982).
- Hutton, Andrew, 'Mood is Slightly Dated', *Oxford Mail*, (21 May 1970).
- , 'Students' Work Goes on Show', *Oxford Mail*, (31 July 1970).
- , 'Things to Wear, Jump On, Touch and Explore', *Oxford Mail*, (13 February 1971).
- , 'Artists Call Spectators Philistines - And Quit', *Oxford Mail*, (15 February 1971).
- , 'Multiple Machinations', *Oxford Mail*, (11 January 1971).
- , 'A Crisis of Survival Faces Oxford's Art Galleries', *Oxford Mail*, (November 1971).
- , 'Gallery Shuts: What Next?', *Oxford Mail*, (9 January 1974).
- Hutton, A.H. (Andrew, 'A Tourniquet for the Eyeballs', *Oxford Mail*, (11th October 1969).
- Hyland, Angus, ed., *C/ID: Visual Identity and Branding for the Arts* (London: Laurence King, 2006).
- Ibsen, Peter, 'Letter to the Editor', *The Listener* vol. 85, no. 2194, (15 April 1971).
- Ichijo, Atsuko, 'Cultural Diplomacy in the Contemporary United Kingdom: the Case of the British Council', in *Cultural Diplomacy and Cultural Imperialism: European Perspective(s)*, ed. by Martina Topić and Siniša Rodin, (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2012).
- Indian Advisory Committee (Festival of India, UK), *Contemporary Indian Art: An Exhibition of the Festival of India, 1982*, exh. cat., Royal Academy of Arts, 18

September-31 October 1982.

- J.A.B., 'Company of Quiet Horrors', *Oxford Mail*, (30 April 1974).
- Jamal, Mahmood, 'Visual Arts', *City Limits*, (23-29 July 1982).
- James, N. P., ed., *David Medalla: Works in the World* (London: Cv Publications, 2012).
- Jameson, Fredric, 'The Politics of Theory: Ideological Positions in the Postmodernism Debate', *New German Critique*, no. 33, (Autumn 1984), pp. 53-65.
- , 'Pleasure: A Political Issue [1983]', in *The Ideologies of Theory: Essays 1971-1986*, (London: Routledge, 1988).
- Januszczak, Waldemar, 'Galleries Briefing', *The Guardian*, (7 July 1982), p. 9.
- , 'A Guide to the Festival of India Art Shows', *The Guardian*, (24 March 1982), p. 9.
- , 'Foghorn of the Revolution', *The Guardian*, (10 March 1982), p. 14.
- , 'Outside London', *The Guardian*, (3 March 1982), p. 11.
- , 'No Way to Treat a Thoroughbred', *The Guardian*, (15 February 1986), p. 11.
- , 'The Shock of Serota', *The Guardian*, (26 November 1987), p. 12.
- Jay, Edward J., '[review]', *The Journal of Asian Studies* vol. 39, no. 1, (1979), pp. 194-96.
- Jay, Maurice, 'Light as Art and Entertainment', *Light and Lighting* vol. 61, no. 2, (February 1968).
- , 'Light, Movement and Kinetic Art', *Light and Lighting*, (February 1969).
- Jay, Martin, *Downcast Eyes: The Denigration of Visual in French Twentieth-Century Thought*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).
- Joachimides, Christos M., Norman Rosenthal, and Nicholas Serota, *A New Spirit in Painting*, exh. cat., Royal Academy of Arts, 15 January-18 March 1981.
- Job, Nick, 'Rail Alphabet', <http://www.doublearrow.co.uk/rail_alphabet.htm>, [accessed 9 October 2014].
- Johnson, Ken, 'Images from After the Revolution', *Bureau's*, (29 August 1985).
- Jones, Gareth, 'Vote!', *Studio International* vol. 183, no. 940, (January 1972) p. 2.
- Jones, Jonathan, 'The Man Who Fell to Earth: Interview with Caroline Tisdall', *The Guardian*, (19 July 1999), p. B14.
- Julia, Carmen, and Pablo Leon de la Barra, 'CURATORS' SERIES #6: FRIENDS OF LONDON. ARTISTS FROM LATIN AMERICA IN LONDON FROM 196X – 197X', 2013, <<http://davidrobertsartfoundation.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Friends-of-London-Leaflet6.pdf>>, [accessed 20 December 2013].
- Kant, Immanuel, 'Critique of Pure Reason [excerpt, 1781]', in *Western Philosophy: An Anthology* ed. by John Cottingham, (Oxford: Blackwell 1996).
- , 'Prolegomena [excerpt, 1783]', in *Western Philosophy: An Anthology*, ed. by John Cottingham, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996).
- Kapur, Geeta, *Contemporary Indian Artists*, (New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House, 1978).
- Karimi, Pamela, 'Of Cultural Diplomacy, Culture Games, and Curation of Non-Western Art', *ArtMargins* vol. 3, no. 3, (October 2014), pp. 98-110.
- Karp, Ivan, and Steven D. Lavine, eds., *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991).
- Karp, Ivan, and Fred Wilson, 'Constructing the Spectacle of Culture in Museums', in *Thinking About Exhibitions*, ed. by Sandy Nairne, Reesa Greenberg and Bruce W. Ferguson, (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 251-268.
- Karshan, Donald, "'The British Avant-Garde'", *Studio International* vol. 181, no. 933, Special Issue: The British Avant-Garde, (May 1971), p. 200.
- Kent, Sarah, 'Red Concrete Dream', *Time Out*, (1 July 1977).
- , 'Visual Arts: Exhibitions', *Time Out*, (16-22 March 1979).
- , 'Visual Arts', *Time Out*, (25 March 1982).

- Kester, Grant H., 'Rhetorical Questions: The Alternative Arts Sector and the Imaginary Public', in *Art, Activism & Oppositionality: Essays from Afterimage*, ed. by Grant H. Kester, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998), pp. 103-135.
- Khan, Naseem, 'Interdigital Antiuniversity', *The Guardian*, (15 February 1968), p. 9.
- , 'Digging for Victory', *The Guardian*, (29 April 1968), p. 7.
- King, Catherine, ed., *Views of Difference: Different Views of Art* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999).
- King, David, and Cathy Porter, *Blood & Laughter*, (London: Jonathan Cape, 1983).
- King, David, *The Commissar Vanishes: The Falsification of Photographs and Art in Stalin's Russia - Photographs and Graphics from the David King Collection*. revised edn., (London: Tate Publishing, 2014).
- King, Emily, 'What's This Business About Culture?', in *C/ID: Visual Identity and Branding for the Arts*, ed. by Angus Hyland, (London: Laurence King, 2006).
- Klonk, Charlotte, *Spaces of Experience: Art Gallery Interiors from 1800-2000*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009).
- Knight, Graham, 'The Secret Block for a Secret Person in Ireland: Joseph Beuys Drawings 1948-72', *Southern Arts*, no. 3, (May 1974).
- Kodicek, Ann, 'Directing Art', *A&I Magazine*, (July 1990).
- Koerner, Joseph Leo, 'Everyman in Motion: from Bosch to Bruegel', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, no. 139, (2006), pp. 297-328.
- Kontopoulou, Anna, 'Young Contemporaries 1968: The Hornsey Light/Sound Workshop', *Lux: Artists' Moving Image*, 2011, <<http://lux.org.uk/blog/young-contemporaries-1968-hornsey-light-sound-workshop>>, [accessed 20 March 2013].
- Kozloff, Max, 'Photos within Photographs', *Artforum* vol. XIV, no. 6, (February 1976).
- Kramer, Hilton, 'Détente Yields a Dismal Show', *New York Times*, (24 April 1977), p. D25.
- , 'REVOLUTIONARY ART', *New York Times*, (24 June 1979), p. 3.
- Krauss, Rosalind, 'Sculpture in the Expanded Field', *October* vol. 8, (Spring 1979), pp. 30-44.
- , 'The Originality of the Avant-Garde: A Postmodernist Repetition', *October* vol. 18, (Autumn 1981), pp. 47-66.
- Kraynak, Janet, 'Dependent Participation: Bruce Nauman's Environments', *Grey Room*, no. 10, (Winter 2003), pp. 22-45.
- Kwon, Miwon, 'One Place After Another: Notes on Site-Specificity [1997]', in *Art of the Twentieth Century: A Reader*, ed. by Jason Gaiger and Paul Wood, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003).
- L'Angelo Mysterioso, 'It's All Down Walton Street', *The Cherwell*, (12 October 1972), p. 9.
- Laing, Stuart, 'Economy, Society and Culture in 1960s Britain: Contexts and Conditions for Psychedelic Art', in *Summer of Love: Psychedelic Art, Social Crisis and Counterculture in the 1960s*, ed. by Christoph Grunenberg and Jonathan Harris, (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005).
- Langston, David, 'Early Soviet Photographers', *Berkshire Eagle*, (12 September 1985).
- Latimer, Clive, Michael Leonard, John Bowstead, and Dick Woods, 'Light/Sound Workshop', *Studio International*, (April 1967).
- Latour, Bruno, and Adam Lowe, 'The Migration of the Aura or How to Explore the Original Through its Facsimiles', in *Switching Codes: Thinking Through Digital Technology in the Humanities and the Arts*, ed. by T. Bartscherer and R. Coover, (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2011).
- Laugier, Marc-Antoine, *An Essay on the Study and Practice of Architecture*, (London: Stanley Crowder and Henry Woodgate, 1756).

- Ledger, Tanya, 'Regional Reviews', *Arts Review*, (2 March 1979).
- Lee, Douglas, 'Spheres and Squares', *The Cherwell*, (10 May 1973).
- , 'Room to Grow', *The Cherwell*, (24 May 1973), p. 7.
- Lee, Pamela, *Object to be Destroyed: The Work of Gordon Matta-Clark*, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001).
- , *Chronophobia: On Time in the Art of the 1960s*, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2004).
- Legge, Rupert, and Mark Powell-Jones, 'Letter to the Editor', *The Guardian*, (17 February 1971).
- Levin, Bernard, 'Keeping an Exhibition Ideologically Germ-Free', *The Times*, (2 March 1971), p. 14.
- Lindesay, James, 'Eadweard Muybridge', *The Cherwell*, (14 May 1975), p. 5.
- , 'Klaus Rinke', *The Cherwell*, (13 January 1976), p. 7.
- Lipmann, Anthony, 'Grey Paintings', *Envisage*, (December 1975).
- Lippard, Lucy R., *Six Years: The Dematerialization of the Art Object from 1966 to 1972: A Cross-Reference Book of Information on Some Esthetic Boundaries*, (London: Studio Vista, 1973).
- , 'Why Separate Women's Art?', *Art and Artists* vol. 8, no. 7, (October 1973) pp. 8-9.
- Livingstone, Marco, 'Reshaping the Whitechapel: Installations from Tomorrow to Today', in *The Whitechapel Art Gallery Centenary Review*, (London: Whitechapel Art Gallery, 2001).
- Lloyd Morgan, Conway, 'Art', *Isis*, (11 October 1969).
- , 'Continuum', *Circus*, (22 January 1970).
- Loake, Jonathan, 'Howard Riley Trio', *OSAC*, no. 3, ([December] 1972) p. 4.
- Locher, J. L., *Journey to the Surface of the Earth: Mark Boyle's Atlas and Manual*, (Cologne, London, Reykjavik: edition hansjorg meyer, 1970).
- , *Mark Boyle's Journey to the Surface of the Earth*, (Stuttgart: Edition Hansjorg Mayer, 1978).
- Lorch, Richard, 'Rodchenko's Constructivism: A Short Critique', *Architectural Design*, (July 1979).
- Lord Robbins, Milton S. Fox, Hans L. C. Jaffé, and Bryan Robertson, *Adventure in Art: An International Group of Art Collections in Industrial Environments*, (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1971).
- Louw, Roelof, "'Withdrawal": Letter to the Editor', *Studio International* vol. 177, no. 912, (June 1969).
- Lowry, Glenn D., 'Building for the Future: A Work in Progress', 2014, <<http://www.moma.org/about/building>>, [accessed 19 July 2014].
- Lucie-Smith, Edward, 'Art and Industry - the Need for a New Relationship', *The Times*, (5 April 1966), p. 13.
- , 'Art May Have to Abandon the Rarity Standard', *The Times*, (27 February 1968), p. 11.
- , 'The Technological Art of the Future', *The Times*, (26 March 1968), p. 7.
- , 'Art & Play-Power: A New Philistinism?', *Encounter* vol. 37, no. 2, (August 1971), pp. 58-60.
- , 'Flying Kites', *Sunday Times*, (7 May 1972).
- Lynton, Norbert, 'The New Generation: 1966 at the Whitechapel Gallery', *The Guardian*, (30 June 1966), p. 8.
- , 'The Stuyvesant Collection', *The Guardian*, (16 November 1967), p. 6.
- , 'Interim Report', *The Guardian*, (8 May 1968), p. 6.

- MacCarthy, Fiona, 'Pictures for the Desk-Bound', *The Guardian*, (11 January 1966), p. 9.
- Macdonald, Peter D., 'Thinking Interculturally', *Interventions* vol. 13, no. 3, (2011), pp. 367-85.
- MacLeod, Suzanne, 'Rethinking Museum Architecture: Towards a Site-Specific History of Production and Use', in *Reshaping Museum Space: Architecture, Design, Exhibitions*, ed. by Suzanne MacLeod, (London and New York: Routledge, 2005), pp. 9-25.
- Manchester, Elizabeth, "'Neo Classic", Robert Morris: Summary', July 2004, <<http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/morris-neo-classic-t07899/text-summary>>, [accessed 20 July 2014].
- Marcuse, Herbert, *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955).
- , *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Society*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964).
- Margolin, Victor, 'Rodchenko', *New Art Examiner*, (February 1980).
- Marlow, Tim, 'Tim Marlow on Modern Art Oxford', Channel Five, film documentary, 39 mins., (2006).
- Marr, Andrew, 'Extraordinary Work of a Revolutionary Artist', *Scotsman*, (18 January 1982).
- Martorella, Rosanne, *Corporate Art*, (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1990).
- Masey, Jack, and Conway Lloyd Morgan, *Cold War Confrontations: US Exhibitions and Their Role in the Cultural Cold War*, (Baden: Lars Muller Publishers, 2008).
- Massey, Anne, 'The Mother of Pop? Dorothy Morland and the Independent Group', *Journal of Visual Culture* vol. 12, no. 262, (2013), pp. 263-78.
- , *Institute of Contemporary Arts, 1946-1968*, (London: ICA, 2014).
- Mayes, Ian, 'Rodchenko... at the Museum of Modern Art, Oxford', *Birmingham Post*, (20 February 1979).
- McCullough, Felix, 'Edinburgh Reviews', *Arts Review*, (29 January 1982), p. 46.
- McEwen, John, 'Designer', *The Spectator*, (10 March 1979), pp. 24-25.
- , 'Through the Ages', *The Spectator*, (14 August 1982), pp. 25-26.
- McGrath, Tom, 'YOU', *International Times* vol. 1, no. 1, (14-27 October 1966), p. 1.
- , 'Hallucinations! Shazam! Can the Fuzman Stop the Menace Called IT?', *International Times* vol. 1, no. 10, (13-26 March 1967), pp. 1-4.
- McIntyre, Peter, 'When Those Bricks Were Displayed In Oxford', *Oxford Mail*, (9 March 1976).
- McLuhan, Marshall, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*, (London: Routledge, 2001).
- McNay, M. G., 'Italian Sculpture at the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool', *The Guardian*, (13 July 1964), p. 7.
- , 'Laboratory of the Invisible', *The Guardian*, (15 April 1965), p. 8.
- McShine, Kynaston, *Museum as Muse: Artists Reflect*, (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1999).
- Meldrum, Andrew, 'Anton Rupert: Obituary', *The Guardian*, (23 January 2006).
- Mellor, David, *No Such Thing As Society: Photography in Britain 1967-87 from the British Council and the Arts Council Collection*, (London: Hayward Publishing, 2008).
- Mellor, David, and Barbican Art Gallery, *The Sixties Art Scene in London*, (London: Phaidon in association with the Barbican Art Gallery, 1993).
- Melvin, Joanna, 'Studio International Magazine: Tales from Peter Townsend's Editorial Papers 1965-1975' (PhD thesis, University College London, 2013).

- Melvin, Joanna, Lucy Gunning, and Victoria Worsley, 'Tangentially: The Archive and the Bathroom', *Tate Papers*, no. 9, (Spring 2008), n.p.
- Merewether, Charles, ed., *The Archive* (London: Whitechapel Gallery, 2006).
- Metzger, Gustav, 'A Critical Look at Artist Placement Group', *Studio International* vol. 183, no. 940, (January 1972), pp. 4-5.
- Mills, Jonathan, 'Rodchenko at M.O.M.A.', *Oxford Art Journal* vol. 2, (1 April 1979), p. 61.
- Ministere de la Culture de L'URSS (Moscou), and Centre National de l'Art et de Culture Georges Pompidou (Paris), *Paris-Moscou 1900-1930*, exh. cat., 31 May-5 November 1979.
- Mitchell, George, 'The Making of a Great Exhibition', *Museum* vol. XXXIV, no. 4, (1982), pp. 221-24.
- Mitchell, Stanley, 'The Man Who Shook the World', *City Limits*, (5-11 March 1982).
- Mitter, Partha, 'Decentering Modernism: Art History and Avant-Garde Art from the Periphery', *Art Bulletin* vol. 90, no. 4, (December 2008), pp. 531-48.
- Molesworth, Helen, 'Cleaning Up in the 1970s: The Work of Judy Chicago, Mary Kelly and Mierle Laderman Ukeles', in *Rewriting Conceptual Art*, ed. by Michael Newman and Jon Bird, (Chicago: Reaktion, 1999).
- Möntmann, Nina, 'The Rise and Fall of New Institutionalism: Perspectives on a Possible Future', *eipcp*, (August 2007), n.p.
- Moore, Darrell, 'White Men Can't Program: The Contradictions of Multiculturalism', in *Art, Activism & Oppositionality: Essays from Afterimage*, ed. by Grant H. Kester, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998), pp. 51-59.
- Morgan, Edwin, 'Some Classical Ephemera', *Times Literary Supplement*, no. 4114, (5 February 1982), p. 133.
- Morgan, Robin, 'Goodbye to All That', *Rat*, (January 1970).
- Morphet, Richard, 'Carl Andre's Bricks', *The Burlington Magazine* vol. 118, no. 884, (November 1976), pp. 762-65.
- Morris, Lynda, 'The Museum of Modern Art in Oxford 1965-1975', *Studio International* vol. 190, no. 978, (November-December 1975).
- , 'Carl Andre Poems 1958-1974', *Studio International*, (September/October 1975).
- , ed., *Documenting Cadere, 1972-1978* (Cologne: Walther König, 2013).
- Morris, Robert, 'Notes on Sculpture, Part II', *Artforum* vol. 5, no. 2, (October 1966).
- Mosquera, Gerardo, 'Some Problems in Transcultural Curating', in *Global Visions: Towards a New Internationalism in the Visual Arts*, ed. by Jean Fisher, (London: Kala Press, 1994), pp. 133-139.
- , 'Alien-Own/Own-Alien: Globalisation and Cultural Difference', *boundary 2* vol. 29, no. 3, (Fall 2002), pp. 163-73.
- Mrázková, Daniela, and Vladimír Remeš, *Early Soviet Photographers*, exh. cat., MOMA, 7 March-2 May 1982.
- Muraska-Muthesius, Katarzyna, and Natalia Zarzecka, *Kantor Was Here*, (London: Black Dog Publishing, 2011).
- Murray, Muz, 'You Are Now Entering Gandalf's Garden - Fear Not', *Gandalf's Garden*, no. 1, (May 1968).
- Museum of Modern Art, 'Cuba! Poland Oxford! advertisement', *Studio International* vol. 174, no. 894, (November 1967).
- , 'Light/Sound Workshop advertisement', *Studio International* vol. 174, no. 895, (1967).
- Museum of Modern Art, New York, 'Projects: Pier 18 press release', July 1971,
 <https://www.moma.org/momaorg/shared/pdfs/docs/press_archives/4679/releases/

- MOMA_1971_0116_80.pdf?2010>, [accessed 29 October 2015].
- N.G., 'Gallery Guide', *The Observer*, (1 December 1968).
- Nairn, Ian, 'Wanted: A Museum Revolution', *The Observer Weekend Review*, (25 April 1965), p. 1.
- Nairne, Sandy, 'State of Flux', *The Cherwell*, (8 February 1973).
- , 'The Institutionalisation of Dissent', in *Thinking About Exhibitions*, ed. by Sandy Nairne, Reesa Greenberg and Bruce W. Ferguson, (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 387-410.
- Neate, Hannah, 'Provinciality and the Art World: The Midland Group 1961-1971', *Social and Cultural Geography* vol. 13, no. 3, (2012), pp. 275-94.
- Neville, Richard, *Play Power*, (London: Jonathan Cape, 1970).
- Newman, Gerald, "'Ten Black Paintings' by Bob Law (exhibition review)", *Studio International* vol. 188, no. 969, (September 1974), n.p.
- Newman, Michael, 'Red Music', *Isis*, (1 November 1974).
- Newton, Christine, 'Modern Art: New Problems. The Education Programme at M.O.M.A', *Oxford Art Journal* vol. 2, no. 3, (October 1979), pp. 28-33.
- , 'The Educational Art of MOMA', *Southern Arts*, (November 1982), pp. 5-9.
- Nochlin, Linda, 'Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?', *ARTnews*, (January 1971), pp. 22-39.
- Nuttall, Jeff, *Bomb Culture*, (London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1968).
- O'Barr, William M., "'Subliminal" Advertising', *Advertising and Society Review* vol. 13, no. 4, (2013), *Project Muse*, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/advertising_and_society_review/v013/13.4.o-barr.html, [accessed 28 June 2013].
- O'Doherty, Brian, *Inside the White Cube: The Ideology of the Gallery Space*. expanded edn., (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).
- O'Keefe, Timothy, 'The Secret Block for a Secret Person in Ireland: Drawings by Joseph Beuys', *Studio International* vol. 188, no. 969, (September 1974), n.p.
- Oakes, Philip, 'Listen to the Radar tree', *Sunday Times*, (14 February 1971).
- Obrist, Hans-Ulrich, *A Brief History of Curating*, (Dijon: Les Presses du reel, 2008).
- Oliver, Cordelia, 'Demarcation Dispute', *The Guardian*, (22 August 1974), p. 10.
- Oliver, Georgina, 'Sol LeWitt: Wall Drawings', *The Connoisseur*, (July 1973).
- Osborne, Alan, and Sir William Emrys Williams, eds., *Patron: Industry Supports the Arts* (London: The Connoisseur, 1966).
- Our Arts Reporter, 'Tate Gallery Defends Purchase of Bricks', *The Times*, (17 February 1976), p. 3.
- Overy, Paul, *De Stijl* (London and New York: Studio Vista/Dutton Pictureback, 1969).
- , 'The Light That Failed', *Financial Times*, (2 March 1971), p. 3.
- , 'Stimulating or Just Infuriating?', *The Times*, (21 August 1972), p. 5.
- , 'Better at Barns: When Inigo Jones Turned His Hand to Architecture', *The Times*, (17 June 1973), p. 10.
- , 'Sheep and Stones', *The Times*, (20 November 1974), p. 20.
- , 'Mystery and Mystification', *The Times*, (10 April 1974), p. 13.
- , 'Paul Klee: The Gift of Visual Thinking', *The Times*, (1 October 1975), p. 9.
- , 'Oxford Rings the Changes', *The Times*, (11 February 1975), p. 7.
- , 'Irony at Oxford', *The Times*, (13 May 1975), p. 13.
- , 'The Eye of Ansel Adams', *The Times*, (1 July 1975), p. 13.
- , 'Products of the Split Personality', *The Times*, (4 March 1975), p. 12.
- , 'Dangerous Axis', *The Times*, (21 June 1977), p. 11.
- , 'Inside Walls', *The Listener*, (26 April 1979).

- , 'Recollection', in *Oiticica in London*, ed. by Guy Brett and Luciano Figueiredo, (London: Tate Publishing, 2007).
- Owen, John, 'Old Ales in Splendid Order!', *Business Times*, (July-August 1991).
- Owen, Phil, 'Enjoy Yourself: An Introduction to Arnolfini's History', <<http://www.arnolfini.org.uk/blog/enjoy-yourself>>, [accessed 16 September 2015].
- Owens, Craig, 'The Discourse of Others: Feminists and Postmodernism [1983]', in *Art of the Twentieth Century: A Reader*, ed. by Jason Gaiger and Paul Wood, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), pp. 249-61.
- Pawley, Michael "'We Shall Not Bulldoze Westminster Abbey": Archigram and the Retreat from Technology', in *Oppositions Reader: Selected Essays 1973-1984*, ed. by K. Michael Hays, (Princeton, N.J. : Princeton Architectural Press, 1998).
- Peltomaki, Kirsi, 'Affect and Spectatorial Agency: Viewing Institutional Critique in the 1970s', *Art Journal* vol. 66, no. 4, (Winter 2007), pp. 36-51.
- Pendergast, Tom, and Sara Pendergast, eds., *Contemporary Artists* (Michigan: St. James Press, 2002).
- Peter Stuyvesant Foundation, and Alan Bowness, *Peter Stuyvesant Foundation: A Collection in the Making - 1965 Purchases*, exh. cat., Whitechapel Art Gallery, 1965.
- Peter Stuyvesant Foundation, Whitechapel Art Gallery, and Robert Hughes, *The New Generation: 1966*, exh. cat., Whitechapel Art Gallery, 1966.
- Peter Stuyvesant Foundation, Michael Kaye, and Jeremy Rees, *City Sculpture: A Special Issue of Studio International*, (Chatham: Mackay, 1972).
- Petherbridge, Deanna, 'Special Supplement: Patronage and Sponsorship: the PS at the Bottom of the Art Balance Sheet', *Art Monthly*, no. 38, (1980).
- Philip Morris Europe, and Harald Szeemann, *Live in Your Head: When Attitudes Become Form. Works - Concepts - Processes - Situations - Information*, exh. cat., Kunsthalle Bern, 1969.
- Pick, John, ed., *The State and the Arts* (Eastbourne, East Sussex: J. Offord Publications, 1980).
- Pointon, Marcia, ed., *Art Apart: Art Institutions and Ideology across England and North America* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994).
- Popper, Frank, *Origins and Development of Kinetic Art [1967]*, trans. Stephen Bann, (London: Studio Vista, 1968).
- Potts, Alex, *The Sculptural Imagination: Figurative, Modernist, Minimalist*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000).
- Pouncey, Edwin, 'Laboratories of Light', in *Summer of Love: Psychedelic Art, Social Crisis and Counterculture in the 1960s*, ed. by Jonathan Harris and Christoph Grunenberg, (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005).
- Poupée, Mathilde, 'Paris-Moscou 1900-1930', 2013, <http://blog.soton.ac.uk/wsapgr/files/2014/10/Looking_at_images_POUPEE.pdf>, [accessed 24 March 2015].
- , 'Exhibition Paris-Moscow, 1900-1930: Paper prepared for the Second Euroacademia International Conference, Reinventing Eastern Europe', 2013, <http://euroacademia.eu/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Mathilde_Poupée_Exhibition_Paris-Moscow_1900-1930.pdf>, [accessed 17 August 2015].
- Poynor, Rick, 'Spirit of Independence', in *Communicate: Independent British Graphic Design since the Sixties*, ed. by Rick Poynor, (London: Barbican Art Gallery, 2004).
- Prakash, Gyan, 'Writing Post-Orientalist Histories of the Third World: Perspectives from Indian Historiography', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* vol. 32, no. 2,

- (1990), pp. 383-408.
- Prendeville, Brendan, 'That Uncertain Object: David Sylvester's Conception of Criticism as a Personal Affair', *Tate Papers*, no. 21, (Spring 2014), n.p.
- Preziosi, Donald, 'The Art of Art History', in *The Art of Art History: A Critical Anthology*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 507-25.
- , "'Palpable and Mute as a Globed Fruit'", *Tate Papers*, no. 15, (Spring 2011), n.p.
- Price, Cedric, Frank Newby, Robert H. Suan, and Ministry of Public Building and Works Great Britain, *Air Structures: a Survey commissioned by the Ministry of Public Building and Works*, (London: H.M.S.O., 1971).
- Pringle, Emily, and Jennifer DeWitt, 'Perceptions, Processes and Practices around Learning in an Art Gallery', *Tate Papers*, (Autumn 2014), n.p.
- Procktor, Patrick, 'The New Generation', *Studio International* vol. 172, no. 879, (July 1966), pp. 5-11.
- , 'The New Generation', *Studio International* vol. 172, no. 879, (July 1966), pp. 5-11.
- Quinn, Ben, 'Tate Modern Perfects the Art of Living Dangerously', *The Guardian*, (12 July 2009).
- Rancière, Jacques, 'The Aesthetic Revolution and its Outcomes: Emplotments of Autonomy and Heteronomy', *New Left Review* vol. 14, (March-April 2002).
- , 'The Emancipated Spectator', *Artforum* vol. 45, no. 7, (March 2007) pp. 272-80.
- Rattemeyer, Christian, and W. A. L. Beeren, *Exhibiting the New Art: 'Op losse schroeven' and 'When attitudes Become Form' 1969*, (London: Afterall, 2010).
- Rawson, Philip, 'Indian Art in London and Oxford', *Art Monthly*, no. 59, (September 1982), pp. 3-7.
- Rawson, Philip S., *Tantra*, (London: Hayward Gallery, 1972, second edn.).
- Rectanus, Mark W., *Culture Incorporated: Museums, Artists, and Corporate Sponsorships*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002).
- Rees, Jeremy, 'Arnolfini Gallery; 10 Years in Bristol', *Studio International* vol. 181, no. 932, (1971), pp. 144-5.
- Reichardt, Jasja, 'Statements by Kinetic Artists', *Studio International* vol. 173, no. 886, (February 1967).
- , *Cybernetic Serendipity: the Computer and the Arts*, exh. cat., Studio International Special Issue, 1968.
- Reid, Norman, Edward Lucie-Smith, and David Sylvester, "'Metamorphosis at Midnight": transcript of BBC Third Programme Recording, 30 Sept 1964', *Apollo* vol. 81, no. 36, (1965), pp. 137-43.
- Reinke, Klaus U, 'Dusseldorf Academy of Art', *Studio International* vol. 183, no. 941, (February 1972), pp. 84-85.
- Reise, Barbara, 'A Tail of Two Exhibitions: The Aborted Haacke and Robert Morris Shows', *Studio International* vol. 182, no. 935, (July/August 1971) pp. 30-7.
- , 'Notes¹ on Jan Dibbets's² contemporary³ nature⁴ of realistic⁵ classicism⁶ in the Dutch⁷ tradition⁸', *Studio International* vol. 183, no. 945, (June 1972).
- Richard, Sophie, *Unconcealed: The International Network of Conceptual Artists 1967-77: Dealers, Exhibitions and Public Collections*, (London: Ridinghouse, 2009).
- , 'Conversation with Charles Harrison, Banbury, 19 May 2013', in *Unconcealed: The International Network of Conceptual Artists 1967-77: Dealers, Exhibitions and Public Collections*, ed. by Lynda Morris, (London: Ridinghouse, 2009).
- , 'Conversation with Sir Nicholas Serota', in *Unconcealed: The International Network of Conceptual Artists 1967-77: Dealers, Exhibitions and Public Collections* (London: Ridinghouse, 2009).

- Richmond, Yale, *Cultural Exchange and the Cold War: Raising the Iron Curtain*, (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003).
- Robertson, Bryan, 'A Word From Our Sponsor', *The Spectator*, (24 November 1967), p. 658.
- Robertson, Bryan, and Peter Stuyvesant Foundation, *New Generation*, exh. cat., Whitechapel Art Gallery, March-May 1964.
- Robinson, Andrew, 'In Theory - Herbert Marcuse: One Dimensional Man?', *Ceasefire*, (22 October 2010).
- Robinson, Jim, 'Indian Tensions', *Oxford Star*, (1-2 July 1982), p. 17.
- Robson, Mark, 'Four-Tier Wedding Cake and A Gorilla that Made Lubetkin Leave', *Oxford Star*, (21 January 1982).
- Roche Court, *New Generation Revisited: British Sculpture from the Sixties and Seventies: A Tribute to Bryan Robertson at the Whitechapel*, exh. cat., Roche Court Sculpture Park, 10 May-7 September 2008.
- Rolfe, Jon, 'Untitled [Daniel Buren at Modern Art Oxford]', MAO Archive, film interview, (2006).
- Rorimer, Anne, 'The Exhibition at the MTL Gallery in Brussels, March 13 - April 10, 1970', *October* vol. 42, (Autumn 1987), pp. 101-25.
- , 'Questioning the Structure: The Museum Context as Content', in *Art Apart: Art Institutions and Ideology across England and North America*, ed. by Marcia Pointon, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), pp. 253-266.
- , 'Siting the Page: Exhibiting Works in Publications - Some Examples of Conceptual Art in the USA', in *Rewriting Conceptual Art*, ed. by Michael Newman and Jon Bird, (Chicago: Reaktion, 1999), pp. 11-26.
- Rosati, Lauren, Mary Anne Staniszewski, and Exit Art, *Alternative Histories: New York Art Spaces, 1960 to 2010*, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2012).
- Rosler, Martha, 'Theses on Defunding', in *Art, Activism & Oppositionality: Essays from Afterimage*, ed. by Grant H. Kester, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998), pp. 94-102.
- Roud, Richard, 'George and the Russian Dragon', *The Observer*, (27 January 1982), p. 11.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, *Emile, or, Treatise on Education*, trans. William H. Payne, (Amherst, N.Y.: Prometheus Books, 2003).
- Russell, John, 'Derek Southall', *Studio International*, (March 1968).
- , 'Hitchen's England', *Sunday Times*, (20 May 1973).
- , 'Rodchenko: "Everything for Everyone!"', *New York Times*, (23 September 1979), p. D31.
- Rydon, John, 'Smash-Up at the Tate Closes Exhibition', *Daily Express*, (4 May 1971).
- , 'Viewers Tackle Assault Course in Art', *Daily Express*, (28 April 1971).
- Sadler, Chris, '[untitled review]', *The Cherwell*, (23 October 1974).
- Sadler, Simon, *Archigram: Architecture Without Architecture*, (London: MIT Press, 2005).
- Said, Edward W., *Orientalism*, (London: Penguin Classics, 2003).
- Salmon, Nanette 'The Art Historical Canon: Sins of Omission [1991]', in *The Art of Art History: A Critical Anthology*, ed. by Donald Preziosi, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).
- Samuel, Lawrence R., *Freud on Madison Avenue: Motivation Research and Subliminal Advertising in America*, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).
- Sante, Luc, 'Our Friend the Cigarette [2004]', in *Kill All Your Darlings: Pieces 1990-2005*, (Portland, OR: YETI, 2007).
- Schiller, Herbert I., *Culture, Inc.: The Corporate Takeover of Public Expression*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).

- Schwartz, Frederic J., 'Utopia for Sale: The Bauhaus and Weimar Germany's Consumer Culture', in *Bauhaus Culture: From Weimar to the Cold War*, ed. by Kathleen James-Chakraborty, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006), pp. 115-138.
- Scott-Smith, Giles, Peter Romjin, and Joes Segal, eds., *Divided Dreamworlds? The Cultural Cold War in East and West* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2012).
- Scrutton, Hugh, 'Industrial Sponsorship of Art Exhibitions', in *Patron: Industry Supports the Arts*, ed. by Alan Osborne, (London: The Connoisseur, 1966).
- Searing, Helen, 'The Brillo Box in the Warehouse: Museums of Contemporary Art and Industrial Conversions', in *The Andy Warhol Museum*, (Pittsburgh: The Andy Warhol Museum, 1994), pp. 39-65.
- , *Art Spaces: The Architecture of Four Tates*, (London: Tate Publishing, 2004).
- Segal, Corinne, 'Art for Politics' Sake: Interview with Claire Bishop', *Boston Review*, (24 August 2012), n.p.
- Serota, Nicholas, *Experience or Interpretation: The Dilemma of Museums of Modern Art*, (London: Thames and Hudson, 1996).
- Sewell, Brian, 'Pride or Prejudice [1989]', in *Art and Its Histories: A Reader*, ed. by Steve Edwards, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999).
- Seymour, Anne, *The New Art*, exh. cat., Hayward Gallery, 17 August-24 September 1972.
- Sharmacharja, Shamita, ed., *A Manual for the 21st Century Art Institution* (London: Whitechapel Gallery, 2009).
- Shaw, Jeffrey, 'Concepts for an Operational Art', *Art and Artists*, no. 10, (January 1969), pp. 47-49.
- Sikkens Foundation, ... *Where colour plays a distinctive role: Sikkens Award*, (Blaricum, The Netherlands: V+K Publishing, 1997).
- Sinclair, Andrew, *Arts and Cultures: The History of the 50 Years of the Arts Council of Great Britain*, (London: Sinclair-Stevenson, 1995).
- Singh, Devika, 'A Modern Formation? Circulating International Art in India 1950s-1970s', in *Western Artists and India: Creative Inspirations in Art and Design*, ed. by Shanay Jhaveri, (London: Thames and Hudson, 2013).
- Singh, Shanta Serbjeet, 'Aspects of Indian Art Singh', *Economic Times*, (1 August 1982).
- Sleeman, Joy, 'The New Art, Hayward Gallery, London, 1972: New as compromise, or when what happens around the exhibition is as interesting as what happens in the exhibition', *Sculpture Journal* vol. 21, no. 2, (2012), pp. 63-74.
- Smith, Ian, 'Man with Vision of Wider Public for Modern Art. Portrait: David Elliott', *Oxford Times*, (18 July 1986).
- Smith, Mark B., 'Peaceful Coexistence at all Costs: Cold War Exchanges between Britain and the Soviet Union in 1956', *Cold War History* vol. 12, no. 3, (2011), pp. 537-58.
- Smithson, Robert, 'Cultural Confinement [1972]', in *Biennals and Beyond: Exhibitions that Made Art History 1962-2002*, ed. by Bruce Altshuler, (London: Phaidon, 2013), p. 171.
- Snow, C. P., *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution: The Rede Lecture, 1959*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959).
- Solomon-Godeau, Abigail, 'Mourning or Melancholia: Christian Boltanski's "Missing House"', *Oxford Art Journal* vol. 21, no. 2, (1998), pp. 3-20.
- Sontag, Susan, 'Notes on "Camp"', in *Against Interpretation: And Other Essays*, (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1967).
- Spalding, Frances, *The Tate: A History*, (London: Tate Gallery, 1998).
- Spencer, Charles, 'The Peter Stuyvesant Collection: Paintings While You Work', *The*

- Studio* vol. 165, no. 837, (January 1963), pp. 18-21.
- , *Fashion*, (March 1969).
- Spencer, Charles S., 'Venice Biennale: Choosing the Artists', *Studio International* vol. 171, no. 878, (June 1966), pp. 230-2.
- Spurling, Hilary, 'Romantic Loner', *The Observer*, (24 September 1972), p. 36.
- Stallabrass, Julian, 'Radical Camouflage at Documenta 13', *New Left Review*, (October 2012).
- , 'Rhetoric of the Image [review of Paul O'Neill, *The Culture of Curating and the Curating of Culture(s)*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2012/Terry Smith, *Thinking Contemporary Curating*, New York: Independent Curators International, 2012]', *Artforum*, (March 2013).
- , 'The Branding of the Museum', *Art History* vol. 37, no. 1, (February 2014), pp. 148-65.
- Stallybrass, Peter, and Allon White, 'The Politics and Poetics of Transgression [excerpt]', in *(Mis)reading Masquerade*, ed. by Frederique Bergholtz and Iberia Perez, (Berlin: Revolver, 2010).
- Staniszewski, Mary Anne, *The Power of Display: A History of Exhibition Installations at the Museum of Modern Art*, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1998).
- Steeds, Lucy, ed., *Making Art Modern (Part 2): 'Magiciens de la Terre' 1989* (London: Afterall Books, 2013).
- , ed., *Exhibition* (London: Whitechapel Art Gallery, 2014).
- , 'Exhibitions [of Drawings] in Britain, 1964-1980', in *Towards Visibility: Exhibiting Contemporary Drawing 1964-1980*, ed. by Julie Enckell Julliard, (Dijon: Les presses du réel, 2015), pp. 54-85.
- Steele, Jeffrey, 'On the Status of the Space Frame', in *Modern British Sculpture*, ed. by Penelope Curtis and Keith Wilson, (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2011).
- Stephens, Suzanne, 'MOMA's Castle in the Air', *Artforum* vol. XIV, no. 10, (June 1976), pp. 28-31.
- Stephenson, Andrew, 'Painting and Sculpture of a Decade '54-'64 Revisited', *Art History* vol. 35, no. 2, (April 2012), pp. 420-41.
- Stevens, Graham, 'Blow-up', *Art and Artists* vol. 7, no. 74, (May 1972).
- Stewart, John G., 'Modern Architecture in Oxford', *Oxford Art Journal* vol. 1, no. 1, (1978), pp. 53-56.
- Stewart, Susan, 'Garden Agon', *Representations*, no. 62, (1998), pp. 111-43.
- Steyn, Juliet, 'From Masculinity to Androgyny: The Whitechapel Art Gallery', in *The Whitechapel Art Gallery Centenary Review*, (London: Whitechapel Art Gallery, 2001).
- Stiles, Kristine, 'Anomaly, Sky, Sex, and Psi in Fluxus', in *Critical Mass: Happenings, Fluxus, Performance, Intermedia, and Rutgers University, 1958-1972*, ed. by Geoffrey Henricks, (Rutgers University Press, 2003).
- Summerfield, Angela, 'Interventions: Twentieth-Century Art Collection Schemes and their Impact on Local Authority Art Gallery and Museum Collections of Twentieth-Century Art in Britain' (PhD thesis, City University, London, 2007).
- Tafuri, Manfredo, *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development*, trans. Barbara Luigia La Penta, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1976).
- , 'Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology [1969]', in *Architecture Theory Since 1968*, ed. by K. Michael Hays, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1998), pp. 6-35.
- Tagore, Rabindranath, 'The Meaning of Art', in *The English Writings of Rabindranath Tagore, Volume Three: A Miscellany*, ed. by Sisir Kumar Das, (New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 1995).

- Tasher, Robert, 'Don't Enroll as a Student, Only a Teacher', *International Times* vol. 1, no. 26, (16-29 February 1968), p. 6.
- Tate Modern, 'The Tate Modern Project', 2014, <<http://www.tate.org.uk/about/projects/tate-modern-project>>, [accessed 19 July 2014].
- Tawadros, Gilane, and Victoria Clarke, eds., *Run Through the Jungle: Selected Writings by Eddie Chambers* (London: inIVA, 1999).
- Taylor, Alex J., 'Forms of Persuasion: Art and Business in the 1960s' (DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 2014).
- Taylor, Brandon, ed., *Art and Politics: Proceedings of a Conference on Art and Politics held on 15th and 16th April, 1977* (Winchester: Winchester School of Arts Press, 1980).
- , 'Komar and Melamid', *Art Monthly*, no. 91, (September 1985), pp. 5-6.
- , 'Displays of Power with Foucault in the Museum', *Circa*, no. 59, (1991), pp. 22-27.
- , *Art and Literature Under the Bolsheviks Vol. 1: The Crisis of Renewal 1917-1924*, (London: Pluto Press, 1991).
- , *Art and Literature Under the Bolsheviks Vol. 2: Authority and Revolution 1924-1932*, (London: Pluto Press, 1992).
- , *Art for the Nation: Exhibitions and the London Public 1747-2001*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999).
- , '“Here Too, Confusion Reigned”', *Oxford Art Journal* vol. 33, no. 2, (2010), pp. 249-52.
- Taylor, Brandon, and Matthew Cullerne Bown, eds., *Art of the Soviets: Painting, Sculpture and Architecture in a One-Party State, 1917-1992* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993).
- Taylor, John Russell, 'Tradition Remaining Strong and Rich', *The Times*, (28 September 1982), p. 8.
- , 'Tradition Remaining Strong and Rich', *The Times*, (28 September 1982), p. 8.
- , 'An Ominous View of the March of Progress', *The Times*, (3 August 1982), p. 7.
- The Editor, 'The Festival of India: Its Import and Perspectives', *Museum* vol. XXXIV, no. 4, (1982), pp. 214-20.
- Thompson, David, 'Venice Biennale: the British five', *Studio International* vol. 171, no. 878, (June 1966), pp. 233-43.
- , 'Recent British Painting: The Stuyvesant Collection', *Studio International* vol. 174, no. 895, (December 1967), pp. 253-6.
- Tickner, Lisa, 'The Kasmin Gallery', *Oxford Art Journal* vol. 30, no. 2, (2007), pp. 233-68.
- , *Hornsey 1968: The Art School Revolution*, (London: Frances Lincoln Ltd, 2008).
- , '“Export Britain”: Pop Art, Mass Culture and the Export Drive', *Art History* vol. 35, no. 2, (April 2012), pp. 394-419.
- Tickner, Lisa, and David Peters Corbett, 'Being British and Going... Somewhere', *Art History* vol. 35, no. 2, (April 2012), pp. 206-15.
- Tisdall, Caroline, 'Participation in Art', *The Guardian*, (16 February 1971).
- , 'Sculpture For Performing On', *The Guardian*, (29 April 1971), p. 10.
- , 'Art Think', *The Guardian*, (17 August 1972), p. 10.
- , 'Avant-garde to All Intents', *The Guardian*, (25 August 1972), p. 8.
- , 'Watch My Line', *The Guardian*, (5 December 1972), p. 10.
- , 'European Artists in Oxford', *The Guardian*, (6 July 1974), p. 8.
- , 'Double Figures', *The Guardian*, (20 April 1974), p. 8.
- , '[untitled]', *The Guardian*, (2 January 1974), p. 8.

- , 'Reflections in a Disturbed Eye', *The Guardian*, (25 January 1978), p. 10.
- , 'The Image-Maker Who Sold A Revolution', *The Guardian*, (16 February 1979), p. 12.
- Tisdall, Sarah, 'Oxford Gallery', *Southern Arts*, no. 5, (July/August 1974), pp. 14-15.
- Tolnay, Alexander, 'East/West Artistic Exchange in a Changing Europe', *Kunst & Museumjournal* vol. 4, no. 2, (1992).
- Tomkins, Calvin, 'The Modern Man: How Nicholas Serota is reinventing the Tate Gallery', *The New Yorker*, (2 July 2012).
- Topić, Martina, and Cassandra Sciortino, 'Cultural Diplomacy and Cultural Hegemony. A Framework for the Analysis', in *Cultural Diplomacy and Cultural Imperialism: European Perspective(s)*, ed. by Martina Topić and Siniša Rodin, (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2012).
- Topsfield, Andrew, 'London Hayward Gallery in the Image of Man: The Indian Perception of the Universe Through 2000 Years of Painting and Sculpture', *The Burlington Magazine* vol. 124, no. 951, (1982), pp. 371-74.
- Trodd, Tamara, 'Introduction: Theorising the Projected Image', in *Screen/Space: The Projected Image in Contemporary Art*, ed. by Tamara Trodd, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011).
- Tucker, Anthony, 'A Matter of Light and Life', *The Guardian*, (28 November 1967), p. 7.
- Tupitsyn, Victor, *The Museological Unconscious: Communal (Post)Modernism in Russia*, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2009).
- Tynan, Kenneth, 'Shouts and Murmurs', *The Observer*, (28 April 1968), p. 30.
- Unlimited Ltd., *Takis Signals TS1 TS2 TS3*, brochure, 1969.
- Usselman, Rainer, 'The Dilemma of Media Art: Cybernetic Serendipity at the ICA London', *Leonardo* vol. 36, (October 2003), pp. 389-96.
- Vaizey, Marina, 'Vigorous World of Robert Morris', *Financial Times*, (11 May 1971), p. 3.
- , 'Modern Art Oxford', *Financial Times*, (25 May 1972), p. 3.
- , 'The New Art', *The Financial Times*, (19 September 1972), p. 3.
- , 'Adventure Course', *Sunday Times*, (16 March 1975).
- , 'Russia's Golden Egg', *Sunday Times*, (26 June 1977).
- , 'Secrets of the Workshop', *Sunday Times*, (25 July 1982).
- , 'Inside a Factory of the Human Spirit', *Sunday Times*, (24 January 1982).
- , 'Holland, Joan Mary Crossley- (1912-2005)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
- Vatsayan, Kapila, 'India Presented on its Own Terms', *Museum* vol. XXXIV, no. 4, (1982), pp. 204-13.
- Vaughan, Hannah, ed., *The Graphic Century* (London: Whitechapel Gallery, 2009).
- Vergo, Peter, '[reviews]', *Journal of Russian Studies*, no. 39, (1980), pp. 57-59.
- Vicente, Mercedes, ed., *Darcy Lange: Study of an Artist at Work* (Birmingham: Ikon Gallery, 2008).
- Wagner, Anne, 'Vision Made Visible', in *Light Show*, ed. by Hayward Gallery, (London: Hayward Publishing, 2013).
- Wain, John, 'Oxford', *Southern Arts*, (July/August 1974).
- Walker, John A., 'Joseph Beuys: Secret Block for a Secret Person in Ireland (exhibition review)', *Studio International* vol. 187, no. 967, (June 1974), n.p.
- , *Glossary of Art, Architecture and Design Since 1945*. second revised edn., (London: Clive Bingley, 1977).
- , *Left Shift: Radical Art in 1970s Britain*, (London: I. B. Tauris, 2002).
- Wallis, Brian, 'Selling Nations: International Exhibitions and Cultural Diplomacy', in *Museum Culture: Histories, Discourses, Spectacles*, ed. by Irit Rogoff and Daniel J.

- Sherman, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), pp. 265-281.
- , ‘Public Funding and Alternative Spaces’, in *Alternative Art, New York, 1965-1985*, ed. by Julie Ault, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2002), pp. 161-181.
- Walshaw, Harland, ‘[review]’, *Artscribe*, (August 1982).
- Walters, John L., ‘Britain’s Signature’, *Eye Magazine* vol. 18, no. 71, (Spring 2009), n.p.
- Ward, Frazer, ‘The Haunted Museum: Institutional Critique and Publicity’, *October* vol. 73, (Summer 1995), pp. 71-89.
- Ward, Martha, ‘What’s Important about the History of Modern Art Exhibitions?’, in *Thinking about Exhibitions*, ed. by Reesa Greenberg, Sandy Nairne and Bruce W. Ferguson, (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 451-64.
- Wastell, Paul, ‘Exhibits: Arts’, *Isis*, (21 January 1982).
- Watkins, Jonathan, Simon Chapman, and Ikon Gallery, *This Could Happen to You: Ikon in the 1970s*, (Birmingham: Ikon, 2010).
- Watkins, Jonathan, Diana Stevenson, and Ikon Gallery, *Some of the Best Things in Life Happen Accidentally: The Beginning of Ikon*, (Birmingham: Ikon Gallery, 2004).
- Waugh, Evelyn, *Brideshead Revisited: The Sacred & Profane Memories of Captain Charles Ryder*, (London: Chapman & Hall, 1945).
- Weiss, Rachel, ed., *Making Art Global (Part 1): The Third Habana Biennial 1989* (London: Afterall Books, 2011).
- Whitelegg, Isobel, ‘Signals Echoes Traces’, in *Oiticica in London*, ed. by Guy Brett and Luciano Figueiredo, (London: Tate Publishing, 2007), pp. 89-92.
- Whiteley, Nigel, ‘Toward a Throw-Away Culture: Consumerism, “Style Obsolescence” and Cultural Theory in the 1950s and 1960s’, *Oxford Art Journal* vol. 10, no. 2, (1987), pp. 3-27.
- Willats, Stephen, “‘Stephen Willats: Visual Automatics and Visual Transmitters’ at the Museum of Modern Art, Oxford - to November 16’, *Studio International*, (November 1968).
- Willatt, Hugh, ‘How the Arts are Promoted’, in *The State and the Arts* ed. by John Pick, (Eastbourne, East Sussex: John Offord Publications, 1980).
- Willet, John, ‘Early Soviet Photographers’, *Creative Camera*, no. 209, (May 1982), pp. 510-12.
- Williamson, Beth, ‘Recent Developments in British Art Education: ‘Nothing Changes from Generation to Generation except the Thing Seen’’, *Visual Culture in Britain* vol. 14, no. 3, (27 August 2013), pp. 356-78.
- Wilson, Andrew, ‘Towards An Index of Everything: The Events of Mark Boyle and Joan Hills 1963-1971’, in *Boyle Family*, ed. by Andrew Wilson, Bill Hare and Patrick Elliott, (Edinburgh: National Galleries of Scotland, 2003).
- , ‘Spontaneous Underground: An Introduction to London Psychedelic Scenes, 1965-1968’, in *Summer of Love: Psychedelic Art, Social Crisis and Counterculture in the 1960s*, ed. by Jonathan Harris and Christoph Grunenberg, (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005).
- Wilson, Christopher, ‘Reputations: David King’, *Eye Magazine*, no. 48, (Summer 2003) n.p.
- Wilson, Harold, ‘Leader’s Speech, Brighton’, *British Political Speech*, 1964, <<http://www.britishpoliticalspeech.org/speech-archive.htm?speech=162>>, [accessed 19 August 2012].
- Wilson, Keith, ‘British British Sculpture Sculpture’, in *Modern British Sculpture*, ed. by Keith Wilson and Penelope Curtis, (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2011).
- Winnicott, D. W., *Playing and Reality*, (London: Tavistock Publications, 1971).
- Witts, Richard, *Artist Unknown: The Alternative History of the Arts Council*, (London: Warner, 1998).

- Wolfram, Eddie, 'London/Edinburgh', *Art and Artists* vol. 7, no. 8, (November 1972), p. 44.
- Wood, Anthony, 'Oxford Man in Art Exchange with Russia', *Oxford Mail*, (13 September 1978).
- Wood, Jon, 'The Studio in the Gallery?', in *Reshaping Museum Space: Architecture, Design, Exhibitions*, ed. by Suzanne MacLeod, (London and New York: Routledge, 2005), pp. 158-69.
- Wood, Paul, *Western Art and the Wider World*, (Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell, 2014).
- Wood, William, 'Still You Ask For More: Demand, Display and 'The New Art'', in *Rewriting Conceptual Art*, ed. by Michael Newman and Jon Bird, (Chicago: Reaktion Books, 1999), pp. 66-87.
- Woolf, Virginia, *A Room of One's Own*, (London: Hogarth Press, 1929).
- Woolley, Liz, 'Industrial Architecture in Oxford, 1870 to 1914', *Oxoniensia* vol. 75, (2010), pp. 67-96.
- , *Oxford's Working Past: Walking Tours of Victorian and Edwardian Industrial Buildings*, (Oxford Huxley Scientific Press, 2012).
- Woudhuysen, J., 'David King: Graphic Designer, Ranged Left', *Blueprint* vol. 2, no. 11, (November 1984).
- Wright, Alastair, 'Response: Thoughts on Differences in India and Elsewhere', *Art Bulletin* vol. 90, no. 4, (December 2008), pp. 549-55.
- , 'T. J. Clark: Image of the People: Gustave Courbet and the 1848 Revolution, 1973', in *The Books That Shaped Art History: From Gombrich and Greenberg to Alpers and Krauss*, ed. by Richard Shone and John-Paul Stonard, (London: Thames and Hudson, 2013).
- Wright Jr., Charles A., 'The Mythology of Difference: Vulgar Identity Politics at the Whitney [1993]', in *Art, Activism & Oppositionality: Essays from Afterimage*, ed. by Grant H. Kester, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998), pp. 133-139.
- Wrigley, Richard, 'The Art Club', *Oxford Art Journal* vol. 1, no. 1, (1978), p. 59.
- , 'Oxford University Art Club', *Oxford Art Journal* vol. 2, (April 1979), p. 60.
- Wu, Chin-Tao, *Privatising Culture: Corporate Art Intervention Since the 1980s*, (London: Verso, 2002).
- , 'Biennials Without Borders', *Tate Papers*, no. 12, (Autumn 2009), n.p.
- Wyver, John, 'Photo Premiere at MOMA: Matisse Lithos', *Oxford Tributary*, (29 January 1975).
- Yates, Richard, 'It's Different, It's New and It's Free', *Oxford Mail*, (22 February 1974).
- Žižek, Slavoj, 'Multiculturalism, or, the Cultural Logic of Multinational Capitalism', *New Left Review* vol. I, no. 225, (September-October 1997), pp. 28-51.