

# ‘Making Britain a Gayer and More Cultivated Country’: Wilson, Lee and the Creative Industries in the 1960s

Lawrence Black

*Interrogating the Wilson administration’s cultural agenda seems key given the seismic shifts assumed to characterise British society and particularly cultural life in the 1960s. Yet historians have given this little attention. Exploring Jennie Lee’s tenure as Arts Minister this article discloses cultural besides financial tensions over the status and definition of the arts, both within government and between government, a vibrant artistic community and the public. Besides interpreting Wilson’s government outside the declinist mainstream, it hints at links with New Labour’s penchant for the creative industries and at post-industrial contexts for understanding British politics and culture.*

*Keywords:* Arts; Culture; Creative Economy; Cultural Industries; Jennie Lee; Elite and Popular Culture

Rather than stressing Harold Wilson’s shortcomings, recent re-evaluations have emphasised the difficulties he faced: a poor hand, rather than one badly played.<sup>1</sup> Aside from economic, industrial and foreign policy, the liberal social and permissive legislation Roy Jenkins oversaw at the Home Office often command centre stage. Even critics find such initiatives, on divorce, abortion, censorship and homosexuality, ‘commendable since it was achieved in the face of an awful economic legacy’.<sup>2</sup> Arts Minister Jennie Lee’s efforts play more of a bit part in this narrative. But in a backstage, atmospheric sense they can be cast as contributing to modernising cultural life and attitudes. Was Minarts as emblematic of the 1960s Wilson governments as Mintech?

Wilson has often been regarded as a maestro of the political arts, but his 1964–70 government also saw the politics of the Arts climb up the agenda. In 1964 Jennie Lee

---

Lawrence Black is a lecturer in Modern British History at Durham University. Correspondence to: Lawrence Black, History Department, Durham University, 43 North Bailey, Durham DH1 3EX, UK. Email: lawrence.black@durham.ac.uk. A version of this paper was delivered to ‘The Cultural Industries: The British Experience in International Perspective’, Humboldt University, Berlin.

became the first Arts minister and in 1965 was moved from the Ministry of Public Buildings and Works into the Department of Education and Science (DES). The Arts Council of Great Britain (ACGB) moved at the same time from the Treasury to the DES.<sup>3</sup> Wilson backed the move, recommended in the 1963 Robbins Report, despite resistance from the chancellor as well as the ACGB's Nigel Abercrombie, Secretary-General between 1963 and 1968.<sup>4</sup> Assuring them of their continuing financial autonomy, Wilson emphasised how the Treasury may have constrained expenditure. Keith Jeffrey, Lee's Private Secretary, brought Cabinet Office know-how (besides his own artistic bent) and was the 'first Whitehall bureaucrat ever to work full-time on the arts'. Equally, however, Wilson's characteristic expediency was evident. At one point, he mused that the shift took place because the Arts "had to have a home" somewhere.<sup>5</sup>

Lee's 1965 White Paper, *A Policy for the Arts – The First Steps*, tallied with Wilson's modernising homilies. It asserted that 'in any civilized community the arts... must occupy a central place', and welcomed the prospect of 'increasing automation bringing more leisure'. The White Paper aligned itself 'against the drabness, uniformity and joylessness of much of the social furniture we have inherited from the industrial revolution', in favour of 'making Britain a gayer and more cultivated country'.<sup>6</sup> This echoed Wilson's 'white heat' speech that saw in 'scientific progress... the possibility of leisure on an unbelievable scale'. It also drew on revisionist thought. Jenkins' 1959 Penguin election book outlined a modern, civilising cultural agenda.<sup>7</sup> A 1964 research department paper, *The Quality of Living*, pressed for cabinet representation for the Arts and acclaimed the regional funding case made by the Northern Arts Association. In 1964 Labour promised 'generous support for the Arts Council, the theatre, orchestras, concert halls, museums and art galleries', and the 1966 manifesto regarded 'access for all to the best of Britain's cultural heritage' as a 'hallmark of a civilized country'.<sup>8</sup> Political interest in culture and leisure was not Labour's preserve. Conservatives, notably the Bow Group, argued that the state should compensate for shortfalls in private patronage and encouraged greater business involvement and generosity towards the ACGB. From 1967 an Arts Policy Group was interested in Arts Council funding, regional initiatives and, anxious not to lose ground on Labour, a shadow minister was appointed in 1968.<sup>9</sup> Such political interest is one sign of the emergence of a post-materialist political culture.

### **'The Biggest Increase in State Subsidy This Country Has Ever Known'**

In 1971 Lee told Wilson: 'throughout the whole of the arts world, establishment, avant-garde, the older and younger generation, I am continually being thanked for what the Labour government did'. When Lee lost her parliamentary seat in 1970, National Theatre staff and actors wrote to say 'future generations have need to be grateful to you'. Even Lord Eccles, her Conservative successor as Arts Minister, paid tribute to Lee and Goodman, ACGB Chair between 1965 and 1972.<sup>10</sup> For the Open University (OU) as well as her Arts work, Lee is today, in Geoff Mulgan's opinion,

a 'sanctified figure'.<sup>11</sup> Working-class Scottish origins, radical tone and marriage to Aneurin Bevan, who died in 1960, made her a potent Labour icon and aided her in carrying off the grand itinerary of her ministerial post. Left critics like Paul Foot and the New Left scarcely mentioned culture or Arts – whether because they were preoccupied by other issues or because they shared Lee's basic outlook.<sup>12</sup>

If the left spared Lee talk of an aristocratic embrace, the subject did excite comment. A standard charge (here from an 'I'm Backing Britain' supporter, a campaign to boost British industry) was that Arts spending 'is a luxury this country cannot afford'. Another (anonymous but knowing) critic asked, 'what has your ministry of arts done beyond the Thames and Millbank? We in Wales have not benefited... don't patronise us by sending a company to play a Greek tragedy here at the Miners' Institute'. Her defeat at Cannock (a Black Country coal-mining constituency) in 1970 was ascribed to metropolitan gallivanting and theatre-going – activities that did not impress those Barbara Castle dubbed the 'philistines of Cannock'.<sup>13</sup> Nor was the White Paper's reception unanimously rapturous. Denys Sutton, editor of galleries-museums-antiquities review *Apollo*, thought it more spin than substance and 'jejune', well-intentioned, but overly reliant on (a phrase borrowed from it) 'temporary inflatable structures'.<sup>14</sup>

Nonetheless, histories of the Arts routinely focus on the 1960s as a key moment in the flowering of cultural life in Britain and expansion of public funding. For Gray, the creation of the Arts Minister, the 1965 White Paper and relocation in the DES meant ACGB expenditure 'mushroomed during the 1960s, increasing by nearly 500 per cent in real terms'. For Priestman, the Wilson government marked 'a quantum leap in the philosophy, and ultimately the reality, of state funding'. The 1965–66 ACGB report talked of a shift from subsistence to growth.<sup>15</sup> The ACGB grant grew from £3.2 million in 1964–65 to £9.3 million by 1970–71. The 'Housing the Arts' fund established in 1965 more than trebled by 1969–70. And only 40 per cent of government arts spending went to the ACGB in 1967–68, with most flowing directly to the national museums and galleries. Total spending increased most sharply in 1966–67: by 45 per cent, celebrated by Lee as 'the biggest increase in state subsidy this country has ever known'.<sup>16</sup>

The shift from subsistence to growth was as significant attitudinally as fiscally. In 1965 Political and Economic Planning (PEP) noted how former ACGB secretary-general, William Emrys Williams had functioned as crisis management, doling out assistance to prestigious but needy institutions. PEP believed: 'The Arts Council if it is to carry out its function properly must be a body which strengthens rather than rescues'.<sup>17</sup> Even while boosting funding for the arts, Labour regularly underlined that 'no amount of money can manufacture an artist'. Nor was there any desire to be a patrician cultural provider, or 'to dictate taste'.<sup>18</sup> The state promoted change in the 1960s by acting as an enabling force and by reducing its powers of censorship of publishing and theatre. The 1944 Education Act, expansion of higher education and subsidies to Arts premises and Art colleges, did *produce* artists and audiences. But 'the most valuable help that can be given to the living artist', the White Paper surmised, was

‘a larger and more appreciative public’. As a 1966 DES Arts bulletin saw it: ‘social changes including a better education for all, have increased the number of people able and eager to appreciate the arts while, at the same time reducing the scope for individual philanthropy’.<sup>19</sup>

All the same, the contemporary reduction of private patronage was problematic for the high arts. Goodman’s 1967 ACGB Chair’s report noted that ‘private bounty or investment is now totally inadequate to sustain a civilised ration of music and theatre, of poetry and pictures’ since ‘the government has garnered in much... of the wealth that cultured patricians and public-spirited industrialists could formerly bestow’.<sup>20</sup> Business reactions to this perceived inadequacy was slow and halting, though the Institute of Directors did form an Arts Advisory Council in 1963. Leading TV art critic Sir Kenneth Clark and W.E. Williams (with Laurence Olivier, Peter Hall and Henry Moore) advised it. Business donated to The Mermaid, a new City of London theatre opened in 1958.<sup>21</sup> One suggestion was a US-style tax remission for business donations and charitable foundations such as the Gulbenkian Foundation. But many on the left still disapproved of business ties. In 1965 the IOD complained about Salford West MP Stan Orme, who had criticised using art for profit.<sup>22</sup>

### Elite Outlooks and Political Divisions

The ACGB was an unpromising instrument for the left. In 1968–69, one third of its spending went on the National Theatre, Royal Opera House, Royal Shakespeare Company and Sadler’s Wells. And an elitist vision of what arts were worthy of funding prevailed. Film and photography, the latter ‘Britain’s leading hobby’ according to a 1966 survey, were ineligible for funding until the 1970s.<sup>23</sup> Raymond Williams saw the ACGB, on the verge of downsizing by Thatcherism, pilloried from all sides. The right-wing ‘press gives an impression of the Council as a wanton subsidiser of sub-artistic layabouts, the radical press continues to insist that it is the citadel of bureaucratic establishment art’. Lee received as much support from patrician Tories, frequenters of the opera and theatre, as from Labour supporters who felt there were fewer votes and less ‘bread and butter’ issues at stake.<sup>24</sup>

On the other hand, as Travis’ history of obscenity relates, Goodman’s (and Lee’s and Jenkins’) impeccable liberal sensibilities damned Scotland Yard’s pursuit of pornography and offensive art in the Victoria and Albert Museum, the Tate, the Institute of Contemporary Art (ICA) and *International Times* in 1966–67: everywhere, it seemed, but Soho. The ACGB created a working party to review the obscenity laws in 1968. Its own form of irreverence became obvious when the Chairman noted that in 1965–66 as much was spent on military bands as awarded to the ACGB.<sup>25</sup> Jazz became eligible for subsidies in 1967, and the film industry also benefited independently of the ACGB. The British Film Institute’s budget leapt by two-thirds in Lee’s first year, and a National Film School was created.<sup>26</sup>

Confounding the fear Labour ministers had of being countermanded by Whitehall, Lee dealt successfully with civil servants. Like Bevan, she combined firebrand

tendencies with administrative ability. She defended the Cabinet Arts and Amenities Committee against Cabinet Secretary Burke Trend's efforts to dissolve it. It met only twice between 1965 and 1967 but was a crucial discussion forum for the White Paper.<sup>27</sup> This was combined with political advocacy of the Arts, to which Lee brought the tenacity she applied to the OU. One argument put to Patrick Gordon-Walker (Crosland's successor at Education in 1967) was that demarcating the Arts, rather than merging it with Sport as desired by the Treasury, 'has given the government a lead envied by our opponents and deeply appreciated by institutions and individual artists'. Another was that a small increase in Arts spending could yield disproportionate benefits – culturally and politically – for the government. Lee marshalled this case repeatedly in that spending round, although not always successfully – in 1965 she had to 'bully' Crosland to bail out the National Youth Orchestra.<sup>28</sup>

The Arts seemed an area of government success which gave Lee more room for manoeuvre. In 1969 she told Chancellor Roy Jenkins how 'the full consequences of cutting below 10 per cent increase in *real terms* is not fully appreciated by colleagues. . . it would. . . endanger our good reputation in this field', by contrast with troubles elsewhere, 'when a relatively small additional sum to that proposed by your department can save the day'. Lee warned Wilson in 1969 that spending cuts would mean an end to 'making the best generally available', cuts in regional funding or to Covent Garden, and that since 'we spend less than any other European country on our opera. . . all the high Tory gentry would be on their feet, ensuring maximum political damage'. 'At relatively small cost', she posited, 'we can maintain a buoyant and optimistic atmosphere'. Media discussion was more cynical, suspecting a 'cheap votes' strategy or that 'subsidies for the arts are never likely to be an issue in a British General election'.<sup>29</sup>

Lee's battles were with Crosland and Jenkins, precisely the revisionist theorists who in the late 1950s had urged the left to show greater interest in culture and leisure, as economic and welfare problems were resolved. Jenkins must have recognised Lee's case for the merits of a small spending increase, since in 1959 he had argued that 'a government policy of moderate generosity would make the world of difference to the whole climate of our cultural life' and that the 'money needed would not be enormous'. Jenkins' contemplated increase, from 0.1 per cent to 0.3 per cent of the government budget, was more than Lee achieved.<sup>30</sup> There was also political baggage here – Crosland, Diamond and Jenkins had been leading Gaitskellites, something Lee could deploy when she called on, and often received, Wilson's support.<sup>31</sup>

Jeffrey thought Lee 'never let her own left-wing prejudices show'. For a political animal of Lee's sort – for whom, Goodman noted, 'a Tory was a repugnant creature' – this was no mean achievement.<sup>32</sup> Lee could be partisan. 'As the NHS stands as the most important contribution to the future by the 1945 government', she told *Tribune* in 1967, 'this government will be honoured for what it has done for the arts. The Tories can't undo what is being done'. Richard Hoggart, critical of the White Paper's blurring of high and low culture and categorisation of 'the young' as 'raw material', nonetheless

felt it 'inconceivable that a Tory government could have produced its best paragraphs'.<sup>33</sup>

Conservatives harboured political agendas too. Alec Douglas-Home was anxious enough that W.E. Williams, as founder of the wartime Army Bureau of Current Affairs and former Penguin editor-in-chief, should not become ACGB Chair in 1965 that he wrote to Wilson.<sup>34</sup> At a 1967 Royal Academy dinner, Edward Heath was heard to comment on a 'belief that all socialists are descended from the apes'. To this gathering Wilson committed £200,000 to the Tate and the Manchester and Edinburgh opera houses (though the latter progressed little pre-1970).<sup>35</sup>

### Section 132

Bevan 'believed that only the best was good enough for the workers and was determined to smash open the great houses, their libraries and wine cellars': he was grieved that art was 'immured in museums and art galleries'. Rather, Bevan wanted the state to 'enfranchise artists, by giving them our public buildings to work upon'. Charier of government power, J.B. Priestley, who also had Lee's ear, insisted 'the state must leave the artist alone with his work after creating reasonable conditions for them'.<sup>36</sup>

The left was steeped in Bevan's high-mindedness. Labour's *Leisure for Living* looked forward to people aspiring to own 'an oil painting of real merit for half the price of a television set'. It applauded the BBC for broadcasting classical music and London's Mermaid and Coventry's Belgrade theatres for 'bringing drama to a largely apathetic public'. The 1962 Festival of Labour displayed Labour's cultural repertoire: a classical concert at the Royal Festival Hall, international and modern art exhibitions and attempts to commission ballet. But as at the 1951 Festival of Britain (an essentially social democratic celebration, Conekin insists), a distinction was drawn between such activities and the mere entertainment of a carnival parade and sports. Proposals from Michael Ayrton (painter, sculptor and son of Labour MP Barbara Ayrton Gould) and Michael Middleton (deputy director of the preservationist Civic Trust between 1957 and 1969) chimed with Bevan and Lee's preferences and belief in public 'art's therapeutic value'.<sup>37</sup>

Lee envisaged her work extending Bevan's. Labour griped about the scarce use local authorities made of their voluntary power to spend up to a 6d rate on music and arts, provided by section 132 of the 1948 Local Government Act, an amendment Bevan introduced. Speaking in 1964 at Darlington's Little Theatre, Labour's Anthony Greenwood explained:

Nearly  $\frac{1}{2}$  the authorities who are empowered to spend up to a 6d rate on promoting music and the arts and helping voluntary bodies are in fact spending precisely nothing – and the rest spend little more than a penny rate. . . If we are to . . . meet the challenge of increased leisure we must have a strengthened Arts Council.

A 1965 DES circular pressed local authorities on this.<sup>38</sup> Since section 132 was permissive, Conservative MP Robert Cooke wondered what powers the government



might use to 'make these backward authorities spend more'. The left also voiced worries about those powers from the other direction, fearing not *dirigisme* but inertia.<sup>39</sup>

One authority that made use of section 132 was Bevan's former constituency, Ebbw Vale. Lee lauded this on a 1966 visit, stressing art was no addendum of material progress. Nor was it 'fiddling while Rome burns' to invest in 'culture' in hard times. Invoking Cripps and the Festival of Britain, she argued follies like the Channel Tunnel and space travel should follow solving access to the South Bank via an 'enclosed travelator'. This would 'bridge the gap between the two sides of the river' (culturally metaphorical) and replace the insalubrious trip across Hungerford Bridge.<sup>40</sup>

### **'Not Only a Source of Expenditure but also a Source of Income'**

Lee's own passions were for Italy and George Eliot (rather than Henry James). She disliked opera (particularly Wagner); found the James Bond films 'boring – all the same' and was 'allergic to football', especially on TV. That 'she wanted nothing to do with sport' was partly a matter of taste and partly to avoid being combined with Denis Howell's portfolio. Lee told one interviewer that 'if the world was made in my image it would be perfect', but generally suppressed such instincts in favour of emphasising her 'function is merely a permissive one'<sup>41</sup>. Likewise Wilson, who was reportedly 'never happier than when he is watching *Coronation Street*', but, 'recognised that the ambit of British culture should not be controlled by his own personal predilections'.<sup>42</sup>

In what was touted as a technocratic government of experts replacing an aged, gentrified Toryism, Lee was an avowed amateur when it came to the Arts, and senior too at 60. This facilitated her ability to press the case of the Arts without seeming to infer taste judgments, if raising queries about a lack of expertise. Lee played the populist, concerned for the audience and visitor as much as producer or performer in insisting on 'improved *restaurant facilities* at the British Museum' and 'the enlivening of the *atmosphere* of the great museums and galleries'.<sup>43</sup>

Lee made a virtue of her amateurism, contrasting her approach to André Malraux, French Minister of Cultural Affairs (1960–69) – an old radical like Lee and writer on art. 'We are not French', Lee explained in 1966, 'we are our own empirical selves'.<sup>44</sup> French regional policy was more *etatiste* than British. *Temples (maisons) de la culture* were funded by state and municipalities – though reportedly attracted few workers.<sup>45</sup> West German regions received more generous business support. Except in Bavaria, lower taxes were levied on artists, and Munich invested as much in the Arts as the annual ACGB budget. West German audiences were larger – helped by the tradition of the *Volksbühne*, with cheaper tickets for workers. But US federal spending was lower than Britain's – if with tax concessions for private donations to state arts bodies.<sup>46</sup>

The Wilson government's Arts policy aimed to provide support more than direction and, like the BBC, to do so at 'arms length'. But as with the BBC's Reithian ethos, culture was conceived as a cohesive force, overcoming social divisions through a common national identity. This had been the purpose of the wartime innovations like

the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts (CEMA) that marked the state's formal incursion into cultural realms. The White Paper saw exclusion 'from the best of our cultural heritage as damaging to the privileged minority as to the under-privileged majority'.<sup>47</sup> Increased spending was induced by the belief the Arts were a remedy for social problems. As Goodman put it, 'a dose of culture could turn hooligans into citizens'. Like Matthew Arnold, Lee imagined that the Arts might fill a spiritual void in a secular society. Or there was the prospect, as John Maynard Keynes outlined as Chair in the ACGB's first report, that as economic problems receded, 'the heart and head will be occupied. . . by our real problems. . . of life and human relations, of creation and behaviour and religion'.<sup>48</sup>

This was Lee's defence for public spending on minority, elite pastimes – that improving access to them might have a cultivating trickle-down effect or therapeutic value, combating commercial, mass, American, popular culture. Lee contended: 'before we arrogantly say that any group of our citizens are not capable of appreciating the best in the arts, let us make absolutely certain that we have put the best within their reach'. Lee revived the National Theatre, dormant since 1949, and the White Paper aspired to bridge cultural gaps, noting how 'in . . . jazz the process has already happened; highbrow and lowbrow have met'. Her proudest achievements were 26 branches of the National Film Institute, 125 Art Centres and 36 regional theatres. Audience creation saw rising attendances at concerts, exhibitions and libraries. Local government library spending increased as Boots' and W.H. Smith's lending libraries closed – though by 1969 it had prompted an author's revolt at Lee's failure to institute a public lending rights scheme of royalties for those whose books were borrowed.<sup>49</sup>

Change of the sorts Lee desired could be detected in broadcasting. Local radio, corresponding with Lee's regionalism, started in 1967 with BBC Radio Leicester. *Monitor*, BBC1's Arts series, won audiences of three million, as did *Omnibus*, its successor from 1965. Commercial broadcasting saw Sir Kenneth Clark make 48 Arts programmes for ATV from the 1950s.<sup>50</sup> Programming like this, socially aware TV drama and BBC2 (partly through OU programming), assuaged fears of Americanisation and saw the left surmount the hostility it had towards TV in the 1950s, coming to regard it more as a cultural protagonist than a threat in itself. Still, its aversion to passive television viewing persisted, bolstering its preference for edifying cultural activities in the public sphere.

Another rationale for Arts policy, Lee told the Royal Academy in 1970, was that 'the arts are not only a source of expenditure but also a source of income. . . income from tourists next year will have reached the six hundred million pounds mark'. Tourism was increasingly a government concern. London hotel developers claimed subsidies under a Wilson initiative. Crosland's prudence at Education changed to generosity at the DTI, particularly towards the National Film School.<sup>51</sup>

In 1966 Lee argued that artists 'are not essentially takers. . . they are givers'. In this context, Wilson's award of MBEs to The Beatles in 1965 denoted more than a courting of popular opinion. Though it certainly denoted this quality – witness Wilson's use of *Steptoe and Son*'s Harry H. Corbett (a TV émigré from Joan Littlewood's Theatre



Workshop) during the 1964 election and at the Festival of Labour, where he presented *Coronation Street* with an export award for sales to Australian TV. Tangible economic achievement was also evident: the record business doubled in size in the UK in the 1960s, making Britain a global player.<sup>52</sup> This can be seen as part of a marginal agenda identifying the contribution creative industries could make to the economy and quality of life, a theme later extolled by New Labour.

### The Break-up or Extension of Keynesianism?

Lee's distinctive aim was regional funding, straining at the stranglehold of the dead wood of the metropolitan establishment. Rather than being socialised by elite institutions, Labour was attempting (tentatively) to refashion their influence within civil society. If culture meant the best of the 'high' arts, there was a built-in drag to London – and around 30 per cent of ACGB spending went on London up to 1965. Goodman and the ACGB themselves were having none of suggestions that they themselves might relocate to Woking, Manchester or Basingstoke. The 'provinces' inferred narrow-minded provincialism, so reference was to 'the regions'. Goodman's 1968 ACGB Chair's Report noted that in offsetting Londo-centrism, it was 'only in very rare cases seeking to stimulate some local activity where at least the nucleus of existing demand is not already established'.<sup>53</sup>

The state's role was then defined within traditional, liberal parameters: permissive not prescriptive. If there was occasional frustration that the full potential of state agency was constrained, this limited power also provided a useful opt out. Thus those who felt Exeter's Northcott Theatre should have been built in the city, rather than on the University campus, were told by Lee: 'you argue this out among yourselves'. Not that Lee evaded debate. After a performance of the musical comedy *Lock up your Daughters* at Coventry's Belgrade Theatre in 1966, an event to which trade unionists had been invited, she heard debate on theatre decorum and the desire for Sunday performances ('the very night we could fill the place', one told). Sunday was an institution questioned by 1960s modernity. Jim Haynes' Edinburgh Traverse Theatre pioneered Sunday opening and Monday closing. Lee initiated Sunday opening at the Victoria and Albert in 1966. A private members bill to legalise Sunday theatre opening was defeated in 1968 (though Lee and Hugh Jenkins got it onto the statute book in 1972).<sup>54</sup>

In 1967 Scottish and Welsh Arts Councils were created to match Northern Ireland's. The proportion of total Arts investment going to Scotland almost doubled between 1964 and 1970. This reversed the metropolitan propensities of the ACGB – CEMA's last regional offices closed in 1956 – that it inherited from Keynes. The Keynesian consensus broke down after 1964 as a regional focus prevailed; the ACGB returned to DES control; and the elitist maxim of 'few but roses' reverted to CEMA's mantra of 'the best for the most'.<sup>55</sup> By post-imperial analogy, the power of the metropole was diminishing. Yet in other ways metropolitan standards were extended. The ACGB's focus remained professional, unlike CEMA's encouragement of amateurs. Lee told the

Commons in 1970 that 'there should be no cutting back on metropolitan standards in order to spread the available money more evenly throughout the country'. Keynes standards were here being exported. Lee told the 1969 Musicians' Union May Day concert that 'we should be trying to bring the best within reach of all; but at the same time. . . broadening of opportunities should not lead to a lowering of standards'.<sup>56</sup> The equation of culture, civilisation and 'high' Western art held good, just as for Keynes in the 1940s.

Regionalism was not without critics. PEP believed the ACGB should 'concentrate' expenditure, and that London's 30 per cent was reasonable given its 'potential audience' and 'international level'. Funding to theatres outside London should be cut, PEP proposed. Even if this entailed 'hardship for those areas of the country where the level of artistic life is dismally low', PEP felt, 'where it exists it must be fostered. . . but the present level of subsidy makes it too expensive to create an appetite from scratch'.<sup>57</sup>

Devolution agitated ACGB fears over standards and an intrusive state. Eric White, ACGB assistant secretary in the 1960s, argued that this was one area in which the Arts Ministry displayed 'the character of a shadow arts council secretariat'.<sup>58</sup> Still, the initiative did for the most part rest with the regions. 'Best practice' came from the North East Arts Association (later Northern Arts Association), established in 1961 by Arthur Blenkinsop (South Shields MP from 1964). Blenkinsop was a critic of pirate radio, preferring the countryside and formal culture.<sup>59</sup> He convinced local authorities and business to contribute £40,000, with £500 from the ACGB. Business contributions were no mean achievement given the condition of the region's industry, though annual donations in the 1960s never topped £8,500. Some of the difficulties of section 132 were overcome. In 1967 no local authority contributed more than a  $\frac{1}{4}$ d rate, but 72 of 89 authorities in the region did contribute. The Association's director, Alexander Dunbar, rectified the ACGB's parsimony, such that local authority contributions were pegged to the ACGB's, which by 1966–67 totalled £60,000. Eight of the 12 English Regional Arts Associations started up between 1964 and 1970.<sup>60</sup>

Spending in the North East on music, ballet, drama, film, arts centres and transport tripled in the period 1963–67. From October 1965 the Association sponsored a project to use 20 post offices as mini Art Galleries. Postmaster General Tony Benn wanted 'the post office through stamps and crown buildings to promote the arts in the community'. But it would be wrong to imagine a uniformly vibrant, cultural scene in the North. Postmasters were 'afraid . . . that they would be required to show nudes painted by local artists'; 'trade union apathy for the arts' local media reported, and government spending constraints after 1967 hampered local authority and business contributions.<sup>61</sup>

Another instructive example of local difficulties was the Nottingham Playhouse. Both political parties supported civic theatrical development, but the issue was politicised on the city council over rates and whether a new building or a re-fitted cinema should be used. The Playhouse opened in December 1963, Hayes notes, to be hailed as 'one of the best examples of the "utopian" type of facility for which Jennie Lee had been calling', particularly director John Neville's youth, education and outreach

work. Mervyn Jones agreed the Playhouse was a success, playing to 85 per cent capacity at 'a high artistic standard', but was concerned that its fate had been politically precarious enough to hang on the Mayor's vote and may not have been built had the Conservatives won the 1960 elections. It was difficult for local government, especially in industrial areas, to prioritise theatre as 'what the people want', and Jones required the Arts Ministry to be more strident. ACGB funding was promised only once the Playhouse was actually open.<sup>62</sup>

### 'With It'?

Many Britons inhabited an entirely different cultural world by the 1960s. If Britain was palpably gayer in the second half of the 1960s – and for most commentators the 'if' only concerned whether this was more cultivated – this was more coincidental with than a product of Lee and Labour's efforts. Lee did flirt with the élan of 1960s pop and youth culture, talking up 'cultural revolution' and 'cultural bonanza'.<sup>63</sup> In London's *Evening News* in 1966 she enthused:

Youth today isn't servile any more. They don't want to fit into orthodox middle-class society. You've got your Carnaby Street and your Mary Quant – that's this country's raw material – this enormous energy. Off... on their scooters... to some seaside town and start punching up each other.

Whilst trumpeting a 'hurrah for turbulent youth', Lee cautioned that 'one of the saddest and funniest things in the world is older people trying to be with it'.<sup>64</sup>

The Arts Council had 'tried to remain... "with it"', its 1970 annual report explained. But its New Activities committee, a basis for the claim, was itself invaded by radical protesters in 1969. The narrow definition of culture and of the state's role absolved it of responsibility for leading or controlling cultural change and limited the expectations more innovative, cutting-edge practitioners might have of the ACGB.<sup>65</sup> Nevertheless, such was the atmosphere Lee engendered that *Private Eye* applied for funding. 'Nothing could be nearer to my own wishes', Lord Gnome enthused, than 'Jennie Lee's determination to foster a gay, fun-loving Britain through the influence of the arts'. Richard Ingrams and John Wells were interviewed and argued satire was a new artistic form, but were dissuaded when it was pointed out the magazine's anti-authoritarian edge might be blunted by association with so establishment an institution as the ACGB.<sup>66</sup>

Jim Haynes' experimental Arts Lab, based in two Drury Lane warehouses, had ACGB applications vetoed by Goodman. A former US soldier, Haynes established the Edinburgh Traverse Theatre Club in 1962 as an outpost of the city's festival fringe and hub of sub-cultural happenings. Arts Lab followed suit in 1967. Haynes was key to the *International Times*, a counter-cultural newspaper, launched at a party-cum-rave at the Roundhouse in 1966. Goodman disapproved of the drugs associated with *IT* and Arts Lab. Lee, though at odds with *IT*'s apolitical stance, was close to Haynes and fought with Goodman over the ACGB grant. Ironically, the main bankroller of Arts

Lab and *IT*, Nigel Samuel, the son of wealthy socialist Howard Samuel, was Goodman and Lee's godson.<sup>67</sup>

Fringe or mainstream, Labour's relationship with popular culture was uneasy. Its definition of culture, exclusive of much everyday culture (dress, dance, music), limited its influence in these areas, but also insulated its fortunes from them. 'The socialists. . . really made asses of themselves' by awarding the Beatles MBEs, George Melly (writer, singer and presenter of *Monitor*) adjudged in 1970. Dick Crossman was more positive, but felt they were as far as Labour need dabble in 'pop' culture – it had been 'right to give the Beatles their MBEs. How respectable they seem now, how useful, how neat their hair-cuts and their dark blue suits, compared to the Hippies of five years later'.<sup>68</sup>

Lee admired left-cultural activities like Littlewood's Theatre Workshop and dramatist Arnold Wesker's Centre 42, named after a 1960 TUC motion. This project argued that the Labour movement had privileged material at the expense of cultural well-being and contrasted British with US and European trade union cultural participation. Lee thought it a 'brave idea' that could 'rescue us from the torpor of a subtly totalitarian culture' and sat on its management committee until 1964. Gifted the Camden Roundhouse, a Victorian railway shed, by Louis Mintz (a Mermaid governor), Centre 42 hatched ambitious plans for an artistic hub, and Wilson and James Callaghan launched a funding appeal in July 1964. Despite reassurances from Wilson, Lee, the TUC, ACGF and a Downing Street fundraiser, material aid was as limited as popular interest in Centre 42, and by 1970 the scheme was abandoned.<sup>69</sup>

If more proletarian and folksy in content, Centre 42 shared Lee's vision of professional standards countering mass culture. Both strove for business interest, and Centre 42 ran regional festivals to 1962. Lee took up John Neville's mobile theatre concept, touted for Centre 42. A *Policy for the Arts* belief that cultural provision was a right like health or education was absorbed from Wesker.<sup>70</sup> But after 1964, Centre 42 was a negative reference point: rapt in the Roundhouse, it retreated to London and was overrun by the counter-culture, diminishing its funding profile. Lee did not contemplate Britain's cultural life being moulded in the left's own image. She demurred from delivering the Arts as radical agency, in favour of enabling access to established providers, mindful of her non-prescriptive role.

Sinclair argues that 'the collapse of Centre 42 showed the independence of the Arts Council' and that if 'a common culture were to be created and spread to most communities, only state grants could do it'. Otherwise, Sinclair worried, 'the consumer culture of the young would pullulate in its many contradictions, or the virus of the . . . "counter-culture"'. True, Centre 42 lost out to pop and counter-culture. And the state could obstruct Wesker (since their vision was similar, and Wesker looked for support to it), but its authority did not extend to pop or counter-culture. Labour did little to hamper these, and for many they made for a gayer Britain. As Centre 42's artistic director, who resigned in 1968 on the grounds that social change had undermined its premise that class divided cultural life, explained: 'new theatres, dance groups, bands, newspapers and fashion. . . there was nothing to stop the avalanche, helped by the Labour Government'.<sup>71</sup>

It was not, as Political and Economic Planning pessimistically suggested in 1965, that 'the appetite for culture in this country is less voracious than many of us pretend', but that changing popular aspirations competed with and limited the impact of Labour and the ACGB's ambitions for popular participation in the arts.<sup>72</sup> All around new forms flourished and the common national culture was increasingly diverse. As with much late 1960s permissive legislation, Labour's Arts policy was at odds with popular opinion, but with the difference that it endeavoured not to erode the traditional but to promote access to it.

### **Wilson and New Labour's Heritage**

Labour was a convinced advocate of traditional elite culture, liberal and inclusive in purpose. It regarded traditional culture as civilising, uplifting and a barrier to commercial mass culture. Lee's efforts in the 1960s involved a belief in the moral value and uses of culture and a desire to infuse Britons with it: a populist awareness of its commercial potential; focus on its consumers and audience besides producers and artists; the state as enabler rather than deliverer. These were also sources for New Labour's take on creative enterprise. Labour's traditionalism in the 1960s contained traces of what by the 1990s was seen as a more modern approach and interest in what were termed creative and cultural industries.

This shift can be traced through the notion of heritage. In the 1970s and 1980s the 'heritage industry' had been glumly tied to 'a climate of national decline', preservative not innovative or progressive and a more-or-less conservative, elite version of national identity. But it was increasingly read as evidence of a healthy historical consciousness; not confined to grand houses and galleries, but including popular pasts. In that case it was a marker of post-industrial consumption patterns and tastes – heritage and modernity were not opposed but twinned, not least as creative enterprise.<sup>73</sup>

Alongside, if less pronounced than, Labour's rhetoric of modernity in areas such as housing and planning, was one of conserving and democratising access to worthy traditions and institutions. The two were not necessarily at odds. In 1935 Hugh Dalton wrote that 'the National Trust is... practical socialism in action', and whether nationalized or not, 'a Labour government should give it every encouragement'. As Chancellor, Dalton's 1946 National Land Fund did that, freeing from death duties land and property bequeathed to the Trust and extending its holdings.<sup>74</sup> Centre 42 received £2,000 from the Trust's Historic Buildings Council for the Roundhouse in 1967. The dramas of evolution to a post-industrial society can be viewed in the Roundhouse's transition from Victorian industry to Arts Centre (like Haynes' Arts Lab, or latterly Tate Modern). Lee's White Paper proposed 'a historic building can be adapted at comparatively little cost – certainly less than the cost of a new centre' and thereby 'two objects are achieved in one'. Besides the Roundhouse, Temple Newsam (Leeds City Council) and Corsham Court in Wiltshire (Bath Academy of Art) were cited as examples, as was the ICA's use of Nash House in the later 1960s. As the Nottingham Playhouse and National Theatre evinced, new building was politically thornier.

A neglected feature of the Wilson government – at the time for contradicting the dominant technological rhetoric, and afterwards because of the conservative connotations of ‘heritage’ – was its preservation legislation, notably the 1967 Civic Amenities Act and 1968 Town and Country Planning Act.<sup>75</sup>

Lee’s activities and outlook can then be framed by reference to Dalton and 1940s planning besides inherited liberal-elitist traditions of cultural thought triggered by distaste for modernity. But it might also be read as a progenitor of some purportedly distinctive New Labour traits. Wrapping itself in the entrepreneurial veneer of the cultural industries, New Labour chilled to ‘Cool Britannia’, surfed the IT heat of the knowledge economy and sought to re-brand Britain as ‘the creative workshop of the world’. Culture Secretary Chris Smith’s *Creative Britain* typified this (derided) exercise.<sup>76</sup> Besides distancing itself from trade unionism, New Labour attempted to distance itself from old ‘Labourism’ through such affinities. But some 1960s evidence hints at New Labour’s creative tendencies, questioning whether old ‘Labourism’ was as narrowly focused as New Labour ideologues like Mulgan or other proponents of the ‘labourism’ concept have it.

In 1971 Labour felt it could defend its Arts policy and attack Heath. Eccles’ proposed introduction of museum entrance fees was denounced as an attack on ‘our heritage’ as, ‘the British Museum... is a British monument like the National gallery... we know that whenever and wherever the need arises to refresh ourselves with the priceless collections which are our birthright, we can freely visit these’. Heath retorted by asking why visitors should not contribute to an institution’s upkeep, and noting the success of exhibitions that charged. Besides support from Henry Moore and the directors of Manchester’s Whitworth and Oxford’s Ashmolean, Labour had Lord Kenneth Clark’s backing. Clark pointed out that charges by the National Gallery (of which he was a director to 1937) were designed to deter visitors on certain days.<sup>77</sup>

The 1970s Labour governments saw Hugh Jenkins attempt to democratise the ACGB and Lord Donaldson create the National Heritage Fund. In 1975 Labour discussed enforcing local authority arts contributions allowed by the 1948 Act – fixing it at a minimum of  $\frac{1}{2}$ p (the average being 0.41p) per pound of the rates, still less than the ‘old permissive 6d rate’. It was hoped that industry might contribute and that a levy on television advertising should ‘be channelled back to the creative arts’. Campaigns to culturally enliven the Trade Unions persisted. A 1974 Musicians’ Union motion led to a TUC Advisory Committee on Arts, Entertainment and Sport, though its 1978 congress motion still centred on the 1948 Act.<sup>78</sup> Capping museum charges was revived as Labour policy in 2001, with Chris Smith arguing he wanted ‘the best of our culture and heritage made available to the greatest possible number, regardless of their income’.<sup>79</sup>

In short, New Labour’s use of the creative and heritage industries vocabulary is not so new. Nor was its emergence in political rhetoric New Labour’s invention. Having separated the Arts from the DES in 1979 and slashed the ACGB budget, the Thatcher government awarded a 24 per cent increase for 1990–93, rewarding the introduction of market disciplines. Besides recognising its tourist appeal, the ACGB was felt to have



shed its 'welfare state mentality' and increased business investment tenfold from 1979 to 1988, to £30m. Higher education expansion boosted audiences. It was a revealing development, even though the 1990 handout was also prompted by rising inflation and the spectacle of the RSC at the Barbican running out of money and closing for several months.<sup>80</sup>

During the 1980s a Labour Arts and Museums Association pressed a recognisable agenda. In a 1983 pamphlet the association paid homage to the 1918 constitution as showing that Labour had long been 'concerned with the quality of life'. It argued that like British Rail inter-city trains and 'super pits', the state ACGB was being forced by Thatcherism to specialise rather than provide for all. It proposed decentralising arts funding, replacing the 'secretive' ACGB, and that Labour governments must commit to the 'preservation... and development of our cultural environment'. During the 1980s, the left advocated local initiative and independent production to circumvent Thatcherite control of the state. In hands such as the Greater London Council's, this fashioned a cultural politics, exemplified by Mulgan and Worpole's *Saturday Night or Sunday Morning*?<sup>81</sup>

Rich as the parallels between 1960s initiatives and New Labour are, there are differences. That the Heritage Department (as it had been since 1992) was renamed Media, Culture and Sport suggested a lingering suspicion of 'heritage', if also that 'culture' was integral to, not separate or superior to, other spheres and might be fun and edifying. New Labour is more pluralist, less attached to specific cultural forms. It has embraced the market, inverting the opposition of culture and commerce. Excellence for global competitiveness has supplanted Lee's insistence on standards for edification. Critics hold that this cultivating notion of the public sphere has given way to one more commodified, frivolous and individual-centred. Blair's association with Britpop and Art (like Damien Hirst on *Creative Britain's* jacket) was even more of a statement than Wilson's 'pop' credentials.<sup>82</sup>

As director of Demos in 1996 (and subsequently No.10's Policy Unit), Mulgan advanced a recognisable cultural critique of 'old' Labour: more work-oriented and producerist than European social democracy (as Centre 42 argued); too deferential to elite and critical of popular culture; too fond of the state and hostile to the market; too earnest and lacking a sense of pleasure or risk; too attached to the worthiness of the public sphere and averse to the private or 'domestic'.<sup>83</sup> Evidence from Lee's tenure blurs this easy dichotomy and questions Mulgan's judgement. But however much Mulgan is playing fast and creatively with Labour's past, such critiques of Labour's cultural politics have long been the norm.

## Notes

- [1] McKibbin, 'Homage to Wilson and Callaghan'; Fielding, Young and Tomlinson, *The Labour Governments*.
- [2] Ponting, *Breach of Promise*: 392.

- [3] Gray, *The Politics of the Arts*, 48.
- [4] National Archives, Kew (hereafter NA PRO) PREM 13/358, Note for the record, 23 Dec. 1964.
- [5] NA PRO PREM 13/358, Minutes of meeting, 17 Feb. 1965. Sinclair, A. *Arts and Cultures*. London: Sinclair-Stevenson, 1995, 146, 164. NA PRO PREM 13/2488, Wilson note on Abercrombie meeting.
- [6] Cmnd. 2601, *A Policy for the Arts – The First Steps*. London: HMSO, Feb. 1965, paras.14, 91, 100.
- [7] *Labour Party Annual Conference Report*, 1963, 135; Jenkins, *The Labour Case*, ch.9.
- [8] Labour Party Archives, John Rylands Library, Manchester (hereafter LPA), Research Department RD.748, 1964; Labour Party, *Let's Go with Labour*, 18; Labour Party, *Time for Decision*, 17.
- [9] Carless and Brewster, *Patronage and the Arts*. Conservative Party Research Department Papers, 3/3/1–5.
- [10] Jennie Lee Papers, Open University GB2315/JL/ (hereafter Lee Papers) 2/2/2/1, Lee to Wilson, 22 July 1971, Letter to Lee, 23 June 1970; Viscount Eccles, *Politics*, 11.
- [11] Mulgan, 'Culture', 196.
- [12] Foot, *The Politics of Harold Wilson*; New Left, *May Day Manifesto*.
- [13] Lee Papers 2/2/7/4, Letter to Lee, 5 Jan. 1968 and 2/2/7/6, 'A. Miner' (Flintshire Miners Institute, North Wales) to Lee, 18 Jan. 1968; Hollis, *Jennie Lee*, 381.
- [14] *Financial Times*, 2 Mar. 1965
- [15] Gray, *Politics of the Arts*, 47–51; Priestman, 'A Critical Stage', 122.
- [16] White, *The Arts Council*, 287–8, 311; Hutchison, *The Politics of the Arts Council*, 171; NA PRO PREM 13/721, DES Report on the Arts, Sept. 1968, 'A Going Concern', 1. *Sunday Times*, 20 Feb. 1967.
- [17] Political and Economic Planning (PEP). 'Public Patronage of the Arts' *Planning* 31 (Nov. 1965), 316; Hutchison, *Politics of the Arts Council*, 20.
- [18] Goodman, *Tell Them I'm on My Way*, 291; Cmnd. 2601, *A Policy for the Arts*, para. 1.
- [19] Cmnd. 2601, para. 88; DES, 'Partnership in Patronage', 1966.
- [20] Goodman, *Not for the Record*, 121–2.
- [21] Lee Papers, 2/2/1/3, DES Report on Education, Sept. 1967, 'Music and the Young'.
- [22] Mark Abrams Papers (hereafter Abrams Papers), Churchill College Cambridge, Box 58, file, 'Taste of the Arts, 1955–66', IOD, *Investing in the Arts*. London: IOD, 1964; IOD, *Arts Bulletin* 3 (July 1965).
- [23] DES, 'A Going Concern', 1968, 1; PEP, 'Public Patronage', 324–325; Abrams Papers Box 70, file, 'Leisure 1956–67 (1/2)', London Press Exchange Intelligence Centre, *Photography in 1966*.
- [24] Williams, 'The Arts Council', *Political Quarterly* 50 (1979), 157; Lee papers 2/2/1/3, 'Power Politics' (n.d.).
- [25] Travis, *Bound and Gagged*: chs.7–9; Goodman, *Not for the Record*, 126.
- [26] Laing, 'Institutional Change', 36; Hollis, *Lee*, 280–82.
- [27] NA PRO CAB 165/555, Herbert Andrew to Burke Trend, 18 Aug. 1966.
- [28] NA PRO PREM 13/2488, Lee to Patrick Gordon-Walker, 8 Dec. 1967; Burke Trend paper, 17 Feb. 1965; Lee papers 2/2/2/1, Lee to Wilson, 22 July 1971.
- [29] Lee Papers 2/2/2/1, Lee to Jenkins, 10 Feb. 1969; NA PRO PREM 13/2488, Lee to Wilson, 6 Feb. 1969; 2/2/2/2, Lee to Jack Diamond, 10 Feb. 1969. Profile, *Sunday Times*, 20 Feb. 1967; *Guardian*, 27 May 1966.
- [30] Jenkins, *Labour Case*, 1. Lee directed c.0.15 per cent of government expenditure.
- [31] Lee Papers 2/2/2/1, Lee to Wilson, 22 July 1971.
- [32] Sinclair, *Arts and Cultures*, 145. NA PRO PREM 13/2488, Goodman to Wilson, 7 May 1969.
- [33] *Tribune*, 21 July 1967; Hoggart, 'The Culture Confusion', *Focus* (Mar. 1965), 33–4.

- [34] NA PRO PREM 13/358, Note of 16 Mar. 1965. Home's bother, William, was a playwright, best known for *The Reluctant Debutante*, a comedy of Anglo-US aristocratic/pop values, on which the film, *What a Girl Wants*, was based.
- [35] Heath in *New Christian*, 4 May 1967; Lee Papers 4/1/2/8, Lee to Wilson, 24 Apr. 1967.
- [36] Campbell, *Nye Bevan*, 69; Bevan, *In Place of Fear*, 50–51; Priestley, *The Arts Under Socialism*, 13, 19.
- [37] Labour Party, *Leisure for Living*, 9–11, 23; LPA, 'National School of Opera' file and Ayrton, Middleton memos in 'Art Exhibition' file, Festival of Labour papers; Conekin, *Autobiography of a Nation*.
- [38] Abrams Papers, box 58, 'A Taste of the Arts, 1955–66', Greenwood, press release, 26 Apr. 1964; DES, 'Partnership in Patronage', 1966.
- [39] *House of Commons Debates* fifth Series (hereafter *H. of C. Debs.*), vol.711, col.237, 27 Apr. 1965; *Tribune*, 21 July 1967.
- [40] Lee papers 2/2/1/3, Ebbw Vale speech; 'Housing the Arts' *Contemporary Review* 222 (Jan. 1973), 25–26; 'Art in a Cold Climate', *The Times*, 29 Jan. 1975.
- [41] *Evening News*, 25 May 1966; NA PRO CAB 165/555, Note for record, 2 Nov. 1964; *Sunday Times*, 20 Feb. 1967.
- [42] *Guardian*, 27 May 1966; Goodman, *Tell them*, 261.
- [43] Lee Papers, 2/2/1/4(2), 'The Success of Government Policy for the Arts', n.d., c.1967.
- [44] *Sunday Times*, 20 Feb. 1967; Lee Papers 4/1/2/7, BBC Press Release, 19 Mar. 1966; Harris, *Government Patronage*, 63. Marwick, *The Arts in the West*, 186–9.
- [45] *The Times*, 11 Oct. 1971
- [46] Lee papers, 2/2/2/2, Jefferys, K. 'The Arts in the Federal Republic of Germany', 2 June 1971; NA PRO PREM 13/2488, Jeffreys, K. 'International Comparisons', 30 Jan. 1969.
- [47] On CEMA, ABCA, ENSA, Minihan, *The Nationalization of Culture*, 238. Cmnd. 2601, *Policy for the Arts*, para.99.
- [48] Goodman in Mulgan, 'Culture', 207; DES, 'A Going Concern', 1968, 4; *Evening News*, 25 May 1966; Keynes in Jenkins, *Culture Gap*, 41.
- [49] *H. of C. Debs.*, vol. 711, cols. 294–295, 27 Apr. 1965. Cmnd.2601, *Policy for the Arts*, para.71. Lee Papers 2/2/2/1, 1969 May Day Concert; Laing, 'The Politics of Culture', 81. Weight, *Patriots*, 390; Laing, 'Politics of Culture', 84; *The Times*, 15 Feb. 1969.
- [50] Hind and Mosco, *Rebel Radio*, 13; Walker, *Arts TV*, 23, 45, 77.
- [51] Lee Papers 2/2/2/2, Royal Academy address, 5 May 1970; Porter, *London*, 382; Hollis, *Lee*, 282.
- [52] Lee Papers 4/1/2/7, BBC Home Service Transcript, 19 Mar. 1966; LPA, Festival of Labour Box 4, 'Fanfare' file, Reg Wallis memo, n.d.; Goodman, *Not for the Record*, 123–5; Jenkins, *Culture Gap*, 39; Weight, *Patriots*, ch.5; Harker, 'What Was Popular Music?', 238.
- [53] PEP, 'Public Patronage', 326; Sinclair, *Arts and Cultures*, 139, 146; Goodman, *Not for the Record*, 144.
- [54] *Western Morning News*, 12 Nov. 1966; *Guardian*, 13 Jan. 1966; *The Times*, 8 Apr. 1968. Jenkins, *Culture Gap*, 63–65.
- [55] White, *Arts Council*, 311; Jenkins, *Culture Gap*, 41.
- [56] *H. of C. Debs.*, vol.795, col. 716, 5 Feb. 1970; Lee Papers 2/2/2/1, May Day Concert message.
- [57] PEP, 'Public patronage', 329–330.
- [58] White, *Arts Council*, 72–74.
- [59] Blenkinsop, *Enjoying the Countryside*.
- [60] Sinclair, *Arts and Cultures*, 112–13, 133–4; Harris, *Government Patronage*, 104. DES, 'A Going Concern', 1968; Gray, *Politics of the Arts*, 69.
- [61] Harris, *Government Patronage*, 105; Benn, *Diaries 1963–67*, 199, 237, 302, 309. *Northern Echo*, 25 Feb 1963.
- [62] Hayes, *Consensus and Controversy*, 185, ch.8; Jones, M. 'Labour and the Arts', *New Statesman* 18 Feb. 1966, 221.
- [63] *Evening Standard*, 17 Sept. 1968; *Sunday Times*, 20 Feb. 1967.

- [64] Interview, *Evening News*, 25 May 1966.
- [65] ACGB, *Annual Report* (1970), 6; Hutchison, *Politics of the Arts Council*, 106.
- [66] *Private Eye*, 5 Mar. 1965; Goodman, *Not for the Record*, 287–288.
- [67] Green, *All Dressed Up*, 154, 157, 168–9; Interview, Haynes, 11 Aug. 2005; Laing, ‘Politics of Culture’, 90. Lee Papers 2/2/2/2, Lee to Wesker, 14 June 1966.
- [68] Melly, *Revolt into Style*, 77; Walker, *Arts TV*, 50; Crossman, 1 Jan. 1970, in Howard, A., ed. *The Crossman Diaries*, 603.
- [69] *TUC Congress Report*. London: TUC, 1960, 435–8; Wesker, *Fears of Fragmentation*, ch.2; *Encounter* 19 (Aug. 1962), 95–6. Wesker papers, University of Texas, 146/10, Wilson to Wesker, 6 Jan. 1965, Lee to Wesker 7 Jan. 1967.
- [70] Coppieters, ‘Centre 42’, 38; *Tribune*, 21 July 1967. Cmnd. 2601, *Policy for the Arts*, para.98; Wesker Papers 137/4, ‘Draft Appeal for funds and the 1962 series of People’s Festivals’ (c.1963/4).
- [71] Sinclair, *Arts and Cultures*, 150, 147; Wesker Papers 137/4, V.Elyashiv, 21 Jan. 1968.
- [72] PEP, ‘Public Patronage’, 329–330. See Weight, “‘Building a new British Culture’”.
- [73] Hewison, *The Heritage Industry*; Corner and Harvey, eds., *Enterprise and Heritage*.
- [74] Dalton, *Practical Socialism for Britain*, 292–3. Thanks to Richard Toye for this point. Dalton was President of the Ramblers’ Association between 1948–50.
- [75] Wesker papers, 148/7, ‘Response to Downing Street Gathering’. Cmnd. 2601, *Policy for the Arts*, para.53; Lee Papers 2/2/1/3, ‘Art and Entertainment in the New Towns’, n.d.; Mandler, *The Fall and Rise*, 399.
- [76] Smith, *Creative Britain*; Littler, ‘Consumer Culture’; Bayley, *Labour Camp*.
- [77] Labour Party. *An Attack on the Arts*; Lee papers 2/2/2/2, Heath to Robert Sainsbury, 1 Dec. 1970; Jenkins, *Culture Gap*, 77.
- [78] Labour Party, *The Arts; Working party on the arts report*. London: TUC, 1976. *TUC Congress Report*. London: TUC, 1978, 196.
- [79] <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/700215.stm>, accessed 3 Apr. 2000.
- [80] *Financial Times*, 18 Nov. 1989; *Guardian*, 29 Dec. 1989; Myerscough, *The Economic Importance*; Laing, ‘Institutional Change’, 47–49; Porter, *London*, 382.
- [81] Labour Arts and Museums Association, *Arts Funding*; Mulgan, and Worpole, *Saturday Night*.
- [82] Harris, *The Last Party*, ch.12; Littler, ‘Consumer Culture’, 208–9.
- [83] Mulgan, ‘Culture’, 195–213.

## References

- Bayley, S. *Labour Camp*. London: BT Batsford, 1998.
- Benn, Tony. *Diaries 1963–67*. London: Hutchison, 1988.
- Bevan, A. *In Place of Fear*. London: Heinemann, 1952.
- Blenkinsop, A. *Enjoying the Countryside*. London: Fabian Research Series no. 265, 1968.
- Campbell, J. *Nye Bevan and the Mirage of British Socialism*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1987.
- Carless, R, and P. Brewster. *Patronage and the Arts*. London: Bow Group/Conservative Political Centre, 1959.
- Conekin, B. ‘*The Autobiography of a Nation*’: *The 1951 Festival of Britain*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003.
- Coppieters, F. ‘Centre 42: A Cultural Revolution Betrayed’, *Theatre Quarterly* 5 (1975).
- Corner, J. and S. Harvey, eds. *Enterprise and Heritage*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Dalton, H. *Practical Socialism for Britain*. London: Routledge, 1935.
- Eccles, Viscount. *Politics and the Quality of Life*. London: CPC, 1970.

- Fielding, S., J. W. Young, and J. Tomlinson. *The Labour Governments 1964–70*, 3 vols. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.
- Foot, P. *The Politics of Harold Wilson*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968.
- Goodman, A. *Not for the Record*. London: Quality Book Club, 1973.
- . *Tell Them I'm on My Way*. London: Chapmans, 1993.
- Gray, C. *The Politics of the Arts in Great Britain*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000.
- Green, J. *All Dressed Up: The Sixties and the Counterculture*. London: Pimlico, 1998.
- Harris, J. *The Last Party: Britpop, Blair and the Demise of English Rock*. London: Fourth Estate, 2003.
- Harris, J. S. *Government Patronage of the Arts in Great Britain*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Hayes, N. *Consensus and Controversy: City Politics in Nottingham 1945–66*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1996.
- Hewison, R. *The Heritage Industry*. London: Methuen, 1987.
- Hind, J. and S. Mosco. *Rebel Radio*. London: Pluto, 1985.
- Hoggart, R. 'The Culture Confusion'. *Focus* (Mar. 1965) : 33–4.
- Hollis, P. *Jennie Lee*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Howard, A., ed. *The Crossman Diaries*. London: Book Club Associates, 1979.
- Hutchison, R. *The Politics of the Arts Council*. London: Sinclair-Browne, 1982.
- Jenkins, H. *Culture Gap: Experience of Government and the Arts*. London: Boyars, 1979.
- Jenkins, R. *The Labour Case*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1959.
- Labour Party *Leisure for Living*. London: Labour Party, 1959.
- . *Labour Party Annual Conference Report*. London: Labour Party, 1963.
- . *Let's Go with Labour for the New Britain*. London: Labour Party, 1964.
- . *Time for Decision*. London: Labour Party, 1966.
- . *An Attack on the Arts*. London: Talking Points no.2, 1971.
- . *The Arts*. London: Labour Party, 1975.
- Labour Arts and Museums Association. *Arts Funding and Administration*. London: 1983.
- Laing, S. 'Institutional Change'. In *The Arts in the 1970s*, edited by B. Moore-Gilbert. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Littler, J. 'Consumer Culture, The "Creative Economy" and the Cultural Policies of New Labour'. In *Cultural Capitalism*, edited by T. Bewes, and J. Gilbert. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 2000.
- London Press Exchange Intelligence Centre. *Photography in 1966*. London: LPEC, 1966.
- Mandler, P. *The Fall and Rise of the Stately Home*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Marwick, A. *The Arts in the West since 1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- McKibbin, R. 'Homage to Wilson and Callaghan'. *London Review of Books*, 24 Oct. 1991.
- Melly, G. *Revolt into Style*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972.
- Minihan, J. *The Nationalization of Culture*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1977.
- Mulgan, G. 'Culture: The Problem with being Public'. In *The Ideas that Shaped Post-War Britain*, edited by D. Marquand, and A. Seldon. London: Fontana, 1996.
- Mulgan, G. and K. Worpole, K. *Saturday Night or Sunday Morning? From Arts to Industry—New Forms of Cultural Policy*. London: Comedia, 1986.
- Myerscough, J. *The Economic Importance of the Arts in Britain*. London: Policy Studies Institute, 1988.
- New Left, *May Day Manifesto*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968.
- Ponting, C. *Breach of Promise: Labour in Power 1964–70*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1989.
- Porter, R. *London: A Social History*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1996.
- Priestley, J. B. *The Arts Under Socialism*. London: Turnstile Press, 1947.
- Priestman, M. 'A Critical Stage: Drama in the 1960s'. In *Cultural Revolution? The Challenge of the Arts in the 1960s*, edited by B. Moore-Gilbert, and J. Seed. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Smith, C. *Creative Britain*. London: Faber & Faber, 1998.

- Travis, A. *Bound and Gagged: A Secret History of Obscenity in Britain*. London: Profile Books, 2000.
- TUC Congress Report. London: TUC, 1960.
- Walker, J. A. *Arts TV: History of Arts Television in Britain*. London: ACGB, 1993.
- Weight, R. "‘Building a new British Culture’ the Arts Centre movement, 1943-53". In *The Right to Belong*, edited by R. Weight, and A. Beach. London: IB Tauris, 1998.
- . *Patriots: National Identity in Britain 1940–2000*. London: Macmillan, 2000.
- Wesker, A. *Fears of Fragmentation*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1970.
- White, E. *The Arts Council of Great Britain*. London: Davis-Poynter, 1975.
- Williams, R. 'The Arts Council', *Political Quarterly* 50 (1979).



Copyright of Contemporary British History is the property of Routledge and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.