In this section, I will examine power in the contemporary context, analysing how both the market and the state instrumentalise culture. In chapter four, there is a recognition of the importance of culture in society and an analysis of the pressures on cultural practitioners. I am using Tate Modern as a case study to analyse the impact of pressure by the state and the market on cultural practitioners in institutions. I will start by explaining the reason behind my choice of case study and the choice of dates. I will explain the particular benefits of analysing Tate Modern as an institution. I will consider some of the more unusual aspects of the contemporary political moment, including the notion of ‘self-responsibilisation’ and consider their relationship to the ‘cultural sector’. The relationship between these notions and a Foucauldian notion of the interiorization of power will be drawn out.

I will consider the self-censorship which occurs as a result of the desire of the institution to be responsible for its own instrumentalisation, its own adherence to government agendas. I will look at the relationship which has been instituted between performance indicators and monetary rewards, where the funding of the institution depends on the fulfilment of particular targets. I consider how some of these targets meld seamlessly a political agenda for the commercialisation, privatisation and popularisation of culture.

Later in this chapter, I consider some of the problems associated with a new close relationship between the corporation, corporate elites and the art institution. I also discuss the importance of the emergence of the Knowledge Economy to the possibilities for commodification of culture. In later chapters of this section I look at the impact of corporate sponsorship at Tate Modern. I conclude this section by looking at the wider London artworld in the period.

The period, 2000-2006, is of particular interest because 1) it is as contemporary to the writing of this thesis as it is practicable to analyse; 2) it is at the core of the Blair
New Labour government (1997-2007) - aspects of Tate Modern's performance may be seen as a direct result of that government’s policies for the arts (despite plans for the new gallery pre-dating it), or in other words, it is an analysis of the impact of state power over the period; 3) there was during the period a developing understanding of the operation of globalised power (protests at World Trade Organisation [WTO] Ministerial conference in Seattle are considered to mark this period 77; 4) the period contains a further significant swing to centralized power undermining freedom and equality within the democratic society, which can be seen to follow terrorist action on September 11, 2001. In other words, this period marks a change in the nature of power which is different from that described by theorists and practitioners of the avant-garde concerned with social change and art in the twentieth century.

Tate Modern is a particularly appropriate case study for this work for a number of reasons. Firstly, it is the only internationally significant gallery to open in London within the period under analysis. Secondly, Tate Modern is particularly demonstrative of the operations of the market and the state and how both tend to undermine democratic potential in art and culture because of the direct pressures on it. These pressures, also apparent throughout the London artworld, are most applicable to Tate Modern by virtue of its size. In this sense, Tate Modern is a crucible for the effects of power: in its relationship to public funding and the government, to corporate sponsorship and to the market.

Thirdly, the reason Tate Modern is an apposite locus for an investigation into the effects of power on art as a democratic act is that, from its inception, the leading figures at Tate Modern had a commitment to, what is here termed, art and curating as a democratic act and that subsequently, and for a variety of reason which will be investigated, Tate Modern shifted the focus of its operations over the period 2000-2006. In ‘Showing the Century’, written by senior curators, Iwona Blazwick and Frances Morris for Tate Modern: A Handbook, the curatorial ambitions for the new

77 Seattle riots in 1999 were the first anti-globalisation protests to feature significantly within the West’s media.
gallery are stated clearly: to ‘critically redefine [the museum] as subjective, contingent and western in their perspective’ given that:

For those who have found themselves absent or misrepresented by virtue of gender or geography, the museum is a triumphal temple to patriarchal and western hegemonies. The international, civic and social status of the large institution ensures that the art it collects comes to represent a canon, an official pantheon of greatness. All such assertions rest as much on what is absent as what is included.

The acknowledgement of issues of hegemony and marginalisation by senior curators and the attempt to address them in the new museum reflects the understanding of senior curators of the importance of culture to society, a significance which in this thesis is described as a concern with freedom and equality that is counter-Power, and is reflected in the relationship between the content and context of artwork. Founding Director, Lars Nittve, wrote:

Tate Modern's ambition to widen our cultural perspective, from a Western concept of internationalism – in the case of modern museums often synonymous, embarrassingly enough, with NATO alliance – to one which is truly worldwide.

With its reference to NATO (the North Atlantic Treaty Organization), this quote seems to articulate an awareness of the relationship between culture and power and the implicit and explicit choices for practitioners vis-à-vis power. The fact that Nittve states in his foreword to Tate Modern: A Handbook that ‘nothing surrounding a work of art is neutral’ also indicates an awareness of the importance of context and art's relationship to society. Not only is it demonstrable that Tate Modern opened with a

79 ibid
81 ibid, p10
82 A tendency within the contemporary art discourse is to divide into two camps both of which are the legacy of Modernism. One camp is focused on the autonomy of Art and, like neo-liberalism, it is fixated on freedom (of speech) though without reference to equality, and the other revolves around the idea that art is a part of society and therefore has a relationship to all aspects of society.
curatorial commitment to challenging canonical absences and inequalities but, additionally, with a reflexivity around context, an understanding of the importance of the interplay of context and content. This is why an analysis of the impact of power on Tate Modern is so pertinent to this thesis. It is a study in how the state and the market attempt to instrumentalise culture, even (or perhaps especially) that culture with an overt and stated commitment to art as a democratic act, and how in the absence of actions for freedom and equality, the context of power consolidates.

I was employed by the Interpretation and Education department from February 2000 prior to the opening until early 2005. For this reason I am not only interested in the phenomenon of Tate Modern and the changes that took place there, I am also particularly sensitive to the nuances of those changes.

### 3.1 Theories of Power and Culture

The twentieth century saw a number of analyses interrogating the role of culture in maintaining power, particularly state power, including the Frankfurt School (Adorno, Marcuse), Gramsci, Althusser and Chomsky. Gramsci brought the culture-power nexus into focus with his analysis of hegemony. Prior to his work, hegemony had been understood as ‘power over’, where one state had ‘power over’ another and power was largely understood in terms of economic dominance of one class over others. Gramsci understood the world order in terms of the dynamics and dialectics of normative dimensions – ethical, ideological, practical – in addition to the material dimension. 83 Importantly, for this thesis, Gramsci described a hegemonic order as one where consent, rather than coercion, primarily characterises the relations between power and individuals. It is not simply a case of dominance through sanctions, punishments or inducements, but it involves ‘intellectual and moral leadership’, in which culture

---

plays a part. Culture helps to organise and promulgate a set of hegemonic ideas or dominant ideology.

Reading Gramsci, an organisation such as Tate Modern can be seen as simply normalising dominant ideology. However few working within museums and galleries would endorse any strict reading of State-sponsored culture or their place within it. Generally speaking, we who work within the ‘cultural sector’, consider ourselves to be independent thinkers with integrity and the ability to stand firmly against authoritarianism.

In ‘Actions speak louder than words’, a 2006 article for *engage: international journal of visual art and gallery education*, I argue that the current generation of curators and educationalists working in museums and galleries have read psychoanalytic, Marxist, post-colonial, semiotic and feminist theory, and some even claim a position that is overtly counter-hegemonic as the quotes by Nittve, Blazwick and Morris demonstrate. Despite this, little has really changed in museums practice, as Carol Duncan observed in *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*, 1995. Rhetoric goes further than practice. In this thesis, I address the material pressures that support the status quo and undermine action for freedom and equality. In the article, I wrote that it was a ‘culture of the Same’ described in Levinasian terms at Tate Modern which was the main reason for the marked difference between rhetoric and practice over that period. I argued that it was a fundamental inability to perceive the other as Other by the institution that meant that theoretically outmoded hierarchies and exclusions were reproduced despite individual commitments to ideas of equality and freedom. In fact it may be that external pressures to recreate an artworld that is in the interest of power (hierarchy, status, fixity and relations based

in subjugation) combine with the internal, psycho-philosophical rationale described in the article that made it difficult, even impossible, to have an ethical engagement with the Other. 88 This chapter will analyse that exogenous pressure: how power strives to co-opt culture for its own ends and how, despite the best instincts and intentions of artists, curators and academics, amongst others, we readily comply with the instrumentalisation of art and culture. With Arendt's analysis of 'the banality of evil' in mind, this process of instrumentalisation must be analysed when freedom and equality is indeed valued. 89

Understood through a history of critique of the culture-power nexus, power can be understood as always and inevitably attempting to influence culture. Brian Sedgemore MP claims that all politicians today 'have a natural and maybe unconscious desire to keep the notion of cultural value intact because culture is now a matter of public policy in all Western democracies'. 90 This may be particularly so of institutional or hegemonic culture, like Tate Modern, or that culture through which power is mirrored. 91 In *Cathedrals of Urban Modernity*, Pedro Lorente argues this has been the case from the beginning of modernity with Louis XVIII establishing the 'Musée des Artistes Vivants' in 1818 at the Palais de Luxembourg, Paris, as a display of French vitality and creativity. 92

88 'Levinas noted that Western knowledge (philosophy) has been based on an assumption, and an alarming paradox, that knowledge is universal and yet, knowledge all stems from, and is confined to, the particularity of the Greco-European experience and tradition. ... Levinas understands that knowledge, based on this *philia*, a system of like-ness, on the exchange of the Same with the Same is a system of knowledge, of thought, of culture, that inherently has a horror of the Other. This horror can only be minimised when the Other is assimilated as part of the Same. Therefore the other is not allowed to be Other, it must be an extension of the Self / the Same.' p31. Critchley, S., *The Ethics of Deconstruction: Derrida and Lévinas*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, (1992) 1999

89 In *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, Arendt makes the observation that the operation of Death Camps within the Nazi regime was less the product of hatred, or an irrational evil instinct or aberrant behaviour on the part of those Germans, but each and every person involved, from engineers and designers onwards, displaying a commitment to doing a good job.


90 Sedgmore, B., 'Politics and Culture: The State and the Artist', *Art for All*, op cit, p24

91 Clearly politicians and senior management within multinational corporations do not align themselves with all forms of culture (most distinctly, not working class or most migrant cultures), though politicians are particularly fluid in their cultural alignments as demonstrated when suddenly they reference youth culture or, say, black British music culture.

92 Lorente, J.P.,'The Luxembourg museum in Paris', *Cathedrals of Urban Modernity*: 62
However well-established the precedent, Blair's New Labour government revivified the idea with state branding. Naomi Klein's analysis of branding in the contemporary context observed that 'Blair is a world leader as nation stylist'. The state and the market use branding comparably to consolidate power: to maintain market dominance for a given corporation, particularly when it is not tied to any type of product (as Klein skillfully demonstrated), to consolidate 'the message' of the state. Culture as part of the national brand contributes to the manipulation of truth, internationally and intra-nationally. When used internally, as spin, branding is an obfuscation of meanings for the imagined good of the nation. Václav Havel observes in 'The Power of the Powerless' (1978), that true freedom rests on a foundation of truth. Falsity can but serve power. Havel states:

people, both as victims and pillars of the post-totalitarian system, [are served] with the illusion that the system is in harmony with the human order and the order of the universe. ... It pretends that the requirements of the system derive from the requirements of life. It is a world of appearances trying to pass for reality.

Hywel Williams makes the case that the branding of nation and culture is specifically a New Labour technology of government:

---

94 'Ever since, a select group of corporations has been attempting to free itself from the corporeal world of commodities, manufacturing and products to exist on another plane. Anyone can manufacture a product, they reason. ... Headquarters, meanwhile is free to focus on the real business at hand – creating a corporate mythology powerful enough to infuse meaning into these raw objects just by signing its name. ... liberated from the real-world burdens of stores and product manufacturing, these brands are free to soar, less as the disseminators of goods or services than as collective hallucinations.' p22 Klein, N., ibid, pp15-26
95 On the international level, the nation-state brands itself by selling an image based on notional qualities or values, like quality, or friendliness, as Philip Kotler, marketing guru, usefully observes Kotler, P., Jatusripitak, S., Maesincee, S., *The marketing of nations: a strategic approach to building national wealth*, New York, London, Free Press, c1997
The invention of a political party which calls itself New Labour, and its consequent concern with the branding of a product in order to sustain the political cadre in office, stands out therefore as the apotheosis of all modern British politics – its essential and defining concern with the technocratic management of democratic expectations. 97

This concern with managing expectations extends in this period from government to culture and to the promotion of national truths. Thus culture in the period can be seen to be subject to 'technocratic management' in the service of the new political class. Other technologies of government in the period can be seen to impact on cultural practice. 'Self-responsibilisation' was perhaps the unforeseen consequence of the new political ideology, Giddens' 'the third way'. 98 Each individual is self-manager, he must be ‘on message’. According to Neil Barnett's critique of the impact of New Labour policies on the public sector:

[w]e are all increasingly called upon to mobilise and equip ourselves with the dispositions and skills necessary to be ‘active citizens’ and engage in ‘self-responsibilisation’. 99

For Barnett, the public participation underpinned by the concept of ‘inclusion’ is essentially a ‘technology of government’. It is a neo-liberal mechanism of power in

97 Williams, H., op cit, p16
98 Giddens emphasises individual responsibility in The Third Way but this was merely conceptual when Giddens published and even when Neil Barnett wrote his critique in 2002. By November 2002, this was actualised in Citizenship Law in 2002, a marked change in the 1914 British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act. The law changed from citizenship being the inalienable right of every British citizen to citizenship being a privilege and one which can be stripped from any citizen and in 2005 reasons for deprivation of citizenship was lowered to the person must be ‘not conducive to the public good’, with overtones of the mass-deportations to Australia and other colonies of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It is Giddens' treatise, The Third Way, 1998 which underpins New Labour reconceptualisation of politics and society though the thinking within ‘the third way’ can be traced in Social Justice: Strategies for National Renewal: The Report of the Commission on Social Justice, London, Vintage 1994. This publication is the conclusion of an independent commission set up by the late John Smith MP set out to ‘develop a practical vision of economic and social reform for the 21st century’ (blurb). Though innovative and interesting in terms of an attempt to remove gross iniquity and create ‘social justice’, the unintended consequences of third way politics was almost the opposite. Now it was the individual who is blamed for their own exclusion rather than the system. Effectively undermining the class politics of (traditional) Labour by laying all responsibility on the individual, third way politics of New Labour denies the reality of systemic failure further alienating whole groups within society.
which the government operates at a distance via the ‘conduct of conduct’.\textsuperscript{100} For the publicly-funded art institution born to a New Labour government this may mean the management of the message via the institution and an emphasis on participation (in the message) by stakeholders who are understood as the institution’s audiences, prefiguring the importance in the period of the debate on access and inclusion.

Barnett analyses the intended and unintended consequences of New Labour policy within the public sector:

Social cohesion and stability are to be based upon the sharing of common values, which are to be inculcated and ingrained through family, civil society and government. ... Whilst the post-war settlement saw the populace as ‘pawns’, who needed the oversight of ‘knights’ (professionals working for the common good), now the image is of the recipient as knave, who needs to be directed and educated away from his/her base instincts. Fitzpatrick argues that here social engineering gives way to self-engineering - ‘the management of the self by the self in terms of prescribed moral guidelines’, to produce a particular brand of what he calls ‘post-social communitarianism’ or ‘benign authoritarianism’, which requires that the ‘excluded’ be morally re-armed to take responsibility for themselves. ... Governmentality works through the ‘conduct of conduct’ and... control is exercised through the management of freedom, or self-regulation. ... In all cases the emphasis is upon ‘the responsibilisation of the self’ and of instilling reflexive self-control. ... These ‘technologies of the self’ allow for the connection between the ‘micro politics’ of everyday behavior and broad political rationalities.\textsuperscript{101}

In other words, by consciously encouraging self-management, the State has adopted Foucault’s understanding of the operation of power as interiorization and attempts to harness it, furthering control over the individual through ‘technologies of the self’, a disguised tool against individual freedom and equality in the service of power.

\textsuperscript{100}ibid
because choice is curtailed and inequality blamed on individual behaviour rather than systemic iniquity.\textsuperscript{102} As museums are active sites of education, both in the diffuse manner that exhibitions ‘educate’, and directly through their education and interpretation departments, they are well placed to promulgate the government’s agenda for the self and/in society. Barnett’s argument identifies the complicity of those who work towards ‘inclusion’, including museum staff and educators, which despite their best intentions or wishes to the contrary, help to create a culture which does not in fact honour freedom, but rather its opposite. It is a culture of conformity to a government agenda of good citizenship and a self-management against alternative behaviours or values.

Perhaps inadvertently, this policy of ‘self-responsibilisation’ can be seen to have promoted a culture of fabrication and self-censorship within the arts during this period. Everyone in receipt of government funding - arts administrators, managers, artists and curators - must be seen to be fulfilling targets. As Sara Selwood argues in ‘Unreliable Evidence: The rhetorics of data collection in the cultural sector’, statistics in arguably unquantifiable outcomes (such as social and regeneration outcomes) are produced so that an institution is seen as actively conforming to the government’s social agenda for the arts:

DCMS is expected to present ‘evidence’ in ways that not only have to satisfy the criteria by which the department itself theoretically judges the ‘robustness’ of data; but which comply with the specifications laid down in the Treasury’s \textit{Green Book}. They also have to satisfy the recommendations made in the recent Office of Science and Technology review of the department’s management and use of ‘science’. ... [with] the requirement to show ‘a return’.\textsuperscript{103}

A certain amount of fabrication therefore can be seen as one response to government’s instrumentalisation of the arts and culture: performance indicators may

\textsuperscript{102}ibid, p314. It is Hodgson who is quoted as connecting ‘Foucault’s concept of “governmentality”, which allows us to make sense of the paradox of simultaneous “empowerment” with “manipulation”’ with New Labour.

\textsuperscript{103}Selwood, S., ‘Unreliable Evidence: The rhetorics of data collection in the cultural sector’, \textit{Culture Vultures : Is UK arts policy damaging to the arts?}, op cit, p42
necessitate ‘creative accounting’. Fabrication potentially undermines the instruments of government.

A more sinister consequence of self-responsibilisation, though, is a rise in the incidence of censorship and self-censorship in the arts over the period, particularly when in partnership with the private sector, because of the tendency of self-management to inhibit ‘undesirable’ behaviours. The politically committed and socially engaged artist, Peter Kennard, is the most publicly outspoken on this issue but, despite it being a relatively common occurrence, few in the artworld are willing to go ‘on the record’ regarding censorship and institutional self-censorship. The following examples are from my own personal experience or those of colleagues and friends, known anecdotally. To date, nothing has been published on any of these events.

My writing for the teachers’ kit that accompanied ‘Century City’ (sponsored by CGNU, now Aviva) 2001 was ambivalent regarding the effects of globalisation. When the publication came back from the printer, all ambivalence was removed and the text read as unquestionably positive with regard globalisation - a position far from my own. Nevertheless, it was my name at the bottom of the essays. While this type of editorial process may be considered de rigueur for some institutions, Tate Modern prided itself at the time on ‘interpretation [being] about allowing a number of possibilities to co-exist’. 104 In fact, it was my job to introduce levels of criticality to the various exhibitions and displays. The institution’s choice to self-censor for fear of offending the corporate sponsors was out of character and not predictable.

In 2005, South Bank Centre senior management cancelled a programme of events interrogating corporate sponsorship, initiated under the auspices of education and arranged as part of Architecture Week. A new commission by Pankof Bank was cancelled in addition to the live events. The reason for this according to colleagues at South Bank Centre was a fear of alienating its corporate partners, particularly

---

Starbucks. (Self-)censorship may also explain the sudden refusal by South Bank Centre to allow Platform to stage an event on Jubilee Gardens, in front of the Shell Centre, for ‘Remember Saro-wiwa’ (2005).

The part of the chapter has attempted to show some of the indirect and unintended consequences of government policy for the arts and culture during 2000 to 2006 and the various choices individuals make in the face of pressure to conform to an agenda of power within the democratic society. The emphasis throughout this thesis is on the relationship of the individual to power and the attempt to analyse the sum of those individual actions.

### 3.2 Power, Culture and the State

While the government explicitly denied it at the time, there was a demonstrable overt agenda for the arts over the period 2000-2006, ongoing since 1997 when New Labour first came into government, which will be demonstrated here. Further, this instrumentalist agenda over time can be shown to have eroded the potential for publicly funded practices concerned with freedom and equality. Nevertheless, the government persistently claimed an ‘arm’s length’ policy towards the arts. 105 The phrase was first used by the post-war government on inaugurating the Arts Council of Great Britain in 1948. At that time there was a nationalistic agenda for the arts, displaying the best of British, but culture was not tied to any other political or social agenda. A 2004 speech by Tessa Jowell, then Minister for Culture Media and Sport, demonstrates either a wilful interpretation of the concept of ‘arm’s length’ or a misunderstanding of its original meaning:

---

105 Under ‘arts policy’ on the DCMS website, the first submenu was ‘arm’s length policy’ which reassured readers of the Government’s commitment to the principle and defines what they mean by it. Online. Available HTTP <http://www.culture.gov.uk/arts/policy_for_arts/arms_length_principle.htm.> (Accessed 3 May 2006) By 1 November 2006, the website was rehauled and an explanation of how the government took seriously this policy was no longer in existence.
Yes, we will need to keep proving that engagement with culture can improve educational attainment, and can help reduce crime. But we should also stand up for what culture can do for individuals in a ways that nothing else can. Culture alone can give people the means better to understand and engage with life, as such is a key part in reducing inequality of opportunity, and which can help us slay the sixth giant of modern times – poverty of aspiration. This must be the next priority in the mission at the core of this Government: to transform our society into a place of justice, talent and ambition where individuals can fulfil their true potential.  

The government exerts pressure to conform to its agendas for the arts and culture (‘educational attainment’, ‘reduc[ing] crime’, social engineering) through performance indicators and targets. Funding Agreements between the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) and cultural institutions include performance indicators, the instruments of self-governance described by Barnett. Performance indicators monitor the ‘conduct of conduct’, putting the onus on museums and galleries and arts practitioners to self-manage according to the government’s will. Performance indicators are common to all Grant-in-Aid (or government funding) recipients across the museums and gallery sector. As such, they are a means of comparison across museums and galleries regardless of location, collection, history, 

107The Government's performance indicators on audience size and type has on the one hand a commercial emphasis, but on the other, it is socially orientated as a mechanism of ‘social inclusion’. One emphasis in The Funding Agreement between the Tate Gallery and DCMS for 1999-2002 (which covers all Tate Galleries plus new or additional support for Tate Modern 2000-01 and 2001-02) is types of audience. The 1999 Agreement includes the following performance targets: Number of visitors (As a % of visitors: Children, Repeat visitors, Ethnic minorities, C2,D and E SEGs); % of time open; Website visits; Participants in offsite programme; Learners in on-site programmes; Learners in outreach programmes; UK loan venues; Overseas loan venues; % of collection internet accessible; % of space at right environmental quality. Funding Agreement DCMS 06 June 2000, addendum. Over the years, performance indicators changed. In 2003 a new contract was drawn up between the DCMS and Tate trustees for funding the years 2003-2006. Quantitative performance indicators for those years also included total number of visitors, total number of children visitors, number of venues in England to which objects from the collection are loaned; number of C2DE visitors, number of website hits, number of children in organised educational programmes both on-site and outreach. It is notable that ‘repeat visitors’ and ‘ethnic minorities’ are dropped from the targets. The only other targets that are dropped are ones that have been demonstrably achieved such as % of collection internet accessible; % of space at right environmental quality; % of time open.
aim, size, audience. League tables of adherence to government policy and excellence in those terms may be drawn up to further incentivise museums to conform.

Performance indicators are not simply lines drawn in the sand. If Tate, or any other publicly funded body, failed to achieve any of its targets its funding was imperilled with potentially devastating consequences. For example, from 2000-2006, Grant-in-Aid constituted between 29-33% of Tate's annual income. 108 In addition to the performance indicators which help ‘self-management’, details of precisely how Tate must fulfil DCMS priorities were in the Funding Agreement itself. Under the subheading ‘Tate Aims and Objectives’, Tate Galleries must be seen to be fulfilling a government agenda:

[Tate's aim to] develop the Tate's audiences at each of its galleries and beyond [fulfils] DCMS objectives 2, 3, 4 & 6 [while the aim to]
demonstrate leadership in key fields [fulfils] DCMS objectives 2,3 & 4. 109

This Funding Agreement also stated a commitment to ‘form commercial partnerships through and with sponsors, product developers, and potential licensing partners’. 110 While still in its first term in office, the government had a peculiar interest in forming public-private partnerships across the arts and cultural sector. The Millennium Dome was a product of this. To quote Peter Kennard in ‘Blair’s Art’:

Blair's Dome vision is of a world of flashing admonition Plc, a world of instructions to be consumed while consuming McDonalds as you

---

108The DCMS grant is for Tate as a whole. There is no separate grant for Tate Modern and they state it is impossible to break down the Grant-in-Aid for Tate Modern or calculate it as a percentage of total income for Tate Modern alone. It is only possible to do so for the whole organisation.

109Funding Agreement DCMS 06 June 2000, addendum. The focus of this thesis is Tate Modern for reasons already stated, but in this section, I will draw on documents which cover either both London Tate Galleries (such as audience surveys) or all Tate galleries and other enterprises, such as the consolidated Tate accounts. Though Tate Modern is managed and curated as an independent entity, different from each of the other Tate galleries, financially and commercially, it is considered but one of many strands. The government’s Grant-in-Aid goes to all Tate galleries and despite a ‘Freedom of Information’ question, I do not know of the exact proportion going to Tate Modern. This section therefore has a few blurred edges between Tate and Tate Modern.

110Funding Agreement DCMS 06 June 2000, addendum, 2.6
follow the yellow brick logo. ... It's sad that the work of some of the best artists in the country is an ingredient in this unholy swill. It's also sad that their work becomes as anodyne as the surrounding mess. 111

Later in 2000, perhaps as a consequence of the spectacular failure of the Dome on every level (commercial, popular, artistic), Tate Modern was left more or less to its own devices regarding content and details of the precise relations with the corporate sector. By 2003 though, the new Funding Agreement between Tate and the DCMS made the relationship between self-generated income, public and private funding more explicit:

3.5 Success in achieving the targets in this Funding Agreement will inform the way in which the Secretary of State is able to approach the next funding round with the Treasury. Tate's ability to show measurable improvements in service delivery and achievement of the target to support delivery of Government policies will be a factor in the Secretary of State's decisions over future allocations.

3.6 This Funding Agreement recognises that the achievement of the targets may also reflect success in self-generated income, sponsorship and improvements in efficiency.112

The three-year funding agreement of 2003 makes the position of Tate vis-à-vis government funding explicit: if Tate fails to reach their targets, this will be reflected in future funding with the implication of punitive measures. If Tate succeeds in the commercial aspirations set by the Government, this will also be reflected in future funding agreements with unstated consequences but presumably the reward of future public funding. By this it can be seen that it is a DCMS agenda that Tate Modern (and other cultural institutions) becomes, effectively, a public-private partnership.

Andrew Brighton, Head of Public Programmes at Tate Modern 2000-2003, amongst others, have characterised the government's reliance on performance indicators as

112 “Three Year Funding Agreement 2003-2006 Between the Board of Trustees of the Tate Gallery and the Department for Culture, Media and Sport’
Stalinist.\textsuperscript{113} Using terms like *partīinost* to evoke totalitarian leftist centralisation, Brighton states:

> What I have tried to show is that translated into the subtler hegemonic persuasions of a Western democracy we are looking at something near to *partīinost* as the determinate of public-sector arts support in this country.\textsuperscript{114}

Though it is true that performance indicators are a feature of centralised government, they may also be understood as a market-inspired approach. ‘You get what you measure’ is a business homily used to help focus business on potentially profitable angles. Rather than being a throw-back to Labour’s communist roots, performance indicators may be seen as more evidence of growing market ideology and ‘consumerist’ values within the public sector. It is misleading to rely on twentieth century models of critique of market versus state in understanding the contemporary moment. There has been a shift in ideology and market-state alliances are now the norm across all areas of government.

Over the period 2000-2006, the entire DCMS budget, across all of culture, media and sport, was £1.5 billion. To put this amount into perspective, this was the same amount as the 2005 NHS (National Health Service) overspend alone. Of this, less than one third, £400 million, went to museums and galleries across the country. By comparison, the Millennium Dome alone cost £758 million and the budget for the 2012 London Olympics is approximately £10 billion. Other comparisons can be made across government expenditure to indicate just how little £400 million really is by Government spending standards over this period, including the budget for Trident submarines (£15-20 billion per submarine) and the budget for proposed ID cards (£5.5 billion with an original estimate of £3.1 billion).\textsuperscript{115} Culture therefore is not an area which requires financial tweaking in order to maintain an overall healthy

\textsuperscript{113}Munira Mirza, ‘Introduction’, *Culture Vultures*, op cit
\textsuperscript{114}Andrew Brighton, ‘Towards a Command Culture: New Labour's Cultural Policy and Soviet Socialist Realism’, *Art for All*, op cit, p40
\textsuperscript{115}As another comparison but one that falls outside the dates of analysis within this thesis, occurred on November 15 2007. Gordon Brown announced £400 million budget (that is, the same amount of money available for all museums and galleries across the UK) for projects that would help reintegrate radicalised Muslim youth.
budget. Instead, the stress on Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) as a panacea for all financing or management ills may be understood as more ideological than practical. The New Labour government can be seen to have had an almost blind commitment to PPP with little reflection as to efficacy and cost effectiveness, let alone appropriateness.\textsuperscript{116} Yet the model is imposed on every area of government funding and in the area of culture, the Government’s perceived need for corporate intervention must be understood as ideologically-driven, not economically-based, given the relatively nominal sums involved.

One year after opening, Tate Modern issued the following Press Release:

Tate Modern has had 5.25 million visitors in its first year, making the new gallery the most popular modern art museum in the world and the third most popular tourist attraction in Britain.

The gallery helped create approximately 3,000 jobs in London and has brought economic benefits to London of around £100 million a year, helping to generate between £50 and £70 million of economic benefits to Southwark, one of the most disadvantaged boroughs in London.

- Over 100,000 school children visited the Gallery in organised groups
- 135,000 Tate Audios were used (sponsored by Bloomberg)
- 9,800 visitors took part in family workshops
- An increase of 46% to Tate Membership, from 26,000 to 38,000
- 1.5 million postcards were sold
- 55,000 Tate Modern Handbooks were sold
- 850,000 teas and coffees were served

The majority of Tate Modern's visitors were from the UK. 37% came from the London region and 34% from the rest of Britain. 29% of visitors were from overseas, with Europe and North America contributing 12% and 11% each. 75% of Tate Modern's

\textsuperscript{116}Many have tracked the instances where public private partnerships fail, are corrupted, or where the public take on all the risk and the private take all the profit. Most critics are opposed on their own ideological grounds such as George Monbiot’s \textit{Captive State: The corporate takeover of Britain}, London, Pan Macmillan, 2000. Nevertheless, it is true that many of these PPP schemes are underpinned by contracts which favour the private sector because all the risk is underwritten by the Government.
audience were on their first visit and 50% of were under 35. The average visit length was 2 hours 14 minutes. 117

The press release betrays an interesting mix of evidence for a successful integration of government social priorities for the arts and everyday commercial statistics. The various levels of instrumentalisation are enumerated: Tate Modern as epitome of commercial success and as embodiment of state priorities for culture.

A historical suspicion of the market within both academia and the avant garde is overturned with this Tate Modern press release.118 The market and the arts are at one, explicitly and overtly, and the press release can be understood as serving as a public statement of adherence to New Labour policy. After all, Tate Gallery already publishes biennial public reports (in 2002, 2004 and 2006) which are similar to any publicly listed corporation's annual report and are similarly publicly available. Reports are also written directly to the DCMS in order to secure future funding. All this information is already in the public domain. It is therefore probable that this press release serves another purpose: it makes adherence to government policy and its successes 'public' in another sense. The 2001 press release, which was not repeated since (within the time frame of the thesis), seems to indicate the need for the gallery to show willing with regard government policies. This is not to say that Tate Modern as an institution or any of Tate Modern's senior management, from Nicholas Serota down, feels compelled to showing willing. In fact, his independence of government may be indicated by the fact that the Head of Tate Galleries was also a member of many lobbying groups on behalf of the arts, culture and the museums


118 This historical ambivalence, if not hostility, can be seen in the artist group ARBKD's 1928 manifesto: 'Visual artists... your place therefore is at the side of the fighting proletariat!', 'Manifesto and Statutes' ARBKD, 1928 cited in Harrison, C. and Wood, P., (Eds), Art In Theory 1900-2000: An Anthology of Changing Ideas, Oxford, Blackwell 2002, p409. The simplistic idea that the avant-garde was wholly anti-capitalist has been problematised by many including in Corris, M., (Ed), Conceptual Art: theory, myth & practice, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, c2004
sector over the period. Power over this period operated subtly, through complicity, self-management and participation. ‘Self-responsibilisation’ put the onus on us.

3.3 Power, Culture and the Market

Power in the contemporary context is understood here as both the market and the state. Chin-tao Wu's meticulous collection of data and analysis in *Privatising Culture: Corporate Art Intervention since the 1980s* (2002) charts the impact of the corporate sector on the visual arts in the UK and USA. Through her analysis, three major reasons for this involvement in the contemporary context can be distinguished: 1) because of the personal motivation of individuals in powerful positions within given corporations; 2) because culture legitimates new money (an observation made by Pierre Bourdieu in the 1960-70s, and reiterated for the contemporary context by *The Art Newspaper* columnist Georgina Adam); and 3) for marketing purposes. In other words, in a great many instances, corporations and individuals within corporations support the arts for personal or corporate gain. Wu states:

The engagement of this business elite in the arts can thus be interpreted both on the individual and the corporate levels. Despite all the media attention given to self-made entrepreneurs during the Thatcher and Reagan years, top corporate management was, and still is, dominated by an economically privileged, and thereby socially and educationally prominent, class in both countries [UK and USA]. By virtue of their social background and corporate positions, they are participants in an intricate and complicated web of economic and social networks of acquaintance, friendship and inter-marriage. However, inherited wealth or a high-status occupation, as Thorstein Veblen argued in the nineteenth century, does not of itself constitute a sufficient credential for membership of the dominant section of the class.\(^{121}\)

---

119 The ‘Realise your right to art’ campaign is one such lobby. The Visual Arts and Galleries Association vaga.co.uk
120 Bourdieu, P., *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, op cit
Culture is required to legitimate class. This part of her analysis leads to a description of the prevalence of those from the corporate sector sitting as trustees of public museums and galleries, giving contemporary substance to Mills’ analysis of the power elite of the 1950s. As trustees are legally responsible for a gallery, they have a direct hand in the business of running it, guiding its direction as a business entity. They also have a hand in acquisitions and, by virtue of that, employment. For example, at Tate Modern, when trustees decided to focus on Latin America for their new acquisitions, which happened to be a rising market, an appointment was made for a new Associate Curator of Latin American art. The personal influence of individual trustees who are also senior managers of corporations is not to be underestimated, potentially aligning its activities with private sector concerns and orthodoxies. To counterbalance this, organisations like Tate and Arts Council England place artists on their boards which then leads to its own problems. An example occurred during Chris Ofili’s time on the board, when concurrently Tate acquired a number of his works, some of which were displayed at Tate Modern and Tate Britain. (This was noticed in various artworld publications, like Art Monthly, but similar observations can be made of Michael Craig Martin’s tenure just prior to this period of analysis.) A conflict of interest could be said to operate for both artists and corporate trustees.

Individuals have an influence over the direction of a public institution from a position on the board, but so too does a corporation once it comes into a financial arrangement with the gallery. Arts & Business, a government funded organisation devoted to building better business relations with the arts, run seminars to help arts organisations understand what it is that corporations want from partnerships with arts organisations, teaching arts organisations to learn how to meet corporate needs. They state:

122 2.2 ‘Development of the Collection’, Tate Plan 2002, p6. Why Tate Modern in 2002 would focus on contemporary Latin American art may be more to do with the rising market in that area than any inherent connection between the museum or Britain and Latin America either historically or art historically.
[C]ompanies are harnessing the power of the arts to add value to their businesses by:

- increasing brand loyalty
- creating awareness and visibility
- stimulating sales
- creating opportunities to display or showcase products
- communicating commitment to social responsibility
- entertaining clients and prospects

According to Arts & Business, arts organisations working to models of ‘best practice’ pre-empt these needs and accommodate them in their ‘development’ strategies.

With the emphasis this way around it becomes likely that a corporate agenda may influence, even lead, museums' practice even when this is incongruous in terms of the institution's own agenda.

Figure 5: Peter Kennard, 'Untitled', 2003.

---


124 Sue Daniels, Director Arts & Business London, speaking at the Courtauld Institute, 10 October 2007 for ‘Between Culture and Capital: Art, Institutions and Corporate Patronage’. It is of note that originally, 30 years ago and for the first 20 years, Arts & Business was funded by corporate membership. Later it was funded by the DCMS and by 1998, it was 60% funded by Arts Council England thus implying a commitment by government to this relationship. Scottish visual art magazine, Variant, noted growing government pressure towards public-private partnerships in 1997. French, L., ‘Party Swings and Roundabouts’, *Variant*, 3, Summer 1997
For The Guardian, Peter Kennard wrote a piece on an instance of corporate censorship in 2003:

Five weeks ago I was asked, along with the artist Banksy, by Damon Albarn to produce an image symbolising peace and Christmas, to be projected on Trinity House in the City of London as part of the Brighten Up London campaign. I was told it was a project organised by Bob Geldof and sponsored by Orange. There were expenses but no fee. To make a public artwork was my spur, to make an image of hope after a year of war. ... After this, silence. The day for the projection came and went with no projection, followed by a series of confused messages about problems with the image. Eventually Niamh Byrne, head of media relations at Orange, told The Guardian on December 24 that even though she found the image ‘absolutely fantastic ... what we were looking for was something that people from little children to grandparents could appreciate’. My picture did not, apparently, fall into this category.125

This example demonstrates one of the, arguably inevitable, outcomes of corporate sponsorship: if the art doesn’t promote the corporate brand, it goes unsupported, effectively censored. Corporations have marketing requirements of art. The desire for corporate sponsorship to balance the books leads to a conflict of interest manifested as direct censorship (gagging) or institutional self-censorship for fear of offending a sponsor. 126

An economic-based criticism of the market is that it is in the nature of the market to militate against diversity: if and when one company manages to get an advantage over other companies, they will use that advantage to further their advantage, so over time, there becomes structural inequalities across the breadth of the market.

125 Kennard, P., ‘Hung out to dry by the sponsors: Art’s corporate backers decide what we can see in public spaces’, The Guardian, 30 December 2003

126 The project, Brighten Up London, was apparently an Orange corporation initiative, working with Bob Geldof who had stated that he wanted to illuminate London with messages of peace. onEdition, a photographic PR consultancy company has used the event as a case study. They state that the objective was ‘to generate publicity of Orange at Christmas, a time when mobile phone sales are traditionally high. ... Each day a new building was illuminated with a themed message from a series of celebrities [sic], including Nelson Mandela, Stella McCartney, Jerry Hall and Kylie Minogue’. Online. Available HTTP <http://www.onedition/documents/Orange_000.pdf> (Accessed 08/01/08)
The market is necessarily hierarchical, even monopolistic, in its tendency according to economists Nitzan and Bichler. \(^{127}\) State laws preventing monopolies and anti-competitive mergers mitigate the very worst effects of this tendency. This is where the state (or trade laws laid down by the nation-state) is understood as a necessary check on the excesses of the market.

Because an unfettered market inherently tends towards monoculturalism, it is questionable therefore whether a greater alliance between public institutions and the market is advantageous to the public. The market supports monoculturalism while the democratic society demands diversity.

Louisa Buck observed in *Market Matters* that there has always been a relationship between public sector and the market within the visual arts. \(^{128}\) This is true but what is at stake in a growing alliance between market and state is the monoculturalism produced by the market. This monoculturalism is the product of either the tastes of the artworld power elite or that which is instrumentalizable within the economic imperative of corporate sponsorship. It could be argued that any unconsidered, unbalanced or unregulated relationship between market and state with regard to culture must, by definition, erode the platform for art as a democratic act. The market undermines equality and therefore ultimately affords freedom but for the few.

The Knowledge Economy further ties art, as intellectual property and commodity, to the market. According to Jaime Stapleton’s 2002 doctoral thesis, the Knowledge Economy is a result of various changes in global economics and is one major part of the overall globalisation picture (the other being neo-liberal economics, or unfettered market forces). Though knowledge has been an economic product in its own right for 20 years (‘TRIPS’, international trade in Intellectual Property began in 1986), Intellectual Property (IP) has become vitally important to the economies of the west since 1997. This is because the emphasis on knowledge as property meant that the west could prevent jobs moving from the developed world to the cheaper, under-

---

127 Bichler, S., and Nitzan, J., op cit, 2002
128 Buck, L., op cit, p6
developed world as occurred with manufacturing and other material-based economies, like mining.  

With the increasing growth of the Knowledge Economy, there was a greater emphasis on intellectual property, including art, patents and software or anything that can be written down or documented, as commodity. This has a real implication for artists. Not only can artwork now be used to further Intellectual Property rights through the courts of law, as happened in Rogers V Koons (1989-1992), but there is absolutely no type of practice which stands a priori outside property law. In other words, there is no artistic practice or strategy which is not inherently commodifiable and this has ramifications for art's relationship to power, particularly if that relationship is unconsidered. The importance of IP to the British economy also explains the centrality of culture to the British brand as briefly discussed above.

From another point of view, though related, Boltanski and Chiapello analyse the avant garde in relation to changes within capitalism in The New Spirit of Capitalism (2005). Their argument is that, rather than being outside capitalism as is commonly understood by both practitioners and theorists, the avant garde have always been the very epitome of capitalist practice as it mutated from material-based to process-based, and so on to experience-based and transformative. In common with other theorists throughout recent decades, Boltanski and Chiapello's analysis has attempted to remove the anti-capitalist/anti-consumerist pedestal the avant-garde have enjoyed. What makes this theory different from its predecessors is that it implicates avant-gardist practices in the current context of power and the Knowledge Economy, in this sense it substantiates observations by Stapleton. Boltanski and Chiapello argue that the recent increase in business management literature discussing ‘creativity’ and ‘innovation’ is a function of the late capitalist transformation economy with direct parallels in contemporary art practice. Demonstrating through an analysis of management discourse that ideas about the

129 Corner House Briefing Paper 32, Political Organising Behind TRIPS, September 2004
usefulness of creativity and innovation to business have changed and become central, no area of artistic practice can be understood as a priori outside capitalism. These changes in the position of the avant-garde can be traced in government discourse about the arts and culture. Culture today is subsidised not as a public good but as a core business model.

In summary, art institutions like Tate Modern, which can be seen to have been committed to challenging power were both compelled and chose to align themselves with government and corporate agendas. Funding Agreements and the necessity of corporate sponsorship makes some relationship with both state and market inevitable. Changes in the wider context of power, specifically changes in the nature and ambit of the market and the merging of state and market, have fostered this change. In the contemporary context (2000-2006), power (particularly the market and individuals within corporations) no longer simply invests in culture in traditional ways, for status or ‘cultural capital’, or even ‘cultural diplomacy’ in the case of the state. Today, both the market and the state are interested in culture as servicing other social and political agendas as well. These other social and political agendas include those mentioned by Tessa Jowell in 2004 (above) and substantiated by Christopher Frayling in 2006 in the Arts Council England report, ‘The Power of Art: visual arts - evidence of impact on regeneration, health, education and learning’. In the corporate world, ‘other social and political agendas’ include promoting a positive image of the corporation as Good Corporate Citizen. I continue in Chapter 5 to consider the more specific impact of corporate sponsorship at Tate Modern.

CHAPTER 4 : THE IMPACT OF CORPORATE SPONSORSHIP

In chapter four I explored some of the more problematic aspects of the contemporary political moment as they impact on culture. It was noted that New Labour policy put the onus on the cultural institution to forge closer relationships with the corporate sector. It was argued that this is to the detriment of diversity.

In chapter five I will look more closely at the exhibition activity at Tate Modern over the seven years since its opening in May 2000. Looking at the temporary exhibitions programme, I will consider the relationship between the type of work shown and the sponsorship by transnational corporations.

I will highlight some of the changes over the seven years in terms of types of exhibition shown. I will consider some of the data available on attendance and ticketing in order to determine whether assumptions around sponsorship and access can be borne out in practice. I will show that the financial and political impact of corporate sponsorship on the institution can be seen to meet government targets rather than providing any real benefit to the institution.

I will consider the effect of such sponsorship on freedom and equality, using the degree to which an exhibition may be understood as counter-Power or an implicit challenge to the canon of Western art as a measure of its democratic potential.

Because the work of ‘white’ male artists from certain parts of Western Europe and North America has formed the canon of art that curators at Tate Modern explicitly set out to challenge, I will consider the over-representation of art and exhibitions by canonical artists as failing to reflect the values of freedom and equality that is counter-Power.

133 Throughout the thesis I will use inverted commas for the term white to mean the privileged ethnicity in a colour-conscious culture of European descent. This to acknowledge the problematic nature of the concept, moving it away from ideas of ‘race’ and essentialism. Dyer, R., White, New York, London, Routledge, 1997
I will begin by sketching the structure of exhibiting at Tate Modern. The gallery is formed of seven levels, five of which are exhibition spaces. Levels three and five are designated for the display of Tate collections and level four for large-scale temporary exhibitions. Level one is the turbine hall, a major space for temporary commissions (namely, the Unilever series) and occasionally for small temporary exhibitions. Level two has a café, shop and auditorium, and from 2004, the ‘Level 2 gallery’. Level six is a members’ room and level seven has a restaurant and corporate entertainment area.

In the original hang, the Tate collection was divided into four themes – Body, Landscape, Still Life and History. In the re-hang of 2006, the four themes were Abstract Expressionism, Surrealism, Pop Art and Minimalism.

Lars Nittve was the Tate Modern Director from the planning stage to 2001 and Vicente Todoli took over in 2003. No one was in the position of Tate Modern Director in the intervening period. Nicholas Serota was Head of Tate, which covers all four Tate galleries, throughout this time and has been with Tate Galleries since 1988. The Tate Modern Director was assisted by a number of curators and assistant curators. The original curatorial team included Iwona Blazwick, Frances Morris and Emma Dexter. While senior management does effect how an institution is run and its general direction, I do not want to imply either that the various changes in curatorial strategy or that the implementation of government funding agreements was entirely down to changes within senior management. This is but one factor in a range (which includes funding pressures and ‘key performance indicators’, terms and conditions of employment and the skills, concerns and experience of all levels of staff) that influence the day-to-day running of a gallery or museum. Again, the focus of this thesis is the cooperation, complicity or otherwise of each individual with the mechanisms of power.

From May 2000 and for the first eighteen months, each of the initial large-scale temporary exhibitions staged on the fourth floor can be understood as attempting to expand the canon, negotiate dominant artworld discourse and in some cases, directly
address freedom and equality that is counter-Power. I will explain how this is the case. The temporary exhibitions from May 2000 to December 2001 were:

‘Between Cinema and a Hard Place’ (12 May – 3 December 2000),
‘Century City: Art and Culture in the Modern Metropolis’
(1 February – 29 April 2001),
‘Giorgio Morandi’ (22 May – 12 August 2001),
‘Zero to Infinity: Arte Povera 1962-1972’ (31 May – 19 August 2001),
‘Katharina Fritsch’ (7 September – 9 December 2001),

This series can be understood as innovative, experimental and eclectic. This can be seen not only in their relations with outside curators and non-‘NATO’ nations to use Nittve’s term for ‘Century City’, but by being inclusive of other art histories (‘Century City’, ‘Giorgio Morandi’, ‘Katherine Fritsch’ ‘Arte Povera’); other ethnicities (‘Century City’, ‘Between Cinema and a Hard Space’); other geographies (‘Century City’, ‘Eija-Liisa Ahtila’) and other genders (‘Katharina Fritsch’, ‘Surrealism: Desire Unbound’, parts of ‘Century City’, ‘Between Cinema and a Hard Place’). Morandi, Fritsch and Ahtila were not artists ordinarily afforded such a high profile exhibition in the context of London, and Arte Povera could be seen as a counterpoint to the prevailing art of the London artworld at the time, the movement being uncommercial, predominately ephemeral and anti-bourgeois /anti-consumerist.

This early trend was exemplified by the first temporary exhibition after opening, ‘Century City: Art and Culture in the Modern Metropolis’ (2001). Director, Lars Nittve, described it as the new institution’s ‘mission statement which forecasts the richness, breadth and direction that we hope will characterise our activities in the coming years.’ ¹³⁴ ‘Century City’ was so challenging in terms of the canonical view of art and art history, it was lambasted in almost all British-based press. I agree with Art in America critic, Eleanor Heartney, that this was more indicative of the conservative

(even reactionary) nature of the British artworld press than the quality of the exhibition itself. 135 Her review stated that:

British critics denounced as incoherent, misguided, patronizing, wretched, rambling and ill-conceived... [but] though the Tate overreached a bit here, ‘Century City’ represented a laudable effort to take an innovative approach to art history and curatorial procedures.136

‘Century City’ occupied the fourth floor and the Turbine Hall. Space was assigned to ten centres of art and culture across the globe, each centre representing the cultural activity of a single decade from the twentieth century. The exhibition included the customary locations for Art and high culture (London, Vienna, Paris, Moscow, New York), and more expansively it included the artistic and cultural contributions of 1950s Lagos, 1960s Rio de Janeiro, 1970s Tokyo and 1990s Mumbai (Bombay). In addition, the exhibition set out explicitly to counter-balance the skewed collections displays of 2000 and 2001. This skew was understood as a consequence of past collections policy almost exclusively collecting the work of white European or North American men. For ‘Century City’ Tate Modern gave curatorial custody of the space to outside curators, each autonomously curating their part of the exhibition project. This way the overall exhibition avoided any overarching discourse or meta-narrative usually accompanying this type of project. The multiple voices were allowed to be multiple.

Not only diverse in terms of geographical location and art historical status, the range of work on display in ‘Century City’ was also diverse, including non-art forms and high art. To illustrate this variety, I will briefly describe the displays of Vienna, New York, Lagos and Mumbai. Vienna (1908-1918) was devoted to a decade associated

135 Paul Overy’s essay ‘Centuring the city’ indicates the level of hostility by the mainstream press towards this exhibition: ‘ “Century City: Art and Culture in the Modern Metropolis”, the first major show held at Tate Modern, received almost universal critical condemnation. ...it appears to have been such a monumental failure.’ Visual Communication, volume 1, issue 1, 2002, p59
with Sigmund Freud, ‘café society’ and the architecture of Otto Wagner and Adolf Loos. The gallery was partly a ‘white cube’ space and partly designed to evoke a middle-class drawing room of the time, complete with Freud's couch. Artists shown included Egon Shiele and Oskar Kokoschka, highlighting the theme of the new intellectual approach to analysing childhood. New York centred on the early 1970s and particularly the artists and architecture of SoHo. This was explored with photographic documentation of Gordon Matta-Clark's chainsawed interventions into warehouses. Also included were Vito Acconci's ‘Following Piece’ (1969) in which he is documented following strangers around New York's public spaces until they enter private spaces and Hannah Wilke's photographic work which uses her own naked body to disrupt the 'male gaze'. The politics of that context is foregrounded in the exhibit. This is also the case with Lagos (1955-1970) with its time period that straddles Nigerian Independence from British colonial rule in 1960. In this display, work by expatriate artists and resident Nigerian artists like Georgina Beier, Jacob Lawrence, Bruce Onobrakpeya and Uche Okeke, sits alongside artefacts from popular

Figure 6: Rummana Hussain, ‘A Space for Healing’ (1999) metal implements, PVC, poles, cloth, plastic objects, gold paint, vermilion red paint, sound
culture such as Highlife records by the likes of ‘Cardinal’ Jim Rex Lawson. This same mix of ‘high’ and ‘pop’ culture was also found in the Mumbai of the 1990s part of the exhibition. Here paintings advertising Bollywood movies were juxtaposed with a conceptual installation by Rummana Hussain (‘A Space for Healing’ 1999 - fig. 6) and Bhupen Khakhar’s homoerotic naïve paintings, amongst other work.

Democratic action in the context of the artworld therefore is not only action that enacts freedom and equality that is counter-Power in terms of the market and the state, but counter-Power in terms of ‘institutionally dominant art history’. \(^{137}\) Art as a democratic act may negotiate freedom and equality as socio-political or economic power and/or it may address the specificities of artworld power as its context.

Aside from changing from an innovative and challenging exhibitions programme to a more conservative one in artworld terms (as will be demonstrated), Tate Modern also changed over time in its pricing structures. Prices were low for these early temporary exhibitions. The average price for a full priced ticket from 2000 until the end of 2001 was £5.20 with prices starting at £3 and despite the challenging, even subversive material, many of these exhibitions were hugely popular with audience figures between 58,000 – 201,000 per exhibition throughout 2000-2001. \(^{138}\) After that initial period though curating became markedly less democratic in terms of representation (equality and freedom, across geographic, ethnic and gender differences). Indeed entry prices also increased after end-2001 – one of the markers of accessibility or democratic engagement – and though some exhibitions had over 500,000 visitors, others had less than 40,000.

Table 5.1 breaks down the major temporary exhibitions of 2000-2006 into four categories: solo woman, solo man, group exhibition and any exhibition with non-‘white’ artists. While at first glance this may appear a crude classification, the argument is that irrespective of whether the voice of a single woman represents the


\(^{138}\) *Tate Modern: Five years on*, London, Tate Publishing, 2005, p44. See Appendix II
work or voice of all women or a single ‘black’ artist represents all ‘black’ artists, if women or non-‘white’ artists can be seen to be statistically excluded from having a voice, the institution can hardly be understood as affording equality. It can not be regarded as affording a platform for art as a democratic act if only artists from sector of society have a voice. Indeed, as described above, it was in fact a commitment by Tate Modern to intervene into such hegemonic institutional practices.

Table 5.1

Temporary Exhibitions Level 4, 2000-2006
Exhibitions list and raw data available in Appendix III created from information available on Tate website and Freedom of Information questions

On the basis of the above graph created from raw data (see Appendix III), there was a demonstrable trend away from curating as a democratic act over the period 2000-2006 in exhibition themes on level four. (Had data also included 2007 and 2008 the dramatic rise in solo exhibitions by ‘white’ men would not have been quite so significant – though the trend still stands. The cut-off of 2006 for analysis was established at the outset of research in 2004 and therefore this graphically dramatic statistical outcome could not have been predicted.) While there was a steady number of exhibitions which included the work of non-‘white’ artists, these artists were only ever included as part of group exhibitions and since 2000, in the 2000-2006 period, there was a total of four solo exhibitions by women artists in these spaces, a mere 12% of the exhibition opportunities. Meanwhile there was a marked increase in the number of ‘white’ men afforded opportunities to exhibit. I will argue that this can be seen as a direct consequence of the need to secure corporate sponsorship,
particularly once the balance of power shifted away from Tate Modern, as finances became straitened.

Financially, Tate Modern was in a different position in 2000-2001, with start-up funds still available (which are distinct from running costs) and a fairly abbreviated and therefore possibly more open Funding Agreement with DCMS was in place, as compared with the later 2003-2006 Agreement. By 2002, the finances had become straitened after two years of operation with audience numbers far in excess of prediction. 139 This meant an under-calculation in running costs generally and the need to bring forward repairs due to wear and tear. There was no room in the budget for this level of success. Though the government had contributed a figure of £4.90 per visitor (actual figure £4.84) through Grant-in-Aid, the higher numbers of visitors meant a real terms underfunding per person. 140 The government was not going to increase its grant just because Tate Modern was popular. By 2002, Tate trustees and senior management understood that more income had to be derived:

In principle, we could increase income through two overall routes:

- Grant-in-aid: our position is dependent on the outcome of the bid that the Department for Culture, Media and Sport has made to the Treasury to cover the period 2003-6. This will be known by July 2002 and we will be informed of our own allocation over this period by Christmas. We will do everything we can to argue our case, but cannot be confident of a positive outcome.

- Self-generated income: it would not be prudent to increase further our fundraising targets in the light of economic slowdown and increasing competition. We are already anticipating increases on the current year trading income levels. 141

Increased financial pressures meant two things: 1) a greater consumerist focus for the gallery and 2) a greater dependence on corporate sponsorship and other forms of

139 Smith, C., ‘The Political Impact’, Tate Modern: the First Five Years, op cit, p17
140 Tate Accounts 2001-2002, Board of Trustees, p9 Again these figures are for Tate overall. It is not possible to obtain accounts for Tate Modern in isolation.
141 Tate Plan 2002, p16
corporate income, like entertainment nights. Here I will analyse the impact of corporate sponsorship.

The following is the list of exhibitions with corporate sponsorship over the period 2002-2006 (not including other forms of finance, like support by Tate members):

- ‘Warhol’ (7 February – 1 April 2002),
- ‘Matisse Picasso’ (11 May – 18 August 2002),
- ‘Cruel & Tender’ (5 June – 7 September 2003),
- ‘Brancusi’ (29 January – 23 May 2004),
- ‘Time Zones: Recent Film and Video’ (6 October ‘04 – 2 January ‘05),
- ‘Edward Hopper’ (27 May – 5 September 2004),
- ‘Robert Frank: Storylines’ (28 October 2004 – 23 June 2005),
- ‘Frida Kahlo’ (9 June – 9 October 2005),
- ‘Henri Rousseau’ (3 November 2005 – 5 February 2006),

See Appendix III for raw data on exhibitions.

Each of these are more or less canonical in their subject matter and, with the exception of Frida Kahlo, all the solo shows are by ‘white’ male artists from the big European and US cultural hotspots. How a subject is actually curated, how innovative or experimental the actual exhibition experience is, is not at issue here. For example, the exhibition, ‘Matisse Picasso’, though an obvious block-buster which aimed, in terms of subject, at increasing revenue for Tate Modern, it was nevertheless also an insightful and scholarly piece of curating which completely overturned assumptions when comparing the two artists.

Over the period 2000-2006, 58% of corporate sponsorship at Tate Modern went to solo exhibitions by ‘white’ men and 8% to solo exhibitions by women. The remainder went to group exhibitions. Unlike the first exhibitions with corporate sponsorship, ‘Surrealism Unbound’ and ‘Century City’, none of these later sponsored exhibitions
were contentious, nor were any of these artworks or exhibitions particularly socially or politically engaged. This may be contrasted with unsponsored exhibitions over 2002-2006, which do feature examples of art that can be understood as socially or politically engaged, namely, ‘Joseph Beuys’, ‘Open Systems: Rethinking art since 1970’, ‘Common Wealth’, ‘Pierre Huyghe’ and ‘Fischli & Weiss’, though these are notably all white and male. It is important to note that this observation is purely about the subject or theme of an exhibition not how well an actual exhibition is curated.

As previously analysed, it is in the nature of corporate sponsorship to shy away from sponsoring art and culture that might be perceived as potentially damaging to reputation or brand. As the Orange corporation’s censorship of Peter Kennard shows, there may be a conservative reluctance on the part of potential sponsors because of a perceived conservativeness in their market. On the other hand, sponsors like Beck’s beer, who sponsor the annual ‘Futures’ exhibition of young artists at the Institute for Contemporary Art (ICA) might appear to court dissension. Arguably, though, the brand only affords a platform for the types of dissent appropriate to the brand. With these factors in mind, museums may choose not to approach corporations for sponsorship of contentious or politicised exhibitions, and perhaps this is Tate Modern’s strategy after the initial period. ‘Century City’ and ‘Surrealism: Desire Unbound’ were sponsored by corporations in 2001, despite being innovative and challenging.

The sponsorship of ‘Century City’ was deemed ‘enlightened’ by Lars Nittve, presumably because CGNU plc, by sponsoring a challenging exhibition was understood as acting primarily in the interests of Art, art history, the gallery, perhaps even democracy (in terms for example of equality of artistic practices and freedom of speech and information). ‘Surrealism: Desire Unbound’, sponsored by Morgan Stanley Dean Witter, was also challenging (though less radically) in its inclusion of the works of a great many women artists. Both of these examples show that corporate

142 Nittve, L., ‘Foreword’, Century City: Art and Culture in the Modern Metropolis, op cit, p7
sponsoring may lead to a beneficial alliance between publicly funded gallery and the corporate sector. Corporations may support art and curating as a democratic act when it is radically anti-canonical or democratically representative of a range of artistic practices and voices. This said, CGNU plc, sponsors of ‘Century City’ is unlikely to have been aware of just how contentious such an exhibition would be in artworld terms, expecting instead the positive media attention of the opening displays. On the other hand, CGNU did knowingly sponsor an exhibition that is ostensibly about the benefits of globalisation just as the company was about to merge and become the transnational corporation, Aviva. What is clear is that since the beginning of 2002, when government targets became more exacting and Tate Modern’s finances more straitened, the relationship with corporate sponsorship becomes more fraught and much less open to the innovative and experimental, exemplifying the pitfalls of this type of partnership as described and analysed above.

Chin-tao Wu's argument in *Privatising Culture* that the range and diversity of artistic practices is not supported by corporations (in either sponsorship or their collections), is also born out by an analysis of Tate Modern over 2000-2006. Though arguably, as with ‘Century City’ and ‘Surrealism’ it doesn't have to, more often than not in practice the need to appeal to the corporate sector for funding erodes opportunities for art and curating as a democratic act with diversity (equality and freedom) particularly hampered. The choices for the gallery become clear: either take corporate sponsorship and narrow the range of subjects displayed on the fourth floor, or if Tate Modern does choose to continue to exhibit more contentious work in large scale temporary exhibitions, it must do so without corporate sponsorship.

Proceeding without corporate sponsorship has dire consequences for the gallery, but not necessarily to the bottom line. Because corporate sponsorship means increased advertising and the cost of increased advertising eats at profitability, Tate may not in fact have a net increase in income as a result of corporate sponsorship. Additionally, 143 The ‘Sponsor's Foreword’ written by Pehr G. Gyllenhammer, Chairman of CGNU plc does highlight the company’s internationalist outlook: ‘international in outlook and progressive in its thinking, CGNU is proud to sponsor Century City.’ op cit, p6 144 Wu, C., op cit, pp258-270
as sponsored exhibitions tend to be by artists who have a greater market value, there are increased costs in handling and insuring the work. A sponsorship deal for a high market value artist with a big advertising campaign therefore may not increase income for the gallery. The main negative consequence of proceeding without corporate sponsorship is that sponsorship does in fact increase audience figures for those exhibitions. The following graph indicates that the main direct beneficial impact of corporate sponsorship is on audience attendance figures. See Table 5.2.

The graph on the left (Table 5.2) shows the average number of visitors per exhibition. Comparing the two demonstrates that attendance figures for exhibitions with sponsorship are considerably higher than for those without corporate sponsorship. (N.B. These figure are not adjusted pro rata.) In general, sponsored exhibitions continue for longer than those without sponsorship but even with this in mind, it is clear that a corporate sponsorship deal does bring in more people. This is for a number of reasons regardless of the length of exhibition or the relative fame or reputation of the artist. One reason that sponsored exhibitions have increased audience figures is that ordinarily two or more press releases are sent out by Tate press office while unsponsored shows often have just a single press release. Also

Table 5.2

Table 5.3
sponsorship means more money is allocated for advertising which usually equates to increased audience figures.

Table 5.3 shows that sponsored exhibitions have appreciably higher entrance fees than for those without sponsorship, which may be counter-logical, as the need for corporate sponsorship is assumed also to help keep costs down for the consumer, thereby helping with access. High entry fees and issues of increased accessibility have long been understood as incompatible. It can therefore be seen that corporate sponsorship is in fact a hindrance to the ‘access agenda’. 146

With the pressure to act like businesses, museums now focus on market share. 147 In itself, this is no bad thing. The ‘needs’ of a general audience are taken into account. This focus on audience both through the government’s social performance indicators and the market’s need to maximise audiences has led to improvements in physical and psychological access. Departments of Education and Interpretation within galleries and museums were tasked with developing audience heterogeneity, empowering all types of people, regardless of their background, to access culture. But the intense focus on market share by museums and galleries (which in the case of Tate Modern and Tate Britain is under regular scrutiny by market researchers, MEW Research) can be seen to have effected the primary purpose of the gallery, namely exhibitions of art. Chris Smith the first DCMS Minister is at pains in his essay in the Tate Modern five year report, ‘The Political Impact’, to point out how excellence in art exhibitions hasn’t been compromised with the new focus on mass audiences:

access and excellence go together hand in hand, ... The fact that so many were visiting Tate Modern, and that the quality of their experience was unharmed, again helped to make the case.148

146 Chris Smith mentions the correlation between free entry, audience attendance and access in ‘The Political Impact’, op cit, p18
The minister then goes on to explain how, from its conception, Tate Modern was focused on excellence, as compared with the Dome, which is why it achieved both access and excellence. At the beginning, Tate Modern did in fact achieve both access and excellence, but as time wore on, pressure from government targets was increased and the financial bottom line was stressed to the detriment of excellence in its own terms. Given that Tate had a stated commitment to art and curating as a democratic act, this change of focus saw an erosion in the platform for democratic action at the institution. In addition, there was an erosion in one strategy understood as underpinning accessibility, namely pricing structure, as a direct consequence of corporate sponsorship.

It can be shown that corporate sponsorship does effect a number of aspects regarding exhibition curating. Nevertheless Tate Modern continues to pursue it despite the costs. This may be because if Tate Modern do not pursue corporate sponsorship, they run the risk of imperilling Grant-in-Aid. Even if Tate had good reasons not to pursue corporate sponsorship – as it risks the diversity of its exhibition programmes and it perhaps undermines potential for curating as a democratic act or a commitment to access – nevertheless, a dependence on corporate sponsorship ticks a number of Government Funding Agreement boxes which is why it is imperative. These are:

- increases in income from non-government sources;
- growing links with new corporate partners;
- and sustaining a mass audience.

The bottom line is that Tate Modern needs corporate sponsorship. This is not because of income, or because it helps to lower costs and therefore increases access, but because 1) it is a government requirement in itself and 2) corporate sponsorship helps to sustain the exactingly high audience figures, which is again a government requirement. In other words, the reason Tate Modern requires corporate sponsorship is not because it benefits the institution necessarily, the diversity or innovation of its exhibition programme or art and curating, but simply because it is a requirement.
within the Funding Agreement with the DCMS. As the 2003-2006 Funding Agreement states:

The principle challenge for Tate in relation to [specific quantitative targets for audience figures] is to maintain the level of attendance and audience engagement for the coming three years at the current level [5 million people per annum]. ... This Agreement is also supplemented by the performance measures which were established by the Efficiency and Effectiveness Review; these will be collected annually.\textsuperscript{149}

The document itself compares Tate Modern's extraordinary success to other like institutions (MoMA, New York, 1.2million per annum) acknowledging just how difficult it may be to continue in precisely the same vein after the 'halo of attention' is over. \textsuperscript{150} Despite the acknowledged difficulty in sustaining this level of mass appeal, the Funding Agreement warns of punitive action if targets are not met and this is regardless of how exacting or even unrealistic these targets may be. Even if Tate's own curatorial commitments to art and curating as a democratic act as described by Blazwick and Morris in The Handbook are compromised, it becomes more important, imperative, that Tate achieves its performance targets. With this in mind it becomes obvious, even inevitable, that an ambitiously democratic curatorial policy as described by Nittve, Blazwick and Morris, had to change in order to sustain \textit{knowingly} (not experimentally as the first few years were) a mass audience. \textsuperscript{151}

\textsuperscript{149} Three Year Funding Agreement 2003 – 2006, op cit, 4.1 p5
\textsuperscript{150} ibid
\textsuperscript{151} Upsetting previous assumptions about what will make profit, in 2007 the Dali exhibition sold badly and made a loss while the following exhibition, by a living woman artist, Louise Bourgeois, did so unexpectedly well, merchandising sold out in its first weeks. This overturn in assumptions may bode well for art and curating as a democratic act as ideas are challenged as to what does indeed make money and increase audiences.
CHAPTER 5: TATE MODERN AS A CONTEXT OF POWER: FROM LIBERAL FLEXIBILITY TO RIGIDITY VIA THE TATE MODERN BRAND

This chapter continues the analysis of Tate Modern exploring the effects of power on art as a democratic act in contemporary visual art and gallery practice. The previous chapters demonstrated through an analysis of DCMS policy and Funding Agreements that there was an overt, explicit and instrumentalist government agenda for the arts over 2000-2006. The implementation of that agenda by Tate Modern gave rise to greater corporate involvement in the major temporary exhibitions programme on level four of the gallery. This corporate involvement can be seen to have had a negative impact on the potential for art as a democratic act as the analysis of trends in temporary exhibitions demonstrated above. A similar tendency can be seen in other aspects of the gallery's curation. This will be explored here.

This chapter is divided into three parts. In the first part of the chapter, I will trace the stated intentions of Tate Modern curators to challenge modernist orthodoxy in the display of art, describing the importance of this in creating a democratic space by the institution. I will consider the original thematic hang of 2000 as an instance of curating as a democratic act as well as considering the use of net.art to establish a critical space. In the second part, I go on to consider the pressures of Tate branding and its implication for art as a democratic act. I will look at democratic claims for ‘Common Wealth’ (2003) and I will consider Mark Dion’s ‘Tate Thames Dig’ (1999-2000) and Cummings and Lewandowska's ‘Capital’ (2001) to contrast those artworks branded as ‘democratic’ with the curatorial strategy employed for the collections display. Finally in the third part of this chapter, I track changes in curatorial strategy at Tate Modern, contrasting the original hang with the UBS sponsored re-hang of 2006 and the original live art programme of 2003 with the UBS sponsored live art programme of 2006.
First I consider the original stated intentions of Tate Modern curators and how this can be understood as curating as a democratic act. In attempting to take up ‘the challenge issued by artists and historians to review the canon of art history and the museum’s relation to it’, Iwona Blazwick and Frances Morris embarked on a complete re-conceptualisation of curating a museum of modern and contemporary art. The initial curatorial strategy employed by curators at Tate Modern at its opening was ‘thematic display’. This is a curatorial approach to display where the collections are hung thematically as distinct from the standard approach, a legacy from the 1930s where displays are chronological or geographically-based. I will argue that it was in the potential (if not the full realisation) of thematic display that Tate Modern showed its strongest commitment to curating as a democratic act.

As founding curators imply in *The Handbook*, even in 2000 it was difficult to re-conceptualise an exhibition of modern and contemporary art outside Alfred Barr's modernist narrative (created in the 1930s for the inaugural displays at MoMA) despite its critique being fully entrenched in academic scholarship for over 30 years. Barr's curatorial approach was a tale of evolution towards the pinnacle of high modernism and, importantly, the march of progress rested on a bedrock of primitivism, orientalism, and the exclusion of artwork from most parts of the globe, as well as the working class generally and women artists specifically. The modernist paradigm, complete with this skew, quickly became the template for the display of modern (and contemporary) art worldwide, as Carol Duncan observes. So ubiquitous was the display of Barr's modernist art historical narrative that it became tantamount to revolutionary to re-conceptualise curating, as previous attempts by galleries including Tate seem to indicate. Rather than a total re-conceptualisation, most museums and galleries simply added an addendum to the traditional tale. A room of miscellany at the end of the gallery was included with art by ‘black’ and women practitioners, or those schools which, for reasons of geography, fell outside ‘mainstream modernism’ including the various ‘regional’ art practices never regarded as part of the global ‘mainstream’. Barr's narrative of mainstream modernism was

152 Blazwick, I., & Morris, F., op cit, pp32-33
153 Duncan, C., op cit, p103
154 ‘Mainstream modernism’ is defined by Carol Duncan in *Civilizing Rituals: Inside*
left pretty much intact with an addendum required for those who had, through the routes of postcolonial, Marxist and feminist theory, an interest in promoting a democratic story. Most national and international galleries depended on the modified version of *mainstream modernist paradigm* + addendum.

With the ambition of fundamentally challenging the Barr paradigm, Tate Modern curators had the physicality of the space to contend with as well, plus the limitations of the collection, which is patchy and partial even in terms of ‘mainstream modernism’. (Appendix II is a diagram of Tate Modern in its initial formation.) The two floors with a huge chimney in the middle of the building seem to demand dividing the display of the collection into four, though potentially in any taxonomical system. Abandoning chronological display as a rationale for curating a collection meant that the plethora of choice becomes almost infinite. Years before Tate Modern opened to the public, the problem of what part of the collection and how to display it was under discussion.

The solution, ‘thematic display’, was a democratic one in the sense used throughout this thesis as both counter-Power and enacting freedom and equality. It overturned Barr's chronological narrative with its implicit and explicit exclusions. As an overarching curatorial rationale, it could embrace all types of art practice including the various 'other modernisms'. The device has the potential to create juxtapositions across any genre, any geographical region, any artist, any historical period, thereby potentially opening up interpretation. In this way Richard Long's *Red Slate Circle* (1988) may be usefully juxtaposed with Monet's *Water-lilies* (after 1916) as was seen in the opening hang under the theme of Landscape.

---

**Public Art Museums** as the narrative of modernism that Alfred Barr, founding curator of MoMA, New York, created for the museum and which subsequently came to be norm for all museum displays of modern art.

155 Blazwick and Morris state that the theories that informed artists, historians and curators which required this change in curatorial approach are ‘semiology, Marxism, feminism, psychoanalysis, analytical philosophy and the politics of identity’. Blazwick, I., and Morris, F., *op cit*, p33

156 Iwona Blazwick, Frances Morris and Caro Howell were tasked with re-conceptualising the hang at Tate Modern in discussion with senior curators at Tate, Nick Serota, other colleagues both inside and outside the institution plus numerous artists and critics according to an interview I had with Howell.
Figure 7: Claude Monet, Water-lilies (after 1916)

Figure 8: Richard Long, Red Slate Circle (1988)

The four themes of the original hang - Still Life, Landscape, Nude, and History (Painting) - allude to Sir Joshua Reynolds’ categories of art, giving the radical and ahistorical approach to curating an art historical link. 157 Because thematic display is non-hierarchical, non-centralising, non-linear, inclusive, allowing for fragmentation, it

157 Joshua Reynolds (1723-1792) was the first president of the Royal Academy. His treatise, Discourse, delineates the various subjects for art encouraging artists to work with elevated subjects (history painting) as opposed to mere portraiture, landscapes or still life.
allows for curatorial acts that are democratic, by definition. Each artwork is placed in a position of equality and the fact of this equality within the history of high culture is in itself counter-Power. Further, according to Nicholas Serota, in imaging the future of museums and curating, thematic display allows ‘each of us, curators and visitors alike, ... to chart our own path, redrawing the map of modern art, rather than following a single path’. ¹⁵⁸ This quote from 2000 further underlines the radical and democratic intention emanating from senior staff at the time.

Other evidence of the aspiration to curate as a democratic act can be seen in some of the specific curatorial strategies and commissions for the initial period 2000-2001. One of these is Mongrel's net.art commission for the Tate website, commissioned specifically for the opening of Tate Modern. ¹⁵⁹ ‘Uncomfortable Proximity’ (2000) by Harwood@Mongrel was the first net.art commission on the Tate server and it is overt institutional critique. The Mongrel website mimics the official Tate website and, inspired by Bourdieu, Foucault and theorist Tony Bennett, offers a politicised set of interpretations of the collection and the purpose and place of culture in ‘improving the masses’. Parts of ‘Uncomfortable Proximity’ relate to a less-than-glamorous history of Tate locations, and the relationship between Millbank, the early nineteenth century prison, and Tate at Millbank, the site for cultural and social improvement of the poor and the miscreant, by the end of the century. This history is not contested by Tate, the institution, but neither is it usually included in the official story. Nor does Tate ordinarily highlight the relationship between contemporary art, collecting and power, which the Mongrel net.art intervention also brings to light. Harwood ends his own introduction to ‘Uncomfortable Proximity’ with the line:

While Tate can never be fully inclusive of peoples' histories that may have run counter to its own, it can at least be a site of critical participation in the present history of cultural cosmetics of these islands. ¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁹ Mongrel is a group of artists. On receipt of a commission, the group decides who will take the project forward and in what direction.
¹⁶⁰ Online. Available HTTP. &lt;http://www.tate.org.uk/netart/mongrel/home/default.htm&gt; Accessed 23 April
I would argue that over 2000-2001 and as Mongrel (among others) challenged them to be, Tate Modern overall attempted to be just such a site, if tentatively, and perhaps against a variety of vested interests and some internal resistance to change. With this observation I wish to underline the idea that the institution, like wider society, is comprised of individuals who may have different agendas but each face choices and pressures to conform to the agendas of others. It is the sum of these choices which is being traced and analysed in this thesis.

In fact, Tate Modern did something extraordinary in terms of curating as a democratic act at that time, with key curators understanding that the interpretation of an artwork lies in the interplay of context and content (as indeed does its potential as democratic action) as quotes by Serota and Nittve above indicate. One example of how the interpretation around a work of art may change depending on its context can be seen in the display of Sam Taylor Wood’s ‘Brontosaurus’ (1995) for the opening of Tate Modern. The first room encountered in the ‘Nude, Body, Action’ suite was a wryly self-conscious exploration of the nude. Titled, ‘The Naked and the Nude’ in

![Figure 9: Pablo Picasso, ‘Nude Woman in a Red Armchair’ (1932)](image-url)
reference to Kenneth Clark,\textsuperscript{161} the curating took an ironic twist on the history of the painted body as female, young, attractive, often passive, and subject to the male heterosexual gaze. The room included variously over time Picasso’s ‘Nude Woman in a Red Armchair’, 1932 (fig. 9) and ‘Nude Woman with Necklace’, 1968 (fig.10), Christian Schad’s ‘Self-Portrait’, 1927 (fig.11) and ‘Agosta, the Pigeon-Chested Man and Rasha, the Black Dove’ (1929), Lucien Freud's ‘Standing by the Rags’ (1988-89) and Stanley Spencer’s ‘Double Nude Portrait: the Artist and His Second Wife’ (1937).

After this painted flesh festival of female figures, most of which are challenging, either conceptually or formally, the viewer encountered Sam Taylor Wood’s ‘Brontosaurus’. ‘Brontosaurus’ is a video projected to life size. The figure in it is a skinny ‘white’ man in his 20s or 30s gyrating to dance music. The video has been slowed down to make his actions appear balletic, if ungainly, especially with the independent trajectories of his penis. The pleasure in looking is voyeuristic: his dance is one that might be performed alone, behind drawn curtains, not for the gaze of others. The slowed movement, with haunting adagio soundtrack makes the encounter with the dancing figure sitting in a darkened gallery space all the more inviting and ridiculous.\textsuperscript{162} This encounter with ‘Brontosaurus’ effectively turns on its head the

\textsuperscript{162} Sam Taylor Wood: ‘First I filmed a man who was dancing naked in his bedroom, to the rhythm of very fast techno-jungle music. Then I took away the music and projected the film in slow motion. While I was filming, his movements became almost alien, they made no sense, he went through all these motions and they ended up seeming clumsy. In slow-motion they became very beautiful, but totally ungainly. Then I changed the music and introduced Samuel Barber’s \textit{Adagio for Strings}, a melancholy excerpt ’, ‘Sam Taylor-Wood’ catalogue, Fondazione Prada, Milan, 1998, interview with Germano Celant, p192
history of subject / object, artist and model relations, rupturing tradition and one aspect of historical hegemonic power.

5.1 The Tate Modern Brand:

A Concern over Appearance

The above examples of specific new commissions and new juxtapositions, the initial programme of temporary exhibitions and the overall curatorial strategy of ‘thematic display’ demonstrate that Tate Modern did in fact act on its mission statement commitment. In other areas of operation at Tate Modern, this commitment to democratic action can also be seen. For example, the role of interpretation in the gallery initially was as a critical, even interventionist, engagement with the displays in an attempt at creating a mechanism for ongoing critical reflexivity. By 2006 this too had changed though an analysis of this aspect of Tate Modern's operations lies outside the bounds of this thesis.163

Nevertheless, even from the beginning there is evidence that Tate Modern had other pressures and concerns other than simply a commitment to art and curating as a democratic act. Like New Labour, it was intimately concerned with brand image, an instrument of political control. From the beginning of Tate Modern in 2000 there was

163 Because the department did serve this function, a certain tension was manifested from time to time. For example, in 2003, for the ‘Cruel and Tender’ exhibition of photography, a symposium so critical of the exhibition was staged (‘Photography and the Limits of the Document’ 6-7 June 2003) that Tate Modern Exhibitions and Displays curators distanced themselves from the event. It is the only exhibition to date with no link to the concurrent and related symposium on the website or other related literature. Also my own article for Third Text ‘Working within and against Tate Modernism’, (Third Text, 57, Winter 2001/2) was considered an acceptable level of criticality. Over time, this role for Interpretation and Education altered perhaps also as a consequence of funding and marketing pressures of success and with changes in personnel. The most obvious example of this change can be seen in the constituents of its youth programme, Raw Canvas. Originally, and before Tate Modern opened while under the management of Caro Howell, the youth team at Raw Canvas was constituted of young people from the local Southwark community who predominately have Caribbean or Asian backgrounds and who are categorised as ‘poor’ and ‘deprived’. By 2006, Raw Canvas was entirely made up of young people from economically privileged backgrounds with a few from international backgrounds (as distinct from locally ethnically diverse backgrounds). Reasons stated for this change is that Raw Canvas is predominately made up of Tate Modern Members' children, whose numbers have grown with the success of the gallery and that local young people aren't attracted to the programme.
a direct correlation between the image of Britain, the image of the New Labour
government and the image of Tate Modern. The image of Britain in 2000 was ‘Cool
Britannia’, the image of New Labour, young and virile, and the image of Tate Modern,
cool, young, virile and also, interestingly for a gallery of fine art, ‘democratic’. This is
according to John Holden, the Head of Culture at Demos, ‘the think tank for
“everyday democracy”’. In Tate Modern: Five Years On, the report published by
Tate Publishing, Holden states:

Tate Modern is creating public goods: greater confidence in public
spaces, social interaction among members of the public, trust in public
institutions, and national and local pride. In this sense Tate Modern is
an embodiment of democratic values and its Cultural Value extends into
the sphere of the (small-p) political.

Despite the concurrence of image and substance, the emphasis on branding put a
pressure on Tate Modern’s curatorial practices undermining acts that are counter-
Power. This may appear paradoxical. If indeed Tate Modern had innovated new
democratic strategies for curating, as I have argued, its brand-image of democracy
should not have been problematic. Yet in this section I will argue that it was. In fact,
in working towards an image of ‘democracy’, Tate Modern began on its path away
from art and curating as a democratic act. It began to instrumentalise art just as any
corporation or government (power) does.

Mark Dion’s ‘Tate Thames Dig’ was commissioned before the opening of Tate Modern.
Artist and volunteers from the local communities (as well as Tate staff) excavated the
area of the Thames ‘beaches’ in front of both Tate Modern and further upstream at
Tate Britain. It was commissioned as part of the strategy to sit lightly within
Southwark when Tate Modern first opened, amidst fears of the kind of local
resentment that had occurred around the building of The Tate Gallery in Liverpool in

164 Though independent, Demos is largely associated with New Labour.
165 Holden, J., ‘The Cultural Value of Tate Modern’, Tate Modern: Five Years On,
London, Tate Publishing, 2005, pp36
166 The current appearance of the successful regeneration of the Liverpool Docks
has replaced memories of inauspicious beginnings for Tate Liverpool and the
Figure 13: Mark Dion ‘Tate Thames Dig’ (1999-2000) mixed media installation

‘Tate Thames Dig’ was collaborative and site-specific yet political to Tate’s purposes, effectively institutionalised institutional critique. Hal Foster observes of Mark Dion and others that:

site-specific work can be exploited to make these non-spaces specific again, ... the local and the everyday can be revived as simulacrum, ... Art institutions may also use site-specific work for economic development, social outreach, and art tourism, and at a time of privatization this is assumed necessary, even natural ...[artists] could not but serve as a public-relations probe for the corporations and agencies that supported them. 167

This observation is as true for Tate Modern and the redevelopment or ‘regeneration’ of the Bankside site under the New Labour government as it was for ‘Culture in Action’ (1992-3) in Chicago, the curatorial project which included Mark Dion and to general regeneration of the docks area.

which Foster refers in the quote above. 168 ‘Tate Thames Dig’, in this light, can be understood primarily as social outreach on behalf of Tate Modern/New Labour government and as reinforcement of the brand image of ‘democracy’.

In 2003 ‘Common Wealth’ signalled the museum's engagement with relational aesthetics. ‘Common Wealth’ (22 October – 28 December 2003) included artwork or commissions by contemporary artists Jennifer Allora and Guillermo Calzadilla, Carsten Höller, Gabriel Orozco and Thomas Hirschhorn. It included work like Gabriel Orozoco's ‘Oval with Pendulum’ (1996) and Carsten Höller's ‘Frisbee House’ (2000). ‘Oval with Pendulum’ is an elliptical billiard table with no pockets, two white balls and a coloured one tethered to the ceiling in such a way as to create a pendulum-like swing. ‘Frisbee House’ consists of a modern tent-like structure with holes large enough for frisbees and frisbees made of soft collapsible materials. Tate Magazine told readers that the ludic, playful artwork was ‘very democratic work’ 169 while the Tate Modern blurb described the aims of the exhibition:

To use a statement by Hirschhorn, the artists in Common Wealth are interested in making art politically rather than making political art. Their work seeks to bridge the individual and the communal, by developing local practices that remain critically aware of the global situation. 170

In common with Eliasson's statements, we can see the obfuscation of ‘politics’ in this text. Hirschhorn states, and the blurb reiterates, it is not ‘political art’ (and therefore not to be read as prefixed art) but ‘making art politically’. This is an example of the precarious line the mainstream artworld must tread in terms of the institutional

168 ‘Culture in Action’ 1992-3 was a curatorial project consisting of eight public art commissions across Chicago curated by Mary Jane Jacobs. Dion’s ‘Chicago Urban Ecology Action Group’ 1993 worked with high school students from two locations in the city – one poor and one rich – which included a junket to Belize with the students.
theory of art. When an exhibition is marketed as socially or politically engaged it must also distance itself from prefixed art practices, lest its value is eroded.

This was an important exhibition for Tate Modern in terms of its brand both within London artworld contemporary practice and in a wider art context. It was an opportunity for Tate Modern to acknowledge, not just some of the contemporary practices outside North America and Western Europe (areas of the globe and practices which had been neglected by Tate Modern since ‘Century City’ in 2001) but also the wave of interest in London in Nicolas Bourriaud’s *Relational Aesthetics*. This theory and publication, which actively engages in social and political ideals, had influenced exhibitions and practice across London even before it was translated into English in 2002.\(^{171}\) ‘Common Wealth’ signalled that Tate Modern had indeed engaged in Bourriaud’s theories and further it could be also understood as an exercise in Tate Modern branding. Art correspondent for *The Guardian* Jonathan Jones observed that, whatever its stated intentions, it primarily served the Tate Modern brand:

> Common Wealth is full of quite enjoyable and mildly thought-provoking art ... Actually, I’m lying; I found it barely thought-provoking at all. This doesn’t mean it’s dumb or pointless. Like everything at Tate Modern, it makes you feel that you are at Tate Modern - and that’s a fine place to be. Contemporary art in the museum is good at making you think about contemporary art in the museum, and this in itself is political, insofar as it is difficult to imagine the Britain represented at Tate Modern ever voting Conservative. But Common Wealth thinks it is infinitely more radical than that.\(^{172}\)

For Jonathan Jones, this exhibition saw Tate Modern fulfilling its democracy brief; even, perhaps, its New Labour brief. While I agree that many aspects of Tate

---

\(^{171}\) Bourriaud applauds the work of Carsten Höller and Gabriel Orozco in *Relational Aesthetics*. Bourriaud, N., op cit.

Modern’s operation over this period do reflect a close, collusive perhaps even coercive, relationship with New Labour, as I have argued above, ‘Common Wealth’ perhaps can be better understood as simply employing similar strategies to the New Labour government of the time, hence the palpable sympathy between the two.

Further, like the Gasworks exhibition, ‘Gambierra’, ‘Common Wealth’ simply served stereotypes of troubles elsewhere like Hirschhorn’s ‘Hotel Democracy’ (2003). I would argue that this served to distance the exhibition and its artworks from the British context. 173 De-contextualised, these works are no longer counter-Power. Instead they serve as mere spectacle within the institution of Tate Modern. ‘Common Wealth’ was a triumph in terms of the Tate Modern brand, of style over substance. It claimed democratic engagement while obscuring the growing lack of commitment to art and curating as a democratic act within Tate Modern since 2002.

The period 2000-2006 can be characterised as a time when appearance or brand-image was stressed throughout the Western economies and sometimes at the expense of substance. As Naomi Klein argues, this was already a trend in the 1990s. That some art can be used predominantly for its brand-image by Tate Modern implies a growing convergence in the methods of the art institution with those of the corporate sector, just as there has been between public and private sectors. Power (the state, corporations and Tate Modern) may announce itself as espousing one set of values (for example, freedom, equality of opportunity, social or environmental responsibility) while working antithetically in practice. 174 The stress is on brand-image and this stress in itself may be understood as a mechanism of power as described in chapter four. 175 The following section is an analysis of trends in exhibitions across all other

173 This is distinct from a later work by Hirschhorn, also in 2003, ‘Drift Topography’. The subject of ‘Drift Topography’ is the war and occupation of Iraq and in the context of a British publicly funded art institution, it served as an instance of art as a democratic act. It addressed, not a spectacle of ‘troubles’ as ‘Hotel Democracy’ seemed to do, but the specificities of its temporal and physical location, being made with Tate Modern in mind.
175 Hywel Williams’ Britain’s Power Elites: The rebirth of the a Ruling Class describes the disparity between rhetoric and reality with an analysis of Britain that demonstrates an ongoing trend away from democracy, freedom and equality, despite New Labour assertions to the opposite. Williams, H., op cit. The same is true regarding trends in citizenship law, which are becoming more punitive and
areas of Tate Modern which betrays the fact that, over time, the institution did work antithetically with regard its stated aims. It worked towards hierarchy and hegemonic power and away from freedom and equality that is counter-Power despite an image of ‘democracy’.

5.2 RIGIDITY

From late 2002 the level four temporary exhibitions moved towards a programme with a growing dependence on the work of ‘white’ men from North America and Western Europe. Temporary exhibitions and commissions conceived as counter-Power (at least in artworld terms) became marginal, displaced to other areas of the gallery like corridor spaces, cafés and hoardings or to the psychologically marginal spaces of live art practice and net.art, though as mentioned net.art was conceived as interventionist from the outset. Consequently new areas for experiencing art at Tate Modern proliferated. In the original conception for the gallery as a whole experience, it was understood that the temporary exhibition space on level four could counter-balance the skew in the collections display. The collection itself is heavily over-representative of the work of ‘white’ men and only a few mainstream modernist art historical movements, namely Abstract Expressionism, Minimalism, Surrealism and Pop Art. The display of the collection is therefore inherently biased in these directions. The innovation of the thematic hang created great potential for art as a democratic act, particularly as counter-Power in artworld terms. Because anything could be juxtaposed with anything, irrespective of where it was placed art historically – marginally or centrally – the thematic hang could, in theory, embrace and make sense of all art practices. In 2006, Tate Modern abandoned this curatorial device. In the final part of this chapter I will consider examples of those practices of art and precarious, despite a rhetoric of safety and security for all. In terms of CSR, there are many examples of ‘green-washing’, such as Shell’s sponsorship of ‘Wildlife Photographer of the Year’ despite their being implicated in the state execution of environmental protesters in Nigeria in 1995, including Ken Saro Wiwa. The website and charity ‘WorldAware’ is in part a charity set up to enable large transnational corporations to sponsor prizes for other transnational corporations thus facilitating Corporate Social Responsibility programmes which may or may not in actuality serve local social or environmental concerns.
curating as a democratic act since 2002 and their changed context. It will also consider how the rehang of the collections display in 2006 helped to further marginalise art and curating as a democratic act.

Statistics for the collections displays indicate that, of the work on display, there were relatively steady proportions when analysed in terms of gender and ethnicity throughout the whole period 2000-2006. Women consistently made up between 10-15% of the artists on display with women being more likely to be represented by a single piece of their work (9-12% of the actual works on display) while men were more likely to have more of their oeuvre shown. The range, between 10-15%, itself indicates that there were periods of more and less representation of women artists. Generally speaking, the period around 2004 was the least representative in terms of gender and ethnicity or ‘race’, a slow decline statistically from the initial hang. By October 2004, an all-time low was achieved within the collections displays: less than one percent (0.5%) of the work on display was by a non-‘white’ artist. 176 This lack of representation was maintained into the 2006 rehang, particularly in terms of ethnicity, though statistically the work of women artists was more or less maintained at 11% (no longer the dizzy heights of 15%). Originally non-‘white’ artists' work constituted between 2-4% of the work on display. With the rehang of 2006, non-‘white’ artists were represented at a rate of about 1-2% within the collections display. By contrast, between 10-30% of the professional artists working on art projects and commissions instigated by the Interpretation and Education department over the period were from non-European, non-‘white’ backgrounds over the period, including some with international reputations. 177 In fact, for the 2006 re-hang of the collection, an art historical timeline was drawn up and displayed in the foyer of levels three and five. This art history according to Tate Modern included a wide range of non-‘white’ artists (including Adrian Piper, On Kawara, Yayoi Kusama, Jean-Michel Basquiat, Steve McQueen, Isaac Julien, Sonia Boyce, Mona Hatoum and Kara Walker) 

176 This is particularly notable as October is Black History Month and a time for traditional mainstream cultural institutions to support token attempts at redressing historical biases.
177 This includes Chila Kumari Burman, Faisal Abdu’Allah, Zineb Sedira, Yinka Shonibare and Mohini Chandra, some of whom are represented in international biennales, been shortlisted for the Turner Prize and others who are already written into British art history.
and the Black Art Movement, none of which was on display at the time. This contrasts
with the ‘white’ canonical artists who were also included in the timeline and who
comprised the vast majority of the displays. We can interpret this disjunct as either
the consequence of the different agendas and pressures on the Interpretation and
Education department compared with Exhibitions and Displays, or that the brand of
Tate Modern was best served by the inclusion of non-‘white’ artists in an education
context but not displays.

With the 2006 re-hang of the collection, which was sponsored by UBS banking
corporation, the 'strengths' of the collection were displayed as 'hubs' in the four
suites of galleries. These strengths, Abstract Expressionism, Surrealism, Minimalism
and Pop Art, roughly correspond to the hubs named ‘Material Gestures’, ‘Poetry and
Dream’, ‘States of Flux’ and ‘Idea and Object’. These mainstream modernist
movements became a framework through which to understand or interpret the
artworks placed around them. The device centralises canonical art historical
moments, the four strengths of the collection, and then other work is placed in
juxtaposition, interpreted through these movements. Immediately you have ‘central’
and ‘marginal’, a display of hierarchy, not equality.

One example of the new hierarchical method of display can be seen in the original
2006 hang for ‘States of Flux’, which centred on one large room of early mainstream
modernist works including Cubism and Constructivist works. Natalya Goncharova
was the only women artist represented in the room with ‘Linen’ (1913) positioned in a
corner and above the sight-line. Working clockwise through the suite, the next time
we encountered the work of any women artists was when we came to the room of the
Guerilla Girls work of the late 1980s at the end of the suite. A further room included
the only other work by a woman in the suite, and the only non-‘white’ artist, Tomoko
Takahashi's installation, ‘Drawing Room’ (1998). Without the 20-30 examples of their
work in the Guerilla Girls room, statistics for the suite as a whole would have been
well below the statistical average for displaying artwork by women. Instead of the
now usual 11%, it would have been 1-2% without the Guerilla Girls room. Ironically,
the group most sensitive to statistical exclusions have a room devoted to them in a flagrantly statistically skewed display. Amassed like this, not only did the Guerilla Girls room seem like a sad and hopeless curatorial intervention into the suite as a whole (though perhaps the intention was ironic), but the work itself was

Figure 14: Guerilla Girls, ‘Guerilla Girls Talk Back [no title]’, (1985-1990)

disadvantaged for its repetition. Ordinarily, we experience each work separately itself an intervention into its context. Like this, the work read like a nagging rant rather than art.

By contrast, also in 2006 the ‘Material Gestures’ suite was the most successful in terms of curating as a democratic act. It was dominated by a large area devoted to Abstract Expressionism and its off-shoots. Marginal to the area was a smallish room called, ‘Distinguished Voices’ which included the work of Matisse and Picasso which then led to a larger room of contemporary figurative painting. The presence of Picasso and Matisse hung together in the same space promoted the feeling that Tate Modern had indeed returned to mainstream modernism, and this is also implied in the
title, ‘Distinguished Voices’. Visual arts critic for *The Guardian* Jonathan Jones seemed reassured that ‘the nature of Tate Modern [has been changed] for the better’ by this very curatorial device. His review betrays that he had been under the impression that Tate Modern curators, namely Frances Morris, had been locking away all the good (white, male) art and he was pleased to see them come to their senses:

Should it really be up to Frances Morris whether or not we can see Picasso's Three Dancers? (For some of the last few years, we couldn't.) But most of the masterpieces I see in the stores are now on their way to Tate Modern. The new displays contain, quite simply, much more art. There are lots of worthwhile things to see. I've visited the new surrealism display - already open on Level 3 - three or four times, and have barely started to assimilate it. This is a huge and welcome return of works from the stores that changes the nature of Tate Modern for the better.\(^{179}\)

Yet I address his concerns as potentially a misreading of the new display. I see a contingent and even marginalised interpretation of the masterpieces in question (and this time he has failed to realise others are missing). Rather than being portrayed as kings of Modernist genius, central to any reading of mainstream modernist art history, Matisse and Picasso are rendered as historicising or contextualising Abstract Expressionism. And here Abstract Expressionism includes such unlikely figures as Nikki Saint Phalle and Joan Mitchell, though Jackson Pollock and Lee Krasner feature most prominently as we would expect of a suite exploring Abstract Expressionism. Another example of curating as a democratic act (in counter-canonical terms) within ‘Material Gestures’ is the work of Tacita Dean, which is afforded a gravitas and space ordinarily reserved for canonical male artists. Within the space of the suite, her work was almost a counter-balance or response to the room of Mark Rothko's ‘Seagram Murals’ (1958-9). Tacita Dean's work was seen across two large rooms adjacent to the Rothko room. The first room displayed ‘The Roaring Forties: Seven Boards in Seven Days’ (1997) a series of blackboard sketches with maritime imagery which lead onto a

\(^{178}\) Jones, J., ‘Where have you been all my life?’, *The Guardian*, May 2, 2006

\(^{179}\) ibid
second room housing a large projection of her 16mm colour film, ‘Disappearance at Sea’ (1996).

‘Material Gestures’ is the most successful of the four new themes of 2006 in terms of any realisation of democratic action. In fact, the only work by non-‘white’ artists on display on the entire third floor at the time was one large, stunning sculpture by Anish Kapoor, ‘Ishi’s Light’ (2003) at the entrance of ‘Material Gestures’ and a small Wifredo Lam painting, ‘Ibaye’ (1950), in ‘Poetry and Dream’.

Nevertheless, like the failures in curating in 2000, ‘Material Gestures’ also suffered from its own moment of Tate-branded dissent as it included a ‘Tate Modern Contemporary Intervention’ which no longer served as an intervention in this context. Maurizio Cattelan’s ‘The Wrong Gallery’ (2002-onwards) was imported from the streets of New York where originally it disrupted an easy, complacent encounter with the commercial galleries of Soho, New York. \(^{180}\) Taken out of its context the work fails to intervene effectively. It becomes simply a homage to intervention not an intervention itself. This said, ‘Material Gestures’ overall is in tune with Tate Modern’s founding democratic principles particularly if we concentrate solely on equal treatment of women, who have crept into the story of modernism. Oddly, even the most conservative of critics failed to realise the coup.

The less flexible curatorial device of hubs created fewer attempts at incorporating the work of ‘other modernisms’ than that afforded by thematic display. In addition, the sponsorship deal with UBS Swiss banking corporation in 2005-06 included the requirement by Tate Modern to exhibit the UBS collection of contemporary art amidst Tate’s. (It is notable that when a public gallery like Tate Modern shows privately-owned artworks or collections of individuals and corporations, like UBS, the status, and therefore the price of those artworks and the collection as a whole increases.\(^{181}\))

\(^{180}\) ‘The Wrong Gallery’ was founded by artist Maurizio Cattelan and two editors turned curators, Massimiliano Gioni and Ali Subotnick. The gallery-artwork was evicted from its location at 516A½ West 20th Street in Chelsea, New York on July 2005 when the entire building was sold.

\(^{181}\) Louisa Buck, op cit, ‘Once it has come to rest in an important public institution, the artwork's enhanced status is also emphasised by a resulting increase in its monetary worth: the ultimate accolade of “museum quality” is not cheaply won.’
This meant that the ‘joiner galleries’ connecting the West and East wings were earmarked for the UBS collection instead of work from the Tate collection. Before the UBS sponsored re-hang, it was in these specific galleries that the work of ‘political’ artists like Victor Burgin, Barbara Kruger, Tim Rollins and KOS and Jenny Holzer were predominantly shown. They were also the spaces where audiences would most likely encounter the work of black artists, including the 2002-3 collaboration between Tate curator Emma Dexter and Sonia Boyce around the artwork ‘From Tarzan to Rambo: English Born “Native” Considers her Relationship to the Constructed/Self image and her Roots in Reconstruction’ (1987). The Chris Ofili monographic display, when he was on the only non-‘white’ artist in the collections displays during October 2004, was also in one of the level five ‘joiner’ galleries. It was his paintings and drawings that constituted the non-‘white’ 0.5% of work displayed during Black History Month, October 2004. Physically outside of the thematic displays, the ‘joiner’ galleries were also space set aside for ‘education’ exhibitions. They were conceived as areas where Tate Modern curators could place the more ‘challenging’ artwork in terms of subject and the more academic displays, like the 2003 homage to the art historian Herbert Read. As a direct consequence of UBS sponsorship, this type of artwork and curating was supplanted by the much less inclusive, much less artistically diverse and the politically unchallenging work of the UBS art collection itself.

After 2002 examples of art and curating as a democratic act occurred most frequently in the margins, if they happened at all, moving away from the centrality of the fourth floor temporary exhibition spaces, to smaller, physically and psychologically marginal spaces. These include the ‘Untitled Space’ or ‘Level 2 Gallery’ on the footpath level of Tate Modern which was originally a bookshop with a separate entrance from the rest of Tate Modern, as well as in cafés and restaurants, the Members’ Room, corridor spaces, outside hoarding, or as part of the net.art and ‘live art’ programmes. Other than in these marginal spaces, from 2002 onwards, any instances of art as a democratic act were most likely to be commissioned under the auspices of the Interpretation and Education, as distinct from Exhibitions and Displays, and were
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therefore without official Tate exhibitions budget, publicity or documentation. For example, in 2003, the education department inaugurated the Live Art programme at Tate Modern with Live Art Development Agency. ‘Live Culture’ 2003 featured artists with long and illustrious histories of a socially or politically engaged practice such as Guillermo Gómez-Peña, Marina Abramovic, Franko B, Forced Entertainment, Aaron Williamson, Jean Fisher, Carol Becker and John Jordan. Most of the artists in the programme were famous for their criticality, highly regarded since the 1970s and 1980s for their radical politics across ethnicity, disability, gender and social politics. ‘Live Culture’ 2003 was a celebration of the history and contemporary relevance of socially engaged art practices and art as a democratic act.

By 2006, even these marginal arenas for democratic practice were being used otherwise. For the live art programme of 2006, ‘UBS Openings : The Long Weekend’, the programme became little more than advertising for the already heavily publicised UBS bank sponsored re-hang of the collections. Marketed and titled as ‘Futurist Friday : States of Flux’, ‘Surrealist Saturday: Poetry and Dream’, ‘Abstract Sunday: Material Gestures’, ‘Minimalist Monday: Idea and Object’, the event was less a space for art as a democratic act, as the 2003 Live Art programme had been, than a series of spectacles created for maximum publicity featuring famous music acts and one-day installation events created for maximum publicity.

In summary, across most aspects of curating at Tate Modern over the period 2000-2006 there was a demonstrable swing away from art and curating as a democratic act despite an early commitment to this type of practice. Art and curating as a democratic act has been defined throughout this thesis as actions which enact freedom and equality that is counter-Power. In the context of the artworld, power is both the hegemonic influences of the market and the state plus the dominant paradigm of mainstream modernism with all its exclusions and orthodoxies. Over the period 2002-2006, Tate Modern increasingly reflected the orthodoxies of...

---

182 This includes a variety of artworks, some mentioned here like ‘Tate Scavengers Hunt’ and the ‘Live Culture’ programmes, but also ‘The Value of Art’ 2001 and various interventions from ‘Ghetto Superstar’ 2001, 2003, 2004.
‘institutionally dominant art history’, \textsuperscript{183} or power, becoming less inclusive of the work of women, non-‘white’ artists or those artists working outside the geographic area of mainstream modernism. This trend of exclusion is evident both on the level of individual exhibitions, artworks and commissions and systemically by virtue of changes in curatorial device. Evidence of this trend in curating can be traced both in the large scale temporary exhibitions on level four and in the display of the collections on levels three and five.

Arguably this trend away from art and curating as a democratic act is a consequence of corporate sponsorship, which in turn is a consequence of government policy. There appears to be a correlation between corporate sponsorship and the promotion of artwork by ‘white’ men from North America and Western Europe. In other words, artwork that most easily fits within the mainstream modernist paradigm seems to fit corporate brand image more readily than artwork from outside mainstream modernism. This bias may be due to the perception that such work is ‘safer’: safer on the basis that ‘greatness’ is linked to whiteness and masculinity, \textsuperscript{184} or because safety lies in conforming to an (art historical) orthodoxy, or because this work tends to be more valuable economically and corporations are more likely to align themselves with objects of high and therefore ‘safe’ economic value. Whatever the reason, it is clear that there is a direct link between corporate sponsorship over this period at Tate Modern and an exhibitions programme that maintains artworld orthodoxies, a lack of equality, and also a lack of freedom with particular types of practice inherently excluded by virtue of their potential to undermine the brand.

\textsuperscript{183} Harris, J., op cit, p9
\textsuperscript{184} ibid, p101 with Nochlin on gender.

CHAPTER 6 : THE LOGIC OF THE SWING TO POWER

In the preceding chapters I considered the changing environment for culture, the impact of corporate sponsorship and the trend in curating at Tate Modern. In the following pages I will go on to consider the increasing centralisation of the logic of the market within the workings of Tate Modern, specifically the impact of the incorporating the tastes and prejudices of the market.

A conclusion of the preceding chapters is that there were demonstrable trends away from art and curating as a democratic act directly attributable to the pressure of corporate sponsorship and government funding targets. This has been portrayed thus far as a bureaucratic power similar to that described by Gramsci. Here I will argue that there is something in addition to these factors. Some of this swing away from art as a democratic act may also be attributed to a generalised change in the thinking at Tate Modern ushered in partly by changes in key personnel including the Director but also, arguably, to something less demonstrable: a complicity with or institutionalisation of market values. In 1979, Jean-François Lyotard argued that financial value (profit) had already superseded any other type of value in art.185 Here I will demonstrate how a change in values operated in Tate Modern over 2000-2006 which may substantiate this observation. I have argued above that throughout its first eighteen months, Tate Modern's aim and ideals as described in the mission statement followed the logic of democratic action, aligning art practices with freedom and equality that is counter-Power. After that period institutional thinking can be seen to have changed and instead Tate Modern as an institution followed the logic of the market and the logic of pleasing the DCMS at all costs.

Before I begin the analysis I will first mention that any institution, including Tate Modern, is constituted of individuals. As individuals, there are a variety of beliefs, commitments and attitudes across staff at all levels of the institution. It is only from the outside that an institution appears homogeneous, as the totality of its parts.

185 Lyotard, J. F., op cit, p76
Nevertheless, by virtue of the types of people employed, the leadership of management and direct pressures like ‘key performance indicators’, institutions do have discernible cultures and these are subject to change over time. Here I will argue that over the period 2000-2006, the culture at Tate Modern changed to one which accepted market orthodoxies unreflexively.

In the absence of a mechanism for critical reflection, unwitting trends may be set in motion which are difficult to stop. Karl Popper described a ‘closed society’, which may be understood as a society ideologically unable to reflect critically. When power (even a ‘benign’ power) is unable to reflect on its actions inevitably there are unintended consequences, the impact of which go unchecked and therefore grow. 186 Here I argue that because they were left unexamined, orthodoxies crept into the procedures and thinking of staff at Tate Modern which ultimately led to inadvertent inclusions and exclusions based on market assumptions.

The logic of the market can be seen to guide how staff at Tate Modern curated ‘contemporary art’ as seen in the new gallery on level two which opened in 2004, the ‘Level 2 Gallery’. First called the ‘Untitled’ space, 187 the space was conceived as a ‘project space’ where work was shown by younger or less established artists who are (not yet) collected by Tate. In an earlier chapter, we saw that when Tate Modern first opened this type of artwork could be seen in the central parts of the gallery, integrated into its heart on level four in the large temporary gallery spaces such as the exhibition by Eija-Liisa Ahtila. From 2002 onwards, this type of work was moved to more marginal spaces and the shift from central to marginal could be seen as consolidated by the new gallery.

The blurb on the Tate website described the space as:

187 Previously, it had been a not particularly profitable bookshop. The new gallery, conceived as a project space, was on level 2 with a separate entrance opening towards the river Thames. Initially called, ‘Untitled’, it confused gallery visitors who mistook it for a separate gallery.
The Level 2 Gallery is a specifically-designed exhibition space dedicated to displaying new art by contemporary artists. Over the coming year, the gallery will host six temporary exhibitions by a diverse range of artists from all over the world.\footnote{188}

### Untitled Space Exhibition Trends 2004 - 06

Table 7.1 created from data available through Tate website

Statistically, this graph of trends within the Level 2 Gallery demonstrates that more than double the number of solo opportunities went to men (62% of the exhibitions compared with 23% of opportunities going to women artists) over the three years, though with such a small sample size, this could be anomalous and not an indication of (future) trends. The bias is largely attributable to statistics for 2005 when no women artists were afforded a solo show while four male artists were. Compared with the rest of the gallery though, this space is much more representative and diverse: over 20% women were afforded an exhibition opportunity as compared with 11% in the collections display over the same period and 45% of the exhibitions included non-‘white’ artists as compared with none in the level four temporary exhibitions and about 2% in the collections displays over the same period. It could therefore be argued that at least in this marginal space a commitment to art as a democratic could be seen to continue after 2004. Nevertheless, I will argue that these statistics also hide a more sinister bias which seems to indicate otherwise.

\footnote{188 Online. Available HTTP. <http://www.tate.org.uk/modern/level2gallery/> (accessed 10 October 2006)}
As 2006 drew to a close, a pattern emerged in the type of artist afforded exhibitions in the project space. Two distinct groups emerge: commercially successful artists who are predominantly ‘white’ and publicly-funded artists who are not-‘white’. Artists either have a strong art market value and came to Tate Modern through the Frieze Art Fair (these were mostly based in North America and Europe) or alternatively, artists are non-‘white’ with track records of major exhibitions in publicly-funded spaces and these artists usually lack commercial representation.

A similar bias can be seen across the rest of the London contemporary artworld. To be shown in a publicly funded gallery like the 'Level 2 Gallery', an artist is ‘black’ (or non-‘white’) and therefore statistically unlikely to be commercially successful in Britain, or an artist is commercially successful and commercially successful artists are mostly ‘white’ American, ‘white’ European, or Japanese. For example, Simryn Gill, Meschac Gaba and Mohamed Camara who were shown in solo exhibitions in the 'Level 2 Gallery' over 2004-6 and who fit the ‘black artist’ category do not have the high commercial profile of Roman Ondák, Brian Jungen or Jan De Cock all of whom came to Tate Modern through Frieze Art Fair. The other commercially successful artists shown were all ‘white’ with the exception of Damiàn Ortega, a Latin American artist. It is notable that there was a boom in the art market for Latin American artists and in 2005 Tate Modern employed a curator specifically for that region of the world.

An analysis of the press releases issued for these exhibitions betrays the fact that not a single woman artist received Tate press support for their exhibition. This compares with 88% of the male solo projects benefiting from Tate press support.\(^{189}\) In addition to perhaps an obscured institutional gender bias, I will argue that exhibitions in the Level 2 Gallery betray an institutional bias towards art market commercialism (and therefore artworld power) with its own statistical bias towards the work of white men. First, I will briefly consider trends in the press office over 2000-2006 which indicate a trend by Tate towards marketing the corporate sponsorship deals and away from

press support for art and exhibitions in general: further evidence of the growing institutionalisation of market values at Tate Modern.

Table 7.2 Trends in Type of Press Release concerning Tate Modern issued by Tate, 2000-2006 from raw data available through Tate website.

Analysis of press releases issued by Tate Press Office indicates a number of distinct trends across the period 2000-2006. Trends in the dark-blue column highlight the growing commercial focus of Tate Modern, most spectacularly from 2003-2006. Trends in the mid-blue column show that in 2006, when UBS sponsorship was in full swing, there were more press releases issued about corporate sponsorship in that single year than in any of the other 6 years put together. Press Releases issued solely about the art and exhibitions and without any additional emphasis on the corporate sponsorship deal (the pale yellow column) remained relatively steady, plummeting to zero in 2006 when corporate sponsorship featured in every press release about art, events, education and interpretation at Tate Modern. The press release, ‘Tate Modern announces new programmes and facilities for families’ (22 May 2006) is an example. Reiterating the UBS sponsorship throughout the text, the press release describes the continuing family programme and facilities pertaining to access at Tate Modern which had already been implemented since the launch in 2000. In other words, the
press release created the false impression of a link between UBS and the access and family programmes described in the press release.

Over 2005-6 for numerous reasons, some of which are discussed above, the number of temporary exhibitions without corporate sponsorship across the entire gallery had increased. Nevertheless in 2006, Tate Modern only issued press statements that mentioned corporate sponsorship deals. At the same time, there was unprecedented levels of press releases issued parading 'diversity' and 'community relations'. This coincidence of facts may be understood as serving to obscure the prevalence of market concerns with a rhetoric of ‘access’ and democracy.190

The slow increase in institutional bias towards the logic of the market which sees a preponderance for the art that best fits mainstream modernism (with all its exclusions and orthodoxies) is evident across a range of indicators. These indicators include the statistical evidence around gender and ethnicity in the collections displays and the large-scale temporary exhibitions on level four analysed in previous chapters. Instances of art and curating as a democratic act, or art which enacts freedom and equality that is counter-Power (including artworld power), can also be seen to have become increasingly marginalised, if they occurred at all. Additionally, from 2004 onwards Tate Modern can be seen to have had a growing dependence on the art market to ascertain what is ‘good’ art.

This is a flawed logic for a number of reasons, including: 1) the fact that the art market is not inclusive of all types of practice (by definition, it is a very limited sample of all the contemporary practices); 2) by virtue of the type of people who comprise the buyers of contemporary art (described above with reference to Alvin Hall, Georgina Adam and Louisa Buck) art made for the market may be understood predominantly as relatively conservative both aesthetically and politically and 3) the contemporary art market betrays a bias towards the work of white artists and in

190 ‘Mumbai comes to Tate Modern’ 1 September 2006 which features one of the many live events happening at that time for no apparent reason other than the connection to India. ‘Tate Modern and major music acts get together on Tate tracks’ 31 August 2006 which states first that is is a collaboration with hip hop. ‘Tate Modern announces new programmes an facilities for families’ 22 May 2006
particular, white male artists. I surveyed the range of artists represented by commercial galleries on 1 August 2006, analysing the range with the categories, male, female and ‘other’ where other is not-‘white’, and defined broadly to include Latin American artists, African, Asian and Far East Asian artists. This was to ascertain whether the art market is heterogeneous (at least in terms of representation). This was to test Nitzan and Bichler’s analysis above for the wider market which concludes that contrary to mythology, by its nature, the market is actually monopolistic and therefore monoculturalist in tendency.

On 1 August 2006, Gagosian represented 11% women and 6% other; White Cube 15% women and 14% other; Lisson Gallery 18% women and 11% other; Victoria Miro 15% women and 38% other. The vast majority of those within the ‘other’ category are Japanese, then Latin American. Very few black British, African, Caribbean or artists from elsewhere are represented within the commercial gallery system in London and there are some commercial galleries, like Purdy Hicks and Alan Cristea, which show less than 2% ‘other’. Judging by the standards of the market, the best contemporary art is made by white men and particularly those that live or work in particular hotspots in the USA and Western Europe. Non-‘white’ artists are usually so far from market standards that they need public subsidy - or so we might conclude if we regard the art market as an arbiter of artistic quality.

As to the question of bias, it is notoriously difficult to get an overview of the art market as both Louisa Buck and market researchers, Morris Hargreaves McIntyre, conclude.\textsuperscript{191} Artist Tracey Emin’s television piece, ‘What Price Art?’ does attempt to look at the bias within the market in terms of auction sales of women artists’ work. Comparing like with like, female with male artists of the same art movement, period and eminence, on average, women’s sales were approximately 10% of the price of men’s at auction. Comparisons were Eva Hesse $2,202,500 (Christies 1997) with Bruce Nauman $9,906,000 (Christies 1997); Lee Krasner $1,911,500 (Christies 2003) with Jackson Pollock $11,655,500 (Christies 2003); Damien Hirst $1,237,600

(Sotheby's 2004) with Tracey Emin $108,250 (Christie's 2001) or Sarah Lucas $135,750 (Christie's 2001); Henry Moore $8,408,000 (Sotheby's 2004) with Barbara Hepworth $1,228,000 (Sotheby's 2004). If the market is indeed meritocratic with no bias, women make art that is one tenth the value of men's. Yet Oliver Baker, Sotheby's Head of Contemporary Art, explains the disparity as, 'the short answer is yes there has been a sort of prejudice'.

Dealers, auctioneers and others in the commercial system believe that anything can sell. As the art dealer, Sadie Coles says, ‘everything is commercial. You just have to find the right buyer’. Yet it is also acknowledged by gallery dealers that the commercial gallery system is far from representative of all art practices, avoiding ‘less-market friendly artists’. This is particularly as more money is invested in the art market as Matthew Slotover of Frieze (the art magazine and the art fair) observes: since the early 1990s, commercial galleries became increasingly risk averse in the booming market under the weight of greater financial pressures. Interestingly and predictably in terms of art as a democratic act (with Bichler and Nitzan's critical analysis of the market in mind), an under-developed market is more supportive of diversity, the range of artistic practices and voices, than a strong, developed one. Presumably this is not only because of the natural tendency within the market to monoculturalism but also partly because in a rising market, art becomes more about money than anything else.

As the art market reflects the tastes and concerns of an economic and social elite (the process of vetting new art buyers is described above), relying on the art market to ascertain what is good Art indicates a swing away from values of freedom and equality. When market acceptability or economic value is accepted wholesale as a major criteria of good Art by Tate Modern (itself power in the artworld), the values of

192 My transcript. ‘What Price Art?’ Channel 4, 15 March 2006
195 This latter observation made at ‘The Rise of the London Art Market’ regarding the potential of commercial galleries to become risk averse when there is ever greater financial pressures was made by Matthew Slotover, co-founder of Frieze magazine in 1991 and co-founder of Frieze Art Fair in 2003.
196 Bichler, S., and Nitzan, J., op cit
the market are maintained unquestioningly and promulgated. The values of the market are promoted and normalised in this way.

In summary, the swing away from art as a democratic act can be seen partly as the result of a lack of critical reflection on various trends and orthodoxies as they operated in the context of London 2000-2006. Tate Modern can be seen to maintain the values of the market and this is echoed elsewhere within the London artworld. It is also subject to government pressures through the Funding Agreements and this in turn promotes deeper alliances with the market and fosters the logic of the market, militating against freedom and equality that is counter-Power. Once the logic of power prevails, it becomes increasingly difficult for democratic action for the many reasons analysed in the preceding chapters. Opportunities for actions that enact freedom and equality become eroded and the impact of those actions may also be diminished as, for example, they are perceived to lack status or value.

The following chapter will briefly investigate the London artworld 2000-2006 outside of Tate Modern, again tracing the impact of power on art and curatorial practice over that period. This analysis will indicate that there was a rise in instances of art as a democratic act over the period, the opposite of the trend at Tate Modern as we have seen. I will argue that there was a swing to power in wider society over that period (which may have helped create the conditions for the erosion of the platform for art as a democratic act within Tate Modern) which in the wider artworld conversely appears to have necessitated actions for freedom and equality that is counter-Power. My own art practice forms part of this response to power and this will be analysed in Sections III and IV.
CHAPTER 7 : ART AS A DEMOCRATIC ACT,
LONDON 2000-2006

This chapter continues the investigation into the pressures on the individual and institution over 2000-2006 which potentially undermine the values of freedom and equality. Earlier chapters in this section analysed evidence of the pressure exerted directly by the state and the corporate sector on Tate Modern and the acculturation of market orthodoxies by the institution. The analysis appears to demonstrate a deleterious effect on art as a democratic act at Tate Modern over this period as a consequence of these pressures. In addition to these pressures, which are also exerted on other publicly funded cultural organisations in London over that period, it can be argued that the London artworld itself exerted a pressure on individual constituents. This pressure will be analysed here.

This chapter will investigate the pressures of the artworld and how this may effect the type of mainstream art exhibited and therefore the type of art most readily available to inform public discourse. Section I described the institutional definition of art and how the artworld polices the boundary of 'art'. The artworld regulates the type of art appropriate to any given time period, therefore by definition the artworld places limits on freedom of artistic discourse and the equality of its practitioners. Non-art is rendered invisible in artworld terms. Advocates of 'marginal' or marginalised practices including 'political art', 'activist' or 'dialogic art' like Grant Kester, Jane Rendell and Nina Felshin write, in what can be understood as, an attempt at expanding the definition. Kester acknowledges this to be strange thing to do, even a 'disingenuous' one, given his own criticisms of 'the institutionalized art world.'

His answer is that these art practices are in fact part of a 'venerable tradition of self-critique within the history of modernism'. In other words, he attempts to substantiate his position by using the terms of the mainstream artworld itself. He argues that these practices are wrongly understood as non-art when they

197 Kester, G.H., Conversation Pieces: Community + Communication in Modern Art, op cit, p188
198 Ibid
are in fact the very acme of Art. He states that the reason for wishing to confer Art status onto these practices is so that future generations of activist artists need not 'reinvent the wheel'. This argument is comparable to that of archivists and historians of other marginalised groups. The stated and implied reasons to document the creativity of marginalised peoples is 1) to prove its existence and 2) so that future generations may learn from a more inclusive version of the past and create new innovations on the foundation of what has gone before. (This is presumed to have happened within mainstream culture.) This agenda can be seen in the introduction to Shades of Black: Assembling Black Arts in 1980s Britain in which editors David A. Bailey, Ian Baucom and Sonia Boyce write:

[The conference and the book, Shades of Black] proceeds from the conviction that such movements are made, not found, that they are shaped and patterned, that they are historically produced and historically productive, that movements, identities, identifications, and histories are concrete, if highly negotiable, assemblages. Like an archive, however, assemblages of this sort exist not merely to catalogue or contain the past but, as Jacques Derrida has recently reminded us, as openings to the future.

In 1995 Derrida co-wrote an article and wrote a book with the title, 'Archive Fever : A Freudian Impression'. In it he critiques the nature of the archive though in an early footnote he mentions that:

There is no political power without control of the archive, if not of memory. Effective democratization can always be measured by this essential criterion : the participation in and the access to the archive, its constitution, and its interpretation.

In other words, the reason for negotiating the definition of Art, contesting its exclusions, is in itself an act of democratic engagement. It is not merely about status

199 Ibid, p190
for its own sake but about the power to participate and interpret. In *Differencing the Canon: Feminist Desire and the Writing of Art’s Histories*, Griselda Pollock argues that the canon 'should be understood as both a discursive structure and a structure of masculine narcissism within the exercise of cultural hegemony'. The canon as well as the very definition of art is policed along various binaries. These determine what is made available publicly and what is rendered private, what is visible or invisible. This is the seduction of artworld legitimacy. It may not be enough that an action for freedom and equality exists in a specific time and place. As important, or indeed more important for some, is status or visibility in artworld (and therefore historical) terms.

This chapter will demonstrate the impact of artworld legitimacy on the centraity and visibility of artistic action. Also demonstrated will be the fact that irrespective of this legitimacy, some artists and artist groups who value freedom and equality will risk the invisibility of non-art status. Here the thesis explores the idea that while artworld exclusions may be contested in order to democratize the public space, the pursuance of status by artists and curators is also a tool of self-management in the 'society of control' as described by Foucault. This chapter attempts an analysis of the complex pressures of status (and therefore visibility) of legitimated artworld practices in order to investigate Foucauldian notions of power and how these are manifested within the artworld.

I divide the period 2000-2006 into two distinct periods defined by events like '9/11', the rise in Islamic terrorism on Western targets and the response by the British government, the public and the media to these. The first period is broadly 2000-2002 and the second 2003-2006. But before I continue with the analysis I must first state that this chapter does not aim at being a comprehensive survey of all types of practice in London over those periods. Instead I identify broad trends based on an analysis of editorials and articles in London-based artworld publications (specifically *Art Monthly* and to a lesser extent, *The Art Newspaper* which has an editorial board.

---

in London as well as New York) and London-based artwork disseminated through
networks like ArtsAdmin and Arts Council England (artnews).

Over the period 2000-2006, a number of trends appear in the context of the London
artworld. Increasing numbers of individuals within the London artworld appear
convinced by logic of the market: that the market benefits artists and artistic
production per se; that the market is meritocratic (the best art sells for the highest
prices); that there is no bias within the market (no or little systemic racism or sexism,
no monoculturalism); that there is a buyer for every type of product (of value).203
Johanna Drucker's book, *Sweet Dreams: contemporary art and complicity* typifies the
new market-orientation of the artworld. In it she writes:

> Complicity suggests mutual gain. This relationship is not direct or
unmediated, and not obtained through a simple sellout but via a
complicated set of interconnections."204

Over the period 2000-2002, almost as a backlash to the politicised art movements of
the 1980s and early 1990s (AIDS activists, feminists, Black Arts movement) the
mainstream artworld maintained a generalised hostility or ambivalence to
'democratic' and politicised practices.205 Art displaying a contemporary radically
democratic politics was perceived as passé. Class-based critique was seen as
redundant and gender politics were resolved. Even globalisation at the time was
largely understood with the positive aspect of a ‘global village’ and as the answer to

---

203 This was briefly explored in the previous chapters. Evidence can be seen in the
2007 conference at Tate Britain, ‘The Rise of the London art market’, particularly
in the positions of Georgina Adam, Louisa Buck, Sadie Coles and the conclusions of
Sacha Craddock discussed above. Other evidence includes the publication of art
(Chicago, London, University of Chicago Press, 2005). For some, even
'socially engaged practices' became subject to market values as Sarah Thelwall's
'Capitalising Creativity: Developing Earned Income Streams in Cultural Industries
organisations' (Proboscis, Cultural Snapshot, no 14, November 2007)
demonstrates, as well as the mission statement and activities of the London-based
CIDA (Culture Industries Development Agency).

204 Drucker, J., *Sweet Dreams: contemporary art and complicity*, Chicago, London,
University of Chicago Press, 2005, p9

205 For an exegesis of the merits of a socially engaged practice, though also a 'call to
arms' from this period, see Liz Ellis's 'Do You Want to Be in My Gang: An Account
of Ethics and Aesthetics in Contemporary Art Practice', *n.paradoxa*, London, KT
Press, Vol2, 1997 pp 6-14
the problems of post-colonialism. Peter Kennard, writing in 2000 on the art in the Millennium Dome, observed that Art Monthly was complicit in maintaining the irrelevance of a social or political engagement by framing discourse in those terms:

Your editorial ‘1968 and all that’ in the February issue (AM233) reduces political engagement in art to ‘nostalgia for the possibility of political engagement’! ... Your reviewers, Mark Harris and JJ Charlesworth, are even more negative and prescriptive in their arguments in AM233. Charlesworth states that this ‘resurgent activism’ (sounds like a disease to be done away with) ‘returns to the gallery defeated, only to be defeated a second time by the spectacular and recreational imperatives of the art institution’. He goes on to states that the work serves only to ‘reinforce’ the deep mood of pessimism ‘while denigrating art’s real capacity at once to represent and embody humanity’s creative overcoming of the problems it faces’. This sounds disturbingly like an endorsement of Blair’s puff for the Millennium Dome that it ‘embodies the spirit of the future of the world’...

This article is particularly useful in demonstrating the ambivalence of the London artworld towards democratic engagement, or any overt engagement at the time with the ideas of freedom and equality. Yet Art Monthly did publish the article by Peter Kennard. Even if such an engagement was largely derided, its possibility was still being discussed even within the mainstream London artworld. Neil Mullholland observes that the turn of the millennium saw a rise in exhibitions concerned with ideas of freedom and equality as compared with the 1990s. In The Cultural Devolution: Art in Britain in the Late Twentieth Century, he observes that:

prominent artist-curators such as Matthew Higgs searched for alternatives to the yBas’ [young British artists’] paradigmatic self-indulgence and individualism, experimenting with a return to collaborative, extra-mural (outdoors) political art, which reached

206 Issue 13 of engage (Summer 2003) is one example of this assumption. Further analysis of perceptions of globalisation at the time can be seen in David Slater’s ‘Post-colonial questions for global times’, Review of International Political Economy, Vol 5, No 4, Winter 1998 pp 647-678
207 Kennard, P., ‘Blair’s Art’, op cit
beyond the gallery to engage with issues such as globalization, negation, democracy, poverty and consumerism. 208

Within the context of the mainstream artworld, artists and curators overtly concerned with values of freedom and equality, like Higgs, adopted a variety of approaches that were acceptable as Art: 1) exhibitions of artwork were located in a political past (Fluxus, Mail Art, Conceptual Art of 1960s and 1970s); 2) exhibitions understood as interrogating a foreign context where democracy was nascent or contested (China, Russia) were staged; 3) artwork was produced in media understood as non-commodifiable, outside the market, and therefore somehow inherently politicised (net.art, performance / live art).

Some artists opted to work outside the frame of the artworld, taking their cues instead from new forms of direct action like ‘culture jamming’ with its roots in the Situationist strategy of détournement. 209 Culture jamming is described by Naomi Klein as, ‘an X-ray of the subconscious of a[n advertising] campaign, uncovering not an opposite meaning but the deeper truth hiding beneath the layers of advertising euphemism’. 210

I will briefly describe one of the major exhibitions of the time which did in fact attempt to engage with ideas of freedom, equality and counter-Power within the mainstream artworld. This was ‘Protest and Survive’ (2000) curated by Matthew Higgs and Paul Noble for the Whitechapel Art Gallery. The exhibition included artists and artworks from the ‘politcised past’ as well as contemporary artworks. Included were 1970s radical feminist performance artists, Cosey Fanni Tutti and Vallie Export, and Paul Graham's photographic images of Social Security claimants from the

---

208 Mulholland, N., *The Cultural Devolution: Art in Britain in the Late Twentieth Century*, Aldershot, Burlington, Vermont, Ashgate, c2003, p151
209 ‘The closest English translation of détournement lies somewhere between “diversion” and “subversion”. It is a turning around and a reclamation of lost meaning: a way of putting the stasis of the spectacle in motion. It is plagiaristic, because its materials are those which already appear within the spectacle, and subversive, since its tactics are those of the “reversal of perspective”, a challenge to meaning aimed at the context in which it arises. ... a sort of embezzlement of convention.’ Plant, S., *The Most Radical Gesture: The Situationist International in a Postmodern Age*, London, Routledge, 1992, p86
210 Klein, N., *No Logo*, op cit, pp281-2
mid-1980s. Contemporary artworks included those by Jeremy Deller, Rob Pruitt, Thomas Hirschhorn and Gustav Metzger but the majority of work was transported from a past context and recontextualised with the juxtaposition of contemporary artwork. Julian Stallabrass described some of the reasons for problems with the exhibition at the time as:

The radical, activist art of John Heartfield or Tina Mondotti in the 1920s and 1930s or Hans Haacke from the 1970s onwards was founded upon a utopian attachment to the future, as well as a revulsion towards the present. While struggles based on identity issues have provided contemporary art with most of its politics since the 1980s, the very rapidity with which they were adopted by the mainstream ultimately proved discouraging, and their residue consists of a few entertaining ghosts of radical engagement. Without hope for large-scale transformation, critical art often declines into cynicism, violent lashing out, grim humour or nostalgic whimsy (some of these can be found in Protest and Survive)

It was true that this exhibition and others like it seemed to express a nostalgia for politically or ethically motivated art while simultaneously offering only a contemporary cynicism. Within the context of the mainstream artworld, this may have been one of the few legitimated strategies available for engaging with ideas of freedom and equality at the time. At risk was labels of irrelevance or non-art status.

The experience of the exhibition itself was somewhat disappointing. Less than half of the work was contemporary, brought together from a variety of contexts, and the rest was historical, made to intervene into the political and social contexts of the 1960s, 70s and 80s. Some of the contemporary artwork was site-specific, like Thomas Hirschhorn's 'Public Works - The Bridge' (2000), a cardboard and packaging tape construction bridging the Whitechapel Art Gallery with its neighbour, the Anarchist Bookshop. Most did not engage site-specifically. The vast majority of the work on

---

211 The contemporary practitioners were in fact white men, the only exception being Tariq Alvi's 1996 work. Women radical artists were allocated only a historical role.

212 Stallabrass, J., 'Protest and Survive'. Online. Available HTTP <courtauld.ac.uk/people/stallabrass_julian/PDF/protest.pdf> Accessed 6 March 2006
display was decontextualised from its moment of ‘democratic engagement’ whether by virtue of its temporal dislocation (being made in and for a specific historical moment) or its physical relocation and juxtaposition. For example, for ‘Protest and Survive’, the 1970s feminist work by Cosey Fanni Tutti and Vallie Export was juxtaposed, physically and thematically, with contemporary artwork in such a way as to make it seem old-fashioned and faintly ridiculous. This is not a reading inherent to their work as demonstrated in a later exhibition at Whitechapel Art Gallery, ‘Live in Your Head’ (2001). ‘Live in Your Head’, a survey exhibition of conceptual art in Britain 1965-75, created a more dynamic, relevant reading of their work. In this context, their work retained its criticality, its edge and its relevance. In ‘Protest and Survive’ the historical work seemed to have a whiff of a bygone, if cherished, era.

What made this exhibition exciting on the other hand, in terms of a democratic engagement, was its title, ‘Protest and Survive’, which appeared almost as an admonition to the contemporary moment. By virtue of a guerilla marketing campaign that used stickers, the words ‘Protest and Survive’ were littered throughout the East end and central London serving in itself as an intervention into its context, with the New Labour stress on consensus and a market emphasis on conformity.

Being particularly bound by the rules of the institutional theory of art for legitimating practices as Art, these types of exhibitions in the mainstream Art context can be seen as creating space for discourse about democratic action. Working within the institutional theory of art, discourse must change before a contemporary engagement with freedom and equality or action that is counter-Power could be legitimated as Art. Exhibitions like this may not have enacted freedom and equality, but within their specific contexts, in an artworld that was increasingly market-orientated and unquestioningly so, they may have inspired such action.

Strategies which actually created instances of democratic action in the context of the London artworld 2000-2002 were generally concentrated in marginal practices 213:

---

213 Also at this time was Year of the Artist which may be understood as potentiating democratic action, despite being a government-funded Arts Council initiative. It ran from June 2000 to May 2001, during which time over one thousand artists were commissioned to work in residencies in one thousand places throughout England. As a central government initiative, Year of the Artist was uniquely both
ones that, while part of an artworld legitimated Art practice, are distant from the art market being ephemeral or ‘dematerialized’, thereby apparently avoiding market orthodoxies. It is the perception of dematerialized work as inherently uncommodifible that afforded these practices the ‘right’, in artworld terms, to engage with democratic action at a time of generalised antipathy towards such artwork from the perspective of the mainstream artworld. These practices were perceived to be, by their nature, outside the market, therefore art market orthodoxies do not apply. As discussed above, with advances in capitalism described by Boltanski and Chiapello and Jaime Stapleton, the neat distinction between the material-as-commodity and the dematerialized-as- non-commodifiabile was no longer quite so clear-cut. Nevertheless it is arguable that over the period 2000-2002, at least, net.art and live art practices in Britain were still largely understood as being outside the market and therefore they could retain the anti-market, or counter-Power sensibilities afforded to a previous era.

The 2001 article by Rachel Shreiber compares the utopianism surrounding the new medium of video in the 1970s with the utopianism of the new medium of the internet in the 1990s:

> Early in its history, video art experienced a utopian moment in which it seemed that the medium held the means to redress problems many artists were feeling during the waning years of Modernism. Martha Rosler, an influential video artist, photographer, and theorist, has argued that the utopianism of early video artists in the late 1960s and democratic in design and ambitious in scope and itself was one of the contexts within the artworld at that time, though it was only a transitory one. See Hutton L., and Fenn, C., ‘Year of the Artist – Evaluation of the programme in England Research’, report 26, Arts Council of England, October 2002

214 Essays by Benjamin and Lippard helped to create this idea which seemed to hold true largely until the advent of the Knowledge Economy in the mid-late 1980s Benjamin, W., ‘The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction’, *Illuminations*, introduced and edited by Hannah Arendt, translated by Harry Zohn, London, Cape, 1970


The argument around collective or collaborative practices by Claire Bishop in ‘The Social Turn: Collaboration and its discontents’, *(ArtForum, XLIV, no 6, February 2006)* seems to demonstrate that the assumption that collaborative practices lie outside the market can be traced back to authorship, property and copyright law.
1970s grew out of their belief that the medium could foster broad social and cultural critique.

Shreiber then quotes Rosler from the 1985 essay ‘Video: Shedding the Utopian Moment’. Rosler wrote:

Not only a systemic but also a utopian critique was implicit in video's early use, for the effort was not to enter the system but to transform every aspect of it and—legacy of the revolutionary avant-garde project—to redefine the system out of existence by merging art with social life and making ‘audience’ and ‘producer’ interchangeable.

Shreiber then continues with:

The dream for video art to induce a fully fluid interchangeability of production and reception never took place. These utopian hopes were dashed, Rosler argues, by the institutionalization of the medium. Cultural theorist Peter Lunenfeld has observed that today, ‘The utopian dream has moved from video to digital media’. If true, one might ask what will happen to the utopian dream in this new domain. Will it, as was the case for video art, be proven to be an impossible project? After all, embedded within the notion of utopia is a dream that cannot be attained.  

This passage highlights the history of artists and theorists associating art’s democratic potential with a given medium, strategy, method or, more generally, the progress of technology. But investment in the notion of progress, in the evolution of a perfect revolutionary strategy, is not only problematic in terms well understood by critics of revolutionary theory, but on another level, in the end it offers little but the inevitable disillusionment of those practitioners invested in its ideals. Afterall, the landmark first ever sale of an internet artwork in 1999 and Whitney Biennial of 2000 seemed to imply even at the turn of the millennium that the medium was not inherently immune from institutionalization, commercialisation or co-optation as had been previously assumed. Arguably, a position advocating complicity with the

216 Berry, J., ‘Information as Muse: Net Art and the Market’. Initially cited at
market is one inevitable product of a disappointed investment in the notion of revolutionary progress.

Despite investing in the internet this inherent potential for art as a democratic act, there are in fact few examples of this type of an engagement, reflecting the general bias and ambivalences of the London artworld at the time. As with any medium, many practitioners even within this apparently inherently democratic medium were not interested in freedom and equality in concert, in the democratic potential of the medium. The vast majority of net.artists and particularly those based in the UK, instead, created work that either pushed at the boundaries of the medium, in the modernist tradition, exploring light or colour or time or other properties of the internet, or used the new technology to blur boundaries between old media and new formats like that produced under the title, New Media Writing, which stresses formal innovation as content. Generally speaking, during that period, it was US based artists who were more likely to be actively engaged in promoting freedom and equality, recognising the subversive potential realised by a medium which has precisely the same properties and tools as industry: computer plus software / code. A notable exception was London-based international group SPC.org. In 2000 they initiated ‘consume’, a project which both theoretically and practically enables action that is counter-Power by creating broadband network sharing, bypassing the huge profit-making corporations like BT. Particularly remarkable is the fact that SPC was supported by Arts Council England. For May Day 2002, SPC posted information on their website with the possible location of demonstrations, how to make body armour and how to avoid arrest. Subsequently they were featured in the Evening Standard as an example of how the Arts Council England and therefore government funding aids illegal activity and criminality. At the time, Arts Council England responded with:

calarts.edu and Lichty, P. ‘Confessions of a Whitneybiennial.com Curator’, voyd.com
217 For an overview of practices of the time from the perspective of a UK-based organisation, see trAce, tracearchive.ntu.ac.uk/traced/art.cfm
218 Examples of North American engagement with radical democratic politics over 2000-2002 via the medium of the web include Brad Brace’s ‘The 12hr ISBN JPEG Project’, a politicised sense of the problems of hypermodernity’s free-floating signifiers; The Yes Men’s spoof website gatt.org, satire on global capitalism and trade; ®”Mark’s gw bush.com, 0100101110110101.org’s interventions and Florian Cramer’s doppelgänger extending the original groups interventions.
The passing of information is not incitement to violence. One of the ways SPC serves individuals is to provide an opportunity for freedom of discourse without censorship.219

Generally speaking this type of practice thrived in London at that time but rarely with funding or artworld legitimacy. Activist groups based in London or who targeted London in their direct action at this time include Space Hijackers, Clown Army, Notes from Nowhere Collective, Usurp, the Laboratory of Insurrectionary Imagination, Vacuum Cleaner, bid, Mongrel and Platform. Some of these individuals and groups, like bid and the Laboratory of Insurrectionary Imagination, have an uneasy relationship with the description ‘artist-activist’, finding the label ‘artist’ elitist and exclusive, a feeling which is of course supported by the institutional theory of art. Others, like Mongrel and Space Hijackers happily identify as artists and are sometimes covered by the art media. They are also sometimes commissioned and supported through art institutions though usually they act independently of institutional funding. Platform, on the other hand, are a group working with a wide range of people who periodically found themselves outside the institutional definition of art with the London artworld dismissing their work as prefixed art despite also being in receipt of Arts Council England funding. As analysed above in the discussion on how the institutional theory of art works in contemporary practice, it can be somewhat arbitrary which works are legitimated as Art and which remain as prefixed art, though often it appears that prefixed art is attributed to practitioners who attended the wrong, or no, art college.

The period 2003-2006 saw a shift in artworld attitudes. On the one hand, the art market became further entrenched and DCMS policies more deeply instrumentalising as the above analysis of Tate Modern demonstrates. On the other hand, there were far greater numbers of instances of engagement with ideas of freedom and equality across a wider spectrum of practices.

In the period 2000-2002 there appears to have been but a tentative approach to this type of engagement within the mainstream, using nostalgia as the primary strategy, or through marginal practice and specifically the internet. Instances of art as a democratic act were therefore relatively rare at that time in the context of London. By 2003-2006, there are instances of artists actively engaged with art as a democratic act who move to London and practices that foreground equality and freedom that previously happened elsewhere in Britain and the world that were exhibited in London for the first time. In addition, more practitioners within London turned their attention to values of freedom and equality and actions that are counter-Power.

The period of 2003-2006 saw the government’s response to terrorist actions on New York, on September 11th 2001. This response included an erosion of civil liberties in the name of increased security in Britain from 2002 onwards and also culminated in the war on Iraq in 2003. In the build up to war, February 2003 saw the largest demonstration in British history, where up to two million people marched against the prospect of going to war. Throughout this period, the protests against the war, the build up to war and the conduct of the war itself had a profound impact on perceptions of contemporary democracy. The government was seen to have lied to parliament and to its citizens, the war itself was understood as an opportunity in commercial profiteering and traditional forms of protest were patently ignored.

Within the context of the London artworld there had been significant changes both at the DCMS and within the art market. In both areas there was a palpable consolidation of power. By 2003, Tate Modern had also become part of the powerful establishment within the London artworld and no longer an intervention into former institutional practices as evidences of the significant change in curatorial output demonstrates.

In 2001, the New Labour government of Tony Blair entered its second term in office. At the DCMS, Chris Smith (1997-2001) was replaced by Tessa Jowell. This change in leadership may or may not have directly altered DCMS policy but Chris Smith’s essay
for Tate Modern: Five years on, as well as an interview with BBC, betrays an on-going battle with the Treasury on behalf of the arts throughout his tenure. It appears that he used a socially targeted rhetoric to win the cause for arts funding. Once Tessa Jowell took over, however, targets seemed no longer a means to an end, but the ends in themselves. Jowell appeared to have a highly instrumentalist approach to the arts, only just beginning to be in evidence earlier in the New Labour government. The desire to use culture to direct society filtered into all aspects of government funding through Arts Council England and other funding bodies. Even greater pressure to cure the ills of society was subsequently exerted on the arts, including those ills perceived as deriving from religious and ethnic division.

During this time there was also increasing consolidation of power in the commercial artworld. The year 2003 saw the launch of the Frieze Art Fair, the first truly international high profile art fair in London, creating an annual ‘selling season’ in October. Through the direct activities of Frieze Art Fair and increasing numbers of commercial galleries and other related enterprises that opened or grew subsequently (like the growth in commercially orientated art publications, commercial galleries, other art fairs, art dealers and art consultants), the London artworld became ever more commercialised in its focus. Even ‘alternatives’ were promoted not as alternatives to the market, but as alternatives within the market. For example, the introduction to the catalogue for PILOT:1 states:

220 Outside the time frame of this thesis there were other changes in government policy towards the arts including the change in budget for the DCMS. For the first 2 years 1997-1999, the budget was so tight that Chris Smith was unable to implement his plans for free entry to museums that since have been so lauded by New Labour as quintessential to their policies. (BBC News online 5 March 2001, Ray Dunne ‘Chris Smith: Culture, Media & Sport’)

221 There is a plethora of reports on this issue published by the Arts Council England (ACE) beginning 2001 and ongoing which demonstrate exactly how successfully ACE initiatives follow the government agenda for the arts including those around ‘social cohesion’. In addition to ACE, funding for the arts and social cohesion also came from various lottery funds like the New Opportunities Fund, Awards for All, and the Big Lottery Fund as well as other government budgets.

222 There had been projects like ‘Love Southwark Hate Racism’ in this period, but the instrumentalisation of culture for political aims can be seen in the announcement on November 2007 that the government would make available £400 million for cultural projects that specifically intervene into the radicalisation of Muslim young people. These funds were made available just as many arts organisations were losing both core funding and project funds to the growing deficit in the Olympic 2012 budget.

223 Frieze Art Fair was preceded by the London Art Fair in the Business Design Centre, which was not international in scope.
PILOT invited a number of international curators, writers, artists and collectors to each nominate one artist, not yet commercially represented...\textsuperscript{224} [my emphasis]

Another ‘alternative’ to the Frieze Art Fair was the Zoo Art Fair. When Zoo began in 2004, it promoted itself as a platform for new (less than 3 years in operation) commercial and non-commercial art organisations. By 2007, with the requirement for participation now ‘less than 6 years in operation’, its emphasis had become sales:\textsuperscript{225}

Zoo Art Fair yet again experienced significant growth with increased attendance and sales figures. Exhibitors achieved sales totalling over 2.8 million pounds sterling with at least £500,000 anticipated to follow in related sales.\textsuperscript{226}

These lines, from the top of the Zoo Art Fair homepage, clearly owe a debt to the language of the market. Not only are commercial statistics emphasised, but the language of ‘significant growth’ and ‘increased figures’ betray a mentality at home within the logic of the market. The increasing commercialisation helped to foster a discourse in the London artworld in which the idea that any artist and any art form can, and should, find their market niche is normalized. From 2004 onwards, in line with the growth in market values within the London artworld, many more exhibitions in large publicly funded London galleries were in partnership with commercial galleries.

\textsuperscript{225} Another alternative of 2007, which therefore falls outside the scope of this thesis was the Free Art Fair of 2007. The website states ‘The Free Art Fair is an art fair where all the work is given away at the end. People will have the chance to own a piece of art by artists from the Saatchi Collection or who have exhibited at the Tate. For once instead of art going to the highest bidder or those who can afford it, someone who really loves an artwork will be able to have it for free.’ freeartfair.com The arguments against the notional radicalism in giving art away are delineated above with ‘Capital’ by Marysia Lewandowska and Neil Cummings. Also the problematic obfuscation of the swing to Power in aligning ‘access’ and commerce is also described above in the discussion of ‘Artists Products’ at Tate Modern.
\textsuperscript{226} Zooartfair.com, homepage
This is not to say that no radically democratic art or art engaged with freedom and equality exists within market-orientated structures. The commercial gallery Hauser and Wirth, for example, staged ‘Simply Botiful’ by Christian Büchel, one of the most memorable instances of art as a democratic act in 2007 (and therefore outside the scope of this thesis). In addition, the Frieze Art Fair has a charitable, ‘education’ wing, called Frieze Projects which initiates the more critical projects and live art events, like the Iaspis commission, European Cultural Policies, 2015: A Report with Scenarios on the Future of Public Funding for Contemporary Art in Europe, edited by Maria Lind and Raimund Minichbauer. This publication brings together essays by practitioners across Europe who collectively imagine a future ten years from 2005 where all art practice is instrumentalised either to government agendas or corporate agendas. The publication is an indictment of the direction of the (institutionalised) visual arts throughout Europe. The observation that a dependency on the market is bad for diversity is not because the market necessarily censors or that it privileges a minority of practices but because the market has a structural preponderance towards monoculturalism as described by Bichler and Nitzan and as evidenced in the above analysis of Tate Modern. The market in fact requires these exceptions, like those described above, in order to preserve the myth of meritocracy / democracy that underpins its operations.

227 ‘Simply Botiful’ by Christian Büchel was staged in a large warehouse off the northern end of Brick Lane in East London throughout early 2007. From the street it looked like a cheap hotel, with a lit sign over the entrance and the entrance kept up the pretence with an invigilator asking visitors to sign the register. Up the stairs were lodging rooms with many single mattresses per room and some rooms clearly used for prostitution. Each room, other than one, perhaps the ‘manager’s room’, was filled mattresses strewn on the floor including the bathrooms. The ‘manager’s room’ by contrast was filled with collectibles, books signifying a liberal education (including Freud and some English literature) and a sound system playing ‘death metal’, the type of music used allegedly to torture Guantanamo Bay detainees. Walking through the hotel building to an enclosed area in the back, there was a large expanse given over to the storage of objects of previous value – white goods like refrigerators and computers – plus a workshop area, complete with mechanic’s tools, wood-working tools and girlie magazine posters. Whole shipping containers were also devoted to pornographic imagery. Other shipping containers had more bedding, this time arranged more like a holiday caravan - a tiny area but complete with kitchenette and dining area. Above this was a container with what could be read as a blue-collar staff canteen and what may be read as the foreman’s domain. A 7.5 tonne lorry was filled with clothes and was the secret entrance to a series of rooms seemingly beneath the ground. These were interlocking, one leading to the next and each was devoted to one particular pursuit. One had new testament bibles, one more pornography, and the final one, copies of the Koran, arranged ready for a prayer meeting.
In addition to the Frieze Art Fair and a proliferation of commercially orientated organisations and events within the artworld plus a change of Culture Ministers, the period 2003-2006 saw other shifts as well. The co-founder and co-director the Palais de Tokyo, Paris, Nicolas Bourriaud, brought a renewed credibility to a socially or ethically engaged practice with his 1998 treatise, *Relational Aesthetics*, translated into English in 2002. Though its ideas were in circulation before that date, by 2003, Bourriaud's relational aesthetics was almost an orthodoxy within the London artworld. His theory, which places artists at the heart of social change, neatly sidestepped any ‘old fashioned’ leftist politics. Citing Marx, he builds instead on Deleuze and Guattari, who at this time had greater London artworld appeal.  

Bourriaud's is a utopian strategy (despite his direct disavowal of this) and utopianism was ok, even quickly fashionable, within the London artworld. Bourriaud states that:

> Through [art], the artist embarks upon a dialogue. The artistic practice thus resides in the invention of relations between consciousness. Each particular artwork is a proposal to live in a shared world, and the work of every artist is a bundle of relations with the world, giving rise to other relations, and so on and so forth, ad infinitum.\(^{229}\)

Statements like the above explain the appeal of Bourriaud for the artists and curators, and this appeal is bolstered by his position as an eminent curator. It is this role which increases his ability to legitimate as Art, in terms of the institutional theory of art, and to promulgate further this definition.\(^{230}\)

The largest exhibition directly invoking relational aesthetics was Rirkrit Tiravanija's Serpentine Gallery exhibition ‘A Retrospective’ (2005). The space within the Serpentine Gallery, which stands in the middle of Hyde Park, was given over to three temporary structures: a radio transmitting station / performance-rehearsal space and

---

\(^{228}\) At this time 2000-2006, Deleuze and Guattari are seminal in London artworld critical circles (including to Goldsmith's College based theorists like Andrea Phillips and Simon O'Sullivan). Deleuze and Guattari are cited instead of what is perceived as out-moded Marxist critique. Proving there is still mileage in Marxist critique though, Stewart Martin uses Adorno to critique Bourriaud in ‘Critique of Relational Aesthetics’, *Third Text*, Vol 21 Issue 4, July 2007, pp369-386

\(^{229}\) Bourriaud, N., *Relational Aesthetics*, op cit, p22

\(^{230}\) Dickie, G., op cit
two identical rough wooden structures, like apartments, with functioning toilets, bathrooms and kitchens, plus a bedroom and living room complete with tv and video. Outside of private view times, the space was somewhat anarchic in its array of humanity sharing the temporary living spaces. The crowds using the two apartments, which were replicas of Tiravanija's own apartment in layout and proportion, were free to find the space that best suited their mood, and use the space as they saw fit. Each individual audience member could choose to be more or less alone or with the groups that spontaneously formed. With the diversity of the audience, there was no sense of exclusivity or cliquishness in any of the spaces. No one group dominated the spaces (except presumably when schools visited and completely altered the dynamic).

The kitchens stocked bread and various spreads like peanut butter and jam as well as tea and coffee. Some audience-participants chose to eat there. There was evidence of more elaborate meals like spaghetti or Chinese noodles having been put together. According to conversations with Serpentine gallery assistants, there was at least one homeless person who had come to take his meals at the Serpentine on a regular basis as did a few 'asylum seekers', what with the Serpentine being free and in the middle of London's largest park. Apparently, these people enjoyed the fact that in that space over that period it was perfectly ok for them just to loiter. For the duration of the exhibition, there was somewhere legitimate to be, treated as equals with others in society. The array of people actually using the space during the run of the exhibition (as opposed to private view times) underlines the success of Tiravanija's works in terms of democracy: even the most marginal and despised by wider society (homeless people and refugees) felt welcome in the space and also equal to everyone else within the space. The exhibition gave Londoners a moment in which equality and freedom could exist in an almost utopian sense. The exhibition also could be understood as counter-Power in a very specific sense. It ran counter to the ordinary uses of spaces which help to maintain relations of power. Galleries, as have been noted from Bourdieu onwards, are traditionally used as sites of dominant bourgeois power / ideology.

On the final day of the exhibition 21 August 2005, I interviewed each of the Gallery Assistants on duty at the Serpentine in order to have an overview of the exhibition, at least from their perspectives.
Most of the literature and reviews around the event focused on repetition. The apartment had been created in many cities across the world, in commercial art galleries and other prestigious artworld stages. None of this was relevant to the experience of the work in London 2005. The entrance to the Serpentine during the run of the exhibition was through three doors, the usual one and two which led straight onto the park. It would have had a very different feel in winter but in the summertime, the encounter with the work was in the spirit in which it was intended: there was an openness and celebratory feel both to the exhibition itself and more generally to the space itself.232

No longer did the mainstream London artworld employ a strategy of nostalgia to engage with ideas of freedom and equality. Relational aesthetics provided the legitimating discourse for such an engagement and it could be seen as a strategy for artistic practices large-scale and small throughout London. Many artists did not explicitly describe their artwork in these terms but a reading of their practice through relational aesthetics legitimates it as Art. For example, the work of Lottie Child has been aligned with marginalised practices as socially-engaged or community-based art. Reading it through relational aesthetics affords it a discourse of contemporaneity and legitimacy as Art.

Though previously engaged in ‘dialogic’ practices, in 2004, Lottie Child began her ‘explorations into active engagement with urban spaces’. This work involved walking tours through cities with Child encouraging fellow walkers to climb and explore differently and imaginatively the spaces provided by the cityscape. Groups of walkers together climb and sprawl over street furniture, trees and other features of the urban landscape, in the way that little children will when parents’ backs are turned. Not to be mistaken for parkour, what is encouraged is a gentle practice, encouraging, as Child states in her wiki, ‘joy and safety’ and not virtuoso climbing or athleticism. 233

233 Lottie Child’s wiki is Malinky.org and includes statements of her intent. Parkour, from France, is an athletic and gymnastic use of buildings practised
is inclusive of all abilities, asking audience/participants to work within their own limits, but still to extend themselves, their physical bodies and their ordinary uses of the city. By scrambling over benches, fences, railings, steps, bollards, using the structures of the city differently, with no purposefulness accorded to the action and in spite of the socially agreed function of park benches, walls, bollards, we are encouraged in a counter-Power relationship with the physicality of the city. We are also encouraged into a democratic relationship with each other through the differentiated but equal roles of participant-audience-artist climbing, walking, scrambling transgressively within the fabric of society.

In this period in London, there was an increase in the exhibition of artistic practices that are located outside the market and counter-Power in a wider social and political sense. For example, in 2003 US-based Critical Art Ensemble's work, ‘GenTerra’ with Beatriz Da Costa, was shown at the Natural History Museum. Critical Art Ensemble are primarily interested in democratic interventions that undermine ‘the authoritarian underpinnings of pancapitalism and Western culture’. 234 The exhibition ‘GenTerra’ explored the field of biotechnology and genetic modification by creating their own experiments which aim at interrogating the huge corporate profits in this area and the discourse accompanying its dominance. Despite this, the interpretive texts and press for the Natural History Museum claimed that the work is ambivalent around issues of biogenics and genetic modification. That the institution attempted to reposition the overtly democratic aims of the counter-Power project speaks of the pressures on artistic practices by institutions. 235

---

234 From a blurb about the group who were part of ‘enterchange: performance and nature’ by Wallace Helm. Online. Available HTTP. <http://www.greenmuseum.org/c/enterchange/artists/cae/> (Accessed 26/08/07) 235 Critical Art Ensemble are a famous casualty of the ‘war of terror’. Their biotech projects attempt to demonstrate the link between capital-driven technocracy and abuses of power in ‘pancapitalism’ (a phrase from website critical-art.net <http://www.critical-art.net/biotech/conbio/index.html> (Accessed 09/10/07) In May 2004 the Joint Terrorism Task Force arrested Steve Kurtz of Critical Art Ensemble for alleged terrorist activities based on his collection of ‘suspicious’ materials like petri dishes and biological cultures including e.coli from the ‘GenTerra’ project. Three years later, he and Robert Ferrell, Professor of Genetics at the University of Pittsburgh’s Graduate School of Public Health, were still under...
Another work seen for the first time in the context of London during this period was Måns Wrange's 'Average Citizen' (1999-2003) at Pitshanger Manor Gallery 2005. The project describes itself as a 'socio-political experiment that aims to change society in accordance with the opinions of a statistically average citizen'. Her name is Marianne. The website states:

Marianne has been interviewed on how she believes society should be changes and her opinions have been gathered in an 'average citizen data bank'. In collaboration with Marianne herself, a political speechwriter and a copywriter have summarized and formulated her opinions in short, forceful slogans.

Figure 15: Måns Wrange, 'The Average Citizen' homepage (1999-2003)

threat of a 20-year prison sentence, despite the collection, the artworks and Kurtz’s home being deemed of ‘no public safety threat’. In 2007, Robert Ferrell plea-bargained, leaving only Steve Kurtz protesting his innocence. Kurtz was eventually acquitted in 2008.

236 ‘Citizens’ 2005 Pitshanger Manor Gallery, London
Alerting visitors to the manipulation of the public by governments and corporations through advertising and spin, the project intervenes into the idea of consent obtained by governments employing the idea of the ‘average citizen’ as a talisman against dissent. Both ‘Average Citizen’ and ‘Genterra’ are examples of artwork with an overtly political theme. As described above, this type of practice was rare in London prior to 2003 and those artists and exhibitions which did address the issues of power, like ‘Crash!’ (ICA 1999), did so with a certain ambivalence, equivocating over a position around freedom and equality or the value of action that is counter-Power.

Though staged in 2002 in Glasgow, it was in 2003 that the film of Rod Dickinson’s ‘The Milgram Reenactment’ was shown in London as part of South London Gallery’s ‘Independence’ exhibition, where more than one hundred artists were invited to contribute to an exhibition celebrating the gallery’s newly won independence from Southwark Council.238 ‘The Milgram Reenactment’ was a reconstruction of the famous psychological experiment by Stanley Milgram in the 1960s which tested how far a person might go in causing harm when under the supervision of a person in authority.239 What makes this piece an instance of art as a democratic act in this context particularly is its timing. The work appears to be an intervention into a contemporary obliviousness of the impact of individual action when sanctioned by authority.

This period also saw a relocation to London of artists and artist collectives actively engaged in promoting freedom and equality, such as bid (bidibid.org) and ‘City Mine(d)’. City Mine(d) is an organisation which creates and inspires urban interventions. In their own words, they are committed to the ‘development of new

239 In 1961 at Yale University, Stanley Milgram performed the ‘Milgram Obedience to Authority Experiment’. People were recruited from all walks of life. Volunteers were placed in the role of ‘teacher’ and paired off with a ‘student’ who, unknown to the volunteers, was a colleague of Milgram. The ‘teacher’ was instructed to administer a series of electric shocks, one for each incorrect answer given, rising incrementally to 450 volts. The teacher could not see the pupil but could hear the screams when the volts were administered. More than half of the volunteer ‘teachers’ continued through to the end of the experiment, administering ever greater levels of electric shock, even once the ‘pupil’s’ screams were replaced by an ominous silence.
forms of urban citizenship, the re-appropriation of public space ... and the creation of cutting edge public artwork.’ 240 Originally based in Belgium, the group expanded to Barcelona and then to London in 2004. In that year they published *Networkbook for Urban P/Arts: 42 initiatives capturing London's public space*. The publication provides:

> a showcase for the ‘new work’ going on in public areas. We hope it will further the development of this particular art form by putting a number of practitioners in contact with each other, so allowing them to pool human, financial and intellectual resources. Hence the networkbook is both a little black book of valuable contacts, and an inspiring guide to cutting edge art in London.241

As the publication indicates, Citymine(d) operated strategically, helping to create networks of like-minded practitioners. They also initiated art projects like ‘PingPongProject’ (2005-6), where residents and visitors to North Wembley (and later Brent) could share their ideas by writing and drawing on ping pong balls posted though a network of clear plastic tubes which connect post offices, libraries, pubs and schools.

The period 2003-2006 saw a rise in the number of artists based in London who were directly engaged with ideas of freedom and equality that is counter-Power. The year 2004 saw the inauguration of the University of Openness, based in the defunct space of Limehouse Town Hall. Like many other art practices concerned with democratic action, much of its activities were produced and disseminated via wiki, a piece of server software conceived as helping to maintain democratic engagement by allowing users to create and edit web pages freely using any web browser. 242 The University of Openness, a “self-institution” for independent research, collaboration and

240 citymined.org cited 11/12/07
learning', has many departments and faculties including the Faculty of Politics, the Faculty of Problem Solving, the Faculty of De-Colonisation, the Faculty for the Interpretation of Images, Busiless Studies and Psychical Education. Like SPC's 'consume' project of 2000 (above), one of the practical projects that the University of Openness runs which actively supports democratic action is in providing free classes in Unix. Unix, unlike Microsoft or Apple Mac products, is an operating system that works on virtually any computer. Using Unix (or offshoots like Linux) instead of software from the big dominating giants genuinely helps to undermine the hegemonic practices of software companies.

It is important to note that it is not only the overtly political that may be understood as an instance of art or curating as a democratic act. Partly this is because many instances of art with an avowed politics may not, in fact, create or inspire freedom and equality that is counter-Power. One example of this was the ‘Illegal Art Show’ on Brick Lane 2005 which was, in its own right, hierarchical and exclusive of alternative views despite its overt positioning ‘counter-Power’. Any artistic or curatorial act which enacts freedom and equality that is counter-Power may be understood as art as a democratic act, whether or not this was the stated intention of the artist. As the curation of Sam Taylor-Wood's ‘Brontosaurus’ at Tate Modern indicates (as described above), even artwork that lacks any clear ‘politics’ may be an instance of art as a democratic act. This includes instances of commercial practices. For example, in 2004 Angela Meyer and Sonia Bruce curated ‘Splendid’ shown on Commercial Street, opposite the Spitalfields Market development. It was a commercial venture which

---

243 There are many servers for the University of Openness including Online. Available HTTP <http://uo.twentiethcentury.com> and available HTTP <http://ou.theps.net> (Accessed 11/12/07)

244 On Brick Lane 23 October 2005, the flyer described its intentions as a ‘FREE OPEN ART HAPPENING for everybody: free artists, openminded audience, children, adults, stylish guys, mind fuckers, damned poets and whatever you are! You are welcome to this JAM OF ART, with your media, your messages, your body and your joy!!! ... Join the exhibition! You don't need to book, you don't have to pay! You can show your stuff, see the art pieces; SHARE your work with others. No money, no references, no rules. ... The market fills any spaces and possibilities of communication with crap advertising instead. Propaganda inventing a democracy that doesn't exist. All expressions are influenced by corporations and government, everything is done only for the business, the security paranoia takes control of everything, that is not right. War is not right, lies are not right, slaves are not right, panic is not right, advertising with only one message (buy) is not right, this is not democracy. Illegal like censorship, Illegal like war, Illegal like dictatorship. ******!!!ILLEGAL ART SHOW!!!******’
used shops and the shopping experience to orientate visitors through the critical and challenging artworks, which were also playful, using humour to make their point. Though objects were for sale, ‘Splendid’ was not aimed at extending hierarchical assumptions within the London art market and prices were aimed at affordability, not exceeding £150. 245 According to Meyer, ‘Splendid’ was a response to an Arts Council report about who buys art and who sells it:

Sales are partially reputation-based. ‘Splendid’ is an intervention into this process.246

In embracing commerce at the level of the small business or market stall holder, ‘Splendid’ created an encounter with art and curating as a democratic act. Particularly for audiences with little experience of artist-run galleries, it fostered equality across visitors – the codes of behaviour were legible even for new audiences - and the inclusion of overtly political artwork, works that addressed equality across ‘race’ or ecologically-inspired work that ran counter-Power, is further evidence of the curators' commitment to art and curating as a democratic act.

The year 2005 was when the swing towards power in terms of the state became the most palpable of the time period in question. It was the year when censorship started to bite. The 2005 Serious Organised Crime and Police Act made it an offence to protest within one mile of Parliament except with prior police permission; a direct contravention of a history of liberal values of freedom of speech. Many artists have responded to this obvious censorship and erosion of civil liberties, using the geographical context as a site for intervention. However, when Selfridge’s censored the Dora Wade commission ‘Fear on the Streets’ on August 22nd, 2005, both general press coverage and artworld media was quiet on the subject of censorship and instead derided the work. According to the press Dora Wade deserved to be censored simply because she made ‘tasteless’ art.247

245 This is as distinct from a later venture in 2006, ‘The Art Car Boot Fair’ sponsored by Vauxhall Cars which served more as a green-room for the elite art market. Ashton and Hayward were curators, Truman’s Brewery, Brick Lane, 4 June 2006
246 Conversation on site 6 October 2004 with Angela Meyer
247 BBC’s ‘Newsnight’ 25 August 2005 interview with Culture Correspondent, Steve
Having won the opportunity to exhibit in the windows of Selfridge's with ten other artists, Wade began with ‘what it was like to be on the streets after the bombings’ as her inspiration. Each day she added to her original installation with its theme of policing, fear and the controversial ASBO (Anti-Social Behaviour Orders). It culminated in a tableau vivant with a man lying prone under the Brazilian flag and the artist, dressed as a policewoman, standing behind reading a paper with the headline ‘New Order: Shoot To Kill’. This unequivocal reference to the recent shooting of an innocent man, Jean Charles de Menezes, by police in a bungled response to the July 2005 bombings in London, caught Selfridge's attention:

The company requested that the flag and the newspaper be removed from the display. This was done, but when Wade arrived on the following morning, she was told that the installation had been closed and she was told to remove it. Selfridges’s press release tried to play down the political implications of this act of censorship, referring instead to their ‘long and meaningful collaboration’ with the arts.248

Again there is evidence of a market censorship of the arts which has hitherto gone either unnoticed or tolerated. The corporate sector continues to be regarded as neutral or benign, without an agenda for the arts and culture particularly as compared with the state. For example, for a period of 3 years from 2004, Barbara Kruger ‘collaborated’ with Selfridges by loaning her artwork and her aesthetic to the Selfridge's sale experience. The deal entitled Selfridges to use the socially and politically astute phrases she repositioned as Art, like ‘I shop therefore I am’, as marketing for their sales. They also bought the right to use the Kruger aesthetic white text on red on black and white imagery. Interestingly Selfridges does not claim to support art though it has an ongoing programme of extensive commissions of

Smith
248 Paul Bond, ‘Britain: “Fear on the Street” art installation removed from Selfridges's window’, (wsws.org and ukwatch.co.uk) 5 September 2005 Information about the exhibition and its removal are also on the artist's website, dorawade.co.uk cited 10/09/07
contemporary art and a new David Adjaye-designed art gallery. Conversely, *art supports Selfridges* as Marketing Director Bev Churchill, states:

> Culture is at the heart of the Selfridges brand. ... Not only are these cultural events commercially successful – supporting the growth of the business – they also deliver great PR and ensure the originality and energy of the brand. ²⁴⁹

When questioned at a talk at the Whitechapel Art Gallery in 2004, Kruger stated that she didn't mind that a certain politics had been stripped from her work by the Selfridges commission (and replaced by another). During the 1980s she had been a renowned politically active artist and doyenne of radically deconstructivist art aligned with AIDS activism and feminism. According to Kruger, her work was an investigation into semiotics, not politics, in the first place, despite her reputation for ‘institutional critique’ and political activism. ²⁵⁰ This comment seems to betray a continued artworld ambivalence towards a democratic engagement in contemporary practice despite the increase in instances of art as a democratic act both in London and the US where Kruger was based.

I have argued that each action for freedom and equality that is counter-Power potentiates further action. For this reason, even the more problematic strategies of the earlier period, 2000-2002, like a nostalgic engagement with politically and ethically engaged art, can be seen as vital to democratic action. These became the context for later actions. Perhaps the dominance of the market within the artworld appeared to have created a starker choice for artists during 2003-2006. Perhaps a more overtly authoritarian government led to more individuals valuing their freedom. This analysis is too brief to make any real conclusions except I will argue that the need for artworld legitimacy can be seen broadly as influencing art practice as few artists are willing to risk their status as practitioners of Art. Seen in this light, status

²⁴⁹ Arts & Business marketing brochure *Creative Marketing: A book of bright ideas* c2006. Arts & Business is financed by the DCMS and Arts Council England, sporting both logos on their marketing material.

²⁵⁰ Talk by Barbara Kruger at the Whitechapel Art Gallery, 11 April 2004, in answer to a question regarding the Selfridges commission.
and recognition may be understood as tools of self-management in a society of control. Self-censorship is, as we have seen in a previous chapter, one outcome of the technologies of government and artists and institutions may unwittingly maintain these technologies both within an institution like Tate Modern and within the institution of the artworld.