



THE ORIGINS OF THE
ARTS COUNCIL MOVEMENT

Philanthropy and Policy

Anna Rosser Upchurch



New Directions in Cultural Policy Research

Series Editors

Eleonora Belfiore
Loughborough University
Loughborough, UK

Anna Rosser Upchurch
University of Leeds
Leeds, United Kingdom

Aim of the Series

New Directions in Cultural Policy Research encourages theoretical and empirical contributions which enrich and develop the field of cultural policy studies. Since its emergence in the 1990s in Australia and the United Kingdom and its eventual diffusion in Europe, the academic field of cultural policy studies has expanded globally as the arts and popular culture have been re-positioned by city, regional, and national governments, and international bodies, from the margins to the centre of social and economic development in both rhetoric and practice. The series invites contributions in all of the following: arts policies, the politics of culture, cultural industries policies (the ‘traditional’ arts such as performing and visual arts, crafts), creative industries policies (digital, social media, broadcasting and film, and advertising), urban regeneration and urban cultural policies, regional cultural policies, the politics of cultural and creative labour, the production and consumption of popular culture, arts education policies, cultural heritage and tourism policies, and the history and politics of media and communications policies. The series will reflect current and emerging concerns of the field such as, for example, cultural value, community cultural development, cultural diversity, cultural sustainability, lifestyle culture and eco-culture, planning for the intercultural city, cultural planning, and cultural citizenship.

More information about this series at

<http://www.springer.com/series/14748>

Anna Rosser Upchurch

The Origins of the Arts Council Movement

Philanthropy and Policy

palgrave
macmillan

Anna Rosser Upchurch
University of Leeds
Leeds, United Kingdom

ISBN 978-1-137-46162-9 ISBN 978-1-137-46163-6 (eBook)
DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-46163-6

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016957373

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2016

The author(s) has/have asserted their right(s) to be identified as the author(s) of this work in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Printed on acid-free paper

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by Springer Nature

The registered company is Macmillan Publishers Ltd.

The registered company address is: The Campus, 4 Crinan Street, London, N1 9XW, United Kingdom

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The year 2016 marked the seventieth anniversary of Arts Council England, which was originally called the Arts Council of Great Britain and granted a Royal Charter in 1946. Yet this book was not written with an anniversary in mind, because the research project that resulted in the book actually began in 2003 when I was a PhD student at the University of Warwick in the United Kingdom. And the research questions emerged even earlier, during my career working for state-funded cultural organizations in North Carolina in the United States. In the mid-twentieth century, North Carolina's state government established and funded museums of art, history, and natural science, and an orchestra, all located in the capital city of Raleigh. The museums, which are free admission like the Smithsonian museums in Washington, and the symphony orchestra coexist with indigenous regional expressions in literature, crafts, and a range of music that includes gospel, country, folk, and jazz. Working at different times in the 1990s for the art museum, the state arts council, and the NC Department of Cultural Resources, I created strategies and arguments to defend public funding for institutions and programs. I relied on the instrumental arguments about the benefits to education and economy, arguments that were well received, and even widely believed, in North Carolina. My dissatisfaction with those contemporary justifications led to my study of historical arguments for public funding of the arts and of the people who made them. Specifically, I was interested in the origins of the arts council policy model, because of North Carolina's history with that model; I'd heard anecdotally that the local arts council movement had started in the state and knew that the North Carolina Arts Council was established in

1964, before the establishment of the National Endowment for the Arts. I knew that there were arts councils in all 50 states. Initially my questions were: how had this model been conceived and why is it so prevalent in the United States? My research quickly turned to the United Kingdom and addressed these questions:

- Policy analysts and historians have identified a shift in responsibility for arts funding from private philanthropy to the state in Great Britain and Canada during the middle of the twentieth century. Who influenced this shift?
- Why did they choose to get involved? What were their ideas about the arts in society and did those ideas influence arts policy? What arguments did they use to justify state involvement?
- Did their ideas inform arts policy in the United States?

Very often, studies of the individuals involved in policymaking are studies of power and wealth, and the history of arts policy is no exception. Initially, I explored the involvement of intellectuals like the economist John Maynard Keynes and art historian Roger Fry in arts policy in Great Britain (Upchurch 2004). But during my research it became clear that intellectuals were joined in this advocacy work by philanthropists and arts professionals, and that philanthropists—who were themselves establishing and funding cultural organizations—appeared to be highly effective advocates for national funding for the arts in the United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States. This study attempts to understand and analyze their ideological positions, social connections, and working methods, and how they influenced arts policy. The work of Raymond Williams is present in many ways, as I attempt to tease out and articulate the assumptions and motivations underlying their cultural policy advocacy. Williams wrote in his 1978 analysis of Keynes and the Bloomsbury Group: ‘For this is the real point of social and cultural analysis of any developed kind: to attend to not only the manifest ideas and activities, but also to the positions and ideas which are implicit or even taken for granted’ (Williams 1978, p. 42). I also acknowledge that, as my research progressed, I recognized the residue of their ideas in my own beliefs about public funding for the arts. In fact, having experienced the funding systems in the United States and the United Kingdom, I am an enthusiastic and committed supporter of government subsidies for the arts as practiced in the United Kingdom for the past 70 years. The focus on philanthropy and philanthropists in this

study reflects my interpretation of their influence on the formation of arts policy and should not be read as implicit support for reduced government subsidy or for replacement of subsidies by private giving. Far from it.

This study is a social and intellectual history, a history of ideas that influenced the arts council model and movement, beginning with the United Kingdom and following the transatlantic circulation of the ideas to Canada and the United States. Initially, I assumed that a critical examination of published sources, such as policy analysis, institutional histories, and memoirs, would provide evidence for my study. This was true in the United Kingdom, where several historical studies are supplemented by memoirs and analysis written by ‘insiders’ who held positions at the Arts Council of Great Britain. However, the same body of literature does not yet exist in Canada or the United States, where published historical sources are scarce. There is a robust, contemporary, critical scholarship about Canadian and American arts policy, but the relatively small number of historical studies caused me to spend a summer in Toronto searching for material about arts policy in Canada. There I read the private papers, diaries, and correspondence of Vincent Massey, widely credited with the founding of the Canada Council, in the archives of the University of Toronto. I found evidence that Massey collaborated with Keynes and others in Great Britain on cultural policy initiatives. Some years later I explored the beginnings of the local arts council movement in the United States, which took me to the Junior League archives in the Forsyth County public library in Winston-Salem, NC, where I found evidence that women introduced the arts council concept to the United States and collaborated across the Canadian border. Therefore, this book and my interpretation are drawn from an examination of published primary and secondary sources and from unpublished primary sources drawn from archival research. It attempts to answer questions that concerned me, as someone who worked in the arts for many years, and to make a contribution to the historiography of cultural policy.

This book develops and extends research that I have published in the *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. Chapters 3 and 5 draw from arguments and source material published in a 2007 article about Vincent Massey; however, both chapters have been rewritten and expanded to include more evidence and previously unpublished research and interpretations. Also expanded with additional evidence, Chap. 4 is based on previously published research, and I thank Taylor & Francis for permission to reprint material from A. Upchurch (2011) ‘Keynes’s Legacy: An Intellectual’s Influence Reflected in Arts Policy,’ *International Journal of*

Cultural Policy, Vol. 17:1, pp. 69–80, www.tandfonline.com. Chapters 1 and 2 are based on unpublished research conducted during my PhD study and have been expanded and edited for this book. Chapter 6 about the United States is based on entirely new and unpublished research undertaken since 2014, when I was awarded research leave to develop the project.

I am grateful to the Master and Fellows of Massey College at the University of Toronto for permission to quote unpublished material from Vincent Massey's diaries and private papers, and also to the Provost and Scholars of Kings College Cambridge for permission to quote from the unpublished writings of John Maynard Keynes. I also thank the Dartington Hall Trust for the warm support I received while working in the archives there.

With research and writing undertaken in three countries, the UK, the US, and Canada, there are many people to acknowledge and to thank. Most recently, I have been encouraged and supported in this work since 2009 by my colleagues at the University of Leeds, including Ben Walmsley, Jonathan Pitches, and Calvin Taylor. I thank the School of Performance and Cultural Industries for awarding my research leave in 2014 to conduct additional research in the United States and begin the project of writing this book. At Leeds Beckett University, Franco Bianchini and Leila Jancovich are fellow cultural policy scholars and good friends who offer a laugh and good advice over a coffee or a pint. Eleonora Belfiore, now at Loughborough University, was and is a constant and generous friend and intellectual colleague, always willing to share articles, ideas, her spare bedroom, and a good laugh. For their assistance in helping me to understand policy development in the United States, I am grateful to Mary Regan, Milton Rhodes, E'Vonnie Coleman-Cook, Halsey and Alice North, Jean McLaughlin, Ardath Weaver, and Robert Bush.

When my project began at the University of Warwick, Oliver Bennett and Chris Bilton were supportive yet critically demanding PhD supervisors. Jonathan Vickery provided warm support and suggestions for development of the research. Our PhD student community at Warwick was and continues to be a constant source of friendship and intellectual support. Egil Bjørnsen debated methodology and policy models with me and offers friendship with critique. I am also grateful to several people who are scholars today and were fellow students then—Lorraine Lim, Hsiao-Ling Chung, Jane Woddis, and Kjell Maelen—for friendship and mutual support. Richard Perkins at the University of Warwick library was always

responsive, understanding, and funny, when I was in a panic about sources or library issues. Early in my project, Clive Gray, then at De Montfort University and now at Warwick, generously provided his insights about arts policy, as did the late Michael Volkerling from New Zealand.

While I was a Master's student at Duke University in the United States, Craufurd Goodwin provided the initial encouragement of and inspiration for my interest in Roger Fry, Maynard Keynes, and the Bloomsbury Group, and was an example of uncompromising scholarship and warm support. Donna Zapf, director of the Graduate Liberal Studies Program at Duke, offered her illuminating insights about Canada and arts policy, as well as thoughtful discussion and her friendship. Zannie Giraud Voss was a constantly supportive colleague and friend.

Jeffrey Brison at Queen's University in Kingston, Ontario, Canada, offered insights about Canadian policy and enthusiastic support for this work. Claire McCaughey at the Canada Council, who published some of the earliest documentation and analysis of the policy model in North America, was insightful and helpful during my stay in Canada in 2005. Alan Stanbridge at the University of Toronto has been an encouraging and critical friend of this research over many years. Also in Canada, I am grateful to Ariana Bradford, Meriel and Jim Bradford, Joyce Bryant, and Carolyn Zapf for enthusiastic support. The staff of the university archives at the University of Toronto was extremely helpful and accommodating when I worked in their collection.

Others who were enthusiastic and responsive at key moments were Margaret Brill, then the specialist librarian for British and Canadian studies at Duke University and Yvonne Widger, archival administrator at The Dartington Hall Trust in the United Kingdom. Patricia McGuire, archivist in the Modern Archives at Kings College, Cambridge, has been helpful and always responsive to repeated visits and email requests over the years. Initially, Paula Kennedy, and now Felicity Plester, my editors at Palgrave Macmillan, have been patient and supportive over the years as this project took form as a book.

My friends and family have made the necessary travel and immigration much easier than it might have been. In the United Kingdom, Kara McKechnie, Malcolm Johnson, Jodi West, David Lee, and Melissa Nisbett all helped to make immigration easier and feel less isolating. In the United States, Montine Barnette and Graham Turner always provide friendship, advice, and their spare bedroom when I need it. Priscilla Bratcher shares her home as well as her friendship and insights about arts fundraising and

philanthropy. Connie Johnston is another friend who is always willing to share a coffee and conversation. Charleen Swansea made me laugh and gave me an intellectual push when I was feeling cautious during my PhD research. Jean O'Barr always provided friendship along with her wisdom and scholarly coaching. Gene Upchurch was an early and enthusiastic supporter of my PhD study abroad.

Undertaking doctoral study, then immigration to the United Kingdom, has been a demanding challenge. The inevitable losses that one expects at mid-life add another layer, and for constant love and unquestioning emotional support I thank my family: Jim Rosser and Nicki Watts, Susan Rosser, Lauren Rosser, and Caitlin Rosser and Joe Madden and their children, Lindsay, J.T., Paige, and Bridget. Gerry Fisher has enriched my life immeasurably with his emotional support, wit, and insights. This book is dedicated to my parents, Dorothy Reynolds Rosser and the late John Carl Rosser, who taught many children in addition to their own to love reading and learning.

In the past few years, I have had the opportunity to present this research to small groups of fundraisers and managers of the arts in the United Kingdom, and after hearing my presentation, individuals in the group have said privately that policymaking in the arts has not changed since the 1940s. They say it's still a process often dominated by powerful and well-connected men who are often wealthy, sometimes elected officials, and who are engaged in running the national institutions. I hope that by finding answers to my own questions about arts policy, that I've offered a narrative and an interpretation that helps you with insights into your questions about how policy gets made, and why, whether you're a student, an artist, a fundraiser, a researcher, a policymaker, or an arts enthusiast.

CONTENTS

1	Introduction: What Is the ‘Arts Council Movement?’	1
2	Philanthropists and Policy Advisors	11
3	The Ideologies of English Intellectualism and of American Philanthropy	49
4	Arts Policy During the Second World War in the United Kingdom	77
5	The Arts Council of Great Britain: Keynes’s Legacy	103
6	The Canadian Clerisy and the Canada Council	131

7	The Arts Council Movement in the United States	171
8	Conclusions: Towards Social Justice and Equality in the Arts	199
	Index	211

Introduction: What Is the ‘Arts Council Movement’?

The year 2000 saw the turn of the millennium and the founding of the International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies (IFACCA) at a world summit of cultural officers and advocates hosted in Ottawa by the Canada Council for the Arts. Headquartered today in Australia, IFACCA is the global network of national arts funding agencies with member organizations in 78 countries. Among its services, IFACCA maintains a database of cultural policies on its web site (www.ifacca.org), regularly conducts policy research, and hosts world summits to enable networking, advocacy planning, and policy sharing among its members, cultural policy researchers, and arts advocates. The establishment of an international federation followed years of informal meetings by representatives of the first countries to establish arts councils, including the United Kingdom, where the Arts Council of Great Britain¹ was established in 1946, Ireland in 1951, Canada in 1957, New Zealand in 1964, the USA in 1965, and Australia in 1968. The establishment of IFACCA can be considered the culmination of a ‘movement’ that sought recognition for culture and the arts as central to human life and society, a movement that had grown internationally since 1948 and the adoption by the United Nations General Assembly of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Consisting of 30 articles, the Declaration expressed the basic rights to which all human beings are inherently entitled, including Article 27, the right to participate in the cultural life of the community and to enjoy the

arts. Indeed, in 2009, IFACCA found that 99 percent of the 201 countries in its policy database had a ministry or department with responsibility for culture; 90 percent of those departments had a mixed portfolio that included policy domains such as culture, sport, environment, communications, or tourism. Around 40 percent, or almost half, of those countries had both a ministry and an arts council agency (Madden 2009, p. 18). Thus, state patronage of the arts and culture was accepted by scores of national governments by the turn of the millennium, and the ‘arts council’ was included among accepted policy models and institutional structures.

State patronage of the arts in Europe had a long history before the 1940s, when the Arts Council of Great Britain was established. Funding cultural heritage was an established policy of European governments where national museums existed, as were centralized and nationally sponsored programmes for art and design education in several countries. Ministries of culture on the European continent oversaw and supported museums, cultural centers, and national performing arts companies. However, what was new in the middle of the twentieth century was the emergence of a national arts policy model that, in line with concerns about freedom of speech and expression, sought to remove politicians from direct influence and involvement in the funding decisions that supported artistic creativity. Great Britain had long supported national museums and art and design schools, but the policy of providing state funding to living artists and performing arts organizations to produce and create art brought into focus the relationship between the artist and the state. These historical concerns and their implications for the new policy model are the subject of Chap. 5, which considers the beginnings of the Arts Council of Great Britain prior to its establishment in 1946.

The Arts Council of Great Britain was the first national funding body to insist so explicitly that its autonomy and independence from ministers and legislators was necessary to artistic freedom. Since that time, the words ‘arts council’ in the name of the national funding organization have come to signal this idea of ‘distance’, which has been named the ‘arm’s length principle’ by policy analysts. Indeed, the ‘arm’s length principle’ has been the subject of scrutiny and commentary by cultural policy researchers who debate and dispute its effectiveness in practice in arts policy (see Madden 2009 for an extensive review of this literature and its central themes; also Bell and Oakley 2015, pp. 123–126). However, this debate and an administrative analysis of the policy model are not the subject of this book. Rather, it is the history of the people involved in its establishment and the

ideas and values embedded in the policy model in Great Britain and later in North America.

Just as the meaning and practice of the term 'arm's length' has changed over time, so has the use and meaning of the title 'arts council'. In the two decades after 1946, several former British colonies established national arts funding organizations, adopting the 'arts council' name and model. While Ireland established an arts council in 1951, Canada was the first country outside the British Isles to adopt the model in 1957, which was modified there in its earliest years, for reasons of political expedience. Also in Canada, the term 'arts council' gained an association with arts advocacy federations, rather than national funding bodies and policy, when the Arts Reconstruction Committee changed its name to the Canadian Arts Council in December 1945 (Tippett 1990, p. 174), a few months after the British government's announcement that the Arts Council of Great Britain would continue the work of its wartime predecessor, the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts. Representing some 7000 artists and cultural advocates, the Canadian Arts Council was a federation of arts organizations with voluntary officers and directors that lobbied for provincial and national arts funding and advocated for arts education throughout the Canadian provinces. Supported by private funds contributed by its member organizations, this council lacked federal funding and prestige. Instead, the Canadian Arts Council was active in communities and provinces around the country, and in North America, the title, 'arts council', became associated with federations of arts and cultural organizations and with formal and informal advocacy activities. In 1947, two years after the Canadian Arts Council adopted its new name, the city of Vancouver, British Columbia, established the Community Arts Council of Vancouver, the first local arts council in North America. Thus, the term 'arts council' is associated today with advocacy and funding for the arts at the national, regional or state, and local levels.

The following chapters examine the transatlantic movement of the term 'arts council' and of the policy idea as it was adopted in the United Kingdom, then modified in Canada and in the United States. The book argues that alliances of philanthropists, intellectuals, and politicians organized during the 1940s in Great Britain and in Canada and successfully persuaded their national governments to assume responsibility for funding the arts using a policy model that they recommended—the arts council model. In the United States, arts advocates in the 1940s adopted the term 'arts council' to name local federations and membership organizations that

represented and raised funds for the arts, long before the establishment of a national grant-making agency. Indeed, the presence of arts philanthropy and of philanthropists as advocates and policy advisors is common to the policy histories of all three countries. ‘Arts philanthropy’ is considered here to be funding provided by foundations, businesses, and individuals to support the arts, and philanthropists are the wealthy aesthetes whose foundations and private fortunes were donated to arts organizations and cultural causes.

This book contributes to the histories of cultural policy in the United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States, histories that are still somewhat fragmentary. However, this study demonstrates that primary sources exist in each country that provide greater detail, and the book draws upon these sources to contribute to a more nuanced account that traces the origins of the policy idea in three countries. A central concern of the book is the recognition and examination of policy actors whose roles have not been fully explored or acknowledged in the historiography of cultural policy, particularly the role of philanthropists, both individuals and foundations, and of women as arts advocates. Policy historians have explained the shift from private philanthropy to public sources for arts funding in Great Britain by arguing that as the welfare state expanded in the 1940s, it encompassed greater provision for the arts (Minihan 1977; O. Bennett 1995). This is, of course, what happened in broad historical terms. In Canada, historians have documented the post-war shift from arts funding that was provided by American foundations, to national funding provided by the Canada Council (Brison 2005; Litt 1992; Tippett 1990). In the US, histories have focused on the establishment of the National Endowment for the Arts (Binkiewicz 2004), and one influential case study examined urban elites’ development of the nonprofit cultural organization as a model in Boston, Massachusetts in the nineteenth century (DiMaggio 1982).

This book intends to add to this literature by looking closely at policy formation, demonstrating that formal policy and legislative action were often the final steps in a long process of meetings, conversations, and informal exchanges among alliances of individuals through their social interactions and public service on voluntary boards and quasi-public advisory bodies. Rather than planning arts provision in the 1940s and 1950s, the British and Canadian governments instead responded to alliances of philanthropists, intellectuals, and politicians by instituting state support for the arts using a model and funding priorities that these alliances proposed. In the United States, local arts councils representing artists, volunteers,

and businesses helped to establish a grassroots cultural infrastructure and a preference for locally based arts philanthropy over national funding that was later encouraged and enhanced by foundations and the national funding agency.

To understand the influence of these alliances on the histories of arts policy, the book identifies individuals and groups and explores their motivations, ideologies, and working methods. The first chapter sketches out brief biographies of two men and a woman, all of whom were arts philanthropists and offered formal policy recommendations for national funding agencies. The two men are the individuals most visibly associated with the establishment of the arts council model in their countries: John Maynard Keynes in Great Britain and Vincent Massey in Canada. The woman is Dorothy Elmhirst, an American heiress and arts philanthropist whose early work in women's voluntary organizations in the United States evolved to founding organizations and funding cultural policy research in the United Kingdom. These three individuals are selected for historical and conceptual reasons: Keynes represents the intellectual in a policy-making role, while Massey and Elmhirst demonstrate the role of the wealthy aesthete and philanthropist. Elmhirst's inclusion here emphasizes the history of women and their role in arts policy, a theme which is developed in Chap. 7 about the United States.

The short biographies in Chap. 2 give necessary context to Chap. 3, which introduces to the cultural policy literature two central ideologies that characterized these individuals: the ideology of the intellectual and the concept of 'the clerisy' as it evolved in England in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and the ideology of philanthropy held by the wealthy that evolved over the same period. Intellectuals and philanthropists shared a sense of social responsibility drawn from these ideologies that motivated their cultural advocacy. The chapter argues that the theory of 'the clerisy' shaped the identities of Keynes and men like him, who had the benefit of an education at Oxford or Cambridge, to attempt to use their intellectual training to find solutions for social problems. Massey and Elmhirst, as very wealthy philanthropists, shared a sense of social responsibility that motivated them to use their wealth to address social problems. The book argues that these ideologies motivated intellectuals and philanthropists to collaborate to create new institutions in the twentieth century that included national arts funding agencies, as well as private foundations, universities, libraries, and other cultural organizations. The chapter concludes by summarizing the beliefs and assumptions that they shared.

The four chapters that follow examine the arts policy histories of the three countries, tracing the public and private negotiations, policy recommendations, and the transatlantic transfer of ideas and values. The three national histories conclude with the founding of the national arts agency in that country; administrative analysis and institutional histories of the three agencies are beyond the scope of this book and have been referenced where appropriate.

Beginning with the United Kingdom, Chap. 4 examines specific alliances of arts advocates and their working methods during the second world war. Expanding on published research (see Upchurch 2007, 2013), the chapter includes previously unpublished archival research and identifies three wartime projects of an arts policy clique that included Keynes and Massey. Their three projects were the reform and reorganization of the British national art museums, the reopening of Covent Garden for opera and ballet, and the establishment of the Arts Council of Great Britain; they were successful in the latter two projects but not the first one. The chapter closes with a short discussion of the Arts Enquiry, a cultural policy research project funded by Dorothy Elmhirst that began during the war and published recommendations for a post-war cultural infrastructure. In addition to their social and ideological positions, this book examines the working methods that intellectuals and philanthropists used to create arts policy, the process of negotiations that preceded legislation. In Chap. 4, what may seem an absorption with gossip, social maneuvering, and administrative detail is an attempt to create a narrative of the process of policy formation at the end of the second world war. Before leaving the United Kingdom, Chap. 5 takes a closer look at the Arts Council of Great Britain and the policy model, examining and articulating the central assumptions that underlie the policy, and locating those preferences in Keynes's political philosophy as a Liberal. Chapter 5 combines new with previously published research (see Upchurch 2011).

The policy model was transferred across the Atlantic by Vincent Massey in the late 1940s. Chapter 6 examines his role in the founding of the Canada Council as chairman of the Royal Commission on the National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences and combines new with published research (see Upchurch 2007). The chapter argues that Massey was at the center of an alliance comprising politicians, bureaucrats, and intellectuals, assuming (as he did in Great Britain) a coordinating and publicizing leadership role. Indeed, this chapter finds that Massey was among a 'Canadian clerisy' that succeeded in institutionalizing arts policy,

aided by officers from the U.S. general purpose foundations. In Canada, as in Great Britain, arts advocates rejected a ministry in favor of a semi-autonomous organization and retained the peer review process.

While Chaps. 4, 5, and 6 largely trace arts advocacy activities by men and male philanthropists, Chap. 7 documents the role of women in arts advocacy and cultural activism in the United States. This chapter continues the history of the policy idea in North America by examining the emergence of the local arts council movement in the United States in the late 1940s. Through archival research, the chapter locates the first local arts council in the US in the city of Winston-Salem, North Carolina, which was a project of the city's Junior League chapter. The Junior League as a voluntary, women's service organization, was founded in New York in 1901; Dorothy Elmhirst was elected its first national president in 1921. By the middle of the twentieth century, the League's arts liaison officer was providing technical guidance about starting local arts councils to League chapters in North America, resulting in the first community-based arts councils being established as League projects in Vancouver, British Columbia, and Winston-Salem. Documented in institutional histories published by the Junior League of America, women's role in the transfer of the policy term 'arts council' to the United States is introduced to the cultural policy literature by this book. The chapter also examines briefly the role of US foundations in publishing arts policy research and recommendations prior to the establishment of the National Endowment for the Arts in 1965. Indeed, while arts policy history in the United States is considered in this one chapter, the influence of American philanthropy, especially the Carnegie Corporation and the Rockefeller Foundation, is threaded throughout the three national histories. Both foundations were active in the United Kingdom and Canada, and foundations funded the arts in all three countries prior to the establishment of a national funding agency. Funding from private sources—individuals, businesses, and foundations—still characterizes the arts funding system in the United States.

The book closes with an evaluation of the arts council model and a discussion of the relationships of power that characterize policymaking. The final chapter highlights the gendering of arts policymaking in the middle of the twentieth century, when wealthy, white men led national policymaking activities, while middle- and upper-class women were active at the local, community level where their arts activism might be considered an extension of their roles as mothers and community volunteers.

While the book's central concern is the history of arts policy-making, its examination of the ideologies of 'the clerisy' and of philanthropy in Chap. 3 may contribute to studies of philanthropy and to understanding of the nonprofit sector's history among fundraisers, nonprofit managers, foundation staff, trustees, and volunteers.

NOTE

1. To clarify for readers: United Kingdom (UK) is the short form of the full title of the country, which is the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. 'Great Britain' refers to the island that includes England, Scotland, and Wales.

REFERENCES

PUBLISHED SOURCES

- Bell, David, and Kate Oakley. 2015. *Cultural Policy*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Bennett, Oliver. 1995. Cultural Policy in the United Kingdom: Collapsing Rationales and the End of a Tradition. *European Journal of Cultural Policy* 1(2): 15–32.
- Binkiewicz, Donna M. 2004. *Federalizing the Muse: United States Arts Policy and the National Endowment for the Arts, 1965–1980*. Chapel Hill, NC: UNC Press.
- Brison, Jeffrey D. 2005. *Rockefeller, Carnegie, & Canada: American Philanthropy and the Arts & Letters in Canada*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- DiMaggio, Paul J. 1982. Cultural Entrepreneurship in Nineteenth-Century Boston: The Creation of an Organizational Base for High Culture in America. *Media, Culture and Society*. 4: 33–50.
- Litt, Paul. 1992. *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Madden, Christopher. 2009. 'D'Art Report No. 9: Independence of Government Arts Funding. International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies. Available in Three Languages at <http://www.ifacca.org/topic/independence-of-arts-funding-from-government/>
- Minihan, Janet O. 1977. *The Nationalization of Culture*. New York: New York University Press.
- Tippett, Maria. 1990. *Making Culture: English-Canadian Institutions and the Arts Before the Massey Commission*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- Upchurch, Anna. 2007. Vincent Massey: Linking Cultural Policy from Great Britain to Canada. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 13(3): 239–254.
- . 2011. Keynes's Legacy: An Intellectual's Influence Reflected in Arts Policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 17(1): 69–80. First published on 2 August 2010 (iFirst).
- . 2013. 'Missing' from Policy History: The Dartington Hall Arts Enquiry 1941–47. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 19(5): 610–622.

Philanthropists and Policy Advisors

This study begins with brief profiles of three philanthropists who were influential arts advocates in their respective cultural circles. Initially, it considers the two men most often associated with the origins of state funding for the arts in their countries: the economist John Maynard Keynes in the United Kingdom and the diplomat Vincent Massey in Canada. Dorothy Elmhirst is the third, and while she has not been included in the historiography of arts policy, this study will argue that she was involved in arts advocacy in the United Kingdom and represents the role of women in arts advocacy through her creative and philanthropic interests. The following profiles are not intended to be comprehensive, but to indicate these individuals' interests in the arts and in public service and the influences that motivated those interests. The focus is primarily on social influences: their family lineages and connections; their undergraduate educations; aesthetic and artistic influences, especially during their young adulthood; and, finally, their public roles and political involvement. This chapter provides necessary background to those that follow, which examine ideologies, working methods, and policy formation in the United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States.

The chapter begins with John Maynard Keynes, the first chairman of the Arts Council of Great Britain and the individual most often associated with the origins of the arts council as a policy model. The extensive literature about Keynes requires some selectivity, and this profile relies on

the three-volume biography by Robert Skidelsky, as well as essays by Maria Marcuzzo, Samuel Brittan, Donald Moggridge, and the well-known essay by Noel Annan about the ‘intellectual aristocracy’. Because I have examined the influence of the Bloomsbury Group on Keynes’s ideas about the arts in earlier published work (see Upchurch 2004), I will limit my discussion of the group here, citing Raymond Williams’s 1978 essay about the Bloomsbury Group, as well as references from Leonard Woolf’s autobiography and Clive Bell’s memoir. Why did one of the twentieth century’s best-known economists and intellectuals involve himself in arts policy? The following profile examines the formative social, intellectual, and artistic influences on his life that shaped his aesthetic and policy interests.

JOHN MAYNARD KEYNES: FAMILY, EDUCATION, AND THE APOSTLES

Born in Cambridge, [John Maynard Keynes](#) (1883–1946) grew up in the city in an academic household as one of three children of John Neville Keynes and Florence Ada Brown. He attended Kings College at the University of Cambridge, to study moral philosophy and economics. While at university, he joined a secret society called the Apostles and first encountered the future members of the Bloomsbury Group. His Cambridge friends and associations were among the decisive influences in his policy approaches and thinking about art and society. Born in the late Victorian period, Keynes and his friends in the Bloomsbury Group rejected middle-class Victorian public service models based on Christian charitable works and sought other roles for their public involvement, roles that conformed to their inherited values and ideology. He rejected direct participation in politics by not running for political office, choosing instead the role of policy advisor. From the end of the first world war until the publication of his *The General Theory* in 1936, he established a reputation as one of the most influential economists of the twentieth-century. His economic policies, briefly described in Chap. 5, have influenced governments in the west since the 1940s. Books published in 2009 in the wake of the global financial crisis by biographer Robert Skidelsky and historian Peter Clarke argue for Keynes’s central influence in economic thought.¹

Social historian Noel Annan (1955) located Keynes among the later generations of the ‘intellectual aristocracy’ that Annan claims to have emerged in nineteenth-century England from Nonconformist, Whig roots. Annan

argues that these families provided an influx of professional civil servants during the nineteenth century, replacing the sons of the landed aristocracy, as the government and the British Empire required greater technical expertise. Also scholars and headmasters, they usually emerged from Nonconformist, Quaker, and Unitarian families whose philanthropy drew them together and whose evangelism shaped their guiding principles, which were:

a sense of dedication, of living with purpose, or working under the eye, if not of the great Taskmaster, of their own conscience' and 'the sense of mission to improve the shining hour and the profession to which they had been called. [...] There was also the duty to hold themselves apart from a world given over to vanities which men of integrity rejected because they were content to labour in the vineyard where things of eternal significance grew—in the field of scholarship where results were solid not transient. (Annan 1955, p. 245)

Intellectual freedom was a goal they sought continuously, and they were the driving force behind the reforms in the British universities in the nineteenth century that focused student admission based on examinations and merit, rather than on social position and inherited wealth. Annan argues that in later generations, when the practice of church-going and voluntarism subsided, these principles guiding a life's work remained intact. And a larger mission was embraced: 'They were agreed on one characteristic doctrine; that the world could be improved by analyzing the needs of society and calculating the possible course of its development' (1955, p. 250).

Annan characterized the intellectual aristocracy as England's 'intelligentsia,' which was 'stable,' 'wedded to gradual reform of accepted institutions and able to move between the worlds of speculation and government' (1955, p. 244). They were political and social reformers, 'often followers of Mill' (1955, p. 250), who advocated many of the century's reforms in the 1860s and 1870s that extended the franchise and argued for women's education (1955, p. 247). They were financially comfortable, though not vastly wealthy, middle-class reformers, who often moved, due to their social connections and inherited expectations, into positions in the academy and the civil service in the nineteenth century. Given their familial interests in education, Annan finds that the younger generations inclined towards positions where they influenced academic and cultural

policy, and he names the BBC, the British Council, the Arts Council, and the National Trust as among the beneficiary institutions (1955, p. 285).²

Keynes appears to have taken this legacy very seriously. ‘He was strongly imbued with what I have called the presuppositions of Harvey Road,’ writes his first biographer Roy Harrod, in a reference to the Cambridge address where Keynes was raised and his parents lived out their lives: ‘One of these presuppositions may perhaps be summarized in the idea that the government of Britain was and would continue to be in the hands of an intellectual aristocracy using the method of persuasion’ (Harrod 1972, p. 226). Keynes had a life-long association with Cambridge; he was born into an academic household in the town and served as bursar of King’s College until his death, although he spent less time there in the final ten years of his life due to travel and poor health.³ His father, the first of his family to attend Cambridge, was a promising scholar who later retreated into administrative positions with the University. His mother was among the earlier classes of women to be admitted to Newnham College at Cambridge for what was then limited to a two-year education, without a final degree. As her husband retreated into private life, she took a more public role in civic and community life in the town. After attending a premiere public school, Eton College, Keynes went home to King’s College, Cambridge.

His undergraduate years at the University of Cambridge were a central formative influence on Keynes, as most scholars have acknowledged. Although he was a few years younger than they, Keynes was accepted as part of the intellectual and social circle at Cambridge that included Lytton Strachey and Leonard Woolf, the beginnings of the group of friends who would later be called the Bloomsbury Group.⁴ He and his Bloomsbury friends differed from their parents’ generation most distinctly in their embrace of the arts and in their rejection of Victorian social behavior, seeing themselves as part of a revolution in social and aesthetic values grounded, in his case, in the thought of G.E. Moore, a Cambridge philosopher. He came to know Moore through his membership in the Apostles, an elite, secretive discussion society that largely drew its members from Trinity and King’s Colleges. Moore was an Apostle in his late 20s and early 30s when Keynes was an undergraduate. The ‘Society’ met weekly, on Saturday evenings, in the secretary’s room, to hear a paper read by a member on some question of truth, beauty, or philosophy. Discussion followed, ending with a vote on a question stimulated by the paper’s topic. Although

the discussion was serious, wit and humor were considered strengths in presentation. Membership was for life and provided a group of intellectual and social friendships that continued beyond an Apostle's undergraduate years. Keynes was elected to the Society in 1903, the year that Moore published *Principia Ethica*. While the following section focuses only on Moore's influence, David R. Andrews (2010) has published an extended discussion of the influence of the Apostles and their philosophical interests on Keynes's life and work.

Indeed, Moore's philosophy, as described in his *Principia Ethica*, provided Keynes and other young Bloomsburys with what would become guiding principles for their lives. In the book, Moore argues that the most valuable things in life are 'certain states of consciousness, which may be roughly described as the pleasures of human intercourse and the enjoyment of beautiful objects' (Moore 1929, p. 188). Further, he argues that the consciousness of love and of beauty in art and nature are intrinsically good, and that this 'truth' is:

the ultimate and fundamental truth of Moral Philosophy. That it is only for the sake of these things—in order that as much of them as possible may at some time exist—that any one can be justified in performing any public or private duty; that they are the *raison d'être* of virtue; that it is they—these complex wholes *themselves*, and not any constituent or characteristic of them—that form the rational ultimate end of human action and the sole criterion of social progress; these appear to be truths which have been generally overlooked. (1929, p. 109)

It is worth restating here that Moore idealizes love, beauty, art, and nature as ends that are intrinsically good, that the creation or conservation of them justifies any private or public duty, and that their enhancement constitutes the 'sole criterion of social progress.'

Keynes and two of the Bloomsburys, Clive Bell and Leonard Woolf, wrote about the foundational impact of Moore's book on their lives as an influence that extended well beyond their receptive undergraduate years. Although not an Apostle, Bell acknowledged this impact:

Four of us certainly were freed by Moore from the spell of an ugly doctrine in which we had been reared: he delivered us from Utilitarianism. What is more, you can discover easily enough traces of Moorist ethics in the writings of Strachey and Keynes and, I suppose, in mine. (Bell 1956, p. 133)

Woolf cited Moore's great simplicity, his Socratic approach, and his insistence on always reaching the fundamentals lying at the heart of any question or situation: 'The main things which Moore instilled deep into our minds and characters were his peculiar passion for truth, for clarity and common sense, and a passionate belief in certain values' (Woolf 1964, p. 24).

In 1938 in a memoir titled 'My Early Beliefs' written for and read to the Memoir Club,⁵ Keynes described the influence of Moore's thought on his personal philosophy and that of the group:

Nothing mattered except states of mind, our own and other people's of course, but chiefly our own. These states of mind were not associated with action or achievement or with consequences. They consisted in timeless, passionate states of contemplation and communion, largely unattached to 'before' and 'after'. (1949, p. 83)

Love and art were central:

The appropriate subjects of passionate contemplation and communion were a beloved person, beauty and truth, and one's prime objects in life were love, the creation and enjoyment of aesthetic experience and the pursuit of knowledge. Of these love came a long way first. (1949, p. 83)

Worldly success in the form of wealth, power, and popularity, was discarded and despised, but the mature Keynes admits the idealism of their youthful position:

It seems to me looking back, that this religion of ours was a very good one to grow up under. It remains nearer the truth than any other that I know [...] It is still my religion under the surface. I read again last week Moore's famous chapter on 'The Ideal'. It is remarkable how wholly oblivious he managed to be of the qualities of the life of action and also of the pattern of life as a whole. (1949, p. 92)

'My Early Beliefs' is a rich and interesting assessment by Keynes of his own thought, and these points are useful to my discussion here: his idealization of beauty and art; his defense of his life of action; and his mature thinking about human nature and social order (he died eight years later, in 1946).

That Moore's influence made Keynes an idealist in his approach to the arts and artists has been commented upon by critics and scholars, and

needs only brief acknowledgement here. Arts policy literature is filled with analysis and references to Keynes's quotations, such as:

The artist walks where the breath of the spirit blows him. He cannot be told his direction; he does not know it himself. But he leads the rest of us into fresh pastures and teaches us to love and to enjoy what we often begin by rejecting, enlarging our sensibility and purifying our instincts. [...] Artists depend on the world they live in and the spirit of the age. There is no reason to suppose that less native genius is born into the world in the ages empty of achievement than in those brief periods when nearly all we most value has been brought to birth. (JMK 1982, vol. XXVIII, p. 368)

And again writing of the artist and his relationship to society:

He needs economic security and enough income, and then to be left to himself, at the same time the servant of the public and his own master. He is not easy to help. For he needs a responsive spirit of the age, which we cannot deliberately invoke. We can help him best, perhaps, by promoting an atmosphere of openhandedness, of liberality, of candour, of toleration, of experiment, of optimism, which expects to find some things good. (JMK 1982, vol. XXVIII, pp. 344–345)

In the same essay, 'Art and the State', written and published in 1936:

Our experience has demonstrated plainly that these things cannot be successfully carried on if they depend on the motive of profit and financial success. The exploitation and incidental destruction of the divine gift of the public entertainer by prostituting it to the purposes of financial gain is one of the worse [*sic*] crimes of present-day capitalism. How the state could best play its proper part is hard to say. We must learn by trial and error. But anything would be better than the present system. The position today of artists of all sorts is disastrous. (JMK 1982, vol. XXVIII, p. 344)

Thus, Keynes appears to have considered artists as humans with 'divine' gifts who need protection from market forces so that they might lead a receptive society towards greater understanding and tolerance.

Keynes knew artists through his friendships at Cambridge, within Bloomsbury, and in his marriage.⁶ Keynes's youthful affair with painter Duncan Grant created an intimacy and friendship that lasted until Keynes's death; Grant and painter Vanessa Bell were his closest friends until his marriage to Lydia Lopokova in 1925, which shook, but did not destroy, his

Bloomsbury friendships. His country estate, Tilton, is within hallowing distance of Charleston, where Grant and the Bells lived until their deaths. A Russian ballerina, Lopokova gave his interests in theater and ballet focus and motivation after their marriage. Thus, Keynes was surrounded by, and clearly chose to form, some of his most intimate relationships with creative personalities. These emotional relationships and friendships predisposed Keynes to sympathy with artists, their motivations to create, their desire for creative freedom, and the struggle of many to support themselves financially.

KEYNES AS A PHILANTHROPIST IN THE ARTS

Throughout his life, Keynes put his financial skills and personal funds at the service of his artistic friends and his wife, operating as philanthropist, patron, and investor. His most visible project, before he got involved in national arts policy in the 1940s, was the Cambridge Arts Theatre. Smaller experiments in the 1920s included the London Artists Association, which Keynes helped to establish as a cooperative for painters in 1925. Acting on behalf of its members, which included his friends Vanessa Bell, Duncan Grant, and Roger Fry, the cooperative assumed responsibility for sales of the artists' works as well as promotion through exhibitions and loans of paintings. Four guarantors, including Keynes and philanthropist Samuel Courtauld, paid a guaranteed annual income of £150 to any member whose sales failed to generate that amount. The cooperative operated until 1933, when slower sales due to the Great Depression and disagreement among its members caused its dissolution.

His marriage to Russian dancer Lydia Lopokova focused his interests on the ballet and theater.⁷ Indeed throughout their marriage, he and Lydia worked to encourage the development of English ballet through their friendship and patronage of Ninette de Valois, founder of Sadler's Wells (Mackrell 2008, p. 309). They came to know de Valois in 1929 when Lydia was invited to join the organizing committee of the Camargo Society, a short-lived ballet society named for the eighteenth-century dancer Marie Camargo. Lydia hosted Sunday luncheon meetings at the Keynes's Gordon Square home in Bloomsbury; through this association she grew close to de Valois (Mackrell 2008, p. 310). Although the society existed only three years, until 1933, producing only two seasons, this association with de Valois and the Keynes' support for her company would be influential in the establishment of an English national ballet company after the war, as discussed in Chap. 4.

In the 1930s, Keynes established himself more visibly as an arts patron by financing and building the Cambridge Arts Theatre, which is still in operation today in the university city. Believing that the city needed a professional theater, he began planning in 1934 for a 600-seat theater on St. Edward's Passage with King's College providing a 99-year lease on the land. Construction costs on what was intended to be a £15,000 project rose to £30,000 in 1935, with Keynes providing £20,000 of his own funds (Skidelsky 1992, pp. 528–529). A hands-on patron, he oversaw its architectural design and operations, insisting that the theater include a restaurant and later organizing its inaugural season himself. The theater opened on 3 February 1936, and like the Camargo Society, served as a venue and outlet for Lydia's performances on stage. The inaugural season included four Ibsen plays with Lydia appearing as Nora in *A Doll's House* and as Hilda Wangel in *The Master Builder* (Skidelsky 1992, p. 530). In 1938, Keynes transferred control of the theater to a board of trustees representing the university, however, his brief experience of building and operating a professional theater demonstrated his philanthropic, and later, policy interests in buildings and facilities and in the performing arts.

PUBLIC LIFE: POLICY ADVISOR AND ARTS ADVOCATE

In his personal and private life, Keynes promoted and encouraged the arts as practiced by his friends and his wife, demonstrating his arts philanthropy most visibly by building a new theater in Cambridge. In the 1930s he turned his attention increasingly to his role in public life. To understand his role as a policy advisor, we consider again the influence of G.E. Moore and a famously disputed passage of Keynes's memoir, 'My Early Beliefs'.

In 'My Early Beliefs', Keynes claimed that while the Bloomsburys embraced Moore's values, they discarded his rules of general conduct, as well as those of polite society: 'We repudiated entirely customary morals, conventions and traditional wisdom. We were, that is to say, in the strict sense of the term, immoralists' (Keynes 1949, pp. 97–98). Their insistence on a rational view of human nature 'impoverished' their thinking, and he concludes that no 'solid diagnosis of human nature' informed their conversation and debates. They were vulnerable, he believed, to charges that they were isolated and limited in their approach to life. Their youthful idealism assumed continual moral progress by rational human beings who could be released from conventions and inflexible rules of conduct and left

to their own definitions and intuitions of what was good (1949, p. 99). However, the devastation of the first world war and his own experience of two decades led Keynes to conclude:

We were not aware that civilisation was a thin and precarious crust erected by the personality and the will of a very few, and only maintained by rules and conventions skilfully put across and guilefully preserved. [...] It did not occur to us to respect the extraordinary accomplishment of our predecessors in the ordering of life (as it now seems to me to have been) or the elaborate framework which they had devised to protect this order. (1949, pp. 99–100)

After the slaughter and upheaval of a war in Europe, with the possibility of a second one ahead, the mature Keynes reflects on human nature and on the codes and conventions that he had disregarded and criticized as a young man.

In his memoir, *Sowing*, Woolf disputes at length Keynes's characterization of Moore's thought and this question of its influence upon the young men (Woolf 1960, see pages 144–150). This disagreement has been analyzed by philosophers⁸; what is important for this chapter is Woolf's insistence that the youthful Bloomsburys debated passionately their social obligations and role. Considering Moore, he writes:

He and we were fascinated by questions of what was right and wrong, what one *ought* to do. We followed him closely in this as in other parts of his doctrine and argued interminably about the consequences of one's actions, both in actual and imaginary situations. Indeed one of the problems which worried us was what part Moore (and we, his disciples) *ought* to play in ordinary life, what, for instance, our attitude *ought* to be towards practical politics. (Woolf 1960, pp. 148–149; italics in the original)

With Moore's assertion that private consciousness and states of mind represented the highest good, the Bloomsbury men—as youthful intellectuals—found a justification to reject an active role in politics and to focus on their private lives. Woolf argues for the role he assumed, that of the intellectual as policy advisor and social critic, which Keynes also assumed.

In 'My Early Beliefs', Keynes argues for a greater awareness gained by engagement with the world, acknowledging, 'In practice, of course, at least so far as I was concerned, the outside world was not forgotten or forsworn' (1949, p. 96). Thus, Keynes's undergraduate experience

at Cambridge shaped his life, causing him to balance his sense of social responsibility against his notions of personal happiness. As Skidelsky sees it, his life was ‘balanced between two sets of moral claims’ (1983, p. 157). His chief duty was to achieve good states of mind, both for himself and for those closest to him. His duty as a citizen was to help achieve a beneficial state of affairs for society. While Skidelsky argues that Keynes considered the two claims to be logically independent of one another, it is possible that in his work in arts policy, he considered that he was integrating the claims. Greater arts provision would enable him and his contemporaries to contemplate the beautiful, while at the same time providing opportunities for others to do so, too, as their circumstances allowed.

This ‘balance’ involved refusing to seek political office as part of his public duty. Politically, Keynes was a Liberal, coming from a tradition of Nonconformist and Liberal families on his father’s and mother’s sides. He might have run for political office had he wanted to, turning down three offers in 1920 from the Liberals to stand for Parliament and continuing to refuse offers during the interwar years (Skidelsky 1992, p. 21). For Keynes was an active and well-known Liberal during the 1920s and 1930s, who ‘considered that one of his main roles in the Liberal Party was to wean it away from the last vestiges of Gladstonian free market doctrine’ (Brittan 2006, p. 191). He is identified with ‘The Middle Way’ of the interwar years, a ‘Middle’ that was ‘in between *laissez-faire* capitalism and state socialism’ (Brittan 2006, p. 185).

His speeches to political audiences during these years demonstrate Keynes as intellectual and policy advisor and illustrate his hopes for future social progress. He demonstrates what Annan called the ‘one characteristic doctrine’ of the intellectual aristocracy: ‘that the world could be improved by analyzing the needs of society and calculating the possible course of its development’ (Annan 1955, p. 250). Keynes has the confidence of the intellectual in his willingness to diagnose and prescribe for society. In contrast to the idealism of his statements about the arts, his observations and recommendations to the Liberal Party sound forward-looking, pragmatic, and with particular attention to the economic and social conditions of women.

In a 1925 speech, titled ‘Am I a Liberal?’,⁹ he warns that party policies have not kept pace with contemporary social needs, arguing that the ‘historic party questions of the nineteenth century are as dead as last week’s mutton’ and the questions for the future cut across party lines (JMK 1972, vol. IX, p. 297). As for his own political philosophy and interests,

he finds the Conservative Party's programme to be intellectually weak, and its leadership weakened by the aristocracy's reliance on the hereditary principle. The Labour Party is weakened by what he sees as the class hatred of its left wing towards those with wealth and power. Keynes sees the potential for a third party, oriented towards the future, 'which shall be disinterested as between classes.' He then outlines what he sees as the contemporary social conditions that require government policy, suggesting more government activism, but he stops short of recommending specific reforms. His five categories of contemporary policy are '(1) peace questions; (2) questions of government; (3) sex questions; (4) drug questions; (5) economic questions' (JMK 1972, vol. IX, p. 301). His approach to the latter four domestic policy categories are relevant to his ideas about social progress, although he has little to say about the 'drug questions,' which he identifies as drink and gambling; this section was likely included in the speech because of their appearance in national debate.¹⁰ Keynes has little to say on this except that prohibition of both would likely do some good, but not solve much. However, on the government, economy, and gender questions, he offers the following analysis.

Keynes predicts a larger and more activist role for the national government of the future, anticipating the proliferation of semi-independent bodies of citizens and the challenges they pose to the authority of government:

I believe that in the future the government will have to take on many duties which it has avoided in the past. For these purposes Ministers and Parliament will be unserviceable. Our task must be to decentralise and devolve wherever we can, and in particular to establish semi-independent corporations and organs of administration to which duties of government, new and old, will be entrusted—without, however, impairing the democratic principle or the ultimate sovereignty of Parliament. These questions will be as important and difficult in the future as the franchise and the relations of the two Houses have been in the past. (JMK 1972, vol. IX, pp. 301–302)

Demonstrating his concern for conditions of the family and women, Keynes points to the centrality of the category he calls 'sex questions' in the lives of all people, predicting that issues including birth control and the use of contraceptives, marriage laws, treatment of sexual offences, and the economic position of women and children, will soon enter the political arena. He calls current laws and orthodoxy around these issues 'medieval' and

altogether out of touch with civilised opinion and civilised practice and with what individuals, educated and uneducated alike, say to one another in private. Let no one deceive himself with the idea that the change of opinion on these matters is one which only affects a small educated class on the crust of the human boiling. Let no one suppose that it is the working women who are going to be shocked by ideas of birth control or of divorce reform. For them these things suggest new liberty, emancipation from the most intolerable of tyrannies. (JMK 1972, vol. IX, p. 302)

He argues that the political party that discusses these issues openly would be newly relevant, and he goes on to point out the links between economic issues, like population growth, and the provision of birth control. And he suggests that attention to wages, especially wages for working women, may need government oversight to ensure that they are ‘fair’, rather than being left to supply and demand and orthodox *laissez-faire*.

Finally, he turns to the economic questions, ‘the largest of all political questions’ (JMK 1972, vol. IX, p. 303). Here too, Keynes is a reformer, calling for new approaches beyond the *laissez-faire* orthodoxies of the past which characterized Liberal Party thinking. He argues that economic policies require new thinking and new approaches to keep pace with the social changes in society, and he argues for flexibility: ‘A party programme must be developed in its details, day by day, under the pressure and the stimulus of actual events; it is useless to define it beforehand, except in the most general terms’ (JMK 1972, vol. IX p. 306). Thus, Keynes attempts to give intellectual leadership to the Liberal programme; his own efforts were and would be largely focused on the economic questions that he raised. Indeed, he was optimistic that the economic questions would be addressed successfully in the coming century, due to new economic policy and advancing technologies that controlled population through birth control and shortened working hours. In a 1930 article, ‘Economic Possibilities for our Grandchildren,’ he expressed this view: ‘his was a vision of capitalism delivering purely material goods in such abundance that the ordering of social arrangements with the primary purpose of fostering further accumulation would be unnecessary’ (Moggridge 2005, p. 540). Through ‘successfully managed capitalism,’ people everywhere would have sufficient food, shelter, clothing, and work, with enhanced leisure time enabled by labor-saving technology (Moggridge 2005, p. 541). Keynes did not foresee that advancing technology also would provide increasing opportunities for new consumption in the form of faster cars,

televisions, personal computers, portable phones, and a proliferation of digital devices.

As an intellectual concerned with public policy and issues of social justice, Keynes demonstrates what Raymond Williams named ‘social conscience,’ a feeling that the Bloomsbury Group shared with earlier generations: ‘a persistent sense of a quite clear line between an upper and a lower class—with very strong and effective feelings of sympathy with the lower class as victims.’ Williams continues:

The complex of political attitudes, and eventually of political and social reforms of a certain kind, that flowed from this ‘social conscience’ has been especially important in England. It has in one sense become consensual, from the right wing of the Labour party through the Liberal Party to a few liberal Conservatives. Bloomsbury, including Keynes, was in this as in other matters well ahead of its times. In its organs, from the *New Statesman* through to the *Political Quarterly*, it was, in its period, second in importance for this consensus only to the closely related Fabian Society. (1978, p. 50)

This sense of social conscience or ‘individual obligation’ distinguished Bloomsbury, as they insisted, from the complacent state of mind of the dominant sector of their class. ‘It has also to be distinguished—and this the group and its successors did not see—from the “social consciousness” of a self-organising subordinate class. These very different political bearings were not so much rejected as never taken seriously,’ Williams writes (1978, p. 51).

Williams argues that the central value held by the Bloomsburys was ‘the unobstructed free expression of the civilised individual. The force which that adjective “civilised” carries or is meant to carry can hardly be overestimated’ (1978, pp. 61–62). Rather than offering a definitive program for society, Williams argues that they ‘appealed to the supreme value of the civilised individual, whose pluralisation, as more and more civilised individuals, was itself the only acceptable social form’ (1978, p. 62). Williams calls this concept the ‘central definition of bourgeois ideology’ and ‘a philosophy of the sovereignty of the civilised individual’ which today cuts across most democratic thought. He finds Bloomsbury’s time in the development of this concept significant:

In its theory and practice, from Keynesian economics to its work for the League of Nations, it made powerful interventions towards the creation of

economic, political and social conditions within which, freed from war and depression and prejudice, individuals could be free to be and to become civilised. Thus in its personal instances and in its public interventions Bloomsbury was as serious, as dedicated and as inventive as this position has ever, in the twentieth century, been. (1978, p. 63)

Keynes and Bloomsbury sought, in their policy recommendations, to secure stable social conditions for the individual, ‘by finding ways of diminishing pressures and conflicts, and of avoiding disasters. The social conscience, in the end, is to protect the private consciousness’ (Williams 1978, p. 65).

‘Civilised’ individuals were those who sought self-development through education and the arts. In the context of an affluent future, Keynes began to address possible roles for the state in arts provision in his statements during the 1930s (Moggridge 2005, p. 541). And in his statements and positions, he was not as innovative as his friend Roger Fry, who proposed models of state support that attempted to integrate the artist into the country’s moribund residential design and household manufacturing sector (see Goodwin 1998; Upchurch 2004). In summary, Keynes saw roles for the state in civic architecture, both in preserving monuments and funding new construction, and in sponsoring and funding pageants and ceremonies (see Moggridge 2005, pp. 541–546 for a discussion of his statements); both roles gesture to a nationalistic theme that continues in Keynes’s interest in buildings and in national performing arts companies in the 1940s. Without offering a specific program, Keynes was concerned with preparing the general population for a life of prosperity, of providing possibilities for leisure time amusement, and thereby creating ‘a spirit of the age’ that would encourage and support professional artistic production. When he was appointed chairman of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts (CEMA) in 1942, he found himself in a position to make specific policy recommendations for state support of the arts.

As chairman of CEMA, he is credited with taking an organization established during the second world war to employ artists and organize morale-boosting tours of the performing and visual arts, and overseeing its development into the Arts Council of Great Britain. Explaining ‘The Concept of the Arts Council’, Mary Glasgow, first Secretary-General of the Arts Council, writes:

Keynes took office as Chairman of C.E.M.A. (Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts) on 1 April 1942. He died on Easter Sunday 1946. In

the course of those four years he fashioned the Arts Council-to-be and laid the foundations of permanent State patronage of the arts in Great Britain. He did not found C.E.M.A. and he did not live to see the Arts Council incorporated under Charter; but it was he who turned the one into the other. (1975, p. 271)

In a famous BBC broadcast announcing the establishment of the Arts Council of Great Britain Keynes claimed that he was instituting a new model for arts support:

I do not believe it is yet realised what an important thing has happened. Strange patronage of the arts has crept in. It has happened in a very English, informal, unostentatious way—half-baked if you like. A semi-independent body is provided with modest funds to stimulate, comfort and support any societies or bodies brought together on private or local initiative which are striving with serious purpose and a reasonable prospect of success to present for public enjoyment the arts of drama, music and painting. (JMK 1982, vol. XXVIII, p. 368)

Glasgow's essay provides clear evidence of the depth of his involvement and policy oversight of the emerging Arts Council. Far from being the titular head of an arts organization, Keynes kept in almost daily touch with his staff about both policy issues and the minutiae of specific projects. Chapters 4 and 5 will examine his specific activities and role in arts policy development during the war years in the United Kingdom.

This profile described Keynes's family and social connections and located him within a class-based aristocracy of the intellectual life. His undergraduate years at Cambridge, where he was influenced by the aesthetic and philosophical thought of G.E. Moore, were formative both intellectually and socially, because he became acquainted with a circle of young intellectuals, artists, and writers who would become known as the Bloomsbury Group and many of whom became his friends for life. Through Moore's thought, Keynes adopted an idealized notion of the arts in society and his philanthropic projects in the arts reflected this interest and idealism. He inherited a sense of social responsibility to involve himself in the development of public policy, and, as such, he was a reformer who examined contemporary social conditions and then pointed to broad policy directions that he thought would address changing circumstances. He put forward ideas and recommendations, attempted to stimulate serious inquiry and discussion, and, perhaps most importantly, confidently challenged

the status quo in economic questions. In these ways, he demonstrated the role of the intellectual in policy development.

Keynes joined the board of trustees of the National Gallery in October 1941, where he encountered Vincent Massey, a Canadian philanthropist and diplomat who was a fellow trustee. In the following decade, Massey would return to Canada and recommend that the country adopt Keynes's funding model for the arts. The next section will briefly profile Massey, relying on two sources: the two-volume biography by Claude Bissell and a 2004 study by Karen Finlay of Massey's thinking about culture. These are the principal scholarly sources that address Massey's biography and thought in depth; both authors base their studies upon primary sources. The following profile also draws from Massey's memoir and examines the social and political influences on his life.

VINCENT MASSEY: FAMILY, EDUCATION, AND AESTHETIC INFLUENCES

Like Keynes in Great Britain, [Vincent Massey](#) (1887–1967) is credited in Canada for his role in establishing the Canada Council and remembered for his appointment in 1952 as the first Canadian-born Governor General of the country.¹¹ In 1949, he was appointed by the Canadian Liberal government to chair the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences. In its final report of 1951 the so-called 'Massey Commission' recommended the establishment of the Canada Council for the Encouragement of the Arts, Letters, Humanities and Social Sciences. The Canada Council was approved and funded in 1957, after the Canadian government received a financial windfall of CA\$100 million from the estates of two Canadian millionaires, using CA\$50 million to establish an endowment for the Canada Council and CA\$50 million in capital funds for the universities (see Litt 1992 and Granatstein 1984).

In the history of arts policy, Vincent Massey was the social and intellectual link between Great Britain and Canada, as revealed by an examination of his family and social connections, his Anglophilia, his inherited wealth and interest in philanthropy, and his artistic interests. His interest and fascination with England can be seen in his education, his marriage, and his religious affiliation. After gaining an undergraduate degree at the University of Toronto, Massey read history at Balliol College, Oxford. Also in his wife and in-laws, Massey had strong English–Canadian connections.

In June 1915, he married Alice Parkin, daughter of Sir George Parkin, a Canadian and school administrator, who, at their marriage, was the secretary of the Rhodes Trust. Parkin was not wealthy, but had political influence, hosting defenders of ‘the higher politics of the Empire’ at his homes in Toronto and England (Bissell 1981, p. 106).¹² During his diplomatic service in London, Massey converted from his family’s long association with Canadian Methodism to the Anglican Church, largely for ‘aesthetic and social’ reasons (Bissell 1981, p. 116). When the Queen appointed him Governor General, it was formal recognition of his diplomatic skills and long acquaintance with the British Royal Family. He died in 1967, in London, not Toronto, while on a Christmas visit.

Massey inherited his wealth and an accompanying sense of social responsibility, which led to his organizing the first private, family foundation in Canada. The family’s wealth came from the Massey-Harris Company, which produced agricultural and harvesting equipment.¹³ After working briefly in the company, first as secretary-treasurer from 1919 until 1921, then as its president from 1921 to 1925, he spent the rest of his life in politics and diplomacy. His grandfather, Hart Massey, had inherited the company and, before his death, amassed a fortune and became one of Canada’s most prominent industrialists of the nineteenth century. Hart Massey left a portion of his estate to be used for public and philanthropic purposes, and at 23 years of age in 1910, Vincent Massey joined his father and his aunt as a trustee of the estate and began his interest in philanthropy. On his instigation, the trustees established a private foundation modeled on those in the United States. In his memoir, Massey wrote that his father disagreed with idea of converting the estate assets into a trust. However, Massey called in a ‘favourite cousin of mine and a man of great ability, George Vincent, who was the head of the Rockefeller Foundation, a trust vastly larger than anything we had in mind but embodying similar principles’ (Massey 1963, p. 53). As president of the Rockefeller Foundation from 1917 to 1929, George Vincent called on his cousin Vincent Massey during the 1920s for advice on expanding Rockefeller programs into Canada (Brison 2005, p. 57). Massey established what today is called a ‘family foundation,’ created with inherited wealth and overseen by Massey family members. The Massey Foundation was incorporated in 1918 and started operating in 1919; Massey would use it to fund his projects in education and the arts throughout his life (Bissell 1981, p. 51; Finlay 2004, p. 34).

Massey maintained a lifelong interest in education and in the life of the mind, but he was not a scholar; his roles in the academy were patron,

administrator, and institution-builder. Before attending Oxford, Massey was already an experienced traveler who had first visited England and Europe during his childhood. He was well educated and shaped by family expectations of public service, but, like Keynes, was also influenced in his thinking about society by his undergraduate experiences. His biographer, Claude Bissell, described the 23-year-old Massey as a serious young intellectual, who was critical, but not rebellious, with a secular earnestness that reflected something of his Methodist upbringing. He studied Ruskin, Carlyle, and Arnold in an undergraduate literary club, and his mentors were professional academics, not clergyman (Bissell 1981, p. 46). After attending Balliol, he returned to Toronto to be dean of residence at Victoria College, University of Toronto, and a lecturer in modern history from 1913 to 1915, before serving in the military for three years in Canada during the first world war. Before and after his military service, his interest in the extracurricular aspects of the arts in undergraduate experience converged in the completion of Hart House at the University of Toronto, his first major project as a trustee of the Massey estate. Named after the Massey family patriarch as a memorial, the building was started in 1911 to house the YMCA and the student union. Massey assumed responsibility for oversight of the design and construction of the Gothic Revival building, which, when completed in 1919, included the YMCA, a dining hall, and arts facilities such as a sketch room and a theater. Hart House had a collection of Canadian contemporary art and a resident string quartet; both later became projects of the Massey Foundation with Vincent Massey as a personally involved patron. From his undergraduate years, he was a devoted theater patron who traveled to London and New York to see a wide range of work, from musical comedy to Greek tragedy. He started the theater in the sub-basement of Hart House and stayed involved in its first six years, as patron and artist, directing and acting in its productions. Massey appeared on stage usually in character roles in the first five seasons. He insisted on producing two Canadian plays each season and was adamant in his desire that the theater would develop new playwrights. At the same time, he insisted that Hart House Theatre support itself financially. Massey shared this early interest in theater with his brother and only sibling, Raymond, nine years younger, who became a professional actor in London and later in New York. Interestingly, Hart House was not co-educational, but limited to use by the male undergraduates of the University; Massey was a firm believer in single sex education (Finlay 2004, p. 44).

POLICY ADVISOR, POLITICS, AND DIPLOMACY

To broaden his profile beyond the University of Toronto, Massey created a platform for his ideas in education policy by establishing a national commission on private, church-funded education. One of the first projects of the newly created Massey Foundation was the appointment of a commission on 'the Secondary Schools and Colleges of the Methodist Church of Canada' in 1919. Massey chaired this commission, which operated until 1921, and Bissell suggests that Massey created it to expand his public platform beyond the arts to the broader and more national post-war interest in education (Bissell 1981, p. 78). This work merged his and his family's past and present philanthropic interests in building Methodist educational institutions with his ideas about his potential public role. Possibly Massey was learning from his cousin George Vincent that foundations used commissions to influence education (Bissell 1981, p. 80), and the commission as a formal advisory body was an established part of Canadian public life. As Massey was attempting this policy leadership role in education, his involvement at the University of Toronto deepened when he was appointed to the board of governors in 1920. He would make another significant gift to the university in 1961 with the design, construction, and endowment of Massey College, a residential college for male postgraduate students and another project of his family foundation.

After his brief stints in the academy and in business, Massey was recruited into politics by the Liberal prime minister, Mackenzie King, in 1925. A dedicated and lifelong member of the Canadian Liberal Party, he was courted by King, who sought his support as a wealthy, young Toronto businessman who showed promise; over the years their relationship was tense and, at times, turbulent as King sensed a rival in Massey and chafed at his obvious self-interest. King appointed Massey to his cabinet in 1925 as minister without portfolio to bring him into the government; a month later, Massey ran for a seat in Parliament but was narrowly defeated by the Conservative incumbent. He never again ran for elective office, serving in diplomatic and appointed roles. Considered too patrician for the rough and tumble of elective politics, King moved him into the Canadian diplomatic corps when Massey failed to win enthusiastic support from fellow Liberals for other positions. He was appointed Canada's first 'special representative' to the United States from 1927 to 1930, maintaining an understanding with King that he ultimately sought to be High Commissioner to London.

The three years in the United States served as his apprenticeship in diplomacy, and Massey used his time to meet and become better acquainted with American intellectuals and progressive policy analysts, including the journalist Walter Lippmann. In Lippmann, Massey observed the consummate policy insider and publicist. Lippmann was also friendly with Keynes, publicizing the economist's theories about managed capitalism in the 1930s in the United States and anticipating their policy implications (see Goodwin 1995, pp. 337–343). In his memoir, Massey remarks on his acquaintance with Lippmann, first in Washington and later in London, where he claims to have seen the journalist often (Massey 1963, p. 154). When the Conservatives upset the Liberals in the 1930 election in Canada, Massey was recalled from Washington by the new Conservative prime minister.

Like Keynes, Massey worked to influence Liberal Party policy during the early 1930s with Keynesian and American New Deal ideas. With the Liberals turned out of office, Mackenzie King turned his attention to planning for a successful election and their return. He recruited Massey in 1932 to be president of the National Liberal Federation, a role that involved reorganization of the party apparatus, managing fundraising and publicity, and planning strategy and tactics in the next campaign. The clear implication from King was that Massey was expected to do this organizational work for his party, with his reward being the appointment as High Commissioner to London if the Liberal campaign was successful. Massey at first used his position to attempt to influence party positions and policy, beginning a campaign to move the Liberals to the left (Bissell 1981, p. 215). He publicized Keynesian economic ideas and adopted the approach that Keynes took in 1925 in Britain: that a new, middle position existed between the Conservatives and the emerging socialist Cooperative Commonwealth Federation in Canada. Massey organized and planned a Liberal Summer Conference in 1933, modeled after those held by the British political parties, which became a platform to publicize these ideas.¹⁴ Massey invited both Keynes and Lippmann to be guest speakers; neither could attend, but these invitations attest to his interest in their ideas. Massey emerged as a rival to King in press commentary after the conference, and Bissell quotes one article that appeared in many papers, that:

Mr Massey has become an outspoken partisan of ideas grown popular among the younger intellectual Liberals of England, the idea that in the interests of human welfare men should meet the challenge of our economic regime in

which they are the victims of their own creations, the idea that it is the duty of the heads of States to give leadership in escaping from the ignominy and assisting the organization of a coherent, and controllable economic system. (1981, p. 225)

However, when disciplined by King, Massey retreated from his emphasis on policy issues and turned his attention to fundraising and planning the next campaign. His efforts, including a nationwide radio broadcast by King joined by liberal-leaning premiers from the provinces (a new use of mass media), helped to orchestrate the Liberal victory in the 1935 elections. King was re-elected prime minister and offered Massey the post of High Commissioner to London. His work from 1930 to 1935 would be Massey's last direct involvement in Canadian politics: 'he was not fitted to be a strong political leader; he lacked humanitarian zeal; and, even in politics, he remained an aesthete delighting in the glitter of ideas, and pleased by his skill in presenting them' (Bissell 1981, p. 237). Indeed, he would use his political position as a diplomat to further his passions: the arts and education.

HIGH COMMISSIONER TO LONDON

His appointment as High Commissioner to London from 1935 to 1946 was one of the highlights of his long career. Indeed, four chapters, some 220 pages of his 530-page memoir, are devoted to the years in London. When he was appointed, Massey was accepted in British society as an accomplished Canadian diplomat and philanthropist who was comfortable among members of the English upper classes. He did not have ambassadorial status and was not involved in the implementation of foreign policy by his prime minister, for personal and political reasons.¹⁵ However as the senior representative of Canada in Great Britain, he commanded some visibility and used it to further his country's visibility. The historic role of the High Commissioner was to promote Canadian trade with the United Kingdom, which Massey did. However, his interests extended to the 'political, diplomatic, and, in the broad sense, social—entertaining and being entertained, enlarging and brightening the image of Canada, discreetly in private conversations, boldly by deliberate and concerted actions' (Bissell 1986, p. 52).

In fact, Massey practiced a nascent form of Canadian cultural diplomacy as High Commissioner, observing with some interest the operations of

The British Council and its strategy of the ‘soft’ promotion of the United Kingdom.¹⁶ His interests in the arts had long included collecting and museum administration, and as he had aged and entered public service, his time and activities in these areas had eclipsed his amateur theatrical work. As part of his political courtship, King had appointed Massey a trustee of the National Gallery of Canada in 1925, and he continued in that role for 27 years. He began to collect paintings as a young man, selling an inherited collection of European works after his father’s death to focus on collecting Canadian painters. Throughout their married life, his wife Alice shared his interests in collecting art and in the social connections that such activities encouraged. Massey was a member of the Arts and Letters Club of Toronto, a men’s club that included members of the Group of Seven, Canadian painters who were focusing on the remoteness of the Canadian landscape in a modern and abstract manner. He knew them and collected their works, and he and Alice became friends and patrons of painter David Milne (see Finlay 2004, pp. 134–144). By the mid-1930s, they had amassed the largest private collection of contemporary Canadian art in the country (Finlay 2004, p. 5).

As an unofficial cultural ambassador in London, Massey played a coordinating and mediating role as a backroom negotiator. Eager to promote Canadian art and his interests as a collector, he and Alice moved their art collection to their Hyde Park Gardens residence in London and invited connoisseurs, including Kenneth Clark, to see it (Finlay 2004, p. 170).¹⁷ As one example of his coordinating role, in his earliest years in London, he assisted the National Gallery of Canada in negotiations with the Tate Gallery about showing an exhibition of Canadian art. The resulting show, ‘A Century of Canadian Art,’ included some twenty paintings lent by the Masseys and works from the National Gallery of Canada collection in a historical overview of the development of Canadian art. Throughout the years in London, Massey continued to promote Canadian artists, the National Gallery of Canada, and the Art Gallery of Toronto, later extending his involvement in the arts to the national British museums (see Finlay 2004, pp. 167–199, for more details of his promotion of Canadian art and museums).

After the war began, Massey continued to promote Canadian art, but his activities extended to serving on the boards of trustees for the British national museums. As an art collector and philanthropist who had served as a trustee on national museum boards in Canada, he was eligible, and Canada House, situated on Trafalgar Square next to the National Gallery

in central London, placed him in a physical location to pursue his interests. During his service on the board of trustees of the National Gallery, he met Keynes and other arts advocates and philanthropists. He returned to Canada in 1946, and by 1949, was leading a commission that would recommend state support of the arts using the arts council model.

Massey was an eager and articulate spokesman for the ideas of intellectuals and policymakers whom he considered progressive, and these ideas included a Keynesian approach to government intervention in a managed capitalism. He used his diplomatic skills and position to represent Canadian art in the international atmosphere of London in an effort to strengthen intellectual and cultural links between the two countries. In these activities, he served in a publicizing, coordinating, and mediating role as a wealthy, educated, and politically-connected aesthete and philanthropist.

In arts policy history, Massey provided a transatlantic link between Canada and Great Britain by promoting and transferring the concept of a national ‘arts council’ to Canada. However, Massey was far from the only philanthropist who was promoting ideas about the arts and culture through transatlantic connections. Dorothy Whitney Straight Elmhirst, an American heiress and philanthropist, was active in social reform movements in New York in the United States, before immigrating to England with her second husband in the 1920s. There they used her fortune to purchase and restore a fourteenth-century manor with surrounding farmland known as Dartington Hall in South Devon, England, where they operated an arts program open to residents and community members. In the 1940s, the Elmhirsts funded a large-scale cultural policy research project in England called ‘The Arts Enquiry.’ However, unlike Keynes and Massey, long acknowledged as the ‘fathers’ of arts policy in their countries, Dorothy Elmhirst first appeared in the historiography of arts policy in an article about the Arts Enquiry (see Upchurch 2013). Since then, my research in the United States has pointed to the central role of women in transferring the arts council idea between Canada and the United States through their voluntary service organization, called the Junior League, which is examined in Chap. 7. Thus, Dorothy Elmhirst is included here to document the role of women in arts policy history by examining her philanthropic and voluntary work in the United States and, in Chap. 4, her later financial and intellectual support to arts policy development in the United Kingdom. The profile that follows relies on secondary sources that include Michael Young’s book about the Elmhirsts’ development of

Dartington Hall; Erich Rauchway's article about Elmhirst and her first husband, and their founding of *The New Republic*; and Rachel E. Harrison's (2002) unpublished thesis, which examines Mrs. Elmhirst's patronage of the visual arts, particularly British modernism in the 1920–1930s.¹⁸

DOROTHY PAYNE WHITNEY: FAMILY, VOLUNTEER WORK, AND POLITICAL INTERESTS

Dorothy Elmhirst (1887–1968) was born Dorothy Payne Whitney, a contemporary of both Keynes and Massey, in Washington, DC, the daughter of Flora Payne and William Collins Whitney, Secretary of the Navy in the Democratic administration of President Grover Cleveland. Her father's political prominence and the family's wealth meant her birth was something of a public event and her baptism was attended by members of the Cabinet and the US Supreme Court. Her father was a graduate of Yale whose political career began in New York where he was a popular reformer of the Tammany Hall machine. He was quietly instrumental in helping to secure the Democratic nomination for Cleveland, another political reformer, and appointed to the Cabinet. Although he was considered a future Democratic presidential contender, after Cleveland's defeat in 1888, Whitney returned to private life and business, using his connections to make millions in transportation, utility companies, tobacco, and banking. Although his wife, Flora, inherited wealth from her family, their fortune had grown when her brother became the first treasurer of the Standard Oil Company. Dorothy was the fifth and final child of this glittering political couple who reportedly entertained 60,000 guests in their Washington mansion during the four years that Whitney was in the Cabinet (Young 1982, p. 35).

Like others of his generation and wealth, Whitney maintained expensive interests, including houses, horses and riding, and collecting art from Europe, which his daughter remembered: 'all through the house were hung great pictures, Raphaels, Rubens, Van Dykes, early Florentine statues, carpets from Persia. He surrounded himself with these things because he loved them passionately ...' (D. Elmhirst in Young 1982, p. 36). Indeed, Whitney was widely envied as a man who had everything, according to Henry Adams, who wrote in *The Education of Henry Adams*, that, having enjoyed and abandoned politics, he 'had turned to other amusements, satiated every taste, gorged every appetite, won every object

that New York afforded, and not yet satisfied, carried his field of activity abroad, until New York knew no longer what most to envy, his houses or his horses' (Adams in Young 1982, p. 37). However, several tragic deaths occurred in the family's life that would impact Dorothy; her mother died in 1894 when she was six years old. Her father remarried two years later, only to have his second wife die in 1899 as a result of injuries sustained in a horse riding accident. Whitney himself died in 1904, leaving Dorothy at 17, an extremely young and wealthy heiress. She went to live with her older brother Harry and his wife, Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney, a sculptor and artist who later founded the Whitney Museum of American Art in New York (see McCarthy 1991, for a study of Gertrude and the museum's origins).

Losing her parents at a young age gave Dorothy more freedom, and in the following years, she joined in the parties, travel, and charitable works that were part of the life of a wealthy society debutante in New York. In her case, she was increasingly interested in Progressive social reform, woman's suffrage, and workers' rights, as well as theories of social reform and enrolled in courses in sociology, psychology, and economics at Barnard College (Rauchway 1999, p. 65). She joined the Junior League of New York, a new voluntary organization for women formed in 1901 by wealthy young debutantes, whose members worked in poverty relief initiatives and volunteered in settlement houses in the city. She was its treasurer in 1906 and president in 1907, when she introduced a formal training scheme for new members, a course in 'social problems' taught by a Barnard College professor (Jackson 2001, p. 25). She was among the members who pushed the League to investigate the social and living conditions of the poor and to develop programs and lobby the city for support. Indeed, she seems to have been motivated by a notion of social responsibility conferred by her inherited wealth—a sense of social responsibility widely shared among members of her class that was articulated during the late nineteenth century by philanthropists like Andrew Carnegie and will be explored in the next chapter. Great wealth conferred with it the responsibility to address social problems, and she 'was drawn into campaigns to end corruption in city government, to aid immigrants, to ease poverty' (Young 1982, p. 47). She reflected the spirit of the times, a reformer during a period of reform in the United States, and her political interests and support extended to radical causes like the Women's Trade Union League (Young 1982, p. 45).

MARRIAGE AND *THE NEW REPUBLIC*

As with Vincent Massey, Dorothy Elmhirst's wealth coupled with her activism enabled her to establish institutions that extended her involvement in reform movements. Her founding of the political weekly *The New Republic* with her first husband was one such project (Rauchway 1999). In 1911, she married Willard Dickerman Straight, a US diplomat posted to China who would join the J.P. Morgan bank in New York after their marriage. Together they read Herbert Croly's book *The Promise of American Life* (1909), which was a manifesto of Progressive Era reform and argued that American life must include political, social, and material equality for all, backed by a strong central government. By 1913, the Straights had met and started socializing with Croly, and, in 1914, they provided financial backing for Croly's new weekly journal of news and commentary, *The New Republic*. The three conceived of the periodical as an outlet for Progressive ideas and a means to educate the professional classes about their social responsibility and other readers, about the opportunities and obligations of democracy. Willard Straight was publisher, resigning from his position at J.P. Morgan within the first year of publication to focus his time on the new periodical. Yet Dorothy considered *The New Republic* their shared responsibility, and the Straights 'read over the issues together, compiled critiques, and when they were not together, she wrote him her impressions' (Rauchway 1999, p. 75). During the first world war, when Willard was away in Europe, his wife took over his role, attending meetings and conferring with Croly, and by 1918, she wrote to Willard, 'The paper is really extraordinary—and I believe it is going to do more for the education of this country than any other one force I know of ... I do believe that *The New Republic* is the best thing that you and I ever put over' (Elmhirst in Rauchway 1999, p. 75). However, while the Straights influenced *The New Republic*, they gave it editorial independence leaving editorial decisions to Croly and his staff. Tragically, the Straights' marriage was very short, ending in 1919 with Willard's death at age 38 from complications from pneumonia after he suffered from influenza. He died in Paris, where he was stationed as an officer with the American Expeditionary Force. After his death, Dorothy Straight continued to publish *The New Republic* and attend editorial board meetings, underwriting the publication costs, which she did until 1953 when the family sold the journal.

In his analysis of Dorothy's role in the journal, historian Eric Rauchway argues that she made *The New Republic* 'an institution that would give her

entrance to the men's world of politics and economics. She did not use this access chiefly to pursue the agenda of reform that typified her Junior League activities ... Instead, she used her new platform to broaden her audience' (1999, p. 77). Her 'politics of benevolence,' Rauchway argues, 'rested on assumptions about human nature that characterized Progressive politics generally': a firm belief in democracy that also insisted that people needed education to function as effective citizens. *The New Republic* was a vehicle for political education. Indeed, Rauchway argues that in her youth, Dorothy exercised a 'respectable variety of radicalism, taking up causes that were identifiably women's before she intentionally married ambitious men whose ambitions matched her own' (1999, p. 77). Then, through her marriages, she found ways to exercise influence in the traditionally male world of politics, finding that 'marriage to the right man let her make her opinions heard without transgressing the bounds of propriety' (Rauchway 1999, p. 77). The institutions she established 'permitted her political access without publicly defying gender norms' (Rauchway 1999, p. 77). Because of this discretion, Rauchway argues that historians must be sensitive to their 'workings of indirect influence' in order to understand the impact of Dorothy and women in her social and political position. This indirect method of influence would characterize Dorothy's involvement in the development of arts policy in the United Kingdom, as discussed below and in Chap. 4.

At age 31, Dorothy Straight found herself a widow with three small children, publishing a weekly journal and running a number of other projects. Her home at 1130 Fifth Avenue in New York 'was a kind of conference centre for her causes. There would be three different meetings in progress simultaneously on three different floors' all coordinated by her secretary (Young 1982, p. 72). The editorial board of *The New Republic* met there on Fridays, with Dorothy in attendance. Other projects included being a founder in 1919 of the New School for Social Research in New York, which the Straights had begun to support before Willard's death; the Women's Trade Union League (Dorothy was named a life member); and the Association of Junior Leagues of America. With thirty chapters established in cities around the country by 1921, the League held its first convention in New York and Dorothy was elected the first president of the newly formed national organization. Projects at Cornell University in Ithaca, New York, Willard's alma mater, also emerged, because Willard had left funds in his will for making the school 'a more human place' (Young 1982, p. 62). After consultation with staff and professors there,

Dorothy funded and built the Willard Straight Hall Student Union, which was one of the first student unions in the United States and—in a connection to Vincent Massey’s early philanthropic work at the University of Toronto—was inspired by Hart House in its college-style Gothic architecture, purpose, and programming. Hart House was completed in 1919, and its attention to students’ extracurricular, rather than academic interests, was reflected in the memorial student union that Dorothy funded at Cornell. Located at the center of the Cornell campus, ‘the Straight’ as it became known, included an art gallery and theater and was completed in 1925. Like Hart House, it was not coeducational initially; women could enter through a separate entrance and mingle with men in the art gallery. By 1935, the restaurants and cafés in the building began to open to women guests and students.

Dorothy met her second husband, Leonard Elmhirst, in 1920 through their shared connection to Cornell, where Leonard was a graduate student. An Englishman, Leonard was the unconventional son of a Yorkshire vicar, who attended the University of Cambridge as an undergraduate and afterwards continued his work with the YMCA there by volunteering to work in India. After this first experience in India, he resolved to study agricultural economics in the United States at Cornell, and he met Dorothy when he approached her to ask for funds to support the Cosmopolitan Club, a residential home for international students studying at the university that was deeply in debt and risked being closed and sold (Young 1982, p. 62). Dorothy agreed to help the club financially, and, over the next few years, she and Leonard met on her visits to Cornell and his visits to her various homes in New York. By 1925, she had agreed to marry him after repeated proposals, and they embarked on their lifelong joint project—the purchase, restoration, and running of a ruined fourteenth-century manor and surrounding farms known as Dartington Hall in South Devon, England—using her wealth to finance it.

THE ARTS AT DARTINGTON HALL

In their development of Dartington Hall, the Elmhirsts succeeded in synthesizing art and science, experimental education and rural development, and ideas from the United States, India, and England in South Devon. For if the money to restore Dartington came from the United States, the inspiration came from India, from Leonard’s experiences working for Rabindranath Tagore, the poet and Nobel laureate, at Tagore’s farm and

schools in India. Not long after he met Dorothy, Leonard was introduced to Tagore, who hired him to lead rural reconstruction activities on his properties in India. Leonard later became Tagore's personal assistant and he travelled internationally with him before marrying Dorothy in 1925. By then, he had observed the implementation of Tagore's ideas about rural development and education and had resolved to bring those ideas to rural England. After he and Dorothy married, they restored Dartington Hall in the late 1920s, establishing the Dartington Hall Trust in 1931.

So while its intention was explicitly local, and its project the 'rural reconstruction' of the Devon countryside, Dartington Hall at this point in its history was a focus for international ideas and influences led by Dorothy and Leonard. It synthesized his passions for farming and rural industry underpinned by scientific and economic research, and her passions for the arts and progressive education. Local employment would be stimulated by modernizing and operating the estate's farms and developing small industries such as sawmilling, building, textiles, and crafts. The Elmhirsts opened an experimental, coeducational boarding school on the estate for their children and other students whose parents' sought alternatives to single-sex, class-bound, English boarding schools. Believing the arts to be essential to individual and community well-being, they operated an arts programme open to participation by students, estate workers, and community members. They considered the entire Dartington project to be experimental, with results that might be shared nationally and internationally (Cox 2005, p. 6).

In his history of Dartington, Young—who as a child was a student at the Elmhirsts' boarding school and was later considered part of their family—writes that the Elmhirsts considered the arts to be integral to the estate and its community of family and workers (1982, p. 215). Like her father, Dorothy Elmhirst collected art, but on a smaller scale than he did, also believing that patronage and encouragement of the arts was one of the responsibilities of wealth (see Harrison 2002, which examines her patronage of the visual arts, particularly British modernism in the 1920–1930s). Yet her interest in the arts in the Dartington period of her life became more complex than exercising responsible patronage. Young writes that after Willard Straight's death, grief and so many tragedies in her life caused her to withdraw emotionally and increased her shyness. He documents that, in her letters to Leonard, she found an almost therapeutic release of feelings during her experiences with theater, when she studied acting with Michael Chekhov, who was in residence and teaching at Dartington

(Young 1982, pp. 197–198). Especially in dance, music, and drama, she found emotional release, writing in a statement for the trustees published in 1950: ‘In drama, too, we are able to go out of ourselves: to extend the limits of our own small personalities: to put ourselves imaginatively into another human being, another human situation; to touch the springs of feeling that lie beneath the surface’ (Elmhirst in Young 1982, p. 205).

The Elmhirsts believed that creativity and the expressive quality of the arts encouraged the imaginative freedom and emotional health of individuals and communities. Accompanying this belief was Dorothy’s pursuit of a spiritual life that was stimulated by reading poetry. Although Leonard was the son of a vicar, and Dorothy had attended church regularly as a child and young woman in the United States, by the time they married and started the Dartington project, both Elmhirsts were disillusioned by the practices, creeds, and beliefs of the organized church. Neither they nor their children attended religious services in their parish; similarly, they did not require boarding school students to attend, and nor was there organized religious activity on the estate. Dorothy pursued a spiritual life in practices that included reading books and poetry, spending time in nature, seeing and practicing the arts, and, at times, practicing meditation. The arts at Dartington were not intended to be leisure time activities, but to be central to the spiritual life of the community, thereby replacing the church. The arts were, according to Young (1982, p. 216), ‘the means by which the Elmhirsts themselves, everyone at Dartington, everyone everywhere, could transcend the boundaries of self and enter into a communion with what lies behind the surface of life. Hence their significance. They were not just veneer plastered on top of industry and agriculture. They were themselves the very substance of real life.’

From the 1930s to the present, Dartington Hall has initiated and funded an amazing array of amateur and professional programs in drama, dance, music, arts education, film, the visual arts, and crafts, especially glass and pottery. Both Dartington Crystal and Dartington Pottery are contemporary commercial businesses that were originally funded by the Dartington Hall Trust. Leonard initiated the enterprises in crafts and pottery, inviting Bernard Leach to move to the estate in 1932, where he produced until 1940. This history of the arts at Dartington is too extensive to be summarized here; studies by Peter Cox, Lorraine Nicholas, and Rachel Esther Harrison have documented aspects of the history.¹⁹ Therefore, this discussion will be limited to Dorothy Elmhirst’s interests and activities in the 1930s and 1940s.

The Elmhirsts considered the arts central to their project and began by encouraging local amateur productions as part of the estate's activities (see Young 1996, Chap. 9, for a more detailed account of the following discussion). In most cases, Dorothy oversaw the arts projects, often responding to suggestions from friends and family members. Through these connections, they became financial backers for a play titled *Journey's End*, which became a West End, and, later, international success. With their profits from the play, the Elmhirsts invested in London theaters, and because of their West End contacts, Dartington Hall hosted rehearsals for *Othello* with Paul Robeson in the lead. The African-American actor was the first theatrical professional to be in residence at the estate, and his presence started the estate's practice of inviting artists to be in residence for master classes, performances, and teaching. In subsequent years, the arts program was characterized by Dorothy's sponsorship of modernist, avant-garde artists. Dartington in the 1930s was a refuge and residence for artists escaping fascist movements throughout Europe. The estate sponsored classes in actor training by Michael Chekhov and by Kurt Jooss in dance, and hosted Hans Oppenheim, the composer, who taught music, and Willi Soukop, the sculptor. In 1934, the Elmhirsts hired Christopher Martin to provide program management and budget oversight to this burgeoning arts program. However, with the outbreak of the second world war in 1939, many of the artists were interned or evacuated, and Martin turned to other projects to find a future direction for the arts program.

As a result of Martin's initiative, Dorothy and Leonard Elmhirst agreed to fund a cultural policy research program called The Arts Enquiry that continued throughout most of the 1940s. Initially responding to the losses in the artistic program, Martin got involved in Devon arts and education planning and research, becoming an investigator for the Nuffield College Social Reconstruction Survey directed by G.D.H. Cole, the economist and Labour Party intellectual. Cole suggested that Martin undertake a study of arts organizations in England and Wales, which he then proposed to the Elmhirsts. Adding research to the arts program was in keeping with the Dartington project and the Elmhirsts' interests, and they agreed to sponsor The Arts Enquiry, as it was named. In his reports to the Elmhirsts, Martin saw the Enquiry as an opportunity for Dartington to develop contacts with national arts organizations and to gather information that could be used to shape a post-war policy for the nation, as well as a direction for the arts program (Harrison 2002, pp. 203–206, also p. 221). Thus, Dorothy Elmhirst, as a philanthropist, funded a cultural policy research program for England. This research program and its position in post-war

politics is discussed further in Chap. 4 and in previous published research (see Upchurch 2013).

Dorothy Elmhirst, like Vincent Massey, died in England. She died at home at Dartington Hall in December 1981. By that time, her son, Michael Straight, had served as Deputy Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts in the United States from 1969 to 1977, yet a further connection in transatlantic arts policy circles. In a further twist that links the arts to the Cold War, Michael Straight was later identified as one of the Cambridge Five, a KGB spy ring that he joined through the Apostles, which also included Anthony Blunt (see Perry 2005, for the story of Straight's life and Communist connections).

CONCLUSIONS

These profiles reveal similarities and contrasts between Keynes, Massey, and Elmhirst. Keynes and Massey were well-educated men, attending male boarding schools as well as Cambridge or Oxford. Both assumed the existence of a political hierarchy dominated by educated elites like themselves, part of a legacy of social responsibility they inherited. However, each defined his own responsibility to suit his personality and interests, with Keynes rejecting an actively political life, and Massey embracing an active political life through appointed positions. Both men held Liberal Party credentials and shared aspects of the political philosophy. They were acquainted personally, even intimately, with artists; Keynes was married to a dancer, while Massey's brother was a professional actor.

While both were interested in ideas and attempted to influence policy, Keynes as a professional and public intellectual offered criticism and thinking intended to stimulate new approaches, while Massey was more often a publicizer of others' ideas, including those of Keynes. Keynes was an active policy advisor, usually challenging conventional thinking, while Massey retreated under political pressure when his personal interests were threatened. Massey gravitated towards mediating, coordinating, and publicizing roles that emphasized negotiation, compromise, and presentation. Both put forward ideas that challenged the *laissez-faire* status quo, with Keynes more strongly a social reformer. Both sought to create and strengthen educational and cultural institutions with one obvious difference: the wealth that they commanded. Massey inherited industrial wealth and had the assets of a foundation at his disposal, and, thus, the ability to stimulate change through wealth. Keynes lacked this inherited financial asset, but used his knowledge and talents to create wealth for himself, and for artists and institutions he personally supported.

Like Massey, Elmhirst was a philanthropist who had inherited her wealth and gained a sense of social responsibility that motivated her involvement in social reform issues. Both lived a substantial portion of their adult lives in the United Kingdom, and Chap. 4 will detail their involvement in arts policy formation in their adopted home. As philanthropists, both had the financial means to create new institutions; Elmhirst started a political periodical magazine in the United States, and, later, she bought a country estate that she and her husband built into an experimental model of rural development in England. Constrained by conventional expectations of her gender and social role, she was able to be an active volunteer in benevolent causes and show leadership in woman-centered organizations. By marrying men who were ambitious and shared her interests, she was able to use her money to extend her influence in politics and policymaking by working collaboratively with them.

The next chapter examines the ideologies of intellectualism and philanthropy that shaped the identities of these three and others of their age and social class and influenced their motivations to get involved in arts policy.

NOTES

1. See Peter Clarke (2009) *Keynes: The Twentieth Century's Most Influential Economist* and Robert Skidelsky (2009) *Keynes: The Return of the Master*.
2. Robert Hewison also discusses the intellectual aristocracy, its heirs, and what he sees as its role in creating consensus in post-war Britain (see Hewison 1995, pp. 75–81). For Stefan Collini's critique and analysis of Annan's essay, see *Absent Minds: Intellectuals in Britain*, (2006), pp. 140–145.
3. For more information about Keynes's connections to Cambridge, see Maria Cristina Marcuzzo, 'Keynes and Cambridge,' in *The Cambridge Companion to Keynes*, Cambridge University Press, 2006, pp. 118–135.
4. The Stracheys and the Stephens (Virginia Woolf's family) are among the families that Annan identifies in his intellectual aristocracy genealogy.
5. The Memoir Club was an informal gathering of Bloomsbury members who read short memoirs to each other.
6. Biographer D. E. Moggridge provides a rare and useful overview of his activities in the arts in a 2005 essay 'Keynes, the Arts, and the State' (see pp. 535–538), so I have limited my remarks here.
7. See Judith Mackrell (2008) *Bloomsbury Ballerina* for Lopokova's biography.
8. For a thorough analysis and discussion of the development of Moore's ideas and his impact on Bloomsbury, see *Bloomsbury's Prophet: G. E. Moore*

- and the Development of his Moral Philosophy*, Temple University Press, 1986, by Tom Regan.
9. This speech was made to the August 1925 Liberal Summer School meeting at Cambridge and was published in the *Nation and Athenaeum* in two installments on August 8 and 15, 1925 (JMK 1972, vol. IX, p. 295).
 10. Prohibition was in force in the United States from 1920 to 1933.
 11. The Governor General is the formal head of state in Canada and the Queen's representative, nominated by the Prime Minister, and appointed by the Crown. It is a very visible, ceremonial position, and all previous Governors General had been British.
 12. One of Alice's three sisters, Maude, married William Grant, making Vincent Massey the uncle of George Grant, the Canadian intellectual.
 13. The company exists today as Massey-Ferguson and is an international producer of tractors.
 14. As King sensed that Massey's policy ideas did not reflect his own more traditional laissez-faire approach, Massey was forced to dissociate the conference from official party activities; when held it was considered 'unofficial' (Bissell 1981, p. 220).
 15. For Massey's view on this, see Massey 1963, p. 227.
 16. See Finlay, pp. 189–196, for a more extensive discussion of Massey's engagement with The British Council.
 17. At his death, Massey bequeathed the collection to the National Gallery of Canada.
 18. Biographical sources about Dorothy Elmhirst are very limited, although the British writer Jane Brown is currently at work on a biography.
 19. Peter Cox, who was arts administrator at Dartington Hall from the 1940s until the 1980s working for the Elmhirsts and after their deaths, has published a history of the arts and education programming (see Cox 2005). Other extended studies of the arts at Dartington include Lorraine Nicholas' *Dancing in Utopia, Dartington Hall and Its Dancers* (2007), and Rachel Esther Harrison's *Dorothy Elmhirst and the Visual Arts at Dartington Hall 1925–1945* (2002, unpublished thesis).

REFERENCES

ARCHIVAL SOURCES

- John Maynard Keynes Papers, GBR/0272/PP/JMK, Modern Archives Centre, King's College, University of Cambridge, UK.
- Vincent Massey Papers (VMP), File Series B87-0082. University of Toronto Archives, Toronto, Canada.

PUBLISHED SOURCES

- Andrews, David R. 2010. *Keynes and the British Humanist Tradition: The Moral Purpose of the Market*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Annan, Noel. 1955. The Intellectual Aristocracy. In *Studies in Social History*, ed. J.H. Plumb. London: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Bell, Clive. 1956. *Old Friends: Personal Recollections*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- Bissell, Claude. 1981. *The Young Vincent Massey*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- . 1986. *The Imperial Canadian: Vincent Massey in Office*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Brisson, Jeffrey D. 2005. *Rockefeller, Carnegie, & Canada: American Philanthropy and the Arts & Letters in Canada*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Brittan, Samuel. 2006. Keynes's Political Philosophy. In *The Cambridge Companion to Keynes*, eds. Roger E. Backhouse, and Bradley W. Bateman, 180–198. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clarke, Peter. 2009. *Keynes: The Twentieth Century's Most Influential Economist*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Collini, Stefan. 2006. *Absent Minds: Intellectuals in Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2007 paperback edition.
- Cox, Peter. 2005. *The Arts at Dartington 1940–1983: A Personal Account*. Totnes: Dorothy Whitney Elmhirst Trust.
- Finlay, Karen A. 2004. *The Force of Culture: Vincent Massey and Canadian Sovereignty*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Glasgow, Mary. 1975. The Concept of the Arts Council. In *Essays on John Maynard Keynes*, ed. Milo Keynes, 260–271. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, Craufurd. 1995. The Promise of Expertise: Walter Lippmann and the Policy Sciences. *Policy Sciences* 28: 317–345.
- Goodwin, Craufurd. 1998. *Art and the Market: Roger Fry on Commerce in Art*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Granatstein, J.L. 1984. Culture and Scholarship: The First Ten Years of the Canada Council. *Canadian Historical Review* 65(4): 441–474.
- Harrod, R.F. 1972. *The Life of John Maynard Keynes*. Great Britain: Penguin Books.
- Hewison, Robert. 1995. *Culture and Consensus: England, Art and Politics Since 1940*. London: Methuen.
- Jackson, Nancy Beth. 2001. *The Junior League: 100 Years of Volunteer Service*. New York: Association of Junior Leagues International.
- Keynes, John Maynard. 1949. My Early Beliefs. In *Two Memoirs*. Introduction by David Garnett. London: Rupert Hart-Davis.
- . 1972. *Collected Writings of John Maynard Keynes, Vol IX*. London: Macmillan and St. Martin's Press. (Abbreviated as JMK 1972, Vol. IX)
- . 1982. *Collected Writings of John Maynard Keynes, Vol XXVIII*. Donald Moggridge (ed.), New York: Macmillan and Cambridge University Press. (Abbreviated as JMK 1982, Vol. XXVIII)

- Litt, Paul. 1992. *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Mackrell, Judith. 2008. *Bloomsbury Ballerina: Lydia Lopokova, Imperial Dancer and Mrs John Maynard Keynes*. London: Weidenfeld.
- Massey, Vincent. 1963. *What's Past Is Prologue: The Memoirs of the Right Honorable Vincent Massey, C.H.* London: Macmillan & Co.
- McCarthy, Kathleen D. 1991. *Women's Culture: American Philanthropy and Art, 1830-1930*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Moggridge, Donald. 2005. Keynes, the Arts, and the State. *History of Political Economy* 37(3): 535–556.
- Moore, G.E. 1929. *Principia Ethica*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Nicholas, Lorraine. 2007. *Dancing in Utopia: Dartington Hall and Its Dancers*. Dance Books, Ltd.
- Perry, Roland. 2005. *Last of the Cold War Spies: The Life of Michael Straight*. Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press.
- Rauchway, Erich. 1999. A Gentleman's Club in a Woman's Sphere: How Dorothy Whitney Straight Created the New Republic. *Journal of Women's History* 11(2): 60–85.
- Skidelsky, Robert. 2009. *Keynes: The Return of the Master*. London: Allen Lane.
- Skidelsky, Robert. 1983. *John Maynard Keynes: Hopes Betrayed 1883–1920. Vol 1 of John Maynard Keynes, a Biography*. London: Macmillan.
- . 1992. *John Maynard Keynes: The Economist as Saviour*, vol 2. London: Macmillan.
- Upchurch, Anna. 2004. John Maynard Keynes, the Bloomsbury Group, and Origins of the Arts Council Movement. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 10(2): 203–218.
- . 2013. 'Missing' from Policy History: The Dartington Hall Arts Enquiry 1941–47. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 19(5): 610–622.
- Williams, Raymond. 1978. The Significance of 'Bloomsbury' as a Social and Cultural Group. In *Keynes and the Bloomsbury Group*, eds. Derek Crabtree, and A.P. Thirlwall, 40–67.
- Wolf, Leonard. 1960. *Sowing: An Autobiography of the Years 1880–1904*. London: The Hogarth Press.
- . 1964. *Beginning Again: An Autobiography of the Years 1911 to 1918*. New York: Harcourt Brace & World, Inc.
- Young, Michael. 1982. *The Elmhursts of Dartington: The Creation of an Utopian Community*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Young, Michael. 1996. *The Elmhursts of Dartington. Totnes: The Dartington Hall Trust*.

UNPUBLISHED PAPERS AND THESES

- Harrison, Rachel E. 2002. *Dorothy Elmhirst and the Visual Arts at Dartington Hall, 1925–1945*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis.

The Ideologies of English Intellectualism and of American Philanthropy

In the previous chapter, I introduced three advocates of arts policy development, John Maynard Keynes in the United Kingdom, Vincent Massey in Canada, and Dorothy Elmhist in the United States, briefly sketching out their biographies and introducing their participation in cultural advocacy. I argued that Keynes demonstrated the role of the intellectual as policy advisor, while Massey demonstrated the coordinating and mediating role of the wealthy aesthete and philanthropist. Dorothy Elmhist, also an arts advocate and philanthropist, introduces and represents the role of women in arts policymaking.

The three shared extremely privileged social histories and similar understandings about the role of the arts in human life. They also shared the motivation to involve themselves in public life, and this chapter will examine two ideologies, or sets of beliefs, that shaped their identities and motivated their arts advocacy. First, the chapter will examine the ideology of ‘the clerisy,’ which emerged among English intellectuals, and trace its articulation in England in the nineteenth century. This book will argue that the theory of the clerisy, with its notion of social responsibility for the man who had the benefit of an education at Oxford or Cambridge, motivated Keynes, Massey, and other male intellectuals and wealthy men to get involved in shaping arts policy in Great Britain and Canada. Second, the chapter will explore the ideology of philanthropy

as it was articulated in the United States in the nineteenth century, an ideology that led to the establishment of the first general purpose foundations in that country. Massey, Elmhirst, and other very wealthy philanthropists shared beliefs about the social responsibility that followed their inheritance or accumulation of great wealth. This motivated their public activism, and as the following chapters will show, American foundations provided funding for the arts and culture in the United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States in the twentieth century, prior to the establishment of national arts funding agencies.

For the theory of the clerisy, the chapter relies on published primary and secondary sources, drawing from two important studies: Ben Knights's (1978) study of the clerisy and Stefan Collini's (2006) study of British intellectuals. To trace the evolving concept, I will examine the ideas of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Matthew Arnold, and John Stuart Mill, focusing primarily on nineteenth-century English theorists whose thought would have been read and discussed by Keynes as a young Cambridge intellectual at the turn of the twentieth century. Twentieth-century theorists, such as T.S. Eliot (see Collini 2006, Chap. 13, for a discussion), I have omitted because Keynes was older than Eliot and less likely to have had his attitudes formed by Eliot's ideas. For the ideology of philanthropy, the chapter examines ideas articulated by Andrew Carnegie in the late nineteenth century and relies on the biography of Carnegie by David Nasaw, as well as excerpts from Carnegie's polemic *The Gospel of Wealth*. Carnegie established numerous foundations in the early twentieth century that funded cultural, educational, and medical projects throughout North America and the United Kingdom. His philosophy of philanthropy, as well as his cultural patronage in both Canada and Great Britain, factor into this study.

THE IDEOLOGY OF 'THE CLERISY': COLERIDGE, ARNOLD, MAURICE, MILL

In the previous chapter, the short profile of Keynes pointed to his acceptance of an ideological inheritance from the 'intellectual aristocracy.' This attitude of privilege and duty was described by Keynes's biographer Robert Skidelsky:

By civilisation he meant an endowed aristocracy of learning and the arts, with a strong sense of duty. He was never an egalitarian. Even his orthodox

belief in equality of opportunity was tempered by the thought that ‘certain small [family] “connections” have produced eminent characters out of all proportion to their size’. Keynes rarely used the word, but he thought of himself as part of the ‘clerisy’—a secular priesthood, setting standards of value and behaviour, practising the arts of leadership and mutual accommodation. (1992, p. 8)

In his study of nineteenth-century debates about epistemology and the role of scholars, Ben Knights examines the idea of the ‘clerisy’ in the writings of Coleridge, Carlyle, Arnold, and Mill. His analysis points to

the creation of an ideology for the intelligentsia, comprising an ideal character and an ideal role in relation to society as a whole. This may be a mediating role (like that of Coleridge’s clerisy), a challenging role (as with Mill), or a renewing and conserving role (as with Arnold). There is thus a common insistence that, while the intellectuals stand apart from the existing classes and preoccupations of society, their activity is a precondition of social health. (1978, p. 7)

Knights, like Annan, acknowledges that these writers were not alienated from the ruling classes, never challenging the legitimacy of the ruling classes or their own complicity in maintaining class hierarchy. This emerging ideology is concerned with the educated man as a social being whose education implied his social responsibilities. The ideology develops as a set of assumptions that suggest the nature or form his influence should take and insists on the integration of the life of the mind with the practical life of society. Indeed, the educated man locates his responsibility in the ‘national intellect and culture, and he is a member of a fraternity whose education gives it a common intellectual nourishment, and which is enabled to grapple with all problems by virtue of its mental training’ (Knights 1978, p. 2). What emerges in the nineteenth century is a vision of an intellectual who is a man with a classical liberal education and who strives to influence society by ideas, eschewing direct involvement in politics or social movements.

Knights argues that notions of the educated man’s social role rested upon theories of knowledge in the nineteenth century (1978, p. 23). Theorists of the clerisy pointed towards the necessity of ‘an ideal of purity (conceived as the renunciation of the sensible world)’ for the intellectual (Knights 1978, pp. 3–4). These thinkers conceived of a duality of ‘transcendent’ unchanging knowledge represented in ideas we might associate

with philosophy, religion, ethics, and morality, versus the changing nature of worldly knowledge that governed political and commercial life. Their ‘purity’ and theories of knowledge and historical forces made them, they reasoned, better equipped psychologically than politicians to understand the pressures upon and the needs of society. Knights writes:

The partiality or incapacity of the established powers is a theme on which all our writers play variations. The corollary—that there has historically been or that there ought to be a group in society which sees more clearly, describes the permanent and truly important behind the ever-shifting, untrustworthy phenomena, and consequently knows society’s needs better than its ostensible rulers—becomes the central assertion of the clerisy argument. (1978, p. 6)

Politics had secondary importance, for ‘They were to work on that substance of national life upon which political institutions were based—its opinions, its language, and its conceptions of ethical action’ (Knights 1978, p. 6). They aspired to a broad, general knowledge, not specialisms, and considered that their minds actively shaped and created order from the actions of a chaotic world. The clerisy ‘was to do for society something that society, unaided, could not do for itself. It was to render susceptible of comprehension the raw matter of experience under the headings of transcendent principles. Thus the clerisy was to act as the active mind of society’ (Knights 1978, p. 8). Theorists of the clerisy insisted on the necessity of a classical liberal education so that they might share a ‘common form of discourse’ to discuss social problems unambiguously.

To understand the theory of the clerisy and its implications for arts policy, the following sections examine the writings of Romantic poets and social critics Samuel Taylor Coleridge and Matthew Arnold, and briefly look at John Stuart Mill’s work. As many scholars have suggested, the historical reason for its articulation and emergence at this time in English history was reactionary; the French Revolution had alarmed the English upper and middle classes who sought to prevent revolution in their own country by extending the franchise and opportunities for education to men outside the aristocracy. The Revolution focused attention on the social activities of intellectuals and their role in instigating it (Knights 1978, p. 4). It is beyond the scope of this chapter to discuss the upper- and middle-class responses to these tensions in English society (see Minihan 1977; O. Bennett 2005, pp. 464–467), except to acknowledge that a

social climate existed in England in which literary men and scholars were imagining, articulating, and justifying their activity (Knights 1978, p. 3).

This examination begins with Coleridge, as Knights does in his study, because Coleridge is acknowledged to have first articulated the concept of the clerisy in English thought and society in *On the Constitution of the Church and State* first published in 1830.¹

COLERIDGE: TOWARDS AN ANALYSIS OF FUNCTIONAL ELITES

In *Church and State*, Coleridge identifies three social groups or ‘estates of the realm’ that have existed in England and their functions in society: the first being the propertied landowners and the second comprising merchants, manufacturers, and artisans. He writes that the landed estate ensures permanence, and the merchants and industrialists ensure ‘progress’ through trade and the maintenance of wealth. The third estate, which he calls the clerisy, ensures the continued education, in the broadest sense, of the citizenry, and is ‘the necessary antecedent condition, of both the former’ estates (Coleridge 1839, p. 46). He details the organization and purpose of the third estate and claims that it had been, and should be, supported by the State using the ‘Nationalty,’ a percentage of land set aside for this purpose.

Coleridge argues that the clerisy should be a permanent ‘class or order’ with two categories. A smaller group was to remain ‘at the fountain heads of the humanities’ as researchers and teachers of the larger group, whose members would be located throughout the country to serve as guides, guardians, and instructors of the population (1839, p. 47). The ‘whole order’ had an educational duty, ‘to preserve the stores and guard the treasures of past civilization, and thus to bind the present with the past; to perfect and add to the same, and thus to connect the present with the future’ (1839, p. 47). To this duty of ensuring permanence, the clerisy would instruct the citizenry in the laws and knowledge of their rights and duties as citizens; Coleridge links an informed citizenry to national security and argues that the landowners and the merchant industrial classes need the clerisy to ensure their own stability and continuity. Although Coleridge is careful to distinguish ‘the Clerisy of the nation, or national Church’ from the Christian Church, and its members from the priesthood, he gives priority to theology among the disciplines (1839, p. 49).

Theology, with its emphasis on ethical and moral claims, is the foundation ‘because the science of theology was the root and trunk of the knowledges that civilized man’ (1839, p. 51). Over time, some of the clerisy had assumed more specific functional roles: ‘under the common name of professional, the learned in the departments of law, medicine, and the like, formed an intermediate link between the established clergy and the burgesses’ (1839, p. 53).

In his 2006 study, Stefan Collini locates the concept of the clerisy in ‘the larger tradition of debate about intellectuals in Britain’ (p. 3). About Coleridge’s conception, Collini points to the religious connotations of the clerisy as ‘a means of diffusing *spiritual* cultivation among the population at large’ (italics in the original) in the manner of a local vicar (Collini 2006, p. 78). He also writes that Coleridge envisioned that members of the clerisy would ‘pursue cultivation as an *inward* activity, and hence to influence their neighbors more by example than by writing’ (2006, p. 78, italics in the original) or by ‘speaking out’ in public in the manner of later cultural critics.

In addition to Knights, Raymond Williams and Andrew Elfenbein examine the growing self-consciousness of the clerisy and its evolving social role in discourses of the nineteenth century. Indeed, Williams’s *Culture and Society 1780–1950* is an extended examination of the nineteenth- and twentieth-century thought that attempted to counteract what the thinkers considered the destabilizing impacts of democracy, industrialism, and capitalism. Moving away from religion as a counteracting force, they focused instead on broadening an understanding of ‘culture’ as the symbolic expression of a spiritual realm and a mode of living whose values would, they believed, counteract those of industrialism and capitalism.² For Coleridge, this realm of culture would be defended and dissipated by a ‘National Church,’ an endowed clerisy. Because it was unlikely that the clerisy would ever assume the formal institutional role of a ‘church,’ ‘the nature of the defending minority had continually, by the successors of Coleridge, to be redefined’ (Williams 1983a, p. 254). Knights, Williams, and Elfenbein analyze this redefinition and broadening of the minority. Williams makes a further point that in this process, the theorists attempted to move away from definitions of ‘class’ based on inherited lineage and wealth, and towards an association of class with ‘function’ (1983a, p. 236).

MAURICE: ENLISTING THE 'MAN OF LETTERS'

In his analysis of Coleridge's thought, Williams is careful to point out the emphasis on the need for institutions to support personal and individual effort (1983a, p. 62); for Coleridge saw the clerisy (increasingly understood to be an informal institution) comprising university professors, pastors, and schoolmasters, who, through their institutional associations in postings and parsonages, were networked throughout the country (Elfenbein 2001, p. 83). Elfenbein argues that the clerisy idea had resonance with intellectuals throughout the nineteenth century due to this institutional specificity. He credits Frederick Denison Maurice, a Cambridge graduate and professor of English literature at King's College, London, with extending Coleridge's vision to the working classes by founding the Working Men's College to offer a liberal education like that provided to the middle and upper classes by the traditional grammar schools and universities (2001, p. 85).

Maurice also expanded the clerisy to include writers, the 'man of letters', arguing in *The Workman and the Franchise* (1866) 'that literary men need to abandon their privileged isolation to form a "communion with those sons of the soil" much like the teachers at the Working Men's College' (Maurice in Elfenbein, p. 86). Elfenbein points out that Coleridge insists that members of the clerisy possess a passionate commitment to their cause. A technical mastery of ideas and knowledge was insufficient; a member of the clerisy must possess an ability to convince others of the value of the knowledge. The qualifications therefore demanded more:

If a good capitalist needed to cultivate the stereotypically Protestant virtues of thrift, industry, sincerity, and hard work, then the clerisy demanded quite a different set of values: passionate conviction, emotional involvement, spiritual vocation, and the dissemination of feeling. (Elfenbein 2001, p. 85)

His study goes on to describe Edward Carpenter's early career as a curate to Maurice at Cambridge; Carpenter found Maurice to be a charming man to whom his students were devoted, but who lacked intellectual coherence as a speaker and teacher. In addition to this unfortunate example, Carpenter became dissatisfied with his own role in the clerisy as he became aware of its limitations as a democratizing force. He saw in it a conservative bias that reinforced social hierarchy in its maintenance of existing

institutions of the church and the university. Elfenbein describes how Carpenter turned to alternative living arrangements with working-class men, homosexual relationships, and Walt Whitman's poetry for alternatives to the existing class hierarchy and to create a message of 'universal common humanity' (2001, p. 103).

So still working within the tradition, Maurice formed a new institution, the Working Men's College, and enlisted writers and scholars to teach in an attempt to share the cultural inheritance with the working class. Matthew Arnold appears to broaden the tradition further in a series of essays that might be considered a manifesto for the clerisy.

ARNOLD: A MANIFESTO FOR THE CLERISY

Among Knights's group of clerisy theorists, Matthew Arnold is cited most often for his influence on twentieth-century ideas in Great Britain about the relationship between culture and the state (see Hewison 1995; Sinclair 1995; O. Bennett 2005; Belfiore and Bennett 2008, for examples). Writing in the 1860s and 1870s, Arnold presumes that English society is moving towards greater equality and democracy, and in his social criticism, he 'is torn between allegiance to the static world of truths and the dynamic, changing world' (Knights 1978, p. 128). Responding to what he regarded as the possibility of social disintegration, he set up a famous antithesis in 'culture and anarchy' (or order and disorder), the title of his well-known series of essays. Arnold conceives of the state as an ethical and educational community, which, to be spiritually healthy, must be 'in touch with the timeless body of moral truths to which great literature bore witness' (Knights 1978, p. 111). So, for Arnold, 'culture and its social agents are normative and regulatory' (Knights 1978, p. 111), and his desire for order causes him to favor established institutions, a statist (French) over laissez-faire (English) approach to government, and standards set by the center (Knights 1978, p. 137). Continuity would also be assured by the existence of an educated minority who would instruct the majority. Knights examines Arnold's lectures and essays tracing his idea of 'the remnant' and the majority, which he drew from biblical sources (the Book of Isaiah). Drawing parallels between his own times and the biblical example of the 'remnant' among the Israelites which saves their tribe, Arnold criticizes the majority for its obsessions with the 'machinery' of the practical world (O. Bennett 2005, p. 464), pointing to the few who gain transcendent knowledge:

The highly-instructed few, and not the scantily-instructed many, will ever be the organ to the human race of knowledge and truth. Knowledge and truth, in the full sense of the words, are not attainable by the great mass of the human race at all. (Arnold in Knights 1978, p. 100)

Arnold argued that society faced a choice between the salvation or the destruction of the state. His argument, which begins in *Culture and Anarchy*, is that hope for the continued existence of the state rests upon the assumption that modern society will provide a ‘remnant’ that is large enough to save the state (Knights 1978, p. 106). While he believes that the dysfunction in society cuts across social classes, Arnold implies that the ‘remnant’ might also be drawn from across social classes, again theorizing an elite based on function, rather than birth. In *Culture and Anarchy*, he somewhat satirically identifies three classes: the aristocracy as ‘Barbarians,’ the middle class as ‘Philistines,’ and the Populace. He writes that some individuals seek a different state of consciousness that sets them apart from their fellows:

But in each class there are born a certain number of natures with a curiosity about their best self, with a bent for seeing things as they are, for disentangling themselves from machinery, for simply concerning themselves with reason and the will of God, and doing their best to make these prevail;—for the pursuit, in a word, of perfection. (Arnold 1993, p. 109)

This ‘best self’ for Arnold represented ‘a continuity of national life that might well be invisible to most men’ and ‘stood for right reason and was independent of all governments and governing classes as such’ (Knights 1978, p. 113). Arnold called these people ‘aliens’:

there are a certain number of *aliens*, if we may so call them,—persons who are mainly led, not by their class spirit, but by a general *humane* spirit, by the love of human perfection; and that this number is capable of being diminished or augmented. I mean, the number of those who will succeed in developing this happy instinct will be greater or smaller, in proportion both to the force of the original instinct within them, and to the hindrance or encouragement which it meets with from without. (Arnold 1993, p. 110, italics in original)

These ‘aliens’ make up the ‘remnant’ that will teach the masses, and the existence of the remnant is thus linked to social stability. But Arnold goes no further to identify his ‘aliens’ than this. Unlike Coleridge, his clerisy is more secular, less defined, and not endowed by state support (Knights 1978, p. 102).

Arnold may appear to reject social circumstances—affiliation with a hereditary class—as a condition of membership in the ‘remnant.’ However, Knights suggests that Arnold does not describe ‘aliens’ in more detail, because they were the intended readers of his essay, and, thus, they knew who they were (1978, p. 129). Oliver Bennett traces Arnold’s intellectual and social biography to point out that there is an implied class assumption in the essay, and that Arnold considered himself an ‘alien,’ one of the intellectual elite who saw their duty to analyze society and prescribe for it: ‘This kind of intellectual confidence, with its presumption of general truth, is a product of Arnold’s class, family background and privileged education’ (2005, p. 459). Noel Annan locates Matthew Arnold as among the second generation of his intellectual aristocracy (Annan 1955, p. 259).

The ‘aliens’ or ‘great men of culture’ would be, like Arnold, men of liberal education familiar with a classical and literary canon of works which they consider normative and which they use as a basis to critique contemporary thought and art, ‘creating a regulatory rather than an exploratory culture’ (Knights 1978, p. 128). Indeed, Arnold envisions the intellectual working from the center under the aegis of the state, and ‘he found a function for the remnant in the maintenance of an avowedly conservative culture. He formulated for future English practitioners the belief that culture could inform the national life through the organs of the centre’ (Knights 1978, p. 139). This notion of a ‘cultural authority’ based on a Western European canon has been fiercely criticized—criticism which seems to discount that Arnold is advocating ‘the constant questioning of one’s own position’ and that “‘getting to know the best that has been thought and said” is an attitude of mind rather than a task that can be completed’ (O. Bennett 2005, pp. 469–471).

It would be difficult to overestimate the influence of Arnold’s thought and that *Culture and Anarchy* have had upon cultural policy in the United Kingdom and beyond. Oliver Bennett (2005) has examined his influence on British cultural policy, an influence that extended to cultural policy in Canada. Certainly his polemical style resulted in a number of catch-phrases that recur in rhetoric about British culture; Knights points out Arnold’s reliance on biblical and classical quotations removed from their contexts to support his thesis and his use of antitheses and taglines, such as ‘unsound majority,’ ‘best that has been thought and said in the world,’ and the phrase that echoes repeatedly, ‘sweetness and light’ (Knights 1978, p. 107). Scholars have suggested that his polemical style and presumptions contributed to a popular antagonism towards the notion of, and even the word, ‘culture,’ in the twentieth century (Williams 1983b, p. 92).

Thus Arnold favors a conserving and regulatory role for the minority that insists on standards, and he favors institutions managed from the center. The next section examines Mill's thought and his contribution to an evolving notion of the 'disinterested' intellectual.

MILL: 'DISINTERESTED' AND CHALLENGING VOICES

The liberal theorist John Stuart Mill admired Coleridge's concept of the clerisy and also contributed to its evolving ideology. Mill's theories argue for a government comprising skilled thinkers, a cultural and intellectual elite with the political competence he thought necessary to enlightened governance (Duncan 1973, p. 258). Knights's analysis of Mill's contribution to clerisy theory is rich and complex (see pp. 141–177); for the purposes of this study, I will emphasize a few main points.

Mill analyzed Coleridge's arguments in *On the Constitution of the Church and State*, praising his attention to education and arguing that education is essential to maintaining order in society. That education:

whatever else it might include, one main and incessant ingredient was *restraining discipline*. To train the human being in the habit, and thence the power, of subordinating his personal impulses and aims, to what were considered the ends of society. (Mill 1980, p. 121; italics in original)

He applauds Coleridge's idea of the clerisy, quoting at length from the poet's essay describing the institution, and praising Coleridge for rescuing 'the principle of an endowed class, for the cultivation of learning, and for diffusing its results among the community' (Mill 1980, p. 148).

As his thinking deepened about the interplay of forces within democratic society, Mill's insistence on the need for pluralism caused him to articulate a different role for the educated elite, beyond the 'mediating' and 'conserving' roles envisioned by Coleridge and Arnold. Mill envisions the intellectual's role in society 'as a stimulant to dissatisfaction' (Knights 1978, p. 161). The intellectual should be, as Mill himself was, a person who examines and interrogates many positions in a 'scientific' and 'disinterested' fashion. He will challenge convention and social order to prevent the predominance of any one class in society. However, in common with the previous theorists, Mill retains an 'impulse to authoritative oversight of society's affairs' (Knights 1978, p. 176). Indeed, Mill combined two values of his class, 'the belief in the widest scope for individual liberty—a value dear to a class forged in the effort to establish a meritocratic ideal in

the face of “old corruption”—and the equally powerful belief in a fixed moral hierarchy’ (Mandler and Pedersen 1994, p. 3).

The principles of individual liberty and self-development underpin the ideology of philanthropy that will be explored in the following section, and so before leaving Mill, I will quote from *On Liberty* about individuality: ‘Among the works of man which human life is rightly employed in perfecting and beautifying, the first in importance surely is man himself’ (Mill 1929, p. 71). And the development of the individual is the end of, and the stimulant to, social progress:

In proportion to the development of his individuality, each person becomes more valuable to himself, and is therefore capable of being more valuable to others. There is a greater fullness of life about his own existence, and when there is more life in the units there is more in the mass which is composed of them. (Mill 1929, p. 76)

Mill was influenced by and translated the ideas of Wilhelm von Humboldt, the German theorist, and the theory of *Bildung*, or individual self-development through knowledge and education (Mill 1929, p. 69); this complex idea and its German articulation are traced to its classical roots by Belfiore and Bennett (2008, see Chap. 6). Indeed, according to Humboldt, the aim of the state is to provide freedom for the individual, and such freedom is a prerequisite for self-education (Belfiore and Bennett 2008, p. 118).

The association of intellectuals and nineteenth-century Liberal ideas continued into the early twentieth century, and these ideas ‘had by the 1920s become assimilated as part of the received political culture of the English educated classes’ (Collini 1991, p. 338). Scholarly studies cite five distinguishing aspects of ‘public intellectuals’ in Great Britain at the turn of century: ‘their exclusivity; pursuit of intellectual inquiry within distinctive English “national” traditions; adherence to an ideology of “liberal pluralism”; commitment to social improvement through individual exertion; and accordance of a purely formal role to the state’ (Stapleton 1999, p. 252). Indeed, as the century progressed and the Liberal Party was challenged by Labour, then fragmented and was marginalized politically, intellectuals found they could remain engaged through policy advice ‘not so demeaning as official civil service, if rendered on a freelance basis, as Keynes, Beveridge and Hubert Henderson discovered’ or pressure group activities ‘if offered across party lines and under the cloak of professional

expertise' (Mandler and Pedersen 1994, p. 11). Other studies that examine the social role of the English intellectual in the twentieth century include Mike Savage's (2010) history of the development of social science research methods in the United Kingdom (see Chap. 3 for a discussion that situates Keynes and Bloomsbury within the evolving identity of the 'intellectual' and its association with the humanities).

To summarize to this point, scholars have traced the ideology of a 'clerisy' inherited from the nineteenth-century reform movements in England that emphasized a need for education of the middle and lower classes. This ideology held that an educated, enlightened minority of men would instruct the majority, and that the health of society depended on the presence of this minority, who, by their knowledge of 'transcendent' ideas, theories and histories, could diagnose the causes of tensions in society, predict outcomes, and prescribe solutions to those who governed. Indeed, many believed that, as a class, they had a social responsibility: they were guardians of an inheritance of ideas which should be shared with future guardians and the wider public. This inheritance of ideas included the canon of Western European intellectual thought, especially philosophy, history, and literature; men trained in this tradition were considered the best prepared for their roles of conserving and mediating, and, later, challenging, when they considered that social progress was threatened. The intelligentsia believed that their ability to remain removed from or outside the interests of government and commerce assured their disinterested stance.

The next sections of this chapter will examine the ideology of philanthropy as articulated and practiced by wealthy industrialists in North America.

WEALTH AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

As we saw with Vincent Massey and Dorothy Elmhirst in the previous chapter, some of the newly wealthy industrialists of North America also had a sense of social responsibility towards community and country. This section examines their ideas about their social responsibility to indicate the shared concerns of intellectuals and the very wealthy. There was a crucial difference, of course, in the actions of the two groups. Where intellectuals used their ideas and connections to the governing class to exercise their influence on society, wealthy industrialists had money, often vast sums, to use in philanthropic work. As we saw with the Massey family, and

with Dorothy Elmhirst, they contributed to universities and educational institutions. In North America, they created foundations to help manage their philanthropic activities. To understand their sense of social responsibility and philanthropic work, the next section will focus on Andrew Carnegie, who articulated the ideology of American philanthropy.

ANDREW CARNEGIE AND *THE GOSPEL OF WEALTH*

The influence of Matthew Arnold's ideas and of English intellectual thought was combined with a fierce defense of industrial capitalism in Andrew Carnegie's philosophy of philanthropy. I focus here on Carnegie for several reasons; first, because his philanthropy influenced the development of the cultural infrastructure and arts policies in all three study countries; second, he articulates and reveals the philanthropist's preference for funding specific institutions in society; and third, his approach to establishing certain institutions demonstrates the degree of collaboration between philanthropists and intellectuals in the twentieth century. Also Carnegie, along with John D. Rockefeller, established the general purpose foundation as an institution in the United States after amassing huge personal fortunes amounting to an estimated one hundred billion dollars in today's money for Carnegie and two hundred billion dollars for Rockefeller (Fleishman 2007, p. 40). While observers of modern philanthropy claim that both men sought not to ameliorate immediate social problems, but, more heroically, 'to enhance society's ability to solve fundamental scientific and social problems' (Fleishman 2007, pp. 41–42), reforming the system did not mean rethinking or questioning the tenets of industrial capitalism. Indeed, there is a defiant defense of industrial capitalism in Carnegie's commentary about philanthropy, and he makes his own contribution to the nineteenth-century discourses in his claims about the superiority of the businessman in solving social problems.

Carnegie's success story, his rise from poor Scottish immigrant to possibly the richest man in the world in 1901, is the stuff of legend, some of which he encouraged himself in his autobiography (Nasaw 2006). I will not go into extensive detail here, except to observe that Carnegie was born in Dunfermline, Scotland, in 1835, immigrating with his parents and only brother to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, when he was 13 years old. He started working as a telegraph messenger for the Pennsylvania Railroad, and by his early thirties, with help and investment capital from well-positioned friends and business partners, he had started several businesses and made a

fortune in iron manufacturing, bridge building, and bond trading. Besides being financially ambitious, Carnegie was intellectually ambitious, and, after his fortune was made, he moved to New York in the 1870s and left the daily management of his Pittsburgh manufacturing interests to others. A great ambition for this self-educated man was to establish himself as a ‘man of letters’ respected for his intellect as much as for his business acumen (Nasaw 2006, p. xii). To this end, he befriended noted English intellectuals, wrote articles and published in journals in both the United States and Great Britain, and wrote and published books, some of which became bestsellers. In the late 1880s and early 1890s, he published in literary journals on issues related to business, such as trusts, tariffs, monopoly regulation, the gold standard, and wealth and poverty (Nasaw 2006, p. 343).

Among the English intellectuals he befriended and idolized were Herbert Spencer and Matthew Arnold. Carnegie was a lifelong agnostic (Nasaw 2006, p. 624) who found his moral framework in Spencer’s concept of evolutionary philosophy:

Spencer offered Carnegie and his generation an intellectual foundation for their optimism, their sense that history was a record of forward progress, by arguing that material progress went hand-in-hand with moral progress, that industrialization was a higher state of civilization than that which had preceded it, and that the future would be even rosier than the present. (Nasaw 2006, pp. 228–229)

Indeed, Spencer’s philosophy provided the rationale for the massive material success of the Gilded Age multimillionaires, who considered themselves ‘agents of progress.’ Carnegie called himself a disciple of Spencer, referring to him as the ‘great thinker of our age’ (Nasaw 2006, p. 229). Carnegie not only read Spencer, he met the philosopher in London in 1882 and kept up a correspondence with him afterwards. He also became a personal friend of Matthew Arnold’s; when he learned that Arnold was planning a speaking tour of the United States in 1883, he offered his services as a host, and remained friends thereafter (Nasaw 2006, p. 231).

While Arnold’s ideas may have focused Carnegie’s interests on arts and literature, Spencer’s thought not only provided the justification for Carnegie’s acquisition of massive wealth, but also provided the logic that made him, Carnegie, the most appropriate agent for its dispersal. He began to publicize his ‘gospel’ of wealth, beginning in 1889 with the publication of an essay titled simply ‘Wealth’ in the journal *North American*

Review; the essay was republished in the British *Pall Mall Gazette* as the ‘Gospel of Wealth’ and included in a collection of essays titled *The Gospel of Wealth*, published in 1901. The following analysis quotes extended passages from Carnegie’s gospel, because it bears careful consideration as a foundational rationale for his philanthropy.

Carnegie was not the first nineteenth-century American millionaire to make substantive donations, but in his eagerness to gain attention and establish himself as an intellectual, he publicized his philosophy of philanthropy and sought to portray himself as a moral force among the Gilded Age millionaires. He saw his wealth and all social inequality as a ‘natural’ condition of ‘progress’, writing:

The contrast between the palace of the millionaire and the cottage of the laborer with us to-day measures the change which has come with civilization. This change, however, is not to be deplored, but welcomed as highly beneficial. It is well, nay, essential, for the progress of the race that the houses of some should be homes for all that is highest and best in literature and the arts, and for all the refinements of civilization, rather than that none should be so. Much better this great irregularity than universal squalor. Without wealth there can be no Maecenas. The ‘good old times’ were not good old times. Neither master nor servant was as well situated as to-day. A relapse to old conditions would be disastrous to both—not the least so to him who serves—and would sweep away civilization with it. But whether the change be for good or ill, it is upon us, beyond our power to alter, and, therefore, to be accepted and made the best of. It is a waste of time to criticize the inevitable. (Carnegie 1901, p. 2)

The industrial economy, by creating vast quantities of material goods at lower costs and prices, had made life easier and more comfortable for all, according to Carnegie. Concepts like individualism, private property, competition, and free trade, for example, all become ‘laws’ in Carnegie’s Spencerian universe. Here he explains the ‘law’ of competition:

It is here; we cannot evade it; no substitutes for it have been found; and while the law may be sometimes hard for the individual, it is best for the race, because it insures the survival of the fittest in every department. We accept and welcome, therefore, as conditions to which we must accommodate ourselves, great inequality of environment; the concentration of business, industrial and commercial, in the hands of a few; and the law of competition between these, as not only being beneficial, but essential to the future progress of the race. (1901, p. 4)

And those few who amass great fortunes are the superiors of their fellows:

We might as well urge the destruction of the highest existing type of man because he failed to reach our ideal as to favor the destruction of Individualism, Private Property, the Law of Accumulation of Wealth, and the Law of Competition; for these are the highest result of human experience, the soil in which society, so far, has produced the best fruit. Unequally or unjustly, perhaps, as these laws sometimes operate, and imperfect as they appear to the Idealist, they are, nevertheless, like the highest type of man, the best and most valuable of all that humanity has yet accomplished. (1901, p. 7)

Two central tenets of Carnegie's 'gospel' were, first, that the vast fortunes acquired by American multimillionaires were the property of the community and, therefore, were held in trust by those millionaires, and second, the millionaire's responsibility was to take an active role in returning those funds to the community through donations made during his or her lifetime. He cites three methods of disposing of surplus wealth: 'It can be left to the families of the decedents; or it can be bequeathed for public purposes; or, finally, it can be administered by its possessors during their lives' (1901, p. 8). The first method only brings problems to the families, according to Carnegie, who need enough money to live comfortably and no more; he cites the financial and moral decline of European aristocracy as his evidence. The second method leaves the responsibility for the dispersal of the wealth to potentially unproven heirs and marks the deceased millionaire as a hoarder. For this reason, Carnegie writes in favor of a graduated inheritance tax because he believes it would induce the wealthy man to put his fortune to some public use, rather than hoarding it. The third method he considers the most evolved, and the 'true antidote for the temporary unequal distribution of wealth':

Under its sway we shall have an ideal State, in which the surplus wealth of the few will become, in the best sense, the property of the many, because administered for the common good, and this wealth, passing through the hands of the few, can be made a much more potent force for the elevation of our race than if distributed in small sums to the people themselves. Even the poorest can be made to see this, and to agree that great sums gathered by some of their fellow-citizens and spent for public purposes, from which the masses reap the principal benefit, are more valuable to them than if scattered among themselves in trifling amounts through the course of many years. (1901, pp. 12-13)

Carnegie sees the wealthy man as a steward of his community who knows best what that community needs, for the rich man should ‘consider all surplus revenues which come to him simply as trust funds,’ and ‘the man of wealth thus becoming the mere trustee and agent for his poorer brethren, bringing to their service his superior wisdom, experience, and ability to administer, doing for them better than they would or could do for themselves’ (1901, p. 15).

Carnegie advocated a type of giving that foundation analysts today describe as ‘instrumental’ in contrast to ‘expressive.’ Instrumental giving is characterized as ‘strategic’ and is intended to address a policy objective or social problem. Expressive giving is characterized as reflecting a donor’s desire to show support for a cause or for an organization without the expectation of social impact (Fleishman 2007, p. 26). According to analysts, instrumental giving is characterized by intention and discipline on the part of a foundation’s trustees (Fleishman 2007, p. 27). Indeed, Carnegie insisted on the conscious intentions of the millionaires who practiced philanthropy to establish and enhance civic institutions with their wealth. He complimented those

who know that the best means of benefiting the community is to place within its reach the ladders upon which the aspiring can rise—free libraries, parks, and means of recreation, by which men are helped in body and mind; works of art, certain to give pleasure and improve the public taste; and public institutions of various kinds, which will improve the general condition of the people; in this manner returning their surplus wealth to the mass of their fellows in the forms best calculated to do them lasting good. (1901, p. 18)

Carnegie articulates and reveals the philanthropist’s reasons for funding and establishing certain institutions in society in an article titled ‘The Best Fields for Philanthropy’. He begins by stating that his concern is to aid the ‘ambitious’:

The individual administrator of surplus wealth has as his charge the industrious and ambitious; not those who need everything done for them, but those who, being most anxious and able to help themselves, deserve and will be benefited by help from others and by the extension of their opportunities by the aid of the philanthropic rich. (1901, p. 22)

He then describes each type of institution that merits the millionaire’s support, in his order of priority, and illustrated by examples of donations

that he considers appropriate. Universities were first among the institutions that merit support, but few could afford to establish new ones in the manner of donors like Stanford, Cornell, or Vanderbilt. Carnegie encourages philanthropists to consider large donations to existing institutions to deepen or expand their research and curriculum. Free libraries are next on his list as the best gift for a community, ‘provided the community will accept and maintain it as a public institution, as much a part of the city property as its public schools, and, indeed, an adjunct to these’ (1901, p. 27). He cites personal experience in this case, recalling how a Pittsburgh benefactor had opened his personal library to lend books to boys, among them Carnegie himself. Ideally, according to Carnegie, the library is the focus of a cultural center, with an art gallery, museum, and lecture hall, citing examples from Great Britain and Europe. He urges millionaires who collect art to donate to these institutions.

The third type of institutions deserving philanthropic support are hospitals, medical colleges, laboratories, and those institutions concerned with preventing illness. Carnegie advocates for medical research, writing, ‘No medical college is complete without its laboratory. As with universities, so with medical colleges: it is not new institutions that are required, but additional means for the more thorough equipment of those that exist’ (1901, p. 31). Public parks are his fourth category ‘always provided that the community undertakes to maintain, beautify, and preserve them inviolate’ (1901, p. 33). Besides donating land for a park, Carnegie encourages donations of features that might enhance existing parks, such as conservatories, memorial arches, and other public art. He compliments a donor who gave conservatories as:

a wise as well as a liberal giver, for he requires the city to maintain these conservatories, and thus secures for them forever the public ownership, the public interest, and the public criticism of their management. Had he undertaken to manage and maintain them, it is probable that popular interest in the gift would never have been awakened. (1901, p. 34)

Carnegie reminds his readers that European cities set an example for US cities in their parks and public art, and he defends expenditures for art against criticism that such spending is frivolous:

As with libraries and museums, so with these more distinctively artistic works: they perform their great use when they reach the best of the masses

of the people. It is better to reach and touch the sentiment for beauty in the naturally bright minds of this class than to pander to those incapable of being so touched. For what the improver of the race must endeavor is to reach those who have the divine spark ever so feebly developed, that it may be strengthened and grow. (1901, p. 36)

Using the same argument about the civilizing power of art, he advocates in his fifth category the gift of concert halls for ‘elevating music’ and lecture halls for meetings of all kinds, again, because the United States lags behind Europe in providing these facilities (1901, p. 37). Europe also provides an example for Carnegie’s sixth category, public swimming pools. Here again he admonishes his readers to donate the pool but leave its upkeep and maintenance to the community, who will appreciate it more, according to Carnegie, if they must pay a small fee to use it (1901, pp. 38–39). Carnegie reserves donations to churches as his seventh, and last, category. What he advocates here too is a bricks-and-mortar approach, advising the millionaire to donate funds for the construction of lasting and impressive structures, but not endowing the congregation for the building’s maintenance.

With this Spencerian logic, Carnegie persuaded himself and his fellow multimillionaires of the moral worth of their philanthropic work: ‘The gospel of wealth provided an ideological antidote to socialist, anarchist, Communist, agrarian, single-taxer, and labor protests against the unequal distribution of wealth by arguing that the common good was best served by allowing men like himself to accumulate and retain huge fortunes’ (Nasaw 2006, p. 351).

Carnegie’s gospels were not without critics, and his respondents included the British Prime Minister William Gladstone, who reviewed the gospels in 1890 in the journal *Nineteenth Century*. Gladstone’s review was positive, but, not surprisingly in a country with an aristocracy, he disagreed with Carnegie on the question of inherited wealth and linked the ‘hereditary transmission of wealth and position’ with ‘the calls of occupation and of responsibility’ (Nasaw 2006, p. 351). Gladstone’s review was followed the next month in the same periodical by three more reviews, the most critical that of the Reverend Hugh Price Hughes, a Methodist bishop, who declared that Carnegie, as the representative of a class of millionaires, was ‘an anti-Christian phenomenon, a social monstrosity, and a grave political peril’ and argued that far from being natural, the accumulation of wealth by a minority was not worth the pauperization of the working

classes (Nasaw 2006, p. 352). Carnegie defended himself in print, arguing that poverty alone created the conditions to produce genius, not wealth, which depleted the self-respect of the inheritors. Against the Methodist bishop's criticism, he argued that millionaires were good for society by virtue of the jobs they created and insisted that the industrial economies of the west were far advanced in creating wealth for all members and diminishing poverty (Nasaw 2006, p. 352).

Certainly Carnegie's wealth, as manifested in the many trusts and institutions he created or supported, distinctly influenced the cultural infrastructure of the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom. During his lifetime, Carnegie made 1419 grants for 1689 public libraries in the continental United States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico—with the grants totaling \$41 million during the decades when they were made.³ An additional \$15 million built 660 libraries in Great Britain and Ireland, 125 in Canada, 17 in New Zealand, and 12 in South Africa (Nasaw 2006, p. 607). A second program that Carnegie developed and oversaw himself was the church organ program; during his lifetime, 7689 organs were given away costing more than \$6.25 million, including 4092 in the US, more than 2119 in England, and 1005 in Scotland. In addition to these programs, he endowed dozens of trusts, including the Carnegie UK Trust, and the Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland; built Carnegie Hall in New York; created the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; and endowed the Carnegie Institute, which would become Carnegie-Mellon University in Pittsburgh. After his death, the Carnegie Corporation began to fund social science and humanities research and scholarship in the United States and in Canada, will be examined in Chap. 6.

In his ideas, Andrew Carnegie attempts to integrate the evolutionary philosophy of Spencer with Arnold's attention to culture and the arts and a bias towards institutions. He argues for the intellectual and moral superiority of the businessman, who has a social responsibility to accumulate wealth and return it to the community as he sees fit. This ideology resulted in the formation of two general purpose foundations in the United States, which will be discussed briefly in the next section.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF GENERAL PURPOSE FOUNDATIONS

After declaring his intentions so publicly, Carnegie spent the rest of his life, from the 1890s to 1919, giving his money away. By 1911, with his fortune growing faster than he could give it away, due to compound

interest, he followed the advice of his attorney and put the remainder of his estate into a trust. The Carnegie Corporation of New York was organized in November 1911, as the largest of the trusts that Carnegie established during his life and the largest philanthropic trust organized to that point (Nasaw 2006, p. 766). One of Carnegie's admirers was John D. Rockefeller, another American multimillionaire and the owner of Standard Oil. The two were wary of each other in business concerns, but shared an interest in philanthropy. Carnegie sent Rockefeller copies of his articles and pamphlets, and Rockefeller wrote to him, expressing his admiration for Carnegie's giving (Nasaw 2006, p. 516; Fleishman 2007, p. 41). Like Carnegie, Rockefeller felt a social responsibility to give away his excess wealth and his, too, accumulated faster than he could research and respond to requests for donations; he had established his foundation in 1909 for the same reason, that he and his associates could not give the money away fast enough (Fleishman 2007, pp. 38–39).

For all his rhetoric about his concerns for the ambitious among the middle and working classes, intellectuals were among the immediate beneficiaries of Carnegie's gospel, for professional intellectuals and researchers had much to gain in his advocacy of philanthropy for universities, libraries, hospitals, and laboratories. Indeed, Carnegie, Hart Massey (Vincent Massey's grandfather), and other late nineteenth-century, wealthy industrialists relied for advice and expertise upon a 'community of experts' that included 'lawyers, clergymen, college presidents, doctors, and academics', all of whom shared 'the same religious commitments, the same sense of community order, and the same conception of economic justice' (Karl and Katz 1987, p. 34). Whether practicing believers or not, American Christianity shaped their view of the world:

This same set of values united the lawyers, doctors, and academics whom they consulted. All also shared common beliefs about the character of American politics, and how politics related to their reform interests and religious values. None of them believed that political parties and politicians were equipped to solve problems efficiently or economically. (Karl and Katz 1987, p. 34)

In the United States, the notion grew that the necessary expertise should be nurtured: 'Foundations were created, in part, to give industrial society an educated class that would continue to produce generations of researchers, teachers, and managers in every field of culture and technology' (Karl

and Katz 1987, p. 31). Thus, in the United States, many intellectuals and wealthy industrialists were allied in their concerns about social progress and both groups benefited from their association with each other. Wealthy industrialists provided large infusions of capital to universities and research laboratories that supported intellectual work; intellectuals provided the wealthy donors with expertise and new ideas to support, gaining attention and credibility for the donor.

This discussion of Andrew Carnegie, his associations with English intellectuals, and his ideology of philanthropy demonstrates the basis of the working relationships between ‘men of letters,’ intellectuals, professionals, and the wealthy.

INTELLECTUALS AND PHILANTHROPISTS COLLABORATE

As the brief profiles of Keynes and Massey in Chap. 2 indicate, these ideologies shaped the identities of both men. Using more than CAN\$1 million from his grandfather’s estate, Vincent Massey established the Massey Foundation in 1919, engaging in the new type of philanthropy modeled by his American counterparts (Bissell 1981, p. 18). By placing the estate’s financial assets in a trust where they might accumulate value, and by spending the income from these investments on their projects, Vincent Massey reasoned that they would extend and expand the potential of the original bequest. Among his many projects, Massey supported universities, education, and culture, as had Carnegie.

Where Massey and other wealthy industrialists sought to influence social conditions with their money and foundations, intellectuals like Keynes sought to influence by their ideas. Certainly Keynes, a Cambridge graduate and later a Cambridge don, and an advisor to the Liberal Party and to British governments, had the pedigree, credentials, and assumptions for the role. When critics describe his radio broadcast tone⁴ as ‘that of the teacher’ with ‘an unblinking assumption of authority’ (Pick 1991, p. 22), it is a description that Keynes would not have found offensive. As we saw in the previous chapter in his speech to the Liberal Party, he sought to analyze social conditions and recommend policy approaches that could improve material conditions.

Intellectuals and philanthropists shared several concerns and assumptions. In both the ideologies of intellectualism and of philanthropy, they share a sense of their own social responsibility and superiority. Where intellectuals were privileged by, and thus obligated by, their extensive

educations, the wealthy industrialist was privileged, and obligated, by his wealth. Both groups shared a confident and paternalistic sense that they could prescribe for society. In Carnegie's case, he assumed himself to be superior to the mass of citizens, as demonstrated by his business acumen and success at wealth accumulation.

Both intellectuals and philanthropists assumed the ineffectiveness of politicians and government in fashioning approaches to address social problems; indeed, intellectuals understood their distance from the political process as both an advantage and a virtue. Both groups were interested in the identification and maintenance of a 'learned minority.' In England, an 'intellectual aristocracy' and ancient universities appeared to assure an ongoing pool of new members for that minority. In North America, foundations were created to provide ongoing financial support to the universities and other institutions that supported the selection and training of that minority.

Both intellectuals and philanthropists shared a common interest in education in the broadest terms, education through formal schooling and learning, as well as informal models of learning. Their advocacy of universities, libraries, and museums points to this shared concern, which they also articulate quite directly in their polemics. The English theorists insist that hereditary class should not be an impediment to the 'alien' who has the 'spark' within him to develop his 'best self'; Carnegie argues that inherited wealth is itself an impediment. This interest in education is bound up in liberal ideas about citizenship, individuality, and self-development that Mill and other liberal theorists articulated. Because the individual bore responsibility for his or her self-development, the logic followed that the appropriate policy response was the establishment of institutions in society—libraries, museums, universities, parks, and swimming pools—that were believed to support the individual's personal initiative and self-education efforts. The philanthropist or the state might provide the infrastructure, but in a liberal, democratic society, it was the individual's responsibility to find the motivation, free time, physical stamina, financial means, and intellectual capacity to take advantage of what was offered.

These disparate discourses from English theorists and a Scottish-born, American businessman attempt to articulate and legitimize their own presumed superiority within their respective societies. Certainly both ideologies support the maintenance of industrial capitalism. But even more fundamentally, both ideologies articulate claims by educated, wealthy, white men to organize and control not only politics, but also culture and

human symbolic life. As such, they can be understood as ideologies that support the maintenance of patriarchy. By patriarchy, I refer to the 'system of social structures and practices in which men dominate, oppress, and exploit women' (Walby 1990, p. 20). The English theorists argue for their authority, based on their familiarity with knowledge considered timeless and universal, in contrast to knowledge that is ephemeral and changing. Arnold's implication is that he and those with his degree of learning are intellectually and morally superior to the mass of his fellow citizens, both men and certainly women. The businessman argues for his authority based solely on his financial success, ignoring or overlooking the moral implications of the business activities that may have accumulated that wealth. Carnegie, in fact, claims that his financial success demonstrates his moral superiority.

As a woman philanthropist, Dorothy Elmhirst shared with these men a sense of social responsibility conferred by wealth, which seems to have motivated some projects of her activism. Like them, she used her wealth to fund institutions, including the student union at Cornell University, following the directions of her first husband's will. Also with her first husband, she supported the founding of the New School of Social Research in New York with her money, following the prescribed practice of funding education and research. The couple allied with intellectuals—Herbert Croly and his writers and editors—in founding the political magazine, *The New Republic*, which they shaped to have an educative role in US politics. In these projects, she provided money, connections, and organizational support, working within the social constraints of her identity as a wealthy wife and mother.

And yet, unlike Carnegie, her sense of social responsibility extended to poverty relief and the related social and economic conditions of working women, their families, and immigrants. In these areas, she was able to exercise her leadership most visibly within the women's organizations of the times, the Junior League of America and, notably, the far more radical Women's Trade Union League. Women's organizations gave middle- and upper-class wealthy, white women a forum for their activism, especially in the United States. Later, she collaborated with her second husband to use her wealth to create an organization, which they considered to be an experimental model, where the arts were central to social life, and to influence arts policy in the United Kingdom. When collaborating with men, her influence was 'indirect,' conforming to social norms (Rauchway 1999).

In the chapters that follow, these elite ideologies of the clerisy and philanthropy frame the motivations and activities of many of the men involved in arts policymaking. The two chapters that follow will examine in more detail the working methods of Keynes, Massey, and their allies in arts policymaking in the United Kingdom.

NOTES

1. For a discussion of the German idealist position that influenced Coleridge, see Knights, pp. 37–71.
2. See Belfiore and Bennett (2008, pp. 130–136), for a discussion of the claims of the Romantic poets for poetry and the arts as a civilizing force.
3. I should disclose that my hometown of Charlotte, North Carolina, has a ‘Carnegie’ library, therefore as a student, I, like many Americans, have benefited from Carnegie’s philanthropy.
4. Pick is referring to the oft-quoted BBC broadcast announcing the creation of the Arts Council of Great Britain.

REFERENCES

PUBLISHED SOURCES

- Annan, Noel. 1955. The Intellectual Aristocracy. In *Studies in Social History*, ed. J.H. Plumb. London: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Arnold, Matthew. 1993. *Culture and Anarchy and Other Writings*, ed. Stefan Collini. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Belfiore, Eleonora, and Bennett, Oliver. 2008. *The Social Impacts of the Arts: An Intellectual History*. Basingstoke, Hampshire, UK: Palgrave/Macmillan.
- Bennett, Oliver. 2005. Beyond Machinery: The Cultural Politics of Matthew Arnold. *History of Political Economy* 37(3): 455–482.
- Bissell, Claude. 1981. *The Young Vincent Massey*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Carnegie, Andrew. 1901. *The Gospel of Wealth and Other Timely Essays*. New York: The Century Co.
- Coleridge, S.T. 1839. *On the Constitution of Church and State*. London: William Pickering.
- Collini, Stefan. 1991. *Public Moralists: Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain 1850–1930*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 2006. *Absent Minds: Intellectuals in Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2007 paperback edition.

- Duncan, Graeme. 1973. *Marx and Mill*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Elfenbein, Andrew. 2001. Whitman, Democracy, and the English Clerisy. *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 56(1): 76–104.
- Fleishman, Joel L. 2007. *The Foundation: A Great American Secret*. New York: PublicAffairs.
- Hewison, Robert. 1995. *Culture and Consensus: England, Art and Politics Since 1940*. London: Methuen.
- Karl, Barry D. and Stanley N. Katz. 1987. Foundations and Ruling Class Elites. *Daedalus: Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 116(1): 1–40.
- Knights, Ben. 1978. *The Idea of the Clerisy in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mandler, Peter, and Susan Pedersen. 1994. Introduction: The British Intelligentsia After the Victorians. In *After the Victorians: Private Conscience and Public Duty in Modern Britain*, eds. Susan Pedersen, and Peter Mandler. London: Routledge.
- Mill, J.S. 1929. *On Liberty*. London: Watts & Co.
- Mill, J.S. 1980. Coleridge. In *Mill on Bentham and Coleridge*, with an Introduction by F.R. Leavis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Minihan, Janet O. 1977. *The Nationalization of Culture*. New York: New York University Press.
- Nasaw, David. 2006. *Andrew Carnegie*. New York: The Penguin Press.
- Pick, John. 1991. *Vile Jelly: The Birth, Life, and Lingering Death of the Arts Council of Great Britain*. England: Brynmill Press.
- Rauchway, Erich. 1999. A Gentleman's Club in a Woman's Sphere: How Dorothy Whitney Straight Created the New Republic. *Journal of Women's History* 11(2): 60–85.
- Savage, Mike. 2010. *Identities and Social Change in Britain since 1940: the politics of method*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sedgwick, John. 2000. *Popular Filmgoing in 1930s Britain: A Choice of Pleasures*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Sinclair, Andrew. 1995. *Arts and Cultures: The History of the 50 Years of the Arts Council of Great Britain*. London: Sinclair-Stevenson.
- Skidelsky, Robert. 2001. *John Maynard Keynes: Fighting for Britain 1937–1946*, vol 3. London: Papermac.
- Stapleton, Julia. 1999. 'Political Thought, Elites, and the State in Modern Britain', *The Historical Journal* 42(1): pp. 251–268.
- Walby, Sylvia. 1990. *Theorizing Patriarchy*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Williams, Raymond. 1983a. *Culture and Society 1780–1950*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Williams, Raymond. 1983b. *Keywords*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 1984. State Culture and Beyond. In *Raymond Williams: On Culture and Society, Essential Writings, (2014)*, ed. Jim McGuigan, 305–311. London: Sage Publications.

Arts Policy During the Second World War in the United Kingdom

The two previous chapters have examined the biographies and ideologies of three individuals, John Maynard Keynes, Vincent Massey, and Dorothy Whitney Payne, who influenced arts policy in the United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States. Their backgrounds and ideologies provided a set of shared assumptions and concerns about their roles in society, suggesting the reasons *why* they chose to get involved in cultural policy activity. This chapter will look more closely at *who* was involved and collaborating with Keynes and Massey in the United Kingdom, the nature of their involvement, and how they sought to institutionalize their cultural values in society.

During the second world war, cultural patrons in Britain believed that they were witnessing grave threats to ‘civilization,’ and their concerns caused them to organize during the war years by creating alliances with elected politicians and appointed civil servants. This chapter focuses on a precise period in the cultural policy history of Great Britain, the years from 1939 to 1946, and illustrates the nature of their activism and their working methods by examining their interactions on behalf of the national museums and art collections and the Royal Opera House. The chapter ends with a brief examination of the Dartington Hall Arts Enquiry and a discussion of arts policy historiography and the influence of historiography on policy analysis.

These were not their only cultural projects during the war years, but surviving primary sources illustrate their working methods and interorganizational relationships. This chapter attempts to illuminate activities and decisions normally ‘shrouded in the usual mellow dusk’, as Raymond Williams observed about the Arts Council in a 1979 article (Williams 1979, p. 160). The aim here is to show *the process* of making cultural policy in wartime Britain—especially the undocumented part of the process that occurred before legislation. The evidence presented in this chapter suggests that an analysis of published documents and legislation is not sufficient to understand cultural policy development, especially when it occurs during a crisis like the second world war. More individuals than politicians and civil servants were involved. What may seem to be an absorption with administrative detail and social gossip is an acknowledgement that human beings, not documents, carry ideas between each other, between social groups, and across national borders. To ignore this human dimension in cultural policy history risks missing key agents in the process of policy development. It rationalizes and simplifies a complex process. Shining a light into the mellow dusk of wartime London required a close study of unpublished primary sources, including diary entries and correspondence. Thus this chapter relies on a combination of unpublished and published primary sources with secondary published sources, where they exist, supplementing the primary source material.

What the evidence suggests during the war years is an alliance of several groups—intellectuals, wealthy aesthetes, and politicians or civil servants—who allied around what they perceived as a crisis for the arts: the very real threats of violence, destruction, and war to artists, art forms, and museum collections, and the related threats of propaganda and censorship to freedom of thought and expression. In addition to war, there was also a perceived crisis that traditional artistic forms were threatened by the economics of the new welfare state and by the popularity of mass culture. Thus, a set of conditions and perceptions existed that motivated these cultural patrons to act.

THE CRISIS: CIVILIZATION THREATENED BY WAR AND THE WELFARE STATE

Along with the violence of war and death during the second world war, intellectuals and philanthropists in Great Britain worried about the threats to artists and culture from war and fascism. Under wartime conditions,

they experienced the closing of theaters and cinemas; the shutting down of book and periodicals publishers by paper rationing; wartime censorship; and the government production of propaganda. As the war ended in the victory of the Allies, they worried about the future of the arts and creativity in a welfare state.

At the outbreak of war in 1939, cultural life in London shut down for a few months.¹ The National Gallery, the British Museum, the Victoria and Albert, and the Tate all sent their collections for safekeeping to provincial quarries or other locations considered safe from bombing. Theaters and cinemas closed, and the Royal Opera House in Covent Garden was converted to a dance hall. Many magazines shut down, depriving writers of a free-lance market. Over the weeks that followed, when no attack occurred, cinemas re-opened and pianist Myra Hess began her legendary lunchtime concerts at the National Gallery that would continue to the end of the war.

The two groups of artists most successfully and immediately organized by the government to wartime needs were painters and performers. Following patterns of involvement set during the first world war, painters were hired by the government to document the war and wartime conditions (Hewison 1977, p. 142). Their works filled the empty galleries at the National Gallery; some toured the country in special exhibitions as the war continued. Visual artists were also employed to record the country's natural and architectural features—before their destruction—in a program called 'Recording Britain' run by the American-funded Pilgrim Trust, which would later provide the initial funding for CEMA (Hewison 1977, p. 143). Performers were quickly organized into the Entertainments National Service Association (ENSA) and assigned to troop entertainment, a duty later expanded to the civilian population. No similar programs to document wartime conditions were organized for writers and poets. Those who were hired were expected to write government pamphlets and propaganda, work that many considered stressful and demoralizing. With the Blitz, from June 1940 to June 1941, theaters and cinemas were closed again as nightly bombing sent people to shelters and the subway stations for protection.

As intellectuals and aesthetes saw their society threatened by totalitarian regimes then taking hold in Europe and Russia, they reconsidered their distrust of state-supported culture. By 1939, the realization that Europe would soon be engaged in a second major war caused Bloomsbury art critic Clive Bell to reconsider his ambivalence and opposition to state

patronage. In an article for *The New Statesman and Nation* published on 14 October, he called for the establishment of a Ministry of Arts in Great Britain. Admitting that war time might be an unusual moment to institute government support of the arts, Bell writes:

If England were to emerge from the war indistinguishable from Hitler's Germany or Stalin's Russia, historians might well enquire whether it was worth fighting for what the dictators would have let us have for nothing. Our aims need stating; and the first should be the preservation of spiritual values. We shall lose them, just as Germany has lost them, if we devote our energies exclusively to fighting, training, making arms and producing food.

The situation appeared sufficiently threatening to Bell that he was willing to turn to the government that he had blasted in previous statements:

But if the spark of civilization is to be kept alive, the Government must take a hand. I have never imagined that a government, or any other public body, was likely to be a judicious patron of the arts; but now it is not so much a matter of patronage, of encouragement, as of arresting destruction.

He called for the establishment of a public institution that, 'if not a ministry, must at any rate be in close contact with the Government.' His preference was a ministry with broad powers to 'protect and employ artists,' to organize and tour exhibitions and performing arts, to publish, and to oversee the reconstruction of public buildings and monuments. Bell names specific individuals with credentials and experience to run such a ministry and concludes: 'We have the arts, the artists, and the art directors: it remains to be seen whether we have politicians of sufficient imagination and good will to make use of the opportunity.' Bell would later write in his memoir of Keynes that this article was the result of a conversation with the economist, who urged him to write it for *The New Statesman*, which Keynes partly owned at the time (Bell 1956, p. 57). His fears for art and civilization were shared by his friend and fellow Bloomsbury, author E.M. Forster.

In a series of BBC broadcasts in 1940 Forster described what he feared as the consequences for British culture if the Nazis invaded England. In his talks, Forster linked political freedom to artistic freedom in an open society, denouncing the Nazis' appropriation of culture for political ends and their use of censorship. 'It is all part of a single movement, which has

as its aim the fettering of the writer, the scientist, the artist and the general public all over the world,' he concluded (Forster 1951, p. 39). He also described the chilling effect that the war had on British publishing and free expression: '... it is well to remember that as soon as the war is won people who care about civilization in England will have to begin another war, for the restoration and extension of cultural freedom' (Forster 1951, p. 39). If freedom of expression is threatened, civilization itself is at risk, for: 'Creation is disinterested. Creation means passionate understanding. Creation lies at the heart of civilisation like fire in the heart of the earth' (Forster 1951, p. 43).

By the end of the war, concern shifted to the future of the arts in the coming welfare state. Indeed, by March 1942, Lord Esher, the Conservative politician, would write to Keynes:

It appears clear that the patronage system has been at last destroyed by the war, and that, for better or worse, the Lady Cunard method of art production is over. The disappearance of her & her money gives music, drama & painting no alternative but to throw themselves into the arms of Socialism, & I think everyone is agreed that State subsidies are essential if these arts are to be maintained. The difficulty arises over control, English bureaucratic tradition decrees that if the State provides the money, it must control the policy. Nearly everybody connected with the arts is opposed to the dead hand of Whitehall being allowed to touch artistic production, & for this reason I believe that any proposal to create a Ministry of Fine Arts, with a political Minister responsible to Parliament & a staff of civil servants, would fail. (Esher in Weingärtner 2006, p. 100)

These conditions and perceptions motivated philanthropists, intellectuals, and other arts advocates in Great Britain to organize on behalf of artists and cultural institutions during the early 1940s. Indeed, the archival evidence suggests that a small group collaborated on at least three projects during the war years.

THE ARTS POLICY CLIQUE

Research into the activities of groups of intellectuals and aesthetes during these war years points to a working alliance between five men: John Maynard Keynes, Kenneth Clark, Samuel Courtauld, his son-in-law R. A. Butler, and Vincent Massey.² They appear to have had at least three projects during the war years. The first was an attempt to strengthen and renew,

through reform, the national art collections and the museums that housed them. They were also instrumental in the reopening of Covent Garden for productions of opera and ballet and in institutionalizing the Arts Council of Great Britain, both at the end of the war. The evidence to associate these five men in a working alliance stems from two sources: first, they served together on voluntary boards of trustees for several of the institutions in question (except for R. A. Butler); and, second, Vincent Massey's diary from these years illustrates their working and social relationships. I have identified this arts policy clique in previous published work (see Upchurch 2007, pp. 245–246), however, this chapter reveals the depth and extent of their collaboration on their three war-time projects using additional evidence from Massey's diary and other primary sources.

A brief introduction points to their shared backgrounds and social experiences. While all five might easily be described as aesthetes, for all of them were well educated and collected art, Keynes and Clark were the intellectuals among the group. All of them apart from Courtauld had attended either Oxford or Cambridge. Keynes and Butler were part of the intellectual aristocracy; Butler was identified as the third generation in the Cambridge lineage of that family (Annan 1955, p. 270). Indeed, Butler was a Conservative politician who served as President of the Board of Education and, later, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, during the time period of this study. In the first office, he had the authority to make appointments, a power which he used to appoint Keynes and Massey to positions where they could influence arts policy.

All five men were wealthy arts patrons. Massey, Clark, and Courtauld had inherited wealth: Massey from Massey-Harris; Clark from the Coats and Clark thread manufacturing company; and Courtauld from his family's silk (later rayon) manufacturing company. Keynes did not inherit wealth, but amassed his assets through investments and speculation. Butler gained wealth when he married Courtauld's only child, a daughter named Sydney, in 1926, and his political career was financed by his father-in-law's wealth. Women provided some of the social networks for these men to become acquainted, through marriage and society events. Their wives contributed to their interest and motivation to be involved in the arts and to socialize with one another. As discussed in Chap. 2, Keynes married the Russian ballerina Lydia Lopokova and expanded his cultural interests in the performing arts after their marriage; she strengthened his social connections to Courtauld, one of her closest friends (Skidelsky 1992, p. 143), and thereby to Butler. Courtauld, whose connections to Bloomsbury

also included the art historian and critic Roger Fry, joined Keynes in the late 1920s as a guarantor in the London Artists' Association, an artists' cooperative that Keynes started. The cooperative handled sales of member artists' paintings, guaranteeing them a small annual income through sales or underwriting by the guarantors; Bloomsbury artists Duncan Grant, Vanessa Bell, and Roger Fry were the established artists of the group. Keynes closed it in 1933 due to slow sales during the Depression and quarrels with Bell and Grant (Skidelsky 1992, p. 527). Butler may have gained his cultural connections from Sydney Courtauld after their marriage, and scholars have found that Sam Courtauld may have suggested some of the board appointments to Butler, including that of Keynes to chair CEMA's board (Skidelsky 2001, p. 286; Hewison 1995, p. 39; Witts 1998, p. 91). Butler met Massey as early as 1935 when Massey arrived in London as High Commissioner. Their close personal friendship is revealed in Massey's diaries and correspondence, for Massey was named as godfather to the Butlers' daughter, Sarah. This friendship continued after Massey returned to Canada, including correspondence between him and the Butlers in the 1950s, around the time of Sydney Butler's illness and premature death from cancer at 54.³

Society hostesses provided the settings and sites for informal networking among the men and their wives. Several in the clique were sought after by the society hostesses of the day, who continued to entertain during the war years. Massey likely met Sam Courtauld in his activities with the museum boards, but certainly by January 14, 1943, his diary records that he and Alice saw Courtauld on a social occasion: 'L. and I dined with Sibyl Colefax at one of her "ordinaries". An interesting group, the Kenneth Clarks, Simmonds of the Board of Trade, Joad of the Brains Trust,⁴ Lady Willingdon, Sam Courtauld, Lady Aberconway, "Shakes" Morrison, Tommy Keswick, Camrose, etc.'⁵ Sibyl Colefax, a well-known society hostess of London, is remembered fondly by Kenneth Clark in his memoir (1974, pp. 212–215), who comments that 'Diarists, except for Harold Nicolson, have been malicious about Sibyl Colefax, and the Bloomsburys in particular shuddered at her name. But they went there,' meaning they accepted her invitations (1974, p. 215). Massey also remembers her fondly in his memoir:

Perhaps she was happiest with literary people, and I recall an occasion when I met in her drawing room Somerset Maugham, Osbert Lancaster, Christopher Sykes, Rosamund Lehmann, Beverley Nichols, Rose Macaulay,

and the John Gunthers. Bereavement, ill-health, financial difficulties—all failed to break Sibyl’s spirit, and until the end she carried on with great gallantry. Her “ordinaries” at the Dorchester were famous. She could no longer afford to give large parties, so her guests were happy to respond to the “chits” they got telling them what they owed. She remained a gifted hostess, with an instinct for the choice of people and their *placement*. (Massey 1963, pp. 443–444; italics in original)⁶

Like other wealthy foreigners or Britons who could afford it, with the outbreak of war, the Masseys moved to the Dorchester Hotel off Hyde Park, considered one of the safest locations in London due to its steel-frame construction and air-raid shelter in the basement (Bissell 1986, p. 108). They continued to entertain, but more modestly:

During most of the war period we had a cocktail party every Monday. We found our quarters at the Dorchester Hotel suited us admirably. We slept on the floor in our little entrance-hall on noisy nights during the bombing to get relative quiet and to avoid the danger of flying glass. (Massey 1963, p. 289)

Massey also used their Dorchester apartment for meetings and luncheons of his museum trustee colleagues throughout the war. It is conceivable that he hosted meetings there to avoid public buildings that may have been damaged by bombing; however, using his residence also permitted privacy and secrecy in conducting business using informal methods.

The next section describes an aspect of their larger cultural project—the National Gallery and British museum policy—and demonstrates their working relationships, methods, and roles, especially the working relationships between Massey, Courtauld, and Butler.

MUSEUM POLICY AND THE MASSEY COMMITTEE

In addition to social events, their service on boards of trustees was another method that the arts policy clique used to work together socially to institutionalize their ideas. Their board memberships also demonstrate their influence within the cultural infrastructure of the time, for they held cross-memberships on various boards and committees. Four of the five men served on the wartime boards of CEMA, the National Gallery, the Tate, and, later, Covent Garden. Indeed, the National Gallery seems to have been a focus of their interests, for three of the five—Massey, Keynes, and

Courtauld—served on the board of the National Gallery during the war, and the fourth, Kenneth Clark, was its director until 1945.

An examination of their relationships and working methods on the National Gallery board illustrates Massey's coordinating role as well as their informal, and, at times, secretive, methods. The relationship between Massey and Samuel Courtauld illustrates these points. By the 1940s, both were known for their philanthropy and art collections. I have described Massey's collecting interests in Chap. 3. Courtauld, chairman of his family's rayon manufacturing business, was respected as a businessman, a patron of the arts, and a serious connoisseur. He collected paintings and by the 1930s had assembled the major collection of French Impressionist and Post-Impressionist paintings in Great Britain that included works by Degas, Renoir, Manet, Seurat, and Cézanne. In 1923 he gave £50,000 to the nation for purchases of modern paintings, many of which he selected; they include nineteenth-century highlights of the National Gallery collection such as Van Gogh's *Sunflowers* and Seurat's *Bathing Party* (Murdoch 1998, p. 7). When his wife Elizabeth died from cancer in December 1931, Courtauld established and endowed the Courtauld Institute of Art in the University of London as a memorial to her and gave the institute many of the paintings from his collection and most of the remainder upon his death in 1947. He was a trustee of the Tate Gallery from 1927 to 1937 and of the National Gallery from 1931 to 1947.⁷

Massey's wealth and manner, collecting interests, museum trustee experience, diplomatic position, and social connections and friendships, likely led to his election as a trustee of the National Gallery in May 1941, followed quickly by his appointment to the Tate Gallery board in March 1942. In May 1943, he was elected president of the National Gallery board by his fellow trustees. Massey wrote of his appointment in his memoir:

In 1941, to my surprise and pleasure, I was appointed to the board of trustees of the National Gallery, and from 1943 until my return to Canada I served as its chairman. During most of this time the director of the Gallery was Sir Kenneth Clark—or, as we called him, 'K'. He is one of the ablest people I know. To work with him was a happy experience and a perpetual stimulus; he is unrivalled in his field. The board had some distinguished members. Among them were Lord Bearstead, Sam Courtauld, Lord Herbert, Maynard Keynes, Lord Lee, and Jasper Ridley, who was also chairman of the Tate Gallery, of which I was a trustee for several years. (Massey 1963, pp. 374–375)

Massey's enthusiasm for museum business and policy and his closeness to Courtauld, Butler, and Clark may have led to the formation of a national museums committee that he was appointed to chair at the end of the war. In this project, the clique sought to reform British museum policy and make the Tate Gallery independent of the National Gallery, with its own acquisition funds. His committee's quick work suggests that its outcome may have been predetermined and that Massey was recruited to help push through the desired reforms. A small committee of museum insiders was expected to produce a report that would result in legislation.

Massey recalled in his published recollection of the committee:

My chairmanship of the National Gallery led to another responsibility in the same field. The United Kingdom government decided to set up a committee under the Treasury to inquire into the relations between the three great public collections of pictures in London—the National Gallery, the Tate, and the Victoria and Albert Museum in so far as its pictures were concerned. [...] One problem we had to deal with was the status and functions of the Tate Gallery. It had always been subordinate in its operations to the National Gallery. We recommended that it should be made entirely independent under its own trustees, and that it should perform the dual function of serving as a national gallery of modern art and a national gallery of British art. (Massey 1963, pp. 375–376)

This passage is only a summary of the activities of what came to be called informally the 'Massey Committee,' which was appointed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir John Anderson, and the President of the Board of Education—then R. A. Butler. I have noted Massey's friendship with Butler, and he was also well-acquainted with the Chancellor, whom he remembers as 'among our warm friends were John Anderson and his wife Ava' (1963, p. 444). Members of the committee included Kenneth Clark as director of the National Gallery; Jasper Ridley, chairman of the Tate; and John Rothenstein, director of the Tate. These four men—at least Clark, Massey, and Ridley—were well acquainted. The Victoria and Albert was represented by its chairman, Eric Maclagan, and a new director, Leigh Ashton.

Among the published sources about Massey, Finlay alone has attempted to research and examine this committee's activities (see Finlay 2004, pp. 180–182).⁸ Her account focuses on the committee's attention to the Tate Gallery as a neglected collection of British art and a national

institution. She concludes that Massey's role as chairman is difficult to determine: 'At the least, he was acutely sensitive to the role of the museum in nation-building, while bringing a persona of sympathetic impartiality to the task of adjudicating the claims of the various museums' (2004, p. 182). Massey appears to have played a coordinating role, acting on behalf of interests that included Courtauld and Butler, with whom he shared early copies of the draft report. Reform of museum policy and the national collections was their central interest; that reform focused on the Tate's governance and acquisition funds, but another issue of interest was the reorganization of the national collections in a manner that emphasized art historical periodization over institutional histories. It also appears that the committee was yet another attempt in a long effort by policy reformers to challenge the art purchasing authority of the Royal Academy of Art.

The committee's charge from the government was:

To examine the functions of the National Gallery and the Tate Gallery, and in respect of paintings, of the Victoria and Albert Museum, with special reference to their relations with one another and to the fuller representation of British art; and to consider the working of the Chantrey Bequest.⁹

Administration by the Royal Academy of the Chantrey Bequest, which was then the sole source of acquisition funds for the Tate Gallery, had been a subject of some controversy since a parliamentary inquiry in 1904 (Upchurch 2004, p. 207). At issue was the Royal Academy's use of the funds to purchase artworks by its own members for inclusion in the Tate's collection. The quality and suitability of the purchased works were disputed by connoisseurs on the Tate's board of trustees, and Massey and his committee attempted to shift responsibility for spending the funds from the Royal Academy to the Tate's board. This issue had persisted for decades, and the appointment of this national collections committee appears, among other things, to be an attempt to resolve it in the Tate's favor as the war ended.

Massey took charge at the outset. He appears to have held nearly all the meetings in his residence at the Dorchester, including two private discussions before the first official meeting was ever held. He began with Tate chairman Jasper Ridley, followed about a month later:

Jasper Ridley, Kenneth Clark and John Rothenstein dined with me to have an informal talk about the task of my committee on the relations between

the Galleries, etc. We spent a very pleasant evening and after we got down to business we had a very profitable talk with no trouble about agreement on the report.¹⁰

Another reason for such an early agreement on major questions regarding the national collections is acknowledged in its published report:

Our task was, therefore, to recommend such changes in the activities of the three institutions concerned as would bring to an end the overlapping of their efforts and would give each gallery clearly prescribed functions to perform.

Most of the reforms which we shall propose in this Report are, we feel, long overdue; the case for many of them was persuasively and trenchantly put forward in 1913 in the Report of the Committee appointed by the Trustees of the National Gallery in 1911, at the instance of Lord Curzon, to enquire under his chairmanship into matters connected with the national art collections. The recommendations of this Committee, in so far as they relate to institutions which have also been the subject of our discussions, were either not carried out or gave rise indirectly to inadequate measures, which failed to meet the needs of the situation as envisaged by the Committee.¹¹

Thus the committee leveled a charge of inaction to bolster their call for museum policy reform.

Beginning its work informally in June 1944, the committee and its secretary produced a first draft by December that same year, when Massey recorded:

The Joint Galleries Committee met at 2.30 in my rooms, and before the meeting those who could lunched with me—all the members save Jasper Ridley. I had asked Leigh Ashton to come as a matter of courtesy as he has been appointed the new Director of the V. & A. He took rather more initiative at the meeting than I would have done in the circumstances. We got through the first draft down to the last section on loans which we reserved for the next meeting. The draft was very well received and little altered.

Rab and Sydney Butler dined with us.¹²

However, challenges began to be raised, both from outside and within the committee. A Treasury civil servant, Alan Barlow,¹³ had hoped to negotiate an agreement with the Royal Academy of Art, according to Massey's diary,

but ‘our handling of the Chantrey Bequest in the draft report was not sufficiently conciliatory for this purpose.’¹⁴ Also Leigh Ashton, the new director of the Victoria and Albert, disrupted the protocol of collegiality and informality by writing to the Treasury about his concerns: ‘As a signatory of the report he has written to the Treasury, by-passing the committee itself complaining of some of our findings,’ Massey complained in his diary.¹⁵ Early in the year, however, Massey shared the draft report with Courtauld and Butler, recording in his diary that Butler was pleased with it.¹⁶

By May 1945, Massey had been elected to a second term as chairman of the National Gallery¹⁷ and he continued in the chairmanship of the museums committee, coordinating the negotiations with the Royal Academy over the summer:

At 5:30 had a meeting in my rooms on the recommendations concerning the Chantrey Bequest in the Report of my committee: Alan Barlow, Jasper Ridley, Gerald Kelly and Walter Lamb of the R.A. The atmosphere was a little difficult and Gerald Kelly not an easy negotiator—intelligent but given to irrelevance and considerable obstinacy. Although our recommendations were obviously unacceptable we did make some progress in suggesting ways by which the Tate and the Royal Academy could be brought closer together on this subject, and the atmosphere was entirely pleasant.¹⁸

By the year’s end, Massey was called to respond to questions from the Standing Commission on Museums and Galleries, which had been bypassed by the appointment of the Treasury’s special committee.¹⁹ Indeed, the *Report of the Committee on the Functions of the National Gallery and Tate Gallery and, in respect of Paintings, of the Victoria and Albert Museum*, which was published in May 1946, included the Massey Committee proposals dated December 1944, and a memorandum in response by the Standing Commission dated a year later in 1945. The members of the Standing Commission had some reason to believe their authority had been usurped; the Commission was established in 1931 with a purpose to advise the government on museum policy.²⁰

In its final report, Massey’s committee recommended an organization of the national collections that would establish the Tate’s independence from the National Gallery and challenged the Royal Academy’s authority in making acquisitions for the Tate using the Chantrey Bequest. The committee recommended establishing two collections within the Tate, the National Gallery of British Art of all periods and the National Gallery of

Modern Art. Both would be housed at the Tate as separate collections, but with a Keeper for each and one director to oversee both. The Tate would collect 'modern' and British paintings and sculpture, with 'modern' being defined as works of art created within the previous one hundred years from many countries. Paintings from the modern gallery, if deemed masterpieces, would be transferred after 25 years to the National Gallery, and, if British, transferred to the National Gallery of British Art. The sculpture collection would remain largely at the Victoria and Albert. To give the Tate more autonomy, for its board had operated as a subordinate body to the National Gallery's board of trustees, which had legal authority over the collection, the committee recommended legislation to establish an independent board of trustees for the Tate, with some overlapping membership with the National Gallery board to assure coordination. Administration of the Chantrey Bequest, which at the time provided some £2100 for purchases, should be turned over to the new board, but if that proved impractical, then a recommending committee might be established on which equal numbers of Tate trustees and Royal Academicians would sit. The committee further recommended an additional £5000 per year for acquisitions be allocated by Parliament, or £3000 if the Chantrey Bequest income was transferred to the Tate board. The committee also recommended transfers of works of art between three of the four collections that would, in their view, strengthen the Tate's mission as a National Gallery of British Art. These controversial recommendations involved transferring landscapes and watercolors—two areas in which British artists were internationally recognized—from the Victoria and Albert and the British Museum to the Tate. While strengthening the Tate's claim to be a national collection of British art, these transfers would also present a fuller representation of British art in one gallery. In short, the committee insisted that the government recognize and support the mission of the Tate, which had largely grown by private donations and bequests. Its recommendations also attempted to relate the Tate's growing collections to the existing national collections in a manner that emphasized the rationalizing impulse of art historical periodization by transferring works of art among the institutions in an overall scheme that emphasized connoisseurship and public education.

The Standing Commission, in its memorandum to the proposals, supported many of the recommendations, at the same time resisting this rationalizing focus in favor of a position that might be interpreted as supporting the status quo, or alternately, as taking institutional histories and

current realities into consideration. From Massey's diary remarks about Ashton's (V&A) protests, it appears that Massey's committee may have been attempting to steamroll. The Standing Commission supported the Tate's independence, the recommendations for its collecting focus, and echoed the call for £5000 in acquisition funds. However, quoting a 1929 report on the national galleries, it resisted the impulse towards 'grandiose amalgamation, and that the practical solution [...] is intelligent co-operation and inter-loan between kindred institutions.'²¹ It advised against the transfer of watercolors on the grounds that both the British Museum and the V&A had staff expertise to purchase and conserve watercolors, and that the Tate Gallery, which had been damaged by bombing during the war, would not have adequate gallery space at any time in the foreseeable future to display watercolors. Affirming the general principle of a testator's wishes for a bequest—a cautious approach in a country where gifts and bequests had built the national collections—they opposed changes in the administration of the Chantrey Bequest on the grounds that Chantrey specified that professional artists should make purchase decisions with his funds. On those grounds, they also resisted the recommendation to transfer paintings collections away from the Victoria and Albert. The Commission noted that previous reports had instructed the galleries to create a system of 'intercommunication between the Directors' of the National Gallery and the Tate to share resources and reduce competing agendas, but that no such system existed, and it should be put in place.²²

After this push to support the Tate, Massey's committee recommendations languished, and the bill resolving the Tate's status was not passed in Parliament until 1954 (Finlay 2004, p. 181), when Massey was Governor General of Canada. In a 1953 letter to Massey, Butler (he was Chancellor of the Exchequer by then) writes that work is underway to 'resuscitate' the report and its recommendations. He encloses a draft bill, explains amendments to the draft that he has approved, and writes that a bill may be introduced in the autumn. He asks Massey to keep this information confidential. The draft bill transfers legal authority for the Tate Gallery collection to its board from the National Gallery board of trustees and specifies how works of art will be legally transferred from one collection to the other, as well as to other national collections.²³

On 28 May 1946, the *Times* published a news article about the Massey Committee report.²⁴ An accompanying, unsigned editorial stated that, 'The fact that its chairman was Mr. Vincent Massey is one more reminder

of how much he contributed to the public life of this country during his tenure of office as High Commissioner for Canada.²⁵ It is quite likely that the editorial was written by Robin Barrington-Ward, who was editor of *The Times* and who had been a close friend of Massey's since their days at Balliol College.²⁶ The editorial also mentions a recent survey of the visual arts by Dartington Hall, observing that Massey's committee suggested similar, but not identical solutions as those put forward by the Dartington Hall study. This reference in a *Times* editorial points to another wartime committee also engaged in cultural policy research and recommendations that will be explored at the end of this chapter.

To conclude this section, Massey's committee appears to have been operating to challenge the status quo and push change in British museum policy through legislation. Its effectiveness was diminished, and its suggested legislation postponed, possibly due to the circumstances at the end of the war when the country was concerned with rebuilding and the two art museums in question with reinstalling their collections, repairing damage to their facilities, and resuming normal operations. While the clique's success with this museum policy project was postponed to the post-war period, they succeeded in their second project, the re-opening of Covent Garden as a performing arts house at the end of the war.

RE-OPENING COVENT GARDEN FOR OPERA AND BALLET

As recorded in his diary, Vincent and Alice Massey were guests of the Keynes' on the opening night of Covent Garden after the war:

L.²⁷ and I went to Covent Garden Opera House now in the hands of a trust, at which the ballet, *The Sleeping Beauty*, was presented. A tremendous and very representative invitation list for the opening. The atmosphere could not have been happier and it gave one almost the first impression that peace might really have returned after all. Kenneth Clark told me that the traditional little silk candle shades all over the building, which are essential to its atmosphere, were made possible by the personnel of the opera of all ranks who had given clothing coupons for the purchase of the material, the Board of Trade having refused.

In one of the intervals Keynes asked us to their room for refreshment: We found Lady Keynes officiating in the absence of her husband who was suffering from a heart attack in his box.

Rab and Sydney Butler came back to the hotel with us and we had a later dinner.²⁸

As chairman of the new trust, Keynes was expected to greet the King and Queen at the gala opening and escort them to the Royal Box. As is well known, he had a heart attack shortly before the royal family arrived; according to this entry, Lydia greeted the group on his behalf.²⁹ Keynes would recover sufficiently from this attack in February to travel to Savannah, Georgia, in the US for the organizational meetings of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank later in the month. He died on Easter Sunday, April 21, 1946.

As indicated by Massey's very evocative diary entry about its opening night, the clique's second project during the war years was the reopening of the Royal Opera House at Covent Garden for opera and ballet after its use as a dance hall during the war. Keynes's involvement in this project is discussed in several histories of UK arts policy and is documented by his biographer Skidelsky (2001), whose archival research points to a central role by Keynes in reopening the opera house as well as transferring the Sadler's Wells Ballet to become the resident company there. Keynes's interest in ballet and his connections to Ninette de Valois and her company, Sadler's Wells, were encouraged by his marriage to Lydia Lopokova, as discussed in Chap. 2. Skidelsky argues that Keynes's position as chairman of CEMA was a decisive factor in moving the ballet company to be resident in the reopened theater (2001, p. 298).

Indeed, Keynes got involved in the project because of his position at CEMA, when, in 1944, music publishers Boosey and Hawkes obtained a five-year lease to reopen Covent Garden as a theater for opera and ballet. Approaching CEMA, they were told by Kenneth Clark, on behalf of Keynes, that no CEMA grant could be made to Boosey and Hawkes to run the theater directly. However, Keynes accepted the position as chairman of the Covent Garden Committee, an advisory committee which would run the theater on a sub-lease from the music publishers: 'As chairman of CEMA, chairman of the Covent Garden Committee *and* [italics in the original] the dominant person in the Treasury, Keynes had his hands in all the instruments he needed for carrying out the policy he, Webster, Boosey and Philip Hill, chairman of Covent Garden Properties, were agreed on: to give opera and ballet a home worthy of their traditions, and a secure income' (Skidelsky 2001, p. 296). Members of the Covent Garden Committee included three members of the clique: Keynes, Kenneth Clark, and Samuel Courtauld, and, in addition, Lesley Boosey, David Webster (hired by Boosey and Hawkes to be managing

director of the theater in 1946 and remained there for the next 25 years), Edward Dent, Ralph Hawkes, Stanley Marchant, and William Walton. In February 1946, this advisory committee was converted to a charitable trust, with Keynes as its chairman, to raise money for and oversee operation of the opera house.

On January 30, 1945, Keynes wrote to Alan Barlow, second secretary of the Treasury, with a proposal to secure funding for ballet and opera at Covent Garden:

As you will see from the scheme, this is really a project to establish national opera and ballet by English performers at Covent Garden through building on the sound beginnings already made by Sadlers Wells. It is rather astonishing, I think, that it should be possible to plan something so big on such a very reasonable financial basis. The idea, as you will see, is that there should be a lump sum contribution of £25,000 during the coming financial year for production expenses. In subsequent financial years, CEMA will no doubt be expected to give some guarantee against misfortune. But one would hope that the new institution would have a pretty good chance of covering its running expenses.

I have had personally very little to do with laying the foundations of this and, therefore, perhaps I am entitled to say that they seem to be well and truly laid. Indeed, this is a long way the best concerted effort ever adumbrated in this country. It would be a major disaster, really not to be contemplated, that this opportunity should not be taken. Here is a real possibility of establishing a national art without undue expense.³⁰

In the eight pages of proposal that follows this letter, the committee points to the potential for development of English opera and ballet, writing that ‘Opera and ballet companies of a sufficiently high standard to send abroad are evidence of a nation’s culture, and at home can become attractions for a tourist traffic.’³¹

Further about Sadler’s Wells, Skidelsky writes: ‘Keynes played an equally important role in securing for the Royal Opera House a resident ballet company—the first resident company in its history. This involved tough and complicated negotiations with Sadler’s Wells, covering matters of policy, law and finance’ (2001, p. 298). Skidelsky details several delicate points in the negotiations, concluding that despite these differences with the Sadler’s Wells Board of Governors, Ninette de Valois was determined to transfer her ballet company to Covent Garden. Keynes and Webster, the Covent

Garden manager, were eager to transfer the ballet company, but not Sadler's Wells opera company, which they did not consider of equivalent quality. For the inaugural gala described by Massey on 20 February 1946 at the Royal Opera House, de Valois staged a new production of *The Sleeping Beauty* 'with Margot Fonteyn and Robert Helpmann dancing the principal roles, palatial new designs by Oliver Messel, and Constant Lambert conducting, this production marked the moment that Sadler's Wells Ballet took its place among the historic companies of Europe' (Mackrell 2008, p. 395). And 'Eleven years later its status as a national institution would be acknowledged by Royal Charter and forty-five years later, when de Valois looked back over the Royal Ballet's history, she would claim that without Lydia and Maynard's support she could never have succeeded in taking her company so far' (Mackrell 2008, p. 395).

Thus, Keynes used his connections to CEMA and to the Treasury to re-establish opera and ballet in Covent Garden and to move an existing dance company there in a first step towards establishing an English national ballet company. In this initiative too, he was supported by members of the arts policy clique.

THE ARTS ENQUIRY SPONSORED BY DARTINGTON HALL

While the arts policy clique used their social and political positions and influence to accomplish their specific projects, other arts advocates used their wealth to fund a large-scale study of the cultural infrastructure in England and published recommendations for cultural policy. Dorothy and Leonard Elmhirst of Dartington Hall commissioned The Arts Enquiry, a research project launched in 1941 that brought together specialist sub-committees of artists, intellectuals, and arts professionals to examine and document the infrastructure for the visual arts, music, documentary film, and theater and to make policy recommendations. Over the course of its eight-year history, the Elmhirsts spent £19,000 and published three book-length studies: *The Visual Arts* (1946), *Factual Film* (1947), and *Music* (1949). While The Arts Enquiry was a fully independent and privately funded initiative, archival records from Dartington Hall show that it ran into problems when its visual arts committee sought to make policy recommendations outside the influence of Keynes and the clique. Indeed, even though Mary Glasgow was involved in the early planning for the study, as the secretary for CEMA, the Arts Enquiry was 'erased' from

the book about arts policy in England that she co-authored with B. Ifor Evans in 1949. The Visual Arts study recommended that CEMA's work continue after the war as the Arts Council of Great Britain (see Upchurch 2013 for a full account and analysis of the visual arts committee and report of the Arts Enquiry).

When The Arts Enquiry was initiated by the Arts Department at Dartington Hall, with the Elmhursts' personal and financial backing, their plans were to focus on a survey of the music, theater, and visual arts sectors in England and Wales. Christopher Martin, the arts administrator at Dartington and lead researcher, attempted to organize committees for each of the three sectors. The visual arts committee was the first to organize and complete a report and was remembered by Peter Cox, then a researcher for the Enquiry, as the most efficient of the working committees. Populated by museum directors and arts educators accustomed to committee meetings, and with existing documents to aid in drafting, this committee published its report first in 1946. As the Enquiry got underway, a decision was made to include a report on documentary film when filmmakers approached Martin and asked to be included. The *Factual Film* report followed second and was published in 1947 (see Dupin 2006 for an account). With the studies of music and drama, the Enquiry began to lose momentum (Cox 2005, pp. 26–27). The committee process broke down when the Music committee included professional musicians, composers, and producers, which made meetings difficult to organize because of the performing and touring schedules of the members. Also Cox found that, unlike the visual arts committee, music committee members did not recognize the study's potential to influence arts policy. After this first failed attempt to gain industry involvement, the music committee was reorganized in 1944 and chaired by David Webster, who would be hired as managing director of the Royal Opera House in 1946, as discussed in the previous section of this chapter. Although not an official committee member, Stuart Wilson, director of music for the ACGB, was involved in an advisory capacity. The *Music* report was finally published in 1949, but experienced poor sales (Cox 2005, p. 26). Like the visual arts report, the music report examines the infrastructure and funding for professional orchestras, opera, and chamber music. Although there is a chapter about amateur music, the report is largely concerned with infrastructure, labour conditions, and training for professional musicians and singers.

Efforts to organize a theater committee were not successful, so Martin and later Cox, conducted interviews with professional managers. The

Elmhirsts' producing interests in the West End meant that some industry insiders were willing to cooperate, but the theater report was never published because commercial managers and producers were unwilling to release their income and expense statements. For these reasons, the theater survey was abandoned by the Elmhirsts after the music report was published.

Through the Arts Enquiry, Dorothy and Leonard Elmhirst and their Arts Department staff sought to make connections with arts professionals and to investigate possible roles for Dartington in a post-war cultural infrastructure. However, what they created in the Enquiry was a privately financed and unacknowledged policy research unit for CEMA and later the ACGB. Although the Enquiry's relationship with Glasgow and CEMA broke down during the visual arts committee deliberations, Kenneth Clark remained on that committee and he and others shared early drafts of materials with government officials and civil servants (Sinclair 1995, pp. 25–27). Relations with the ACGB were repaired when the music director got involved with the research into the music sector.

The Arts Enquiry represented significant private sector involvement by the Dartington Hall Trust in arts policy research for advocacy purposes and policy formation. Philanthropists supported policy formation by commissioning research and using it as the basis for their policy recommendations in the United Kingdom and later, in the United States.

CONCLUSIONS

Arts policy research, advocacy, and planning for a post-war infrastructure continued in Great Britain, despite the obvious challenges of wartime, and, indeed, the threats posed by war gave arts advocates more motivation to plan and act. This chapter has sought to illuminate the behind-the-scenes negotiations conducted by a well-connected arts policy clique who worked to influence museums policy, the national performing arts companies, and to institutionalize arts funding after the war. Indeed, this influential group sought to lay the foundations for the nation's cultural infrastructure in the decades to come, and they were managing national institutions that would gain in prominence in the post-war years. In so doing, they imposed their artistic tastes and cultural values on the nation. At the same time, the Elmhirsts at Dartington Hall sponsored a privately funded, but publicly open, study of the country's cultural infrastructure, publishing recommendations for post-war cultural policy. Their efforts intersected

with the clique's through the activities of Kenneth Clark and civil servants who shared draft reports from the Dartington group with policymakers. The next chapter examines more closely the influence of Keynes on the establishment of the Arts Council of Great Britain, which was the third wartime project of the arts policy clique.

NOTES

1. I have relied on Robert Hewison's 1977 study, *Under Siege: Literary Life in London 1939–1945* for this brief description of wartime conditions.
2. Robert Hutchison, in his critical history of the Arts Council of Great Britain, points to the personal and institutional relationships between R. A. Butler, Sam Courtauld, and Kenneth Clark (1982, p. 32).
3. See Bissell's assessment of Massey's friendships with Eden and Butler in *The Imperial Canadian*, pp. 25–27.
4. Massey refers to Cyril E.M. Joad, the philosopher, who was one of the regular 'brains' on the wildly popular BBC radio show titled *The Brains Trust*. Dr. Julian Huxley, the scientist, was also one of the original 'brains' and will enter this narrative later in the chapter. Kenneth Clark made appearances as a 'brain'. The 'brains' responded to questions from listeners on any manner of topics. Source: Tomes, Jason. 'Brains Trust (act. 1941–1961),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online edn, Oxford University Press, January. 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/theme/57624>, accessed January 27, 2008].
5. Massey, Diary, January 14, 1943. Vincent Massey Papers, University of Toronto archives, B87-0082.
6. See Bissell, 1986, pp. 15–19, for more information about Massey's impressions and friendships with society hostesses.
7. Coleman, D.C., 'Courtauld, Samuel (1876–1947)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/32587>, accessed October 16, 2007].
8. See Bissell 1986, pp. 169–170, for a brief description of the committee's work.
9. Report 1946, Committee on the Functions of the National Gallery and Tate Gallery, p. 4.
10. Massey, Diary, June 22, 1944.
11. Report 1946, Functions of National Gallery and Tate Gallery, p. 4.
12. Massey, Diary, December 7, 1944.
13. Alan Barlow appears in Annan's account of the intellectual aristocracy; Barlow married into the Darwin family. Annan also notes that Barlow was the son of a President of the Royal College of Physicians (1955, p. 264).
14. Massey, Diary, December 21, 1944.
15. Massey, Diary, April 19, 1945.
16. Massey, Diary, February 14, 1945.

17. He was nominated for a second term by Arthur Lee and seconded by Sam Courtauld.
18. Massey, Diary, August 1, 1945.
19. See Massey, Diary, December 5, 1945.
20. The commission was given a Royal Charter as the Museums and Galleries Commission in 1987 (Hewison 1995, p. 31).
21. Report (1946) Committee on the Functions of the National Gallery and Tate Gallery, p. 30.
22. Ibid., p. 32.
23. R. A. Butler to Vincent Massey, Letter, 3 February 1953, VMP, Box 387, file 24.
24. Massey had announced his retirement as High Commissioner by March 1946.
25. *The Times*, May 28, 1946, PRO, Kew, EB 3/23.
26. See Bissell 1986, pp. 22–23, for a description of their friendship.
27. ‘L.’ is Massey’s shorthand for Lal, his nickname for his wife, Alice (Bissell 1986, p. 4).
28. Massey, Diary, 20 February 1946.
29. Robert Skidelsky’s biography of Keynes records that he ‘forced himself to entertain a party of people in the first interval and to make presentations to the King and Queen in the second’ (Skidelsky 2001, p. 463). Skidelsky’s source appears to be Keynes’s letter to his mother about the event.
30. Letter, J.M. Keynes to Alan Barlow, January 30, 1945. Modern Archive Centre, King’s College, Cambridge, JMK papers. JMK/PP/84/8/1. Unpublished writings of J.M. Keynes, copyright The Provost and Scholars of King’s College, Cambridge.
31. Letter, J.M. Keynes to Alan Barlow, January 30, 1945. Modern Archive Centre, King’s College, Cambridge, JMK papers. JMK/PP/84/8/5. Unpublished writings of J.M. Keynes, copyright The Provost and Scholars of King’s College, Cambridge.

REFERENCES

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

Report. 1946. *Committee on the Functions of the National Gallery and Tate Gallery*. London: H.M. Stationery Office.

PUBLISHED SOURCES

- Annan, Noel. 1955. The Intellectual Aristocracy. In *Studies in Social History*, ed. J.H. Plumb. London: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Bell, Clive. 1956. *Old Friends: Personal Recollections*. London: Chatto & Windus.

- Bissell, Claude. 1986. *The Imperial Canadian: Vincent Massey in Office*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Clark, Kenneth. 1974. *Another Part of the Wood: A Self-Portrait*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Cox, Peter. 2005. *The Arts at Dartington 1940–1983: A Personal Account*. Totnes: Dorothy Whitney Elmhist Trust.
- Dartington Hall Trustees. 1946. *The Visual Arts*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Dupin, Christophe. 2006. The Postwar Transformation of the British Film Institute and Its Impact on the Development of a National Film Culture in Britain. *Screen* 47(4): 443–451.
- Finlay, Karen A. 2004. *The Force of Culture: Vincent Massey and Canadian Sovereignty*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Forster, E.M. 1951. *Two Cheers for Democracy*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Hewison, Robert. 1995. *Culture and Consensus: England, Art and Politics Since 1940*. London: Methuen.
- . 1977. *Under Siege: Literary Life in London 1939–45*. London: George Weidenfeld and Nicolson Ltd.
- Hutchison, Robert. 1982. *The Politics of the Arts Council*. London: Sinclair Browne.
- Mackrell, Judith. 2008. *Bloomsbury Ballerina: Lydia Lopokova, Imperial Dancer and Mrs John Maynard Keynes*. London: Weidenfeld.
- Massey, Vincent. 1963. *What's Past Is Prologue: The Memoirs of the Right Honorable Vincent Massey, C.H.* London: Macmillan & Co.
- Murdoch, John. 1998. *Introduction, The Courtauld Gallery at Somerset House*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Sinclair, Andrew. 1995. *Arts and Cultures: The History of the 50 Years of the Arts Council of Great Britain*. London: Sinclair-Stevenson.
- Sinfield, Alan. 2004. *Literature, Politics and Culture in Postwar Britain*. London: Continuum.
- Skidelsky, Robert. 1992. *John Maynard Keynes: The Economist as Saviour*. vol 2. London: Macmillan.
- Skidelsky, Robert. 2001. *John Maynard Keynes: Fighting for Britain 1937–1946*, vol 3. London: Papermac.
- Smith, James Allen. 2010. Foundations as Cultural Actors. In *American Foundations: Roles and Contributions*, eds. Helmut K. Anheier, and David C. Hammack. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Upchurch, Anna. 2004. 'John Maynard Keynes, the Bloomsbury Group, and the Origins of the Arts Council Movement', *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 10(2): 203–217.
- . 2007. Vincent Massey: Linking Cultural Policy from Great Britain to Canada. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 13(3): 239–254.

- . 2011. Keynes's Legacy: An Intellectual's Influence Reflected in Arts Policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 17(1): 69–80. First published on 2 August 2010 (iFirst).
- . 2013. “‘Missing’ from policy history: The Dartington Hall Arts Enquiry 1941–47”. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 19(5): 610–622.
- Vipond, Mary. 1980. The Nationalist Network: English Canada's Intellectuals and Artists in the 1920s. *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism* VII(1): 32–52.
- Weingärtner, Jörn. 2006. *The Arts as a Weapon of War: Britain and the Shaping of National Morale in the Second World War*. London: Tauris Academic Studies.
- Williams, Raymond. 1979. ‘The Arts Council’, *Political Quarterly*, 50(2): 157–171.
- . 1983a. *Culture and Society 1780–1950*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Witts, Richard. 1998. *Artist Unknown: An Alternative History of the Arts Council*. London: Little Brown & Co.
- Woolf, Leonard. 1960. *Sowing: An Autobiography of the Years 1880–1904*. London: The Hogarth Press.

The Arts Council of Great Britain: Keynes's Legacy

This chapter continues the examination of the war years by looking at another project of Keynes and his associates: the Arts Council of Great Britain. Examining this history is essential to understanding contemporary arts policy in the United Kingdom as well as in those nations that adopted the policy model during the twentieth century. For by examining Keynes's ideas about the purpose of policy, and how those ideas were reflected in the organization and practices of the Arts Council of Great Britain, policy-makers, analysts, and arts administrators can recognize how contemporary policies still reflect his thinking. Certainly aspects of his legacy have been challenged and debated vigorously, notably his preferences for art forms and institutions of 'high culture'—opera, classical music, ballet, theatre, and art museums. However, this chapter articulates and examines some of the central assumptions that underlie the 'arm's length' policy model, assumptions that continue to inform contemporary policy, even as the policy practices and funding preferences might be changed to accommodate broader definitions of art and culture.

The chapter examines two characteristics of the policy model that have been examined and contested by analysts, critics, and reformers, namely, the notion of 'distance' from government and the emphasis on professional standards, both associated with Keynesian cultural thinking. In the arts policy literature, the 'arm's length principle' is often

characterized as the combination of an autonomous funding agency and peer assessment decision-making processes, with ‘peers’ being individuals who know the artistic field or discipline under review but who are not civil servants (Madden 2009, p. 12). This analysis draws on interpretations of Keynes’s underlying moral approach to public policy to articulate the assumptions that underpin the model. A previous study (see Upchurch 2004) examined the cultural policy recommendations of Roger Fry, Clive Bell, and Keynes within the context of ‘Bloomsbury thought’. That study examined how their policy recommendations demonstrated their commitment to ideas, including artistic freedom, innovation in aesthetics, and public–private collaborations. This analysis examines the influence of Keynes’s political philosophy on the assumptions that underpin these ideas.

Chapter 2 discussed the ideological influences upon Keynes in his social position as a member of the ‘intellectual aristocracy’, an informally recognized group of upper middle-class families whose sons were expected to attend Oxford or Cambridge and then take positions as dons and civil servants. Chapter 3 argued that the intellectual aristocracy included the clerisy, first described by Coleridge and later broadened by English theorists, including Arnold and Mill. The clerisy were intellectual generalists, grounded in classical philosophy and literature and inheritors of a canonical tradition who accepted their social responsibility to diagnose society’s ills and prescribe its treatments. From their positions in the university, they stood consciously apart from politics and commerce and, because of their knowledge of history and philosophy, considered themselves more capable than politicians and businessmen of observing and interpreting social movement and change. Keynes considered himself to be part of the clerisy, and acted accordingly; he was a public intellectual, a Cambridge don who moved between the university and his public role as an economic advisor to the Liberal Party and to successive British governments. Influenced during his undergraduate experience by the thought of philosopher G. E. Moore, and by his friendships with writers and artists, he became a well-known arts patron who had an idealized notion of the role of the artist in society. His arts patronage and contacts with philanthropists and Cabinet members caused him to be named chairman of CEMA in 1942, a position from which he could begin to influence cultural policy in Great Britain.

KEYNES'S INFLUENCE ON ECONOMIC THOUGHT

To understand the reason for his influence on the government at the time, it is important to place Keynes and Keynesian economics within the context of twentieth-century intellectual thought. That Keynes was, and still is, acknowledged as a public intellectual, 'the creator of ideas and the shaper of opinion' (Collini 2006, p. 40) is evident, given the international influence of his thought upon capitalist economies and its attendant policy recommendations. The 'Keynesian revolution' that characterizes capitalist economic thought of the twentieth century was based upon a break with the classical economics of the past, a break that Keynes himself characterized as 'revolutionary.' The classical economic theory had, in very general terms, limited the role of policy and government and left markets to regulate themselves based upon an assumption that individuals make rational choices as consumers and investors.

Keynes's publication in 1936 of *The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money* was welcomed by the profession and 'had an effect on the subject that was unprecedented in both its speed and its depth. Within a decade, it was clear that Keynes had been the leading economist of his generation' and that 'he was probably one of the most influential economists of all time' (Backhouse 2006, pp. 34–35). In addressing one of the most pressing economic problems of his times—massive unemployment brought about by worldwide depression—Keynes sought to understand its causes and propose policy solutions. He proposed a theory of total spending in the economy, which he called aggregate demand, and its effects on output and inflation. He argued that aggregate demand is influenced by numerous public and private economic decisions that sometimes cause demand to behave erratically, because, far from being rational, consumers and investors make choices based on a range of 'animal spirits' that include emotions and superstitions. In policy terms, he believed that unemployment levels were too variable and that periods of depression or recession, rather than being efficient market responses, were economic problems that could be managed with aggressive government intervention. Indeed, government interventions, such as publicly funded capital projects, were intended to provide economic stimulus that would have a beneficial effect on the 'animal spirits' and restore optimism and buoyancy to consumers and capitalists (Backhouse and Bateman 2006, pp. 10–11). While economists in other countries, such as the United States, were

already proposing fiscal stimulus measures to revive national economies in depression, Keynes's theoretical model 'served as the means for economists and economic policymakers around the world to speak a common language and think of themselves as engaged in a common enterprise' (Bateman 2006, p. 284). Thus, his theoretical model and its attendant fiscal policy recommendations had enormous worldwide influence.

This theoretical work in macroeconomics was emerging as major features of the welfare state were being evaluated and proposed. Thus, along with Lord Beveridge, author of the 1942 report *Social Insurance and Allied Services* (the 'Beveridge Report'), Keynes is considered a principal architect of the post-war capitalist welfare state in the United Kingdom. Indeed, Roger Backhouse concludes:

The Keynesian revolutions in economic theory, in macroeconomic policy and in political philosophy are intimately connected with each other. Furthermore, they rest on much broader changes, both within economics and within society more generally [...] Keynesian economics did not cause the ideological shift that came about after the Depression and during the Second World War, but it was such an integral part of that shift that the two became hard to disentangle. (2006, pp. 37–38)¹

His plans for the Arts Council of Great Britain emerged within this context of post-war state activism and at a time when his reputation was well established as one of the world's leading economic thinkers. Indeed, Keynes's activism on behalf of the arts has been interpreted by scholars as part of his larger project, which was to establish post-war economic and social conditions that would extend economic stability beyond the middle class to the working classes and the poor. In this effort, he proposed economic policies that, joined with post-war social welfare policies, were intended to blunt the worst excesses of capitalism, namely unemployment and worker exploitation. Thus, Keynes was acting within a long tradition of intellectuals and philanthropists to support humanist institutions that they believed to offer a moral alternative to the values of industrialism and capitalism (Williams 1983a). Part of his motivation was to counter Benthamite thinking and the money-motive, and he engages with the political world and the policy sector to accomplish this project. He sought to mediate secular liberalism with his moral concerns. Just as the nineteenth-century clergy sought to temper what they saw as the negative influences of commercialism and greed with a spiritual and moral agenda,

Keynes, the secular clerisy who has rejected the conventional spiritual and moral guidance of Christianity, turns to what he regards as the spiritual realm of the artist to provide a moral alternative to the money motive. Ideologically, he remains consistent with liberalism's central concern with the rights of the individual. And he follows his inherited role to guide society, in his case by attempting to *direct the self-interest of the individual* towards the imaginative realm that has enriched his own life—the arts. He does this by instituting public provision for the arts.

KEYNES AND THE WORKING ALLIANCE

That Keynes was an effective political actor in the establishment of the Arts Council of Great Britain is one of the orthodoxies of cultural policy (Sinclair 1995, p. 45; Hewison 1995, p. 45). Chapter 4 details his personal and political connections to sketch out the basis of his support, naming a working alliance that included Keynes; R. A. Butler, the Conservative politician; Sam Courtauld, a wealthy aesthete and philanthropist; Kenneth Clark, an intellectual and wealthy aesthete; and Vincent Massey, the Canadian diplomat and philanthropist. Butler, as is widely documented, was the president of the Board of Education and appointed Keynes chairman of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts (CEMA) in 1942. Even at his appointment, Keynes was planning for CEMA beyond the war, encouraged by Butler, as well as other members of the Council. Responding to a congratulatory letter from Thomas Jones of the Pilgrim Trust soon after his appointment, Keynes wrote, 'I am hopeful from what R. A. Butler told me that it may conceivably form the beginning of something more ambitious after the war. But without private enterprise to start the ball rolling, no balls get rolled.'²

In addition to Butler as the appointing Cabinet officer, all of the working alliance, with the exception of Massey, were involved in CEMA or the formation of the ACGB. Kenneth Clark was the first of the group to be appointed to CEMA, serving from its earliest days at the request of the Pilgrim Trust (Witts 1998, pp. 63–64). When CEMA established peer review panels to oversee activities in art, music, and drama, Clark was appointed chairman of the art panel, whose members included Sam Courtauld; John Rothenstein, director of the Tate Gallery; Duncan Grant, a Bloomsbury painter and friend of both Clark and Keynes; Henry Moore, the sculptor; Philip Hendy, then the director of the Leeds City Art Gallery, would replace Clark as director of the National Gallery in 1946; and W. E.

Williams³ of the British Institute of Adult Education (Witts 1998, p. 98). The panels were not effective (Weingärtner 2006, p. 96); only the art panel met regularly enough to oversee its duty of traveling exhibitions.⁴ Butler had the authority to make appointments to the panels and to the CEMA board. Thus, the working alliance identified in Chap. 4 was present and active in the case of CEMA and the ACGB also. Not only did Keynes know Butler, but as a Treasury advisor, he was well acquainted with Sir John Anderson,⁵ the Liberal Chancellor of the Exchequer who announced in the House of Commons in June 1945 that CEMA would continue as the Arts Council (Hutchison 1982, p. 32). Far from working autocratically and alone, Keynes was assisted and encouraged in his role as chairman of CEMA by members of the working clique. Moreover, his efforts to secure ongoing public funding for CEMA's program had the endorsement of a quasi-public advisory body of intellectuals, aesthetes, and arts professionals working on the Dartington Hall Arts Enquiry (Upchurch 2013). Whether he needed their endorsement or not to secure government funding is a valid question, however, their knowledge of the project and their recommendations point to an interest that they may have expressed in active lobbying on behalf of the arts.

FOUNDATION FUNDS ESTABLISH CEMA

The quotation cited from Keynes's letter to Thomas Jones of the Pilgrim Trust points to the widely documented origins of CEMA's funding from a US-sponsored foundation. Based in the United Kingdom and still operating there today,⁶ the Pilgrim Trust was established with £2 million in 1930 by Edward Stephen Harkness (1874–1940), an American philanthropist whose wealth was inherited from his father, Stephen Harkness.⁷ The elder Harkness was one of the original six stockholders of J. D. Rockefeller's Standard Oil Company and became substantially wealthy as a result. After his death, his widow established the Commonwealth Fund⁸ in 1918 with an endowment of \$10 million, and as Vincent Massey had guided his family's foundation, her son Edward served as Commonwealth Fund president. Not a businessman or politician, however, Edward Harkness worked solely on his philanthropic interests, which included child health and welfare, hospitals, and medical education and research. Like Massey, he was concerned about the quality of student life in North American universities and a proponent of the residential college system at Oxford and Cambridge; he made multi-million dollar donations to Harvard and

Yale to establish the 'house plan' for student residences. He donated \$130 million to charitable causes in the United States and the United Kingdom before his death in New York in 1940.

Proud of his Scottish ancestry, Harkness admired Great Britain like both Carnegie and Massey, and sought to encourage intellectual and cultural exchange between that country and the United States. In 1925 the Commonwealth Fund established 22 postgraduate fellowships that were awarded annually to British or Commonwealth graduates of British universities for study in the United States to further connections between the two countries. He also made substantial donations to British institutions, including Oxford University and the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre at Stratford-upon-Avon. Harkness established the Pilgrim Trust with no directives on how the funds should be spent; however, he appointed the original trustees. In its early days, the Trust had two main interests: social welfare issues, especially adult education and initiatives for poor children, and heritage, specifically church restoration and repair and housing archives. CEMA was established in 1939 with £25,000 in private funds given by the Pilgrim Trust, thus, an American philanthropist actually provided the money for CEMA's initial grants (Witts 1998, p. 55).

The second US-funded foundation to be involved in the early days of CEMA was one of Andrew Carnegie's. The Carnegie UK Trust,⁹ established in 1913 by Carnegie, had in its earliest years been focused upon its founder's library-building campaign, which was carried out in the United States, Canada, and the British Isles. The Trust was very active in Great Britain in other cultural causes, including amateur and professional music and museums, and Witts notes that the highly professional officers of the Trust operated as 'the Arts Council in all but name, privately endowed' in the decades before CEMA (1998, p. 23). His account of the early days of CEMA's history gives good attention to the individuals involved and to their relationships with each other and on the two foundation boards and records a botched attempt to convince the Carnegie UK Trust to match Pilgrim's initial gift (Witts 1998, pp. 67–73). By the time that Keynes chaired his first CEMA meeting in April 1942, the officers of the Pilgrim Trust had withdrawn from the organization, leaving a £12,500 grant, with the Treasury providing the balance of funding and full funding in subsequent years. Negotiations with the Carnegie UK Trust continued in 1942–43, when CEMA assumed responsibility for Carnegie's guarantees and subsidies to the professional orchestras, leaving Carnegie to assume CEMA's support for amateur music and drama (Hutchison 1982, p. 49).

In this section, I have sketched out Keynes's political and social connections, showing that the working clique of Butler, Keynes, Courtauld, and Clark collaborated in the operation of CEMA. I have also pointed to the presence of private funding from US-sponsored foundations, Carnegie and Pilgrim, as a stimulus and subsidy to cultural institutions in the United Kingdom, prior to state support. In the next section, I will examine Keynes's ideas of what constituted 'the state' and his ethical approach to public policy.

KEYNES'S NOTION OF 'THE STATE'

Understanding Keynes's policy contribution first requires an understanding of his notion of what constituted 'the state' and his expectations of what government policy should attempt. In his economic thought, he argued for aggressive government action to stabilize economies and manage markets and advocated a larger role for the state in post-war social conditions. During the 1920s and 1930s Keynes willingly challenged conventional laissez-faire thought, as well as conventional social thinking about issues that affected economic policy such as population growth and pay for women. His conception of 'the state' was broader than a narrowly defined legalistic definition of the monarchy, the Parliament, the judiciary, and the bureaucracy and included those institutions that today would be considered by policy analysts as part of civil society, institutions that, whether publicly or privately owned, operate in the long-term public interest, not in pursuit of short-term profits (Skidelsky 2001, pp. 273–274). These included institutions that provided the infrastructure of society, such as the Bank of England, the railway companies and the ports authority, and he believed that such institutions would grow appropriately in influence as the economy grew.

In analyzing his notion of the state, Keynes has been characterized as an 'end-state liberal' by economist Alan Peacock, meaning that he was concerned with the goals of policy (1993, p. 33). And the aim of government, according to Keynes, should be 'equality of contentment' for all citizens:

it will be the role of this country to develop a middle way of economic life which will preserve the liberty, the initiative and (what we are rich in) the idiosyncrasy of the individual in a framework serving the public good, and seeking equality of contentment amongst all. (Keynes in Peacock 1993, p. 19)

Thus, government's role was to ensure that all citizens enjoyed the benefits of economic advancement while maintaining basic tenets of individual liberty, thus assuming a moral role for the state (Gray 2000, p. 100). In Keynesian economic theory, achieving this required the maintenance of a steady level of employment with control over total investment, and the bulk of investment would be managed or influenced by public or semi-public bodies (Peacock 1993, p. 19). By turning to government intervention, he departed from conventional *laissez-faire* thought which he saw as rooted in fixed assumptions about individuals and markets, assumptions that had been proven obsolete by worldwide events including the Depression. He willingly departed from economic liberalism to achieve full employment when the free market proved ineffective in reaching that policy goal (Peacock 1993, pp. 34–35).¹⁰ Peacock and others have pointed out that Keynes envisioned a moral and ethical transition in society, once the economic needs of all citizens were met. Keynes argued:

When the accumulation of wealth is no longer of high social importance, there will be great changes in the code of morals. We shall be able to rid ourselves of many pseudo-moral principles which have hag-ridden us for two hundred years, by which we exalted some of the most distasteful of human qualities into the position of the highest virtues. We shall be able to afford to dare to assess the money-motive at its true value. (JMK 1972, vol. IX, p. 329)

He goes on to deplore the love of money for its own sake, rather than as a means to 'the enjoyment and realities of life', calling greed 'a somewhat disgusting morbidity, one of those semi-criminal, semi-pathological propensities which one hands over with a shudder to the specialists in mental disease' (JMK 1972, vol. IX, p. 329). Reflecting his intellectual bias, Keynes was deeply suspicious of wealth accumulation and money-making as human motivations and saw both as the means to an end—which was living a civilized life. He sought to understand and manage human behavior, rather than to transform it. Peacock finds that Keynes thought of 'equality of contentment' as the opportunity for 'all to enjoy the cultural benefits' that he had enjoyed by virtue of his social position (1993, p. 23). Rather than interpreting this as Keynes's prescription for living the good life, Peacock understands Keynes's position to be the provision of intellectual and cultural experiences which 'everyone will perceive as in his own interest to embrace' (1993, p. 27). Also following moral and

aesthetic lines of interpretation, Goodwin has argued that Keynes's policy recommendations, both economic and cultural, were intended to make possible the conditions for larger numbers of people to experience the 'imaginative life,' as theorized by Keynes's friend Roger Fry in the 1909 'An Essay in Aesthetics.' Indeed, he argues that Fry's theory of imaginative life provided a central philosophy for the post-Cambridge Bloomsburys, influencing their policy, literary, and aesthetic works (Goodwin 2006, pp. 217–236; Goodwin 1999, pp. 157–184).

These brief remarks about Keynes's conception of the state and the role of government provide context for the discussion of two characteristics of the policy model associated with Keynesian cultural thinking: the notion of distance from government and the emphasis on professional standards.

'ARM'S LENGTH' AND ITS DISTANCE FROM GOVERNMENT

In his economic policy recommendations, Keynes was an advocate of semi-autonomous nongovernmental bodies as early as 1926. Indeed, a central characteristic of the policy model that has been lauded and debated is its explicit attempt to remain outside the political process, thereby supposedly excluding politicians from influencing decisions about what kind of art is produced. This method of distancing government from an institution that it created and financed became known in the 1970s as the 'arm's length principle' (Hewison 1995, p. 32; Hutchison 1982, pp. 16–17; Gray 2000, p. 41).¹¹ Keynes did not, of course, name it 'arm's length,' nor did he originate the 'distancing' concept. He took a model used to fund academic research and applied it to arts funding. Indeed, this idea of distance relies upon and incorporates two policy preferences that Keynes held: what has been called his 'corporatist' approach and his preference for semi-autonomous, nongovernmental bodies. Certainly his notion of the desirability of distance from government are grounded in the ideas discussed in Chap. 3, namely, that the sphere of moral, philosophical, and ethical thought has a constant and unchanging character that stands apart from the immediate and ephemeral knowledge that supposedly characterizes commerce and politics. Thus, intellectuals and artists needed to stand apart from worldly concerns to maintain their capacity to diagnose society. Cultural activists like Keynes believed that what they saw as the self-interested motives of businessmen and politicians could result in debased art, even propaganda (Upchurch 2004). Therefore, the appropriate policy response for this ideological position was distance, or 'hands-off.'

Keynes has been described as a ‘corporatist,’ not meaning the business model or a neo-liberal who favors global corporations and privatization, but a moderate economic liberal who inclines towards large, unelected bodies that usually possess an internal hierarchy and who exercise control over their respective areas of influence, whether social or economic. He is described as

a strong advocate of both public corporations and large private concerns that were ready to do deals with the government and look beyond shareholder value. From the 1920s to the 1940s, he frequently referred approvingly to the two-thirds or three-quarters of fixed investment which he regarded as already effectively under public control or influence. (Brittan 2006, p. 185)

In this preference, too, he is recognized as an early proponent of ‘public-private partnerships’ (Brittan 2006, p. 185). This phrase, public-private partnership, can be used to describe the relationship of grants of public funds from semi-autonomous nongovernmental bodies to privately operated cultural organizations. It has been used routinely in the United States to describe the relationship between government-sponsored arts councils and their beneficiary arts organizations.

Keynes had begun to promote the idea of semi-autonomous bodies as early as 1926, writing:

I believe that in many cases the ideal size for the unit of control and organisation lies somewhere between the individual and the modern State. I suggest, therefore, that progress lies in the growth and recognition of semi-autonomous bodies within the State—bodies whose criterion of action within their own field is solely the public good as they understand it, and from whose deliberations motives of private advantage are excluded, though some place it may still be necessary to leave, until the ambit of men’s altruism grows wider, to the separate advantage of particular groups, classes, or faculties—bodies which in the ordinary course of affairs are mainly autonomous within their prescribed limitations, but are subject in the last resort to the sovereignty of the democracy expressed through Parliament. (JMK 1972, vol. IX, p. 288)

And in the same essay he argued that government’s role was not to undertake actions and activities that were already being done by individuals, ‘but to do those things which at present are not done at all’ (JMK 1972, vol. IX, p. 291). Indeed, the semi-autonomous body was a feature

of English public life, a recognized means of involving citizens in the work of government. J. S. Mill, commenting in 1873 about Tocqueville's concerns over centralization of authority in democracy, wrote that centralization was not an immediate concern in Britain, 'where nine tenths of the internal business which elsewhere devolves on the government, was transacted by agencies independent of it' (Mill 1981, p. 201).

An immediate and successful example of an arm's length body existed within Keynes's experience in the 1940s. The administrative model for the post-war CEMA that he began to consider by 1943 was the University Grants Committee. In an unpublished letter to Butler, he writes:

I am myself more, rather than less, perplexed as to what is the right line of development for CEMA after the war. There are two great questions to make up our minds about. The first is how far we shall do well to be concerned with making buildings available and how far with making occupants available for other people's buildings. The other question is how far we should aim at being a grant-distributing body, rather like the University Grants Committee, and how far we should be an operating body, running our own concerns.¹²

Keynes had been appointed bursar of King's College, Cambridge, in 1924. With his involvement at both the Treasury and in university administration, he was clearly aware of the workings of the University Grants Committee (UGC), established in 1919 after the first world war. There are administrative and ideological parallels between the University Grants Committee and the ACGB. As with cultural organizations, the national government's role in funding universities had evolved from a nineteenth-century practice of ad hoc funding on a limited basis to ancient, independent universities that were supported largely by private donations and endowments. A more formal approach to funding academic research and university operations was adopted in the wake of the first world war, with the recognition of the importance of research to the war effort (Shattock 1994). The Committee was 'primarily a mechanism for resource allocation, for the division of a given sum among a group of needy institutional claimants,' and it was understood to be a 'buffer' between the government and the universities to maintain their autonomy (Shattock 1994, p. 1). It apportioned government funding in block grants to the universities, which were responsible for administration of the funds. The government's policy towards university research at the time was that it should not seek to control either applied or pure research (Shattock 1994, p. 36).

The original UGC comprised a part-time chairman and ten senior academics not in the active service of any of the institutions which might be awarded grants. Its members were appointed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in consultation with the President of the Board of Education and the Secretary of State for Scotland. A full-time secretary—a civil servant—worked for the UGC, which reported to the Treasury, as the ACGB was to do (Shattock 1994, pp. 1–2). The UGC was placed under the Treasury, not the Board of Education, because the Board lacked jurisdictional authority in Scotland and Ireland and could not allocate funds there. This administrative arrangement with the Treasury was

an ad hoc decision which suited the circumstances of the time. The Treasury relationship, while undoubtedly clubby and highly successful on a personal basis, was also highly convenient for the UGC because of the political protection it provided and the direct access to the Government's financial decision-making process. (Shattock 1994, p. 12)

Like the ACGB, the University Grants Committee came to have an international reputation and its model was adopted and modified, based on its effectiveness in distributing government funds, ‘the guarantee it provided for institutional autonomy, and its success as a “buffer” or “intermediary” standing between government and universities’ (Shattock 1994, p. 53). The model appealed to Keynes because it removed decision-making from politicians and could distance the artist-recipients from possible political intervention in their work. Despite Clive Bell's 1939 call for a ministry, cited in Chap. 4, that model was specifically rejected amid concerns about politicization and ‘official’ art. By 1945, Kenneth Clark articulated these concerns when he argued against a government department responsible for working directly with artists. Indeed, concerns about ‘artistic freedom’ were repeated throughout the mid-twentieth century.

Critics and analysts have contested the effectiveness of the notion of ‘arm's length’. Its connection with the idea of ‘artistic freedom’ has a rhetorical and ideological resonance that derives from ideas about ‘intellectual freedom’, but, in practice, the ‘arts council’ is never completely independent (see Gray 2000, pp. 42–43, for a discussion). In a 2009 review of policy literature, Christopher Madden concluded:

...in the arts policy literature, references to the “arm's length principle” could be taken as shorthand for the ethos that arts funding should be subject to the minimal interference from governments as is practicable (2009, p. 13).

Looking beyond the cultural policy literature into the analysis of government's use of semi-autonomous nongovernmental bodies, Madden finds that scholars (McConnel in Madden 2009, p. 15) have identified these objectives for their use: to obtain specialist or expert knowledge otherwise not available; to involve an interest group, or 'others who might be deterred by the aggressive world of local politics'; and 'to protect public administration from the cut and thrust of day-to-day politics'. These objectives would seem to describe the concerns of intellectuals and arts advocates who wished to be seen as independent authorities.

While most of the arts policy literature clearly argues for 'distance' that is sufficient to minimize government interference, Gray has pointed to the consequences of isolation and marginality that can result from too much 'distance.' He argues that by making arts policy the responsibility of a 'quango' (quasi-autonomous nongovernmental organization) reporting to the Treasury without a specific minister to advocate or hold accountable, arts policy was relegated to 'a quiet backwater' and isolated from the political channels that influence other areas of policy. Governments could then ignore arts policy in an 'approach of benign neglect' (2000, p. 44). A consequence of this isolation was that arts policy became increasingly dominated by a restricted group of political actors and increasingly introspective, thus centralizing power within the arts system (2000, p. 45).

Thus, the arts council model, as a national policy in Great Britain, is an imperfect marriage—made hastily in wartime—of the semi-autonomous nongovernmental body with a set of policy issues that existed on the periphery of political and government concern. And the actors involved even insisted on their marginality, as they insisted on their exceptionalism. This claim for the exceptionalism of art and its resulting isolation was pointed out by Raymond Williams in a very different project from Gray's, in *Culture and Society*.

Keynesian ideas about the second distinguishing characteristic of the model, the emphasis on professional standards and 'excellence', are examined in the next section.

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND 'EXCELLENCE'

Keynes's tenure as chairman of CEMA is also associated with a policy change away from financial support and encouragement of amateur creative expression in favor of art produced by professionals reflecting international quality standards (see Hutchison 1982, p. 45, as an example). His statements

indicate that this policy shift reflected his underlying assumptions about who would administer the policy and who would benefit from the funding. Indeed, this policy preference very intentionally favors ‘the exceptional and the aspiring’ and reflects his belief that an intellectual elite should demonstrate ways of living and organizing social conditions that accomplished human progress without diminishing individual liberty (Goodwin 2006, p. 231).

Keynes envisioned that the like-minded descendants of the intellectual aristocracy would administer the system. Two points in the extended passage quoted above about semi-autonomous bodies stand out in a consideration of the ACGB: ‘From whose deliberations motives of private advantage are excluded, though some place it may still be necessary to leave ... to the separate advantage of particular groups, classes, or faculties’. He meant that those individuals involved in decision-making in these bodies should operate in the larger interests of society and not benefit personally and financially from their deliberations and decisions. However, he admitted that ‘particular classes’ would need to be involved until the numbers of such individuals increased. Thus his system of semi-autonomous bodies was predicated on the participation of particular classes of men with specific expertise and moral and ideological leanings like his own. Scholars and critics have not missed this distinction arguing that Keynes assumed ‘the existence of a well-trained bureaucracy and the exercise of political self-restraint’ (Brittan 2006, p. 182). Raymond Williams famously found in his assessment of the Arts Council that, ‘The British State has been able to delegate some of its official functions to a whole complex of semi-official or nominally independent bodies because it has been able to rely on an unusually compact and organic ruling class’ that is ‘reliable and consensual’ (Williams 1979, pp. 165–166). By ruling class, Williams includes the British upper middle class and the professional civil servants from that class. A 1998 examination of the ACGB membership since its founding revealed a shared social background among mostly male, middle-aged members who were highly educated, often graduates of Oxford or Cambridge, heavily professional, and very frequently had a relationship with the arts before their appointment to the Arts Council (Gray 1998; also see Gray 2000, pp. 127–129).

A 2008 study by Griffiths, Miles, and Savage found that Oxbridge graduates continued to dominate the Arts Council board into the 1990s. They conducted a detailed examination of the social and educational backgrounds of board members of the Arts Council, comparing the characteristics of

council and panel members who served in the 1960s and 1970s with those who served in the 1980s and 1990s (see Griffiths et al. 2008). Their study found some evidence of democratization, in the gender of board members, with increasing numbers of women, and a decline in the number of members who held honours and who belonged to private clubs. However, in educational background of members, the study found less of a shift, with 47 percent having attended Oxford or Cambridge in the 1960s/70s, and 40 percent in the 1980s/90s (Griffiths et al. 2008, p. 199). Their conclusion is that the while ‘old, intellectual, gentlemanly elite’ is still over represented on cultural boards, ‘they clearly do not monopolize membership. Even the Arts Council shows shifts towards more open recruitment’ (Griffiths et al. 2008, p. 200). Yet they go on to argue that these looser networks create opportunities for individuals to acquire ‘increased strategic power’ in their ability to connect groups which otherwise would not be connected, acting as power brokers (Griffiths et al. 2008, p. 200). Although the authors are examining elite networks in the post-war period, their finding might also be applied to the arts policy clique, and particularly, to the ‘brokering’ activities of Kenneth Clark and Vincent Massey and their movements and communications between museums boards and policy committees.

This homogenous group, in Arnoldian terms, may be considered an informal social institution. As described in Chap. 3, English intellectuals learned from Matthew Arnold a preference for direction coming from the center of authority. Established standards were to be watched over in a regulatory fashion by individuals working from the center on behalf of social stability in the midst of democracy’s competing forces, or special interests, as they may be called today. We also saw in Arnold a preference for the maintenance of institutions to provide continuity within society, a preference that is reflected in Keynes’s thinking.

Who would benefit from arts funding? First and foremost, professional artists would benefit, ensuring the possibility of their future employment. An obvious reading here is that Keynes included artists in his post-war push for full employment by creating a policy mechanism for state intervention that sheltered qualified artists from the market economy. Keynes intended that greater provision of professional arts would also improve public receptivity to the arts in general, thereby enhancing artists’ potential for future employment. Using some of his most soaring rhetoric, he claimed in the BBC address that the ACGB’s purpose was to create the conditions for a ‘civilised life’. He ended the address with this statement:

The purpose of the Arts Council of Great Britain is to create an environment to breed a spirit, to cultivate an opinion, to offer a stimulus to such purpose that the artist and the public can each sustain and live on the other in that union which has occasionally existed in the past at the great ages of a communal civilised life. (JMK 1982, vol. XXVIII, p. 372)

Typically, Keynes did not specify how the ACGB would achieve this ‘spirit’; his implication is that the provision of more art will cultivate such a spirit, as he implied that the BBC’s broadcasts of orchestral concerts encouraged an interest in classical music. The notion that the public might become more receptive to the arts through greater exposure implied an assumption of some individuals’ interest in self-enrichment and education.

Indeed, the ‘civilised’ individuals whom Keynes had in mind as the direct beneficiaries of the new Arts Council were the talented and the aspiring. While Keynes declared himself to be politically leftist, he was not a socialist and not an egalitarian. His attitude can be interpreted as class-based prejudice; it also reveals his interest in providing access to those who were sufficiently eager to avail themselves of an arts experience. His interest was revealed in a speech titled ‘Liberalism and Labour’ made in 1926 in which he discusses the political philosophy of the two parties:

The political problem of mankind is to combine three things: economic efficiency, social justice, and individual liberty. The first needs criticism, precaution, and technical knowledge; the second, an unselfish and enthusiastic spirit, which loves the ordinary man; the third, tolerance, breadth, appreciation of the excellencies of variety and independence, which prefers, above everything, to give unhindered opportunity to the exceptional and the aspiring. The second ingredient is the best possession of the great party of the proletariat. But the first and third require the qualities of a party which, by its traditions and ancient sympathies, has been the home of economic individualism and social liberty. (JMK 1972, vol. IX, p. 311)

The crucial phrase is ‘which prefers, above everything, to give unhindered opportunity to the exceptional and aspiring’, meaning the talented and ambitious. Keynes was interested in encouraging those he considered the talented in society—both artists and their patrons¹³—by providing public funding for the arts. Professional artists were able to produce their work and, by so doing, provided opportunities to ambitious individuals to be patrons and experience the arts as self-enrichment.

The impact of this thinking on the policy is clear: this interpretation shifts our understanding of Keynes's well-known and well-documented preference for funding the work of professional artists over amateurs and his emphasis on improving 'standards.' He sought to encourage and support those whom he considered the most talented by providing some shelter from the market economy with grants and loans. In this view, amateur artists did not deserve public subsidy for their efforts; it was those who had professional training and who were considered talented who merited public support. His attention to the metropolitan, professional institutions was the policy response that followed this line of thinking (Gray 2000, p. 101). Among the inconsistencies for which he has been criticized was a bias towards London and the rebuilding of major institutions in the metropolis, rather than a community-based, decentralized approach to the provision of buildings, which he seemed to promise in the BBC address. The criticism goes that despite his rhetoric, he made sure that funding priorities favored Covent Garden Opera and ballet in London, rather than community arts centres throughout the country (see Hutchison 1982, pp. 63–66). In this policy recommendation, Keynes continued the intellectual aristocracy's emphasis on meritocracy, the same motivation that caused them to push for nineteenth-century reforms of the universities based on student testing and achievement, rather than birth and inherited wealth. Again, Keynes was hardly acting alone, he had plenty of support and encouragement in his insistence on 'standards' (Weingärtner 2006, p. 95), as a brief review of CEMA correspondence shows. B. Ifor Evans of The British Council, recently appointed to CEMA, wrote soon after Keynes was appointed chairman:

I think that the Pilgrim Trust accomplished a very adventurous task in setting this thing in motion, but their contacts are so much with Social Service and so little with the Arts that I had been anxious whether we could get adequate standards if that type of machinery existed.

This is one of the many reasons why I have valued so very much your acceptance of the Chairmanship. Actually the guidance has come very largely through the Secretary, Miss Glasgow ...¹⁴

Keynes wrote in reply:

I may tell you privately that I had exactly the same reserves about the policy of C.E.M.A. which you set out. I was worried lest what one may call the

welfare side was to be developed at the expense of the artistic side and of standards generally. Before agreeing to act as Chairman, I expressed this view very clearly to the President of the Board of Education. He told me that I need have no anxiety on that head, that he shared this view himself and that, with the disappearance of the Pilgrim Trust from the management (combined with Miss Glasgow's bias in the right direction) all ought to be well on this score.¹⁵

Implied in my remarks and those cited by Gray is the exclusivity created by this policy preference. Hutchison writes that the Arts Council has in large part created 'arts administration' as a profession:

... and the weight of Arts Council subsidy and procedures has gone to maintain a professional exclusiveness. It is, for the most part, professionals who sit on the Council panels and committees, it is professional organisations and professional artists that receive practically the whole of the subsidies distributed by the Arts Council; indeed the terms of financial assistance offered by the Council to most of its client organisations inhibit them from using any of their subsidy for work with amateurs. (1982, p. 54)

In Gray's analysis, the emphasis on professional standards and excellence, concepts that are open to redefinition over time as political actors change, has allowed power to be held and exercised by a minority elite operating in the Arts Council and its regional offices. The result is a 'flawed issue network' giving the appearance of 'relatively pluralist opportunities for participation while masking the reality of a fairly closed field of operation' (Gray 2000, p. 104).

This emphasis on professional standards, taught and learned in academies and schools, led logically to a policy preference to support the institutions of high culture, where traditions were enshrined and innovation slow in coming.

FUNDING FOR HIGH CULTURE

A quotation from Richard Witts summarizes part of the discussion in the previous section, the idea that motivated Keynes, Clark, and others of their educated class:

... that everyone might enjoy the freedom to benefit—intellectually, morally, spiritually—from an artistic heritage confined so far to a favored few,

in order to renew and thus perpetuate that heritage's value. This inclusive vision was the mark of orthodox liberalism. It did not, however, concern notions of social 'rights' nor 'access' [...] It was an individual matter, to be pursued as a personal initiative, that pursuit being itself a sign of sophistication. What concerned Keynes was that the structure should be open to enterprise, that it should not deny revelation to the curious or the novice. (1998, pp. 87–88)

The 'artistic heritage' would be largely confined to the performing arts in the Council's earliest years: opera, ballet, symphonic music, theatre, and touring exhibitions. Indeed, Keynes has been thoroughly criticized for encouraging funding preferences that favored the professional performing arts and high culture. However, he was not alone in those preferences, which were shared across ideological lines. In a comprehensive analysis of the history of the arts policy of the Labour Party, Bianchini (1995) has pointed to that party's interest in subsidizing and widening access to high culture from as early as the 1910s. Examining Labour policy from 1918 to 1939, he documents two strands of interest in music: an interest in folk music and traditional indigenous forms from the past influenced by the ideas of William Morris, and an interest in high culture, specifically opera, influenced by Arnold's ideas. Indeed, he points to an aversion on the part of prominent socialists to art forms, especially jazz, considered commercialized and imported from the United States, and he interprets a 'tradition of cultural anti-modernism' as influenced by Morris's anti-industrialist and anti-modern ideas (Bianchini 1995, p. 41). By contrast, he finds a 'prevailing belief within the Labour movement' that music, especially classical, intrinsically supported the democratizing aims of the movement (1995, p. 45). Quoting several primary sources, he traces an interest in supporting classical music and even a national opera and national theatre to as early as 1920, for their educative potential to workers (1995, p. 46). This interest resulted in the short-lived public subsidy to support opera at Covent Garden during the 1929–31 Labour government; the subsidy ended due to the economic depression of the early 1930s and the defeat of the Labour government in the 1931 election. Bianchini concludes that the pre-war (1918–1939) arts policy of the Labour movement and governments had a 'bias towards "high" cultural forms such as classical music, opera and theatre, and against more popular and commercial

forms of cultural activity' (1995, p. 91). Tracing the emergence of CEMA and the ACGB under the war-time coalition government, he points out that Labour governments from 1945 to 1951 accepted the administrative structure and funding priorities of the arts policy established by interests external to the Labour Party (1995, pp. 97–98).

Hewison points out that, in his BBC address, Keynes echoed the Labour Party's 1945 manifesto to provide concert halls, modern libraries, and theatres 'to assure our people full access to the great heritage of culture in this nation' (Hewison 1995, p. 44). Within this context, Keynes's advocacy of Covent Garden Opera had support across political party lines, and his statement, 'Death to Hollywood,' in the BBC address can be interpreted as a sentiment of this broad anti-commercialism. The phrase created some controversy when the publicity director of the United Artists Corporation, a major Hollywood film production company, replied in a letter to *The Times*, facetiously asking whether Keynes and the Arts Council were declaring war on Hollywood. Keynes quickly apologized, also in *The Times*, claiming that he was making the case for local support of living artists and that he should have said 'Hollywood for Hollywood!' (JMK 1982, vol. XXVIII, p. 372). Yet also in the BBC address, when he points to the lack of theatres, concert halls, and galleries in the provinces, he complains that 'the cinema took a heavy toll' no doubt referring to the conversion of theatres and concert halls to cinemas (JMK 1982, vol. XXVIII, p. 370). Researchers estimate that there were 5000 cinemas wired for sound in Great Britain by the end of the 1930s, after sound technology was introduced in the late 1920s. Studies of cinema attendance in the 1930s show that Great Britain was the largest overseas market for US-produced, or 'Hollywood,' films, second in size only to the United States market (Sedgwick 2000, p. 45).

Going to the movies was a dominant commercial leisure activity for many Britons, as economic life for the population of the United Kingdom during the interwar period has been characterized as 'uneven', particularly during the 1930s (Sedgwick 2000, p. 39). Those who were employed experienced a rising standard of living as prices dropped, while the 3.5 million who were unemployed by 1932 due to worldwide depression generally struggled through an insecure existence. Working-class youths, in demand in some markets because they were paid lower wages than

adults, could afford leisure options that included attending movies; studies show that movie attendance was the most popular form of commercial recreation among youth during the interwar years (Sedgwick 2000, pp. 40–43). However, in the early decades of BBC radio (established in 1922) and before television was a fixture in homes, going to the movies was a frequent leisure pastime for many, especially for women. In 1934 alone, on average each person aged 15 and older attended the cinema approximately 26 times annually or every other week. Working-class people attended more often than middle or upper classes, with skilled and clerical workers attending the most (Sedgwick 2000, pp. 44–45). Great Britain grew in importance during the 1930s as a market for American film after the introduction of sound, when English-language films became less marketable on the Continent and as the Nazi Party closed Germany as a market. Certainly the second world war slowed movie attendance, but Keynes made his ‘death on Hollywood’ declaration in the context of a leisure recreation market dominated by the cinema.

Among other emerging commercial media, radio did not present the same threat, given that commercial radio virtually did not exist in the United Kingdom and the BBC dominated the airwaves. As his Arts Council address broadcast on the BBC indicates, Keynes and his Bloomsbury friends admired the state-run radio service and contributed on-air commentary and articles to *The Listener*, its publication.

So in addition to the wartime concerns over censorship and physical safety, and their concerns about the end of philanthropy in a social welfare state, high-culture proponents like Keynes—and the Labour Party leadership—considered the cinema and other commercialized forms of arts and culture imported from the United States to be inferior and encroaching. Hutchison discusses the Arts Council’s emphasis on funding high culture and its resistance to funding jazz, photography, folk dancing, and applied arts: ‘Such emphasis and defence, class-based if not class-bound, has had the effect, in a developing division of labour, of discriminating against both the useful arts and a number of art forms and practices that have their roots in working-class experience’ (1982, p. 91). However easy it is to criticize Keynes’s funding preferences in class terms, considering that intellectuals and aesthetes were concerned about the encroachment of commercialized leisure entertainment from the United States, I suggest that they had a broader project than simply maintaining the art forms that they enjoyed. They sought to shore up an alternative to mass commercial culture. Scholars have argued this point in the case of Canada, where

the anti-commercial rhetoric was more explicit and pronounced, because commercial radio, press, and Hollywood films imported from the United States were a constant presence. These concerns will be discussed in the next chapter about the establishment of the Canada Council.

CONCLUSION

This chapter has examined in depth two characteristics of the 'arm's length' policy model that are associated with John Maynard Keynes as the first chairman of the Arts Council of Great Britain, the notion of 'distance' from government and the emphasis on professional standards through peer review. In his published policy statements, Keynes advocated for semi-public and semi-autonomous bodies that worked on behalf of the state, which are rooted in English civic thought and practice. The University Grants Committee was one such semi-autonomous body that Keynes had experience with and the specific model that he preferred for arts policy. In this case intellectual freedom and artistic freedom were understood to need 'distance' from government involvement, and a semi-autonomous body was thought to ensure that distance. Scholars have analyzed Keynes's moral and ethical position behind his policy recommendations, citing 'equality of contentment' for all citizens through economic stabilization as the basis of policies advocating government intervention in market economies.

Concerning the emphasis on professional standards and peer review, Keynes intended for the 'exceptional and aspiring' to benefit from greater arts provision, which included professional artists and those individuals with the desire and the means to participate as audience. He assumed that the system would be administered by people who shared his social background and ideas. The emphasis on professional standards was also preferred by Butler, Clark, Glasgow, and many of the individuals involved in administration and cannot be attributed to Keynes alone. It led logically to funding preferences for institutions and arts forms associated with the established standards of high culture located in the metropolitan center, London. Again, Keynes was not alone in his intention to fund opera and high culture, for those preferences were shared by the Labour party, which was elected to govern just as the Arts Council of Great Britain was beginning its post-war existence.

Critics have charged that Arts Council funding has benefited institutions, rather than individuals, that Keynes was not interested in supporting

and stimulating creativity, but in building national institutions in the performing arts (Witts 1998, p. 146). Some historians have concluded that he was right to limit the scope of the Arts Council in its early years, because of the country's financial conditions, when there were few public resources for anything, much less the fine arts (Sinclair 1995, p. 51). In line with Keynes's interests during his time as chairman, the national opera, dance, and theater companies have received annual operating subsidies and the largest percentage of Arts Council funds. As applied in the United Kingdom, the arts council model has supported professional artists through the development and sustenance of artistic institutions that produce, present, and commission work for audiences of taxpayers and tourists. Many critics have seen the arts council model as a flawed one, but one worth reforming (Williams 1979, 1989; Hutchison 1982; Witts 1998).

Finally, this chapter traced the presence of American foundation funding in the start-up of CEMA, introducing both the Pilgrim Trust and the Carnegie Trust UK, whose early philanthropy helped to establish the cultural infrastructure in Great Britain. The Carnegie Corporation will factor in the next chapter about the establishment of the Canada Council. Indeed, the massive fortunes made by Carnegie and Rockefeller in the United States ultimately funded academic and cultural infrastructure in the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom. As in Great Britain, these foundations and their administrators were involved in mid-twentieth-century advocacy and activities to shape cultural policy in Canada.

NOTES

1. Bradley W. Bateman's essay in *The Cambridge Companion to Keynes* assesses the varied interpretations and misinterpretations of Keynesian economic theory. See Bateman, 'Keynes and Keynesianism,' pp. 271–290. Backhouse and Bateman are co-editors of this collection.
2. Letter to Thomas Jones, Pilgrim Trust. January 22, 1942. Keynes Papers, King's College, University of Cambridge, Cambridge.
3. Williams would be appointed Secretary-General of the Arts Council from 1951 to 1963.
4. Richard Witts (1998) gives the impression that the music and drama panels were ineffective because Keynes insisted that CEMA fund the organizations whose personnel and projects he personally supported, making the panel recommendations a moot point. Presumably the art panel would

- conform to his wishes, as it was chaired by Clark and stacked with Courtauld and Grant, Keynes's friends.
5. Hewison identifies Anderson as Keynes's 'patron at the Treasury' (1995, p. 43).
 6. See www.pilgrimtrust.org.uk for the foundation's current funding priorities, which continue to be preservation of churches and social welfare programs.
 7. See Anne Pimlott Baker, 'Harkness, Edward Stephen (1874–1940),' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/68995>, accessed February 26, 2008].
 8. The Commonwealth Fund still operates in the United States and today focuses on healthcare system efficiency and delivery; see www.commonwealthfund.org.
 9. The Carnegie UK Trust continues to operate today; see www.carnegieuk-trust.org.uk for its current funding priorities.
 10. Keynesian economic theory, its influence, and its effectiveness, was debated throughout the twentieth century. While credited with economic growth and stability in the 1950s and 1960s, its focus on government intervention in the economy began to be challenged in the 1970s and 1980s with the election of a Conservative government in the United Kingdom in the late 1970s (for a discussion of the major debates, see Andrew Gamble, 'The Decline of Corporatism' in *Keynes and the Role of the State*).
 11. Hetherington (2015) has published a recent analysis of arm's length funding of the arts in the United Kingdom arguing that it is an outcome of liberal ideas and the expression of laissez-faire policy. He includes a history of the concept of laissez-faire and its use in the British context in this analysis.
 12. Letter, J.M. Keynes to R. A. Butler, March 2, 1943. Modern Archive Center, King's College, Cambridge. JMK papers. Unpublished writings of J.M. Keynes, copyright The Provost and Scholars of King's College, Cambridge.
 13. By 'patron' here, I mean the person who attends and participates as a customer, who patronizes the arts.
 14. Letter, B. Ifor Evans to J.M. Keynes, 23 January 1942. Modern Archive Center, King's College, Cambridge. JMK papers. PP/JMK/84/1/8. Unpublished writings of J.M. Keynes, copyright The Provost and Scholars of King's College, Cambridge.
 15. Letter, J.M. Keynes to B. Ifor Evans, The British Council. January 28, 1942. Modern Archive Center, King's College, Cambridge. JMK papers. PP/JMK/84/1/12. Unpublished writings of J.M. Keynes, copyright The Provost and Scholars of King's College, Cambridge.

REFERENCES

NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS

Bell, Clive. 1939. A Ministry of Arts. *The Statesman and Nation*, October 14, 518–519.

PUBLISHED SOURCES

- Backhouse, Roger E. 2006. The Keynesian Revolution. In *The Cambridge Companion to Keynes*, eds. Roger E. Backhouse, and Bradley W. Bateman, 19–38. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Backhouse, Roger E., and Bradley W. Bateman. 2006. A Cunning Purchase: The Life and Work of Maynard Keynes. In *The Cambridge Companion to Keynes*, eds. Roger E. Backhouse, and Bradley W. Bateman, 1–18. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bateman, Bradley W. 2006. Keynes and Keynesianism. In *The Cambridge Companion to Keynes*, eds. Roger E. Backhouse, and Bradley W. Bateman, 271–290. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brittan, Samuel. 2006. Keynes's Political Philosophy. In *The Cambridge Companion to Keynes*, eds. Roger E. Backhouse, and Bradley W. Bateman, 180–198. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Collini, Stefan. 2006. *Absent Minds: Intellectuals in Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2007 paperback edition.
- Goodwin, Craufurd. 1999. *Art and the Market: Roger Fry on Commerce in Art*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- . 2006. The Art of an Ethical Life: Keynes and Bloomsbury. In *The Cambridge Companion to Keynes*, eds. Roger E. Backhouse, and Bradley W. Bateman, 217–236. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gray, Clive. 2000. *The Politics of the Arts in Britain*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Griffiths, Dave, Andrew Miles, and Mike Savage. 2008. The End of the English Cultural Elite? *The Sociological Review* 56(1): 188–209.
- Hetherington, Stephen. 2015. Arm's-Length Funding of the Arts as an Expression of Laissez-Faire. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. doi:[10.1080/10286632.2015.1068766](https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2015.1068766).
- Hewison, Robert. 1995. *Culture and Consensus: England, Art and Politics Since 1940*. London: Methuen.
- Hutchison, Robert. 1982. *The Politics of the Arts Council*. London: Sinclair Browne.

- Keynes, John Maynard. 1972. *Collected Writings of John Maynard Keynes, Vol IX*. London: Macmillan and St. Martin's Press. (Abbreviated as JMK 1972, Vol. IX)
- . 1982. *Collected Writings of John Maynard Keynes, Vol XXVIII*. Donald Moggridge (ed.), New York: Macmillan and Cambridge University Press. (Abbreviated as JMK 1982, Vol. XXVIII)
- Madden, Christopher. 2009. 'D'Art Report No. 9: Independence of Government Arts Funding. International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies. Available in Three Languages at <http://www.ifacca.org/topic/independence-of-arts-funding-from-government/>
- Mill, J.S. 1981. *Collected Works, Vol I, Autobiography*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Peacock, Alan. 1993. Keynes and the Role of the State. In *Keynes and the Role of the State: The Tenth Keynes Seminary Held at the University of Kent at Canterbury, 1991*, eds. Derek Crabtree, and A.P. Thirlwall, 3–40. New York: St Martin's Press.
- Sedgwick, John. 2000. *Popular Filmgoing in 1930s Britain: A Choice of Pleasures*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Shattock, Michael. 1994. *The UGC and the Management of British Universities*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Sinclair, Andrew. 1995. *Arts and Cultures: The History of the 50 Years of the Arts Council of Great Britain*. London: Sinclair-Stevenson.
- Skidelsky, Robert. 2001. *John Maynard Keynes: Fighting for Britain 1937-1946*. vol 3. London: Papermac.
- Smith, James Allen. 2010. Foundations as Cultural Actors. In *American Foundations: Roles and Contributions*, eds. Helmut K. Anheier, and David C. Hammack. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Upchurch, Anna. 2004. "John Maynard Keynes, the Bloomsbury Group, and Origins of the Arts Council Movement," *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 10(2): 203–218.
- . 2007. Vincent Massey: Linking Cultural Policy from Great Britain to Canada. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 13(3): 239–254.
- . 2013. "‘Missing’ from policy history: The Dartington Hall Arts Enquiry 1941-47". *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 19(5): 610–622.
- Vipond, Mary. 1980. The Nationalist Network: English Canada's Intellectuals and Artists in the 1920s. *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism* VII(1): 32–52.
- Weingärtner, Jörn. 2006. *The Arts as a Weapon of War: Britain and the Shaping of National Morale in the Second World War*. London: Tauris Academic Studies.
- Williams, Raymond. 1979. 'The Arts Council', *Political Quarterly* 50(2): 157–171.

- . 1983a. *Culture and Society 1780–1950*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Witts, Richard. 1998. *Artist Unknown: An Alternative History of the Arts Council*. London: Little Brown & Co.
- Woolf, Leonard. 1960. *Sowing: An Autobiography of the Years 1880–1904*. London: The Hogarth Press.

UNPUBLISHED PAPERS AND THESES

- Bianchini, Franco. 1995. Cultural Policy and Political Strategy: The British Labour Party's Approach to Arts Policy, with Particular Reference to the 1981-86 GLC Experiment. University of Manchester, UK.
- Gray, Clive. 1998. *Oligarchy by Patronage: The Membership of the Arts Council Unpublished study*. Leicester, UK: De Montfort University.

The Canadian Clerisy and the Canada Council

The previous chapter examined the institutionalization of the arts council model in Great Britain and sought to articulate its historical and ideological bases. This chapter will trace the adoption of the arts council model in Canada, the first country outside the British Isles to do so in the decades after the Arts Council of Great Britain (ACGB) was established.¹ Canada did not simply duplicate the administrative structure of the ACGB; indeed, there were significant differences between the two institutions in their earliest years. Where the ACGB was concerned primarily with arts organizations, the resulting Canada Council for the Encouragement of the Arts, Letters, Humanities and Social Sciences was an omnibus organization with a range of activities such as awarding grants to academic researchers in the humanities and social sciences as well as to artists and arts organizations, distributing capital funds to the universities, and overseeing the country's cultural diplomacy activities. As first established, it was a hybrid of the private foundation and the arm's length model of government support. These administrative differences were pragmatic, emerging within the political conditions specific to each institution's time and place; they were issues of administration and expedience more than ideology. This study is concerned with the similarities between the two institutions in their common ideological origins based on the actors involved in policy formation. I have argued that Vincent Massey played a leading role in arts

policy as an ideological and institutional link between Great Britain and Canada (see Chaps. 2 and 4 in this book, also Upchurch 2007), and this chapter examines his part in the establishment of the Canada Council, as well as the influence of US foundations on the development of a cultural infrastructure in Canada. Massey was at the center of an alliance comprising politicians, bureaucrats, and intellectuals, assuming (as he did in Great Britain) a coordinating and publicizing leadership role. Indeed, this chapter finds that Massey was among a ‘Canadian clerisy’ that succeeded in institutionalizing arts policy, aided by officers from American foundations. In Canada, as in Great Britain, arts advocates rejected a ministry in favor of a semi-autonomous organization and retained the peer review process.

More than fifty years after the establishment of the Canada Council, a robust, critical scholarship exists in that country about its recent policies. Fewer published historical sources exist; indeed, little published institutional history of the Canada Council exists, although a scholarly institutional history is underway.² Paul Litt’s account of the Massey Commission is a singular and thorough study, which concludes with the establishment of the Council. Articles and scattered book chapters comprise much of the available material documenting the history of the Canada Council itself, and this chapter relies on J.L. Granatstein’s 1984 article in the *Canadian Historical Review* documenting the first ten years of the Council’s history. Bernard Ostry, a Canadian cultural administrator not associated with the Council, published a widely quoted book in 1978 that he characterizes as an essay, *The Cultural Connection*, that is a useful source about the establishment of the Council. Frank Milligan (1980) has written critically about the evolving relationship of the Council to the government. Only one of the Council’s early administrators published a memoir, Albert W. Trueman, the Council’s first director. Claude Bissell, a biographer and president of the University of Toronto from 1958 to 1971, writes about this gap in the record in his introduction to Trueman’s memoir:

Canada does not have a rich store of autobiography. The deficiency is marked in those areas that do not ordinarily arouse sustained public curiosity—higher education, scholarly research, the administration and development of the arts. Politicians who achieve office, whether or not they write autobiographies or keep diaries, are assured of contemporary recognition and the eventual concern of historians. But educators, scholars, and heads of cultural institutions rarely emerge into public view, either during their lives or afterwards. No doubt they welcome this anonymity, especially during

their active careers. But the result is a gap in the record, a national amnesia in cultural history, so that, ignorant of the past, Canadians live in a perpetual daze of newness. (Trueman 1982, p. 7)

Most scholars prefer that their published research represents their life's work, rather than an autobiography. However, Bissell's comment raises interesting questions about the self-reflection of scholars and cultural and educational leaders and their acknowledgement of their own social role in the 'cultural history' of Canada.

Unlike the United Kingdom, where the ACGB emerged from a war-time emergency, the then-Liberal government of Canada sponsored a formal commission to investigate the need for federal funding for the arts. The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences was authorized in 1949 with Vincent Massey as its appointed chairman. The so-called 'Massey Commission' recommended the establishment of the Canada Council for the Encouragement of the Arts, Letters, Humanities and Social Sciences in its final report of 1951. The Canada Council was not approved and funded until 1957, after the Canadian government received a financial windfall of CA\$100 million from the estates of two Canadian millionaires. The government used CA\$50 million to establish an endowment for the Canada Council and CA\$50 million in capital funds for the universities (see Granatstein 1984; Litt 1992).

As a confederation of former British colonies, Canada's parliamentary government and much of its intellectual life was derived from British precedent and influence, making the adoption of the arts council model hardly surprising. However, Canada's political and geographic conditions are vastly different. Then an emerging nation-state, its leaders debated issues of national identity as well as issues around sovereignty. Its geography factored into these debates, because Canada is geographically vast and lightly populated, with most of its population clustered along the border with the United States. Creating a sense of nationhood distinct from its dominating neighbor, the United States, was complicated by the proximity of the population to the US. Its French heritage has consistently been a critical factor in its culture and governance, leading to widely debated ideas about diversity and an official policy of multiculturalism. To preserve Quebec identity, jurisdictional responsibilities for education had been devolved to the provinces, making federal intervention or funding in arts and education a politically sensitive issue.

In Canadian policy history, there are two broad interpretations of the creation of the Canada Council. One argues for the central position of the Massey Commission and is typified by Bernard Ostry (1978): ‘The Report of the Massey Commission has come to be regarded as the cornerstone for much that has followed in the development of Canadian cultural policy and institutions’ (p. 56). In this interpretation, encouraging a uniquely Canadian culture by establishing an arts council was part of an effort to unite the far-flung population, first through transportation (construction of a transcontinental railroad system) and second, communication (creation of the publicly supported Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, modeled after the British Broadcasting Corporation). Certainly, creating the conditions to encourage the arts and artists was expressed by the Massey Commission as a primary reason for funding the arts at the federal level. Maria Tippett (1990) adds balance and nuance to the centrality placed upon the Massey Commission with a study that documents the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century organization of Anglo-Canadian amateur cultural activities often focused on community and private sector initiatives, all of which she sees as creating the political support for public funding of culture.

A more recent interpretation argues that the Massey Commission and the establishment of national arts policy was a humanistic response to the private sector dominance of mass (American) culture, and to the modernity it represented. Paul Litt (1992) argues in his history of the Massey Commission that the liberal humanist intellectuals on that commission sought to entrench European artistic forms within Canadian life as a bulwark against mass culture and its effects. Philip Massolin (2001) has argued that the Massey Commission was a rallying point for a mid-century reaction to modernity by Canadian intellectuals that included Harold Innis, George P. Grant, and Donald Creighton, among others. Jeffrey D. Brison (2005) has revealed the influence of American foundations on the development of university research, academic infrastructure, and arts funding in Canada, concluding that the policies adopted in the 1950s and interpreted as symbolizing Canadian resistance to American culture, actually represented a collaboration between the Canadian elite and American foundations. Rather than a rejection of the American model of private philanthropy, he finds that it represents an adaptation of that model (Brison 2005, p. 202). Indeed, he concludes that the Canada Council in its earliest years resembled the multi-purpose American foundations more than it did the ACGF (Brison 2005, p. 178).

In fact, when it was first established, the Canada Council for the Encouragement of the Arts, Letters, Humanities and Social Sciences was a hybrid of the private foundation model prevalent in the United States and the arm's length model of government support in Great Britain. Frank Milligan (1980) and J. L. Granatstein (1984) both pointed out this hybridity in their analyses. Like the ACGB, the Canada Council shared the word Council in its name, an appointment process for Council members, and the policy practice of arm's length distribution of funds. Yet in its earliest years, the Council made grants using the interest income from its endowment, in the manner of a private foundation. It also supported a broader range of artistic disciplines than the ACGB, supporting choral and orchestral music, theater and ballet, festivals, and regional arts councils, and made grants to individual researchers in the arts, social sciences, and humanities. It distributed capital funds to the universities. For economy and political expedience, the early Canada Council was an omnibus organization that combined grant-making with responsibilities for cultural diplomacy, such as representation to the new international body, UNESCO. Activities that were split between the ACGB, the British Council, and the University Grants Committee in the United Kingdom were combined in the Canada Council.

Among the striking similarities between the institutionalization of the policy model in Great Britain and Canada are the groups involved and their working methods. In Canada as in Great Britain, intellectuals, wealthy aesthetes, US foundation leaders, and sympathetic Cabinet officers allied around the arts, however, in Canada their concerns would encompass higher education, public broadcasting, and the arts. A Royal Commission—a committee of 'disinterested' intellectuals chaired by Massey—gave its official stamp of approval to policy positions circulating within and outside the Liberal government, much like the officially recognized but privately funded Dartington Hall Arts Enquiry in England. While the official rhetoric in Great Britain focused on threats to culture posed by war and the leveling economic effects of socialism, the 'threat' in Canada was unmistakably the encroaching mass culture from the United States and the perceived attendant values of modern commercialism. An analysis of the primary published sources, specifically Massey's polemical writings and the Royal Commission's report, shows the anti-American and anti-commercial bias. It also demonstrates that the alliances involved were interested in creating the conditions for an alternative 'Canadian' culture to that emanating from the United States and particularly, from

that country's mass culture industries. However, in its early years, that alternative culture would in reality mean adopting and reinforcing European high culture traditions.

Massey had a central role in articulating the threat, posing the policy solutions, and leading the alliance toward foregone conclusions. Certainly he was influenced by both British and American precedents in his formal role as a Canadian diplomat and in his personal relationships and social interests. As examined in Chap. 4, his formal and informal interactions with the alliance of cultural politicians and his experiences working alongside them to manage the British national museums and to promote Canadian visual art, gave Massey the credentials and experience to return to Canada and lead a commission to nationalize Canadian art.³ His political roles within the British Empire, first as High Commissioner to London and later, as Governor General, institutionalized his position as a formal link between Great Britain and Canada. His connections to the United States included his first diplomatic posting to Washington, D.C., and his relationships with the officers of the two leading American philanthropic foundations, Rockefeller and Carnegie. Indeed, Massey continued in his publicizing and coordinating role as a cultural policy advisor, now with international experience, when he returned to Canada. However, as with Keynes and the British alliance, Massey was acting in concert with intellectuals and in this case, with Liberal party politicians. His connections within the Canadian Liberal Cabinet assured that he would be named to chair a commission on broadcasting and the arts. Intellectuals connected to universities, U.S. foundations, and business joined him as commissioners. As its chairman, he ran the commission as he had run the national museums committee in Great Britain: the outcome of its investigation was a foregone conclusion, and as chairman, he kept the proceedings on track to reach that conclusion, working quickly and expediently.

Most importantly for this study, Massey emerges as part of what may be identified as the Canadian clerisy. John Porter, the sociologist, identified the Canadian clerisy as such in his landmark study of the Canadian class system, *The Vertical Mosaic* (1965). Porter located the clerisy in an institution, the Royal Society of Canada, an association of scholars and scientists elected as fellows by the membership (1965, pp. 495–496). Trained at the London School of Economics, Porter likely was introduced to the term 'clerisy' while living and studying in Great Britain in the 1940s. Locating the Canadian clerisy in an institution conformed to his study methodology, which was an empirical analysis of the social, demographic, and

economic characteristics of a defined group of individuals. By contrast, Philip Massolin (2001) does not use the term ‘clerisy’, but he identifies a group of intellectuals in mid-century Canada who shared ideas that he categorizes as Canadian toryism. He includes Vincent Massey in this group, which, he argues, reached the height of its influence in the Massey Commission.

THE CARNEGIE CORPORATION IN CANADA

After his years in London, Massey returned to Canada to find that artists and cultural advocates had been organizing, often motivated by the emergency of the world war, to use the arts to express national values that they perceived to be under threat. Cultural advocates in Canada were also anxious, like their counterparts in the United Kingdom, to argue for post-war federal funding for the arts. Maria Tippett (1990, see Chap. 7) and Jeffrey Brison (2005) have examined this wartime period in some detail, and the following circumstances bear on this study. First, aspects of Canadian social life since the early decades of the twentieth century had been characterized by the organization and growth of voluntary associations and amateur societies to promote culture and education in cities and towns around the country (see Litt 1992; Tippett 1990; Vipond 1980). Many Canadian cities thus had thriving amateur arts societies, while professional artists had organized in discipline-specific associations. Second, US foundations, specifically the Carnegie Corporation, encouraged artists to meet and organize nationally, even funding these activities. Third, this national activity resulted in the formation of the Canadian Arts Council, a voluntary advocacy coalition, not a centralized arm’s length agency like the ACGB. The following section briefly examines the influence and working methods of the Carnegie Corporation in its cultural activity in Canada and the subsequent founding of the Canadian Arts Council.

The Carnegie Corporation in the United States was actively engaged in the Canadian arts during the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s as part of a commitment to strengthen and expand the study of Western art and aesthetics by its president, Frederick Keppel (Brison 2005; see also Tippett 1990, pp. 143–154). Upon becoming president of the Corporation in 1923, Keppel set out to democratize high culture in the United States first by creating an infrastructure of committees, institutions, and associations of ‘like-minded cultural leaders’ (Brison 2005, p. 122). Keppel expanded this approach into Canada, using funds from Carnegie’s British Dominions

and Colonies Fund. The Corporation established the Canadian Museums Committee, an advisory body formed in 1931, whose purpose was ‘to suggest ways and means of aiding the advancement of Canadian Museums and Galleries by direct financial assistance and grants for training’ (Brison 2005, p. 125). Massey, a trustee of Canada’s National Gallery of art, was one of the five members of the Committee, which was effectively controlled by the Corporation through the National Gallery and was active for about four years (*ibid.*, p. 126). His membership was only one of many contacts over the years with the Corporation, as documented by Brison and Finlay. Indeed, Finlay documents two cases in which exhibitions of Massey’s paintings were supported by Carnegie Corporation grants (2004, p 146 and p. 189). Brison sees the establishment of the Committee as the first of ‘a number of quasi-public organizations, funded and influenced by American foundations, set up to organize aspects of the arts and letters in Canada’ (2005, p. 129).

In 1941, the Carnegie Corporation underwrote the expenses of the so-called Kingston Conference, a national conference of visual artists held in Kingston, Ontario, which is considered a pivotal moment in the coming together of artists to organize and lobby for state support of the arts. According to Tippett, 150 artists, critics, curators, and educators attended the conference. While Brison agrees that the Kingston Conference was an important development in the drive for a national arts policy, he argues that it represented the interests of ‘a small group of artists, art bureaucrats, and their backers at the Carnegie Corporation to organize and lead a Canadian artistic constituency. Its success marked a victory for the professionalization and bureaucratization of Canadian culture’ (Brison 2005, p. 69). The Carnegie Corporation paid for many conference expenses, including travel expenses of participants, thereby enabling a ‘national’ representation of artists, and the Corporation negotiated with organizers on conference themes, recommended speakers, and influenced the resolutions that passed (Brison 2005, p. 70). Another organization funded by the Corporation, the Federation of Canadian Artists (FCA), was organized as a national lobbying federation of visual artists (see Nurse 2011, for an early history). It was modeled on the American Federation of Artists, which had been established in 1909 to encourage and promote the visual arts by organizing exhibitions for tours within the United States and to other countries. The Carnegie Corporation enabled the work of the FCA by funding its newsletter, secretary, and travel expenses for members of the executive committee from 1941 to 1945.

The FCA was one of many arts organizations petitioning the government's reconstruction committee for post-war arts funding. In a demonstration of unity in 1944, 16 arts organizations collaborated to produce a single report, representing a range of artists: the Royal Canadian Academy of Arts, the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada, the Sculptors' Society of Canada, the Canadian Society of Painters in Water Colour, the Canadian Society of Painters-Etchers and Engravers, the Canadian Group of Painters, the Canadian Society of Graphic Artists, the FCA, the Canadian Authors' Association, the Société des Écrivains Canadiens, the newly formed Music Committee, the Canadian Society of Landscape Architects and Townplanners, the Dominion Drama Festival, the Canadian Handicrafts Guild, the Canadian Guild of Potters, and the Arts and Letters Club (Tippett 1990, p. 171). Their joint report, titled the 'Artists' Brief to the Reconstruction Committee,' (1944) was a document calling for, among many things, the establishment of a central government agency for the arts as part of post-war recovery activities (see Tippett 1990, p. 172; Finlay 2004, p. 209; and Kuffert 2003, pp. 99–101). Tippett argues that while it was a significant achievement to bring so many interests together, that there were voices missing in this coalition: there was a concentration of visual artists, with limited representation from writers, dramatists, and musicians; no representatives from dance or photography; very limited representation from French-Canadians and women's arts groups, and no native or ethnic cultural groups were included (Tippett 1990, p. 173). Encouraged by acceptance of its report by the government, representatives of the 16 groups continued to meet as the Arts Reconstruction Committee. The committee changed its name to the Canadian Arts Council in December 1945, six months after the announcement of the Arts Council of Great Britain (Tippett 1990, p. 174). Conceived as a national organization of artists, it combined the memberships of the coalition organizations and was a voluntary advocacy association, not a centralized arm's length agency like the ACGB. However, despite these coalition-building activities, the government ignored the petition for the inclusion of a central arts agency in post-war recovery. In his study of the Massey Commission, Litt concludes that 'the artists do not deserve the position they often occupy at the front and centre of accounts of the Massey Commission's origins' calling them 'outsiders in the lobbying game' (1992, pp. 23–24). While acknowledging that the brief did not produce legislation, Tippett argues that it 'initiated serious discussion of the idea that responsibility for cultural activity

should be assumed by the government' (1990, p. 174). However, when Massey returned to Canada to promote a national arts policy, the artists were having little success.

MASSEY AS CULTURAL POLICY PROMOTER

When Massey returned to Canada after the war, he actively promoted his cultural policy interests, publishing a book that reflected the cultural nationalism of the post-war period, specifically linking the arts to nationalist and patriotic themes. Finlay characterizes Massey's efforts to secure national funding for culture in Canada as a 'personal campaign' that included speaking engagements, a book, and ultimately, his chairmanship of the royal commission (2004, p. 200). Indeed, this campaign kept him active for the first four years of his return to Canada, but success would require more than Massey's public advocacy, given the government's lukewarm interest in arts policy. He began with a national tour traveling from coast to coast speaking to voluntary associations. Of the speaking tour, he wrote in his memoir:

Perhaps a more important purpose was to give myself a refresher course on the subject of Canada itself. I found it had changed immensely during the course of the war. The result of this tour was the production of a book, *On Being Canadian*, which, although not a volume of importance, was generously received. (Massey 1963, p. 446)

This comment about the book is not false modesty, for *On Being Canadian* is the sincere and thoughtful expression of a career diplomat who cares deeply about his country and its position in the world and that relies on well-established intellectual sources to support its points. It expresses a post-war cultural nationalism and optimism that Litt describes:

For a generation weaned on the 'colony to nation'⁴ theme of progressive national independence, it seemed that Canada had come of age constitutionally, diplomatically, and militarily. A cultural nationalism that cultivated a unique culture identity was an appropriate capstone for the nation-building process. (1992, p. 17)

Massey considered a 'unique culture identity' as the best defense against the influence of values and ideas coming across the border from the United

States. His book raises a central framing question about the autonomy of Canadian culture and nationality:

Monsieur Siegfried has asked a very searching question: “With an American culture whose centre of gravity lies outside Canada’s frontiers, is it possible to found a lasting Canadian nation?” Our answer to that query must be a confident ‘yes.’ But it is a subject which invites earnest enquiry on the part of Canadians (Massey 1948, p. 124).

He is referring to a 1937 book by André Siegfried, a French sociologist, titled *Canada: An International Power*, which was reissued in 1949. In this study of Canadian nationalism, Siegfried identifies a unique Canadian ‘problem’: that Canada possesses a duality between the ‘New World’ and the ‘Old World.’ While geographically and distinctly American, it is the only country in the Americas with a political allegiance outside the hemisphere:

Canada’s political personality is the result of this equilibrium between two attractions. If this equilibrium were upset, her very existence would be jeopardized, for a Canada that was purely English would be inconceivable in North America, while a Canada that was entirely American could not have existed as a separate entity. This is the way that the Canadian problem—the North American problem if you prefer—is taking shape in the post-war world. (Siegfried 1949, p. 21)

Siegfried sees this duality as an opportunity for Canada to assume an international role as mediator between the New and Old Worlds and cites the country’s location on international air routes as a geographic manifestation of this role. He traces the country’s colonial and political history as a group of disparate provinces united politically by Great Britain to ensure their independence from the US, but geographically far-flung, without a defining geographic feature to form the long border with the US. The rising international influence of the United States and the receding of Great Britain’s position created a north–south orientation that Siegfried saw as a threat to Canadian unity. Another challenge to unity is the presence of what Siegfried identifies as three cultures: a British culture, a culturally and linguistically autonomous French-Canadian population, and an American culture. What will bind all together, he argues, is political patriotism supported by a national culture:

We have already suggested the rudiments of a Canadian culture which would be Anglo-French in its origins and its institutions, but American in its geographical atmosphere, with a touch of poetry and grandeur from the Far North. The culture which is now taking shape is endowed with great feeling. It finds expression in poetry, and in pictures into which the artists have put their heart and soul. If, however, it does not manage to come completely into being, either because it is sterilized by tradition, choked by provincialism, or absorbed by Americanism, then the work of political creation which has now reached fruition may perhaps prove to be insufficient to assure the country's true independence. (Siegfried 1949, p. 248)

In this Eurocentric interpretation, Siegfried argues that he sees the beginnings of a Canadian culture that could assure the country's sovereignty. Massey reflects these ideas throughout *On Being Canadian*.⁵ He uses Siegfried's argument about the potential for unity to call for the strengthening and establishment of national institutions in the arts and education and symbols that will communicate the Canadian character to the country's own population and to the world. In a chapter titled "The Interpreters," he outlines what he sees as the role of the artist and the arts in understanding Canada. 'The artist and the writer have a special role of interpretation,' he writes, arguing that the arts are more than 'frills' (Massey 1948, p. 33). And he cites a familiar British intellectual source, Matthew Arnold:

What can we say about the relation of art to the ordinary man? That it quickens his perceptions, broadens his mental horizon, stimulates his imagination; that it can make him a better citizen. Matthew Arnold's great essay (Culture and Anarchy 1869) on this subject will bear re-reading for it has lost none of its force. Thus runs a familiar passage: 'It is in making endless additions to itself, in the endless expansion of its powers, in endless growth in wisdom and beauty, that the spirit of the human race finds its ideal. To reach this ideal, culture is an indispensable aid, and that is the true value of culture'. (Massey 1948, p. 33)

Thus, the influence of Arnold's thought on modern cultural policy extends to Canada.

Like Siegfried, Massey points to Canadian painters as the example of artists interpreting the land and the experience: 'It is to the honour of our painters that they have made thousands of their fellow-countrymen conscious for the first time of the peculiar charm of their own land' (Massey

1948, p. 35). Both Massey and Siegfried are referring to the Group of Seven, the small group of artists who had painted the Canadian wilderness in an abstract manner and whose landscapes became associated with Canadian pride and nationalism. Massey sees developments he regards as hopeful among Canadian novelists and poets, in particular. His assessment of other arts—specifically music, theater, and architecture—is less positive. He calls for greater inclusion of Canadian composers in concert programs, and he laments the closing of theaters across the country or their conversion to cinemas, counting only four remaining of an earlier network of commercial theaters. Massey urges the development of a Canadian architecture that will blend contemporary with traditional styles.

In his next chapter, titled “Threads in the Fabric of Unity,” he proposes policy remedies, with his first suggestion the establishment of an agency like the Arts Council of Great Britain, because:

No state today can escape some responsibility in the field to which belong the things of the mind. Totalitarian governments, as we know too well, do not neglect this sphere. Their tactics strengthen the argument that democracies should be watchful and diligent in such matters. Our peoples need to understand the way of life which they are defending in the war of ideas of today so that they can defend it the better. The state indeed has very serious obligations in this field. But Canada cannot be said to have accepted this principle. We seem to trail far behind most civilized states in our governmental recognition of the arts and letters and the intellectual life of the community. (Massey 1948, pp. 47–48)

As he did during the 1930s in his promotion of economic policies with the Canadian Liberal Party, Massey becomes a promoter of Keynes’s arts policy model. He specifically calls for the establishment of a body modeled on the ACGB, rejecting the idea of a ministry using the same argument that Kenneth Clark had used in Great Britain:

The Arts Council, which deals with such things, had its beginnings, surprisingly enough, in the middle of the late war when it was founded under another name to promote exhibitions of art, organize concerts, and subsidize the production of meritorious plays for the benefit of the fighting services and the general public as well [...] We would do well to study such a successful experiment in state aid. It offers us a useful model. We need public money for the encouragement of our cultural life, but we want it without official control or political interference. That is why a Ministry of

Fine Arts or a federal Department of National Culture would be regrettable. The very phrases are chilling. The arts can thrive only in the air of freedom. (Massey 1948, p. 48)

He cites the national system of radio broadcasting, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, as a crucial thread, adding that ‘Public vigilance must keep it both efficient and independent of political interference’ (Massey 1948, pp. 51–52). Massey also supports the work of the National Film Board, which is producing documentaries about Canada and Canadian life.

Massey anticipates the jurisdictional issues that assigned the provision of education and culture to the provinces, but argues that should not prevent the federal government from getting involved in Canadian intellectual life. He offers a list of missing institutions: no national library, which greatly inconveniences scholars who must rely on libraries in the US for international loans and documents; no appropriate building for the National Gallery; no national portrait gallery; no flag; no recognized national anthem; no national medals or honors, both to recognize its own citizens and to reciprocate honors to citizens in other countries; and an ‘artificial’ capital city missing these major institutions and lacking architectural distinction.

In *On Being Canadian*, Massey sets out another theme drawn from his London experience with cultural diplomacy, a theme that will be reflected in the Royal Commission report and that has characterized Canadian activities in international cultural politics ever since. In a chapter titled ‘The Projection of Canada,’ he argues that Canada especially needs international publicity, as a relatively new country. Beyond simple publicity, he argues that the country needs to be visible internationally through educational and cultural activities, such as participating in UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization), an organization that he endorses. He explains and endorses the activities of The British Council as a useful model, citing the absence of a formal administrative structure in Canada to promote international cultural and intellectual exchanges.

Finlay found evidence in her research that Massey had drafted the beginnings of the book before the war and outlined his major themes, but she finds the draft ‘did not directly allude to state support of culture. It was Massey’s engagement with state-supported art in wartime Britain that so shaped his convictions in this area ... *On Being Canadian* was, above all, a plea for state-supported art’ (2004, p. 205). Indeed, in the book,

Massey rails against the absence of *professional* cultural infrastructure in Canada, which for him and many others defined ‘nation’ and ‘sovereignty’. Published a year before Massey chaired the Royal Commission, many of the themes and recommendations in the book clearly informed the commission’s final report. However, Massey’s recommendations needed the promotion and endorsement of an alliance of politicians and intellectuals before legislation was possible.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION: ITS COMPOSITION AND PROCESS

By examining the membership and composition of the Massey Commission, this chapter argues that the commissioners were part of the Canadian clerisy, an informal institution that extended even more broadly to the bureaucrats who lobbied the prime minister to create the commission. Politicians in the Cabinet formed an alliance with Massey and with intellectuals to set up the commission and establish the parameters of its inquiry. Massey was an experienced chairman who readily assumed the coordinating and publicizing role required of him and who brought to the project a set of attitudes and policy solutions that were already known to the government and the public. As with his work on the national museums committee in London, Massey had firm convictions on what the outcomes of the commission’s process should be and kept its process focused on his policy approaches within a timeline that he defined.

In his biography of Massey, Claude Bissell points to Brooke Claxton as the source of the idea for the commission. Indeed, Claxton, who was defense minister in the Liberal Cabinet in 1945, and J.W. ‘Jack’ Pickersgill, Prime Minister Mackenzie King’s private secretary and advisor, were both instrumental in the establishment of the commission and later, in the founding of the Canada Council. These politicians were concerned about Massey’s political situation at the end of the war; Massey had no intention of retiring to private life, but King did not intend to appoint a man he saw as a self-interested rival to a national office of any kind. While Massey might have been considered a candidate for minister of external affairs, that position went to Louis St. Laurent, King’s successor as the next Liberal prime minister (Bissell 1986, p. 184).

This change in the Liberal Party leadership was crucial. A year after returning to Canada, Massey was appointed chancellor of the University of Toronto in 1947, a largely ceremonial position that did not completely occupy his time and energy. Claxton had put forward proposals within

King's government to place Massey in charge of the government agencies concerned with arts and broadcasting and within the Liberal Party to establish a commission to look into cultural issues. These efforts were unsuccessful (see Litt 1992, pp. 11–16); however, Pickersgill and Lester Pearson, who would become the new minister of external affairs upon St. Laurent's elevation to prime minister in autumn 1948, successfully pushed the idea of a commission, then arranged a meeting between Massey and the new Prime Minister. Massey was invited to chair the commission, which had lukewarm support from St. Laurent, but a strong commitment within the Cabinet (Bissell 1986, p. 195). After hesitating in order to gauge support for the idea, Massey agreed to chair the Royal Commission on the National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, a commission that would gain a reputation as a model of effective planning (Litt 1992, p. 245). Thus, Massey's prominence in the cultural planning drive that followed was due to politicians in the Cabinet with sufficient influence to secure his appointment.

The arts were a secondary consideration within the context of the commission's work, despite its title. The prime minister and the bureaucracy had far more immediate and greater concerns about the future of broadcasting in Canada and the financial status of the universities, both of which would come under the commission's purview. Indeed, Claxton, Pickersgill, and Pearson were 'members of a rising clique of politicians for whom issues such as public broadcasting and university education were of great importance' (Litt 1992, p. 22). In addition, the prime minister was a strong supporter of public broadcasting who was interested in securing increased funding for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC), which was then dependent on an unpopular licensing fee levied on radio sets (Litt 1992, p. 24). The Canadian radio broadcasting system was supervised by the CBC and included private stations and broadcasters unhappy with the public system's oversight; they pushed for an independent regulatory body as a means towards greater flexibility and openness to U.S. commercial broadcasting. The emerging technology of television promised to make the situation more complex, and there were already calls in the press for a royal commission to investigate broadcasting. St. Laurent and others sought a commission that would provide recommendations that would be authoritative, yet uphold the public broadcasting status quo (Litt 1992, p. 25). The universities, which fell under the jurisdiction of the provinces, faced serious funding shortages in the post-war period, as their enrollments increased. The federal government lacked authority to intervene, because

of the careful jurisdictional distinctions made in education and culture, to preserve Quebec's autonomy. Claxton and others hoped that a commission could create a strategy for indirect federal funding to the universities. By combining these issues under a cultural agenda for a royal commission, the government sought political cover; existing policies could be vetted and, if needed, alternatives proposed without exposing the government to political criticism (Litt 1992, p. 26). The commission therefore had a broad charge to 'make recommendations upon the principles behind Canadian radio and television broadcasting, federal cultural institutions, Canada's relations with UNESCO, national scholarships, and the federal government's relations with national voluntary bodies involved in cultural affairs' (Litt 1992, p. 35).

Three men and one woman joined Massey on the commission. After Massey accepted his role as chairman, care was taken by the Cabinet to appoint four commissioners who provided geographic representation (Litt 1992, p. 32). Massey informally represented Ontario, being from Toronto. Georges-Henri Lévesque was a Dominican priest and the founder and dean of the faculty of the social sciences at the University of Laval, so represented Quebec (Litt 1992, pp. 32–34). Arthur Surveyer, a francophone businessman from Montreal, represented commercial interests but had also served on a variety of voluntary and government boards. Norman Mackenzie, then president of the University of British Columbia, was considered to represent both west and east coasts because he was a native of Nova Scotia. Hilda Neatby, assistant professor and acting head of the history department at the University of Saskatchewan, represented the Prairies, was bilingual, and a woman. All the commissioners had advanced degrees, and all had links to the academy, to government circles, and to national voluntary associations that had formed during the interwar years and had nationalist educational agendas (Litt 1992, p. 35).

In his study, Litt characterizes the commissioners and their supporters as part of the 'cultural elite' and points to their involvement and membership in scores of national voluntary associations which were established and expanded in Canada during the interwar years. His generalized description of the cultural elite is: well-educated, white, middle-class, and male, linked by networks of these memberships, by friendship, and by shared interests (Litt 1992, p. 21). 'The cultural elite was an intellectual elite, but activism in voluntary associations and an involvement in government were also defining characteristics', he writes, describing activist intellectuals who pursued bureaucratic and policy roles (Litt 1992, p. 21). Bissell describes

the commissioners as ‘members of what John Porter would call the clerisy, identified in the public mind with the exposition and defence of established institutions, particularly with institutions that were highly valued by a cultural elite’ (1986, p. 205). Litt, unlike Bissell, does not characterize them as clerisy and cite Porter’s work. However, on this same theme, Litt observes that the commission was set up to protect and advance the favorite causes—public broadcasting, financial support for scholars, and national cultural institutions—of this elite (1992, p. 35). That three of the commissioners—Neatby, Mackenzie, and Lévesque—held faculty or administrative positions at universities, and a fourth, Massey, was sitting chancellor at University of Toronto, points to an obvious bias on the commission to support the existing university system.

Three of these four—Massey, Mackenzie, and Lévesque—had ties to US foundations through their university affiliations, as documented by Brison (2005) in his study of US foundation influence in Canada. Indeed, he argues that it is a disservice to Canadian cultural historiography to pretend that ‘intellectuals were members of the one Canadian social group not affected by American culture [...] the Canada Council, the men who directed it, and the programs of support it offered were all products of a culture in which American foundations were key players’ (2005, p. 186). In fact, Massey had served on a Carnegie Corporation museums committee and lent his personal art collection to exhibitions funded by Carnegie grants. His cousin, George Vincent, had been president of the Rockefeller Foundation during the 1920s. As head of the social sciences faculty at the University of Laval, Lévesque had come within the Rockefeller Foundation’s network of Canadian intellectuals when that foundation funded a visiting sociologist from the University of Chicago to his program (Brison 2005, p. 110). Even more directly, Mackenzie, who chaired the Massey Commission’s advisory committee on scholarships and aid to research, was an original member of the Canadian Social Science Research Council, one of two Canadian research councils whose scholarship, publishing, and fellowship grants were provided largely by the Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations (Brison 2005, p. 175). Thus in Canada, we find a similar relationship between US foundations and intellectuals as that which existed in the United States, a relationship based on funding for academic research that clearly benefited the intellectuals.

Bissell calls the failure to appoint a poet, painter, sculptor or dramatist to the commission ‘a typical act of Canadian caution’ (1986, p. 205).

Additionally, it indicates that artists were not counted among the Canadian clerisy. Bissell cites Massey's attitude towards artists:

he thought that civilization reached its highest expression in their work, but he felt also that there had to be a constant accommodation between the aspirations of the artist and the daily satisfactions of society: artists should be circumscribed by more sober citizens. (1986, p. 205)

The presence of so many academics on the commission was likely intended to give it an air of disinterested integrity. However, my points should indicate that far from being impartial authorities, the members of the Royal Commission were allied with a host of institutions that would be affected by their deliberations and recommendations. Evidently these affiliations were not then considered conflicts of interest. And the commissioners shared the interests of the politicians and bureaucrats who appointed them. Porter pointed out this convergence of interests and values in his 1965 study, in which he found a large number of bureaucrats had been university teachers and academics before joining government. 'Because of the orientation of the bureaucracy to intellectual values, intellectual accomplishment gives prestige', and 'In some respects the conference rooms at Ottawa are more university-like than the universities, with senior officials acting like the seminar leaders that a good many of them formerly were,' Porter observed ([1965] (1992), p. 435). Indeed, Porter describes the Canadian clerisy, the same informal institution as in Great Britain, who self-consciously understood their public duty to lead and govern and who gravitated towards roles in the academy and government.

Porter, who graduated in 1949 with a degree in economics and a specialization in sociology from the London School of Economics, identified the Canadian clerisy as the members of the Royal Society of Canada in his study. This constituted a finite group of individuals, which Porter needed to conduct his quantitative analysis. However, he drew some broader conclusions from his analysis. He characterized the fellows elected to section II, English literature and civilization, as mostly humanists with history as the dominant discipline; indeed only a quarter of the fellows in this category were social scientists. Because the fellows nominated and elected new members, this selection process led Porter to conclude that 'the clerisy of the higher learning is made up largely of humanists who view with suspicion the entrance of the social scientists' (Porter [1965] (1992), p. 497). He found that the University of Toronto dominated as the alma mater of this group,

both for first and second degrees. A large percentage took a first degree at Toronto and a second degree at the University of Oxford. Additionally, almost half the fellows were on the staff of the University of Toronto. A large minority, 40 percent, did not have a Doctor of Philosophy degree or its equivalent. Porter judged their published scholarly output to be academic and not widely read, concluding ‘With few exceptions, their attitudes and values are conventional. Their contribution therefore to a dynamic dialogue is minimal. Their main contribution to ideology is through the teachers and editors who have studied under them’ ([1965] (1992), p. 500). They had served on royal commissions, including the Massey Commission, been government advisors, and two had been directors of the CBC (Porter [1965] (1992), pp. 499–500). The affiliations with the University of Toronto and with Oxford, and postgraduate training not leading to a PhD, describe Massey’s university credentials. Massey was a fellow of the Society, as was Norman Mackenzie.

While Porter identified this clerisy as an ideological elite, his notion of ideology seems to exclude the political, for he was harshly critical of what he interpreted as a lack of obvious political affiliation and activity, writing ‘There appears to be a complete lack of articulation between the clerisy of the higher learning and the political system’ ([1965] (1992), pp. 502–503). He cited a lack of honorary political appointments for Society fellows and what he saw as their conscious avoidance of participation in political debate. Even though he identified the convergence of values between the bureaucracy and Canadian academics, he seemed unaware of the political implications of a bureaucracy which recruited its like-minded ‘experts’ from the academy or the implications of a bureaucracy that appointed academics to royal commissions:

It has been argued forcibly in Canada that a depoliticized intellectual elite is useful as a reserve of neutral investigators for royal commissions and other agencies. There is no doubt that in academic circles there are norms militating against political participation. At least such participation is not associated with academic success. (Porter [1965] (1992), p. 503)

While intellectuals may have avoided party politics, they were hardly ‘neutral investigators,’ as the following analysis will demonstrate. However, Porter’s 1960s analysis provides useful, contemporary insights from a scholar and academic into the context of the Canadian clerisy.⁶

By contrast, writing in the 1980s in the quotation cited above, Bissell⁷ hinted at a broader ideological role for the clerisy by remarking upon the Massey commissioners' commitment to established institutions. This broader ideological role is the subject of Massolin's study (2001), in which he identifies a group of intellectuals in mid-century Canada who shared ideas about the corrupting effects of modernity and sought to attune Canadians to what they saw as the realities of the modern age. This group included Vincent Massey and Hilda Neatby, as well as Harold Innis, Donald Creighton, George P. Grant, and W.L. Morton. Massolin sees the Royal Commission as the event around which these critics rallied, and he analyses that commission's report as one of many documents and writings that articulate the themes of their critique. Those themes will be examined in the next section that addresses the report itself; here I point out the group's evident self-consciousness as social critics. Massolin does not call them 'clerisy'; however, his description of their consciousness of their social role points to their awareness. All, except Massey, were academics engaged in their own intellectual specializations and who participated in specific debates related to their scholarly work; they did not think of themselves as only social or moral critics. However, Massolin describes what he terms their 'elitism' as

made manifest instead in their sense of intellectual superiority; more accurately, it was a notion that they had an immutable awareness of the course of human history. More than this, it was derived from the presumption that the critics themselves were the individuals most able to remedy the ills of modern society. In many ways, the critics believed they had an almost oracular insight into cultural development [...] It is most evident in their desire to establish a social hierarchy, not based on class, but rather in which social critics and moral philosophers gained heightened recognition. (2001, p. 16)

While Massolin finds the sources of this elitism 'not easy to pinpoint' and considers their shared Christian perspective as its source, he describes the self-awareness of the intellectual's role in society that is examined in Chap. 3 in this book. Indeed, this Canadian clerisy perceived itself to be embattled, and its numbers, in fact, were threatened as Massolin points out. Because of the Depression and the second world war, academics had been leaving their poorly funded positions in Canadian universities for government jobs, positions in private research projects, and better opportunities in the United States. Thus, these critics derived a sense of identity from

their membership in a small group of humanists and social scientists who remained in Canada determined to stop the erosion of Canadian academic tradition (Massolin 2001, p. 17).

The crucial importance of the Royal Commission to the country's cultural elite—and its ability to present and promote a national cultural agenda—becomes evident in this context. As stated previously, Litt's history of the commission and its deliberations is a thorough study; the discussion of its process is limited here to indicate Massey's role, the range of participation in its deliberations, and the nature of any resistance. Litt sees the commission as a timely attempt by the cultural elite to put its interests on the public agenda, but cautions against reading the commission as a deception foisted upon an unwitting public (1992, pp. 36–37). He insists that public reaction would determine its success and that the commission was 'intended to be not just an investigation, but a combined publicity venture and public opinion survey. It was designed as a catalyst to activate and concentrate the otherwise disparate political pressure of special interest groups in the cultural field' (Litt 1992, p. 37). In other words, this alliance of intellectuals chaired by Massey was intended to lead a consensus-building drive around issues of public broadcasting, higher education, and Canadian high culture.

That one of the commission's recommendations would be the establishment of a national arts council was never in doubt, all the sources agree. Given Massey's published opinion in *On Being Canadian*, he was understood to be a strong proponent. Bissell notes parenthetically that when Neatby was first mentioned as a possible commissioner, she commented that inside gossip indicated that 'the chairman had already made up his mind about the main issues—a cynical comment with a small, hard core of truth' (Bissell 1986, p. 209). Indeed, meeting minutes show that Massey was establishing the commission's major conceptual frame as early as a private meeting in June 1949 three months before their first public meeting. Massey framed their work within the nationalistic and patriotic context of André Siegfried's question and response about Canadian stability and sovereignty that he had cited in *On Being Canadian* by asking,

Could Canadian culture survive as an entity in view of the increasingly strong influences tending to unify the culture of North America? It was the view of the Commission that at the present time Canadian national feeling is stronger than it has been in the past, but also that the pressures upon Canadian life from abroad were also stronger. (Bissell 1986, pp. 217–218)

Massey's skills as a politician and publicist were crucial in this position; Bissell writes that Massey 'was determined to finish the report of the commission with dispatch' fearing that a long investigation would lose momentum and 'arouse scepticism in the public and indifference in the government' (1986, p. 208).

Every appearance was given of an open process and investigation. Public hearings were held throughout the country, and groups and citizens with an interest in the deliberations were encouraged to submit briefs and offer public testimony to articulate the needs of their constituencies or particular academic or artistic disciplines. Some 473 submissions were received from voluntary associations, professional organizations, universities, government institutions, business organizations, private broadcasters, and individuals, most of whom had an interest in the outcome of the deliberations (Litt 1992, pp. 255–268; Kuffert 2003, pp. 146–153). Additionally, the commission sought its own reports, ordering dozens of briefs on specialized topics. Newspaper coverage of the commission's hearings and its travels was extensive and encouraged.

During its hearings, the commissioners heard many endorsements of the Arts Council of Great Britain, and Keynes's statements about it were very influential in Canada at the time (Litt 1992, p. 181). Of the submissions received, a national arts council was mentioned in 102, and four of the special studies that were commissioned also discussed it. These statistics alone indicate the specialized and professional content of the presentations and submissions to the commission, because, also in public hearings, the commissioners were told that the average Canadian's appreciation of high culture was limited or non-existent and that press, movies, and radio were the dominant cultural influences. A briefing report submitted to the commission stated that according to a study, about 27 percent of Canadians aged 15 to 24 attended at least one movie each week; 17 percent attended two or more. The same age group spent their leisure time talking, listening to the radio, reading, dating, and dancing. Their interest in cultural activities was judged to be low (Litt 1992, p. 59). However, there was no organized resistance to the commission's work among the general population, and the 'general public's attitudes about government cultural activities were never expressed very strongly in the commission's hearings' (Litt 1992, p. 60).

Resistance to the commission's work came from two groups: French-Canadian nationalists, and businessmen, especially broadcasters, who had financial interests in the outcome (Litt 1992, p. 56). Prime Minister St.

Laurent and all the politicians involved had anticipated resistance from Maurice Duplessis, the premier of Quebec, from the beginning. Massey described the premier's response in his memoir:

I wrote to the premier of each of the ten provinces at the beginning of our inquiry to ask whether his province would care to make submissions to the commission when it met in the provincial capital. The premiers of all the provinces—with the exception of Quebec—wrote cordial letters expressing a cooperative spirit. M. Duplessis, although equally courteous, took the view that the establishment of the commission was in itself an infringement of provincial rights and said that he, therefore, could not recognize its existence. The commission, however, met in due course in Quebec City, where we were warmly received, and, with the exception of provincial organizations and officers, we found a very full measure of co-operation. (Massey 1963, p. 453)

As Massey indicates, the commissioners found some allies in Quebec, where the French-Canadian struggle for political survival on a continent dominated by Anglo-Americans had made them more conscious of the importance of culture as a political unifier. There was understanding of and sympathy for the commission's work, as well as greater concern about U.S. cultural influences in broadcasting than the commission heard in English Canada (Litt 1992, p. 74). Only a small number—six—of French-Canadian submissions rejected the legitimacy of federal cultural initiatives (Litt 1992, p. 75).

Echoing Siegfried's position, the commission saw the presence of French and British cultures in Canada as a possible foundation for a national identity. The final report states:

We thought it deeply significant to hear repeatedly from representatives of the two Canadian cultures expressions of hope and of confidence that in our common cultivation of things of the mind, Canadians—French and English-speaking—can find true 'Canadianism'. Through this shared confidence we can nurture what we have in common and resist those influences which could impair, and even destroy, our integrity. In our search we have thus been made aware of what can serve our country in a double sense: what can make it great, and what can make it one. (Royal Commission 1951, p. 271)

The commission sought to demonstrate its respect for French-Canadian culture and its interest in a bicultural approach by conducting its hearings in

Quebec in French. They did not employ interpreters, for the commissioners were at least minimally bilingual; Massey was fluent in French, which the French-Canadian press noted. Given the economic and political dominance of Anglo-Canadians up to this time, the commissioners' efforts to be respectful and inclusive of French-Canadian culture were likely seen as a step towards tolerance. However, reflecting the marginalization of Canada's Native peoples, their art and culture is excluded from the vision of a bicultural, Eurocentric nation and the discussion of their art is limited to only four pages of the final report.⁸

Throughout the public hearings, businessmen and broadcasters generally protested the continued and growing involvement of the state in areas considered commercial, and their briefs attempted to articulate and assert *laissez-faire* principles. As chairman, Massey made sure these positions were heard, but used the commission's lawyer as a forceful interrogator who challenged the claim that the federal government was getting excessively involved in areas where its authority was so limited (Litt 1992, pp. 68–70).

THEMES OF THE COMMISSION'S REPORT

This section focuses briefly on the themes of the commission's final report that are relevant to this study, which are its concerns with the professional, fine arts in Canada and the destructive influence of American mass culture on Canadian cultural development, and the preference for British intellectual sources and policy models.⁹ These themes can be located in the commissioners' ideology, for Massolin writes that this group of Canadian intellectuals shared characteristics which gave them a 'group identity' and which he regards as 'conservative'. He identifies these characteristics as a sense of community; implied Britishness; and an eclecticism in adopting political ideas. Rather than being ideologues, he characterizes them as 'myth-makers and social critics, who were influenced by current events and certain conceptions of history and the future' (Massolin 2001, pp. 8–9). The 'sense of community' he describes places the primacy of community over individualism and conceives of society as 'organic, evolutionary, and anti-individualistic' with Burkean overtones of 'partnership' (Massolin 2001, p. 6). Their emphasis on community was a reaction to American political values:

Such communitarianism enabled them to denounce American individualism, Jacksonian democracy, and the violence of America's past, while lauding the

merits of the dominion's peaceful, indeed evolutionary, development. It is because of this emphasis on the organic nature of the dominion that the theories adopted elements of Burkean conservatism. (Massolin 2001, p. 6)

Their identification with Britain, which was so evident in Vincent Massey's life, grew out of a nineteenth-century imperialist movement that stressed the civilizing and Christianizing virtues of British imperialism. In this ideology, Great Britain was considered the most powerful and the most moral nation on earth, and it followed that Canada should maintain its ties with this morally superior country. At the same time, they were Canadian nationalists who believed their country to be morally superior to the United States by virtue of its ties to a British culture they considered more advanced than the corrupting influences of American republicanism (Massolin 2001, p. 7). They supported what can be described as a desire to build a second community in North America outside the American republic. Massolin points to their highly selective adoption of political and philosophical ideas; they considered the entire British political orientation, whether Tory or Whig, as 'conservative' and rooted in a unifying tradition. At the same time, they saw post-war Canadian society in a crisis that was manifested in trends associated with modernity, such as American-influenced mass culture, materialism and consumerism, and a culture of utility that developed within Canadian universities (Massolin 2001, p. 9). These intellectuals reveal their civilizing intent in their use of Matthew Arnold's ideas to confront what they saw as the cultural anarchy of the post-war period and the modernization of mass culture and consumerism (Massolin 2001, p. 10). These characteristics are all present in the Royal Commission's final report, a 517-page, book-length document which was published in June 1951.

First, the report's tone and recommendations are intended to be instructive and civilizing, reflecting the commissioners' notion of their public duty to instruct the majority. Second, British intellectual sources and policy models are favored, as is high culture from European sources. Third, mass culture from the US is cited as a negative influence on Canadian cultural development. Finally, the report continued to link high culture to Canadian nationalism, as Massey did in *On Being Canadian*. That the arts, as a crucial civilizing force, were believed by the commissioners to be struggling in the emerging nation. This situation was pointed out as a structural challenge that required a response from the state. The commission found two major and related points of concern about the arts: that

the country lacked a cultural infrastructure expressed through funding and facilities, and that the citizenry suffered from what the commissioners saw as provincialism. There were geographic challenges; part of the problem was the vast size of the country with its population clustered principally along the border with the United States.

In its discussion of the arts, the report is largely concerned with the production and working conditions available for professional artists and with cultural institutions, just as the Dartington Hall Arts Enquiry had been in the United Kingdom. A section of the report titled 'The Artist and the Writer' detailed the challenges that faced artists in each discipline, as reported to the commission in public hearings and briefs. The opening section about music was representative of the problems in the performing arts; despite a post-war interest in classical music supposedly encouraged by the CBC and new phonographic recordings, the Canadian professional composer and musician did not benefit, the commission found. The expense of travel in such a geographically dispersed country was seen as prohibitive, and the lack of concert halls and appropriate facilities throughout the country also discouraged touring by professional companies. Even amateur theater companies suffered in a country that lacked theatres with adequate rehearsal and production spaces. Indeed, drama had suffered due to the rise of movies; after sitting empty, theatres had been converted to cinemas by the major motion picture companies with stages often demolished in the renovations (Royal Commission 1951, pp. 196–197).

In addition to the problems of touring, artists faced a shortage of professional training opportunities and what was regarded as limited audience interest, thus forcing many Canadian artists to go abroad to the US and Europe to practice their art. Touring companies from the US or Europe overshadowed native Canadian talent, which the Canadian concert-going public didn't appreciate:

A concert of Canadian music given by the Toronto Symphony Orchestra in January 1948, although well advertised, was so poorly supported that it resulted in a deficit of almost \$3000. Part of this concert was broadcast by the C.B.C. and aroused considerable interest, but obviously no orchestra can undertake such a venture without some form of guarantee or subsidy. (Royal Commission 1951, p. 185)

Professional artists in classical music, theater, and ballet all experienced the same challenges and conditions. The CBC received praise from the

commissioners and the public for providing employment opportunities to professional composers, musicians, dramatists, and actors through its broadcasts of classical concerts and radio dramas.

As Massey had written in *On Being Canadian*, the commission believed that Canadian painting, specifically the work of the Group of Seven, had shown the way to a subject and an aesthetic that had at first been criticized as too modern, and later embraced as unifying. Despite national and international recognition of the country's painters, the report cited a problem with the market—Canadian consumers didn't purchase enough Canadian art to allow the artist to make a living from his or her work alone:

Canadian painting has become one of the elements of our national unity, and it has the particular advantage of being able to express its message unimpeded by the barriers imposed by differences of language. But in order to perform his civilizing function, both within and without our country, the Canadian painter must receive appropriate encouragement. (Royal Commission 1951, p. 211)

The plight of the professional artist in Canada in all disciplines—unappreciated, unsupported, and struggling to find essential training and appropriate venues to perform and to show work—marked the first part of the report and documented what the commissioners evidently heard in their hearings and read in their briefs. Many suggestions and ideas for improving conditions through scholarships, bursaries, and continued work with the CBC fill this section of the report. Canadians were judged to be unappreciative due to ignorance: 'That the education of the Canadian public is a matter of first importance has been stated to this commission on numerous occasions' (Royal Commission 1951, p. 210).

In its briefings and its report, the commission took a disingenuous position that its language and intentions not appear to be high-brow. Massey wrote in his memoir:

'Culture' was a word we tried to avoid, but, regrettably, there is no synonym in the English language to employ. *Culture* in French is a normal term, its meaning perfectly understood; translated into English it produces an uncomfortable self-consciousness. But we had to think of 'culture', using the term in its proper sense; we were concerned with what we were doing in Canada to help our nation express itself. (1963, pp. 451–452)

Despite these stated intentions, a clear disdain for mass culture, then understood as movies, commercial radio broadcasting, and magazines,

was written into the report, which lamented that Canadians living outside major cities had to rely on radio and cinema to fill their leisure time due to an absence of cultural facilities and programming in their communities. Film was not recognized as an art form at the time, although Massey clearly saw the educational value of the documentary. Artistic forms attributed to high culture were seen as superior to mass culture and as civilizing, in passages such as:

There is evidence, too, for the belief that an increasingly large section of the Canadian public is acquiring a discriminating taste in music and has come to know the delight of great music worthily performed. We have been told that there has been a five-fold increase in the sale of recordings of classical music in the last fifteen years; [...] The opinion has been expressed to us that the improvement in taste in music is in part to be attributed to the C.B.C. (Royal Commission 1951, p. 184)

The following passage from the section about drama also elevated the Western European canon:

The point need not be laboured: many of man's greatest artistic achievements, from Aeschylus to Bach and from Euripides to Wagner, have been cast in a dramatic mould. This great heritage is largely unknown to the people of Canada for whom the theatre, where it maintains a precarious existence, is restricted to sporadic visits in four or five cities by companies from beyond our borders ... (Royal Commission 1951, p. 193)

Mass culture and its assumed values were associated with the United States, and resistance to these values is implied to be patriotic:

Without taking sides on this matter we do think it important to comment on the efforts of those literary groups belonging to various schools of thought which strive to defend Canadian literature against the deluge of less worthy American publications. These, we are told, threaten our national values, corrupt our literary taste and endanger the livelihood of our writers. According to the Canadian Writers' Committee:

'A mass of outside values is dumped into our cities and towns and homes. [...] We would like to see the development of a little Canadian independence, some say in who we are, and what we think, and how we feel and what we do [...] The fault is not America's but ours.' (Royal Commission 1951, p. 225)

The impression was given of a society not only ignorant of its native talent and cultural heritage, but also at a critical point: ‘for if our writers are uncertain of the road ahead, their uncertainty, it seems, is derived from the general confusion in a society with no fixed values and no generally accepted standards’ (Royal Commission 1951, p. 226). This critical thinking about mass culture and modernity echoes Massey’s warnings in *On Being Canadian*, and reflects his effort to link culture to nationalism:

Thinking Americans are fighting gallantly against the spiritual dangers which both they and we face: a distorted sense of values, the standardization of life, the worship of mere bulk for its own sake, the uncritical acceptance of the second-rate. But the very size of the United States intensifies these tendencies in that country however they may be resisted, and we in Canada are increasingly exposed to their influence. [...] If, however, we are to keep our Canadian traditions inviolate, we must face another battle, a spiritual battle, for if the obstacle to true Canadianism was ‘Downing Street’ in the nineteenth century, its enemy today is ‘Main Street’ with all that phrase implies. (Massey 1948, p. 124)

Thus, Massey and the commissioners believed that if Canada maintained its cultural independence from the United States, it could build a society based on European precedents that would be more ‘civilized’ than the modernity represented by the US (Litt 1992, p. 107).¹⁰

In its report and recommendations, the commission sought to articulate a vision of Canadian cultural development based on the Arnoldian concept of the ‘best self,’ which was the ‘quest for perfection through personal intellectual development and critical awareness’ that they considered necessary to the social and political development of society (Massolin 2001, p. 10). In this conception, high culture was not elitist or undemocratic, but associated with ‘the acquisition of knowledge and insight’ (Litt 1992, p. 84). Exposure to education and to high culture was essential to individual development, opening ‘a path of self-improvement leading to intellectual freedom’ (Litt 1992, p. 85). Development of critical awareness associated with high culture was an essential quality to citizenship, for ‘as the individual found cultural enlightenment, he or she would absorb the code of ethics that was implicit in that tradition’ (Litt 1992, p. 94). Thus it followed that the cultural traditions of Western Europe—especially Great Britain, France, Greece, and Italy—contained the codes that inspired critical thought and ethical standards of citizenship that the commissioners considered normative. These ethical standards were perceived to be

jeopardized in the face of commercial pressures from materialism and consumerism (Litt 1992, p. 88). Their promotion of high culture had an essentially instrumental function—to nurture good citizens. However, their recommendations benefited talented citizens most directly—intellectuals, public broadcasters, artists, and arts administrators by providing financial support to the universities and the CBC, research support to scholars, and grants to arts organizations and individual artists.

The second part of the report detailed the commission's recommendations; the introduction to this part conveyed great concern about the arts, even given the commission's breadth of inquiry. Clearly, the commissioners saw a civilizing influence in the arts, which they linked to emerging nationalism and a sense of crisis:

The work with which we have been entrusted is concerned with nothing less than the spiritual foundations of our national life. Canadian achievement in every field depends mainly on the quality of the Canadian mind and spirit. This quality is determined by what Canadians think, and think about; by the books they read, the pictures they see and the programmes they hear. These things, whether we call them arts and letters or use other words to describe them, we believe to lie at the roots of our life as a nation. (Royal Commission 1951, p. 271)

The introduction cited the literal and figurative impoverishment of the arts in Canada and called for the attention of all levels of government, with new expenditures by the federal government. Financial support of the arts was presented as a responsibility that most modern nations had accepted, and Canada was lagging behind. The introduction cited two countries, with ample praise for Great Britain and its new model for funding and a singling out of the United States, where the commissioners acknowledged that the major U.S. foundations provided cultural patronage, warning 'The Americans can, therefore, still afford to leave such matters largely in their hands. Other countries cannot afford to follow their example' (Royal Commission 1951, p. 273).

Indeed, the Carnegie Corporation and the Rockefeller Foundation are mentioned in a very limited, but laudatory, manner in the text of the report, most flatteringly in this passage about film:

We should, however, like to add that the cinema at present is not only the most potent but also the most alien of the influences shaping our Canadian life. Nearly all Canadians go to the movies; and most movies come from

Hollywood. The urbane influences of Carnegie and Rockefeller have helped us to be ourselves; Hollywood refashions us in its own image. (Royal Commission 1951, p. 50)

This section of the report goes on to discuss the development of the National Film Board in Canada, which was created with start-up money from the British Imperial Trust, a grant for ‘a survey of Canadian film needs’ from Carnegie, and ‘substantial annual grants from the Rockefeller Foundation from 1937 to 1946’ (Royal Commission 1951, p. 51). Thus, a distinction is made between the refined or ‘urbane’ influences of the American foundations and their attempt to establish documentary and educational film in Canada, and what is perceived as the pernicious influence of Hollywood on passive consumer minds. Grants from Carnegie to art galleries in the major Canadian cities for educational programs are applauded, as is a survey of Canadian museums commissioned by Carnegie and carried out by British authorities, which found 125 museums mostly concentrated in the central provinces. The survey unfavorably compared Canada’s expenditures on museums to that of London, New York, and Chicago, and the report calls their financing ‘generally hazardous and always scanty’ with an equal inattention to the employment of trained curatorial staffs to develop collections. Writing of the Carnegie survey’s recommendations, the commissioners found no action had been taken after the publication of the Carnegie report nearly twenty years earlier: ‘If our distinguished visitors of twenty years ago could then reproach us for being blind to our responsibilities as a “leading nation”, it is perhaps as well that they are not required to pass judgement on us today’ (Royal Commission 1951, pp. 99–100). Thus, the section about museums ends with an attempt to shame the government into action. The real impact of both American foundations, Carnegie and Rockefeller, on Canada can be inferred from tables in the report’s appendices that list their grants and expenditures in Canada. Between 1911 and 1949, Carnegie made grants of nearly CA\$6 million to universities, colleges, and other educational institutions, and grants totaling CA\$1,355,000 to libraries, art galleries, museums, and voluntary and scholarly associations. To 1950, Rockefeller Foundation financial support had totaled CA\$11.8 million to universities, medical laboratories, and the Canadian Social Science Research Council (see Royal Commission 1951, pp. 436–442 for a list of grants). Representatives of these two foundations continued to be involved at the establishment of the Canada Council.

To summarize, the report's themes were Eurocentric and anti-mass culture. In its arts analysis, the report focused primarily on the training and working conditions of the professional artist and on the condition and status of professional cultural institutions in Canada, praising high culture for its educative potential and criticizing commercial culture by connecting it to materialism, for example. Its assessment of American influences is mixed; it condemns American commercial culture, while the cultural patronage of Canadian art by the US foundations is characterized in a positive, and even fawning, manner. The policy remedy for the professional arts is the adoption of the British arts council model; the resulting Canada Council would be a hybrid organization between arts council and foundation models, which will be described in the next section.

THE CANADA COUNCIL: THE HYBRID SOLUTION

The final chapter of the report called for the establishment of the Canada Council for the Encouragement of the Arts, Letters, Humanities and Social Sciences

to stimulate and to help voluntary organizations within these fields, to foster Canada's cultural relations abroad, to perform the functions of a national commission for UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), and to devise and administer a system of scholarships as recommended in Chapter XXII. (Royal Commission 1951, p. 377)

The report recommended that Canada extend the scholarship support it was then providing to students in the natural sciences to postgraduates and established scholars in the humanities, social sciences, and law. Further, it recommended the establishment of grants to be awarded to Canadian artists to fund their work or study at home or abroad, as well as grants for foreign artists to study in Canada. The commissioners cited the Arts Council of Great Britain as a model of funding that provided a measure of independence to the arts, and they quoted at length from Keynes' BBC announcement of the ACGB. However, as stated previously in this chapter, Canada's would be an omnibus organization carrying responsibilities both for stimulating cultural life within the country and representing its cultural life abroad.

The recommendation of an arts council, although widely anticipated, was one that the commissioners themselves regarded as the single most

important proposal to come out of their work (Litt 1992, p. 184). Rather than mediating and negotiating jurisdictional issues or institutional conflicts, as they did in the recommendations around the universities, or holding off the private interests of broadcasters, in this one case they were able to create a new institution.

Why one organization with so many duties? The reasons were practical; the commissioners argued that establishing one agency would avoid duplication of effort and enhance its prestige (Royal Commission 1951, p. 376). They also believed that a recommendation to create one new organization had a greater chance of political success than a recommendation to create three. They reasoned that the new organization, once established, could appoint additional committees (Litt 1992, pp. 183–184). The Canada Council would comprise 15 appointed members—lay people, not specialists—who would represent the citizenry by geography and ethnicity and report to the prime minister, with no relationship to any other department of government. Reflecting Massey's thinking, a ministry was specifically rejected.

A proposal for community centres had support from some cultural interests, including artists, but was not ultimately recommended by the intellectuals on the commission. The Artists' Brief, first presented to the war reconstruction committee, was later presented to the commission by the Federation of Canadian Artists, with the endorsement of the Canadian Arts Council. Central to its recommendations was a call for CA\$10 million in funding to establish community art centers in every city throughout the country, in the belief that a 'true national art movement must be nurtured at the grassroots' (Brison 2005, p. 145).¹¹ This regional initiative was ignored in favor of a 'centralized, "top-down" structure for federal cultural programs' that Brison argues fit better within a corporate model for government that Massey and others favored (2005, p. 146). Litt argues that the community center concept left too much room for popular taste to squeeze out high culture. Often promoted as war memorials, since the arts were conceived as part of the post-war society made possible by the sacrifices of war, the centers were at times supported by civic promoters more concerned with local interests. The national arts council model assured protection for high culture from popular interests (Litt 1992, p. 180).

If its effectiveness is judged by the number and speed with which its recommendations were enacted by the government, then the Massey Commission had a mixed record (see Litt 1992, pp. 223–254 for a

detailed assessment). The first of its recommendations to be implemented were those that motivated its establishment to begin with—the issues around federal support to universities and increased funding to the CBC—which were also Prime Minister St. Laurent’s chief interests. Its recommendations to provide more federal support to national cultural institutions and to establish the Canada Council languished for years. Indeed, it took six years of lobbying and an unexpected financial windfall from the estate taxes of two millionaires to bring the Canada Council into being. Its establishment was likely due to political pressure on the St. Laurent government to provide additional funding to the universities, leading the prime minister to agree to a suggestion from his Cabinet and advisors to use the CA\$100 million windfall in estate taxes to establish the Canada Council, with CA\$50 million for capital grants to the universities and CA\$50 million in endowment funds for the arts. Thus, the Canada Council had ‘piggy-backed into existence behind the government’s efforts to deal with the more politically significant issue of funding the expansion of post-secondary education’ (Litt 1992, p. 242).

Just as in Great Britain, the state assumed responsibility for arts and academic research funding that had been provided for decades by American foundations when the Canadian government established the Canada Council. In his study of the influence of the Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations on Canadian cultural development, Brison (2005) found evidence of favorable bias on the part of Massey and the other commissioners towards the Canadian Social Science Research Council and the Humanities Research Council of Canada, both of which were modeled on the American academic research councils and funded almost entirely by the Rockefeller and Carnegie foundations beginning in the late 1930s. Acting on recommendations from these two research councils, whose foundation funding was set to expire, the Massey commission recommended that funding of academic publications, research, and scholarship be handled by the new Canada Council (Brison 2005, p. 177). Brison also documented the repeated requests to renew their funding made by the Canadian research councils to the American foundations between the early 1950s and 1957, while all waited for the Canadian government to formalize and fund the Canada Council. In fact, the Rockefeller Foundation intended to end its funding to the Humanities Research Council of Canada and was assured by Cabinet officers that legislation or an appropriation of some kind would be forthcoming in the following session of the House of Commons (Brison 2005, p. 184). Once created, the Canada Council

absorbed this academic funding infrastructure, using the research councils as advisory boards to screen applicants and greatly increasing the number of awards. Although US foundation funding to these councils ended, the American foundation leaders attended the first meeting of the new Canada Council to offer their congratulations and advice (Trueman 1982, p. 138). Thus, the Canadian government assumed financial responsibility for the intellectual and artistic patronage that had been provided for decades by the Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations.

That the Canada Council in its earliest years operated like a foundation cannot be attributed to Massey. Existing historical accounts credit the idea for establishing a trust using the estate taxes to John Deutsch, Secretary of the Treasury Board; J. W. Pickersgill, then-Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and long a political adviser to Canadian prime ministers, who had been influential in getting the Royal Commission established; and Maurice Lamontagne, an economics advisor to the prime minister (Granatstein 1984, p. 441). As Royal Commission chairman, Massey clearly established the Arts Council of Great Britain as the funding model, and Litt argues that he was behind the recommendation for an omnibus agency that combined grantmaking and cultural diplomacy (1992, pp. 182–183).

High culture—even ballet, as in Great Britain—was the new Canada Council’s funding focus in the arts. J. L. Granatstein (1984) published an account of the Council’s first ten years, beginning with the circumstances surrounding the legislation and continuing with an account of its early grantmaking. This somewhat celebratory narrative credits the Council and federal money with advancing the arts in Canada. Granatstein traces the development of professional ballet in Canada, finding that the Council’s continued grant support and financial advice to three companies, the National Ballet Guild of Canada, Les Grands Ballets Canadiens, and the Royal Winnipeg Ballet, had, by 1963, created ballet companies that were invited to tour and were critically recognized for their excellence (1984, p. 462). Before then, however, the Council repeatedly hired and sought counsel from US ballet directors to evaluate the funded companies and their artistic prospects, concluding in 1959 that ‘Canada could support only one ballet company with the prospect of development to international standards’ (Granatstein 1984, p. 457). Regionalism and politics usually intervened when the Council faced the question of whether to put all its funding behind one company ‘with a chance to become a world-class ballet’ or subsidize each of the three companies ‘and thus probably ensure that none would reach truly professional standards?’ (Granatstein

1984, p. 457). Granatstein writes that by the end of the Council's first decade 'there had been substantial gains' (1984, p. 462). He finds his evidence in the 1966–67 annual report in an account by a Council official:

he had seen a performance of *Twelfth Night* in Ottawa by the Stratford [Ontario] company; in Toronto there was the National's highly original *Swan Lake*; two days later he was in Vancouver to hear the Vancouver Opera's *Lucia di Lammermoor*. The next night at the Vancouver Playhouse, he saw *Anything Goes*, and a day later Britten's *War Requiem* performed by the Vancouver Symphony Orchestra. Then it was back to Ottawa for Le Théâtre du Nouveau Monde's *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, and while there he saw in the press that three Canadian singers had the leads in *La Bohème* at the Royal Opera House, Covent Garden. (Granatstein 1984, p. 462)

Opera, ballet, symphonic music, and theater dominated Canada Council funding as they did in Great Britain. This passage illustrates the shared, collective investment, both financial and emotional, in attaining what were perceived then as 'international standards' and what today can be seen as the adoption of international aesthetic standards rooted in Western European traditions. There appears to be a sense of pride here, not in the development of a distinctly Canadian aesthetic tradition, but in the mastery of a European one.

In later decades, the Canada Council broadened its funding criteria to include more arts forms and gained an international reputation for its support of Canadian artists. In 1977, the Canadian government passed legislation creating the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, removing funding responsibility for academic research, and from that time, the Canada Council focused on the arts (Klages 2011). The Canadian Commission for UNESCO continued to operate under the auspices of the Council, which also gained a reputation for its international leadership among national arts councils. Demonstrating this leadership, it hosted in Ottawa the organizing meeting of the International Federation of Arts Council and Culture Agencies (IFACCA) in 2000.

CONCLUSION

In Canada, cultural policy was negotiated and recommended by an officially sanctioned committee of intellectuals and Massey, who have been identified in this chapter as a Canadian clerisy. Massey had a central role in articulating the absence of cultural institutions that he perceived as necessary to a modern national identity for Canada. He made his arguments

using nationalistic and patriotic themes that resonated in post-war Canadian society, and he promoted a policy model he observed in Great Britain that appealed to his own liberal ideology. Massey promoted Keynesian economic thinking in Canada in the 1930s and Keynesian arts policy in the 1940s. Associations with Great Britain and British institutions appealed to him as they did to other Canadian Anglo-Americans and to other philanthropists who were actively engaged in cultural infrastructure issues. Through the Royal Commission, he led a campaign to create an atmosphere of consensus among the various cultural and arts interests in the geographically diverse country. However, the campaign would not have succeeded, or even begun, without the intervention of sympathetic politicians including Brooke Claxton and J.W. Pickersgill.

When the Canada Council was established, the government used money from private sources, in effect, the estate taxes from two wealthy Canadians, to set up its own endowment trust to fund the arts and higher education. The new Canada Council behaved like an arts council, with its characteristic appearance of distance and peer review. It assumed the academic and cultural patronage that US foundations had offered Canadian scholars and artists for several decades, even adopting the academic research councils established by the foundations to recommend grant decisions.

By emphasizing professional standards and institution-building, as the ACGB had, the Canada Council favored the talented and aspiring—those whose circumstances allowed them to engage in the long hours of training and practice, or whatever was required—to be recognized as a professional. Also as in Great Britain, in the early years the Council focused on building institutions of high culture—ballet companies, symphony orchestras, opera companies, and theaters—that continued to command a large percentage of Canada Council resources.

The organization and growth of voluntary community and amateur cultural groups that Tippett (1990) has documented in Canada from the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries has been documented also in the United States, where amateur and local groups were the source of cultural life for many people, especially women, before cities, states, foundations, and the federal government began to fund the arts. The next chapter will examine the origins of the local arts council movement in North America, where, years before either the Canada Council or the National Endowment for the Arts in the US were established, the ‘arts council’ concept emerged as a locally based initiative to promote, publicize, and fund a city’s arts groups.

NOTES

1. Ireland established an arts council in 1951.
2. Monica Gattinger, at the University of Ottawa, Canada, is researching and authoring a history of the Canada Council for the Arts for publication in 2017, the year of its sixtieth anniversary.
3. Karen Finlay, in her 2004 study, *The Force of Culture: Vincent Massey and Canadian Sovereignty*, also reaches this conclusion. I have relied on her study, but looked more closely at Massey's relationships while in London from 1943 to 1946.
4. *Colony to Nation* is the title of a well-known and widely used history of Canada by Arthur R.M. Lower. Massey cites the 1946 edition in *On Being Canadian*.
5. Massey knew Siegfried personally and read his books (Massey 1963, p. 152).
6. Porter's book is a central source in Canadian sociology; the most cited book in the history of Canadian sociology, *The Vertical Mosaic* sold more copies than any other sociology work published by the University of Toronto Press (Helmes-Hayes and Curtis 1998, p. 7).
7. Bissell was president of the University of Toronto from 1958 to 1971; a fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, and an English literature professor who earned an MA, but held an honorary PhD. Therefore, like Massey, he conforms to Porter's academic characterization of Canadian clerisy.
8. For a comprehensive discussion of ethnicity and race in Canadian society, see Raymond Breton's essay in *The Vertical Mosaic Revisited*, 1998.
9. For more analysis of the report, see Litt 1992, pp. 209–222, and Massolin 2001, pp. 155–215.
10. Litt points out that many of the 'cultural elite' distinguished between popular culture, which was localized, grassroots culture that they considered participatory and part of community life, in contrast to mass culture, which was despised and considered commercial (1992, p. 85).
11. Proposals for community arts centres also circulated in Great Britain after the war under the aegis of the Arts Council of Great Britain.

REFERENCES

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

Canada. 1951. *Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, Report*. Ottawa: Edmond Cloutier.

PUBLISHED SOURCES

- Bissell, Claude. 1986. *The Imperial Canadian: Vincent Massey in Office*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Brisson, Jeffrey D. 2005. *Rockefeller, Carnegie, & Canada: American Philanthropy and the Arts & Letters in Canada*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Finlay, Karen A. 2004. *The Force of Culture: Vincent Massey and Canadian Sovereignty*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Granatstein, J.L. 1984. Culture and Scholarship: The First Ten Years of the Canada Council. *Canadian Historical Review* 65(4): 441–474.
- Helms-Hayes, Rick, and James Curtis, eds. 1998. *The Vertical Mosaic Revisited*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Klages, Gregory. 2011. Shortening “Arm’s Length”: From the Canada Council to the SSHRC. *Asian Journal of Canadian Studies* 17(2): 33–72.
- Kuffert, L.B. 2003. *A Great Duty: Canadian Responses to Modern Life and Mass Culture, 1939–1967*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Litt, Paul. 1992. *The Muses, the Masses, and the Massey Commission*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Massey, Vincent. 1948. *On Being Canadian*. Toronto: J.M. Dent & Sons, Ltd.
- . 1963. *What's Past Is Prologue: The Memoirs of the Right Honorable Vincent Massey, C.H.* London: Macmillan & Co.
- Massolin, Philip. 2001. *Battling the Philistines: The Quest for Culture in Post-War Canada. Canadian Intellectuals, the Tory Tradition, and the Challenge of Modernity, 1939–1970*. Toronto: University of Toronto.
- Milligan, Frank. 1980. The Ambiguities of the Canada Council. In *Love and Money: The Politics of Culture*, ed. D. Helwig, 60–89. Canada: Oberon Press.
- Nurse, Andrew. 2011. Artists, Society, and Activism: The Federation of Canadian Artists and the Social Organization of Canadian Art. *Southern Journal of Canadian Studies* 4(1): 1–24.
- Ostry, Bernard. 1978. *The Cultural Connection: An Essay on Culture and Government Policy in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd.
- Porter, John. [1965] 1992. *The Vertical Mosaic*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Siegfried, André. 1949. *Canada: An International Power*. Translated by Doris Hemming. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Tippett, Maria. 1990. *Making Culture: English-Canadian Institutions and the Arts Before the Massey Commission*. Toronto, University of Toronto Press.
- Vipond, Mary. 1980. ‘The Nationalist Network: English Canada’s Intellectuals and Artists in the 1920s’, *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism*, VII (1): 32–52.

The Arts Council Movement in the United States

Instead of leading developed nations in establishing national arts funding during the middle of the twentieth century, the United States created a national arts agency in 1965 after Canada and the United Kingdom. And in their strategies and policies, arts advocates in the United States turned to Canada and Europe for models and ideas. This chapter, like those preceding, does not attempt an administrative history of the founding of the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), but instead examines the flow of policy ideas between the three study countries and attempts to introduce previously unknown actors into the historiography of arts policy.¹

Although arts advocates looked to Canada and Europe for inspiration and models, the United States did not establish a ministry of culture; indeed the National Endowment for the Arts is not a Cabinet-level agency. Instead, a system of local arts advocacy developed many years before the establishment of a national agency, and this history and the influence of foundation philanthropy in the arts partly explains the dominance of the private sector on arts funding in that country (see Katz 2006, for a concise discussion of the history of philanthropy in the US). Although the US government had experimented with national funding programmes to support artists and art projects through its New Deal Works Progress Administration programs in the 1930s, the US Congress retreated from centralized funding of the arts until the 1960s (see Cummings 1991, pp. 31–79 for an overview; Binkiewicz 2004). When the national agency was established, its funding and grant-making authority was shared with

the state governments in line with the federal system of government in the United States. This shared funding led to a policy response by the states to create their own state-level arts councils, giving rise to a system of arm's length arts agencies at the state and national levels, and an infrastructure of often voluntary and privately supported arts councils at the local level in cities, towns, and villages. Indeed, the 'arts council' was introduced in the US through the advocacy and organizing activities of women in their communities.

WOMEN LEAD THE US ARTS COUNCIL MOVEMENT

The local arts council movement in the United States was first established by women in the 1940s, reflecting a history of arts advocacy by women's clubs that began in the nineteenth century and continued into the twentieth (Blair 1994). As middle-class women sought to extend their interests outside the home to the community, through activities and service in women's clubs, they nurtured their own creative practices, established arts organizations, and organized visual and performing arts programming in towns and cities. Women extended their proven fundraising abilities beyond their church-related benevolent and charitable work in the nineteenth century to the arts in the twentieth century. Their influence is reflected in two ideas that were, and are, present in cultural policy: their deference to the fine arts, specifically the Western canon of European 'great works' and a corresponding disdain for commercial culture, such as the commercial film industry, and a related belief that all Americans, no matter their economic circumstances or geographical location, deserved access to the fine arts, an idea that they advocated from 1890 to 1930 (Blair 1994, pp. 5–9). Further, they championed the value of creative expression in the lives of all Americans, insisting that amateur arts deserved recognition and attention. Their patriotism and feminism mediated their deference to the Western canon, in that they embraced the cultural expressions of American artists, including Native Americans, African-Americans, regionalists, and women (Blair 1994, p. 9). The tensions inherent in encouraging both amateur creativity in communities, known in policy terms as 'cultural democracy', and access to the professional fine arts, known as the 'democratization of culture', emerged as state and federal arts policies developed in the later decades.

Women facilitated the transfer of the local arts council concept between Canada and the United States. The growth and expansion of women's clubs across North America and their commitment to arts advocacy and

amateur creative expression gave rise to the first local arts councils being established in Vancouver, British Columbia, and in Winston-Salem, North Carolina² (Griffin 1950a). Both councils were established by chapters of the cities' Junior League, and newspaper reports demonstrate that Winston-Salem advocates gained policy and technical knowledge from the Vancouver organization. The Arts Council of Winston-Salem and Forsyth County in North Carolina dates its founding to August 1949 as an initiative of the city's Junior League. Indeed, Winston-Salem first gained a reputation in the 1950s that continued into the 1980s for its support of the arts and as an incubator for arts policymakers, including R. Philip Hanes, Charles Marks, Milton Rhodes, Ralph Burgard, and Halsey North, all of whom, after working in the arts in Winston-Salem, moved on to national positions and prominence (Biddle 1988, p. 189, 239–240; Bauerlein and Grantham 2009, p. 17). The following brief history of the founding of Winston-Salem's arts council illustrates the role of women in spreading the 'arts council' concept, as well as their strategy of recruiting men to join them who had access to power, money, and resources to support and legitimize their arts advocacy.

EUROPEAN CULTURAL TRADITIONS, CIVIC-MINDED WOMEN, AND BUSINESS INTERESTS MERGE

Winston-Salem's interest in the arts and policy can be traced to three central drivers: its European heritage as an eighteenth-century Moravian settlement; the arts and cultural programs of its Junior League chapter; and the civic interests of the Hanes family who founded and developed the Hanes textile industry there in the twentieth century. The city's hyphenated name signifies the merger of the towns of Winston and Salem in 1913, joining Salem, grown from a settlement founded by Moravians in 1766, to Winston, the original home of two industrial companies, tobacco and later consumer goods conglomerate, R.J. Reynolds, and the Hanes textile company. The Moravians' insistence on equal education for girls and their tradition of music in worship services were unusual in American communities. A Protestant denomination that originated in Bohemia, in today's Czech Republic, the Moravian Church included not only congregational singing and choral music in their worship, but also sacred music performed on brass instruments by practiced musicians. They founded a primary school for girls in Salem, NC, in 1772, which evolved into the present-day Salem College, a private liberal arts college with

well-established programs in the arts staffed by faculty members who also provided music and cultural education within the city. Thus the interests of the Moravians in education and the arts have been a continuing presence in Winston-Salem through the college, the Moravian churches, and the restored historic district, 'Old Salem'. By 1950, Salem College was collaborating with the city's Junior League chapter in its arts initiatives (Junior League Annual Report 1950–51, p. 19). The Moravians' interest in music and equal education for women established social conditions in which its Junior League could lead local arts programming and advocacy.

The published histories of the Junior League of America document that organization's catalytic role in the local arts council movement (see Gordon and Reische 1982; Jackson 2001, p. 102). During the twentieth century, membership in Junior League chapters gave upper- and middle-class white women opportunities to develop and exercise social activism, volunteerism, and leadership through community service first in social work and later, in education and the arts and culture. The first Junior League, organized in New York in 1901, emerged from the interests of women volunteers working in settlement houses there, with thirty chapters founded by 1921, when the first national conference was held, again in New York (Gordon and Reische 1982). That year, Dorothy Whitney Straight—by then a widow, Mrs. Willard Straight—was elected first president of the national association (JLWS Annual Report 1950–1951, p. 3; Gordon and Reische 1982). As chapters multiplied in cities with different and varied social needs, the League expanded its mission to include the 'social, economic, educational, cultural and civic fields' (Junior League Annual Report 1950–51, p. 3). Professional staff who had training and experience in social work, children's theatre, and the arts, were employed at the national headquarters and available to consult with League chapters in their communities as liaison officers (Junior League Annual report 1950–51, p. 4). In this role, Virginia Lee Comer, an arts consultant, was employed by the League to develop a community arts survey in 1944, which was published and distributed to all Junior League chapters before the end of the second world war.

Founded in 1923, the Junior League of Winston-Salem by the late 1940s was an established presence in the city with members involved in operating an arts and crafts workshop with its own staff, organizing art exhibits and demonstrations, and the annual Piedmont arts festival (Junior League Annual report 1947–48, p. 14). In their volunteer work, club women collaborated with professionals, generally men, to gain access to

power and resources held by boards of trustees, corporations, or cultural organizations (Blair 1994). Members of the Winston-Salem chapter used this strategy to gain the support of the city's business leaders; however, they also turned to the national organization's professional staff for technical advice and support, which came from Virginia Lee Comer. The chapter sought Comer's advice on several occasions, first, for technical support for planning and organization of the arts and crafts workshop (Junior League Annual report 1948–49, p. 17), and later, in the organization of the new arts council (Junior League Annual report 1950–51). As the national organization's liaison officer for the arts, Comer travelled among the League's different chapters—by 1948 they totalled some 170 in North America³—sharing knowledge and experiences with technical support. In this role, she promoted the model of a central organization for publicity and promotion of a city's cultural projects and provided technical support for the community survey (Bean 1948). In 1947, with her guidance, the Vancouver chapter established the Community Arts Council of Vancouver (Jackson 2001, p. 102). In October 1948, Comer addressed the Spokane, Washington, chapter about the new Vancouver council and shared her experience of attending an international museum conference in Europe where she witnessed the grim circumstances of post-war reconstruction as well as extensive state and municipal funding of museums (Bean 1948). In her role as arts consultant and liaison, Comer seeded ideas among League chapters, across national borders between Canada, the United States, and Europe, and provided technical support during the 1940s which led to the establishment of the first local arts councils in North America (Burgard 1969, p. 2). Her advocacy and technical support is documented in annual reports of the Junior League of Winston-Salem, in newspaper reports, and in the published history of the Junior League of America, which credits her leadership with the post-war growth in local arts projects started by League chapters. Only 33 Leagues reported local arts projects as the war ended, but by the late 1950s, that number had grown to 300 (Jackson 2001, p. 102).

In one of her first visits to Winston-Salem, Comer encouraged the League's leadership to start an arts council, and in 1946, the Junior League's board allocated \$7200 to hold in trust for three years to fund a local arts council (Junior League Annual report 1947–48, p. 15). Three years of advocacy, negotiations with member arts groups, and leadership in organizing large-scale community events followed, until the summer of 1949, when a formal constitution was agreed by the

member arts groups and a board of directors elected. About this time, the League surveyed 56 organizations about cultural and educational resources in the city, probably following Comer's technical guidance for a community survey. And Comer was likely involved when the Junior League of Winston-Salem drew directly on the technical and organizational knowledge of the Vancouver arts council by hiring Gertrude Elliot in 1950 as its first paid staff member. Elliot's arrival in Winston-Salem is documented by another influential woman advocating for the arts in these years: Frances Griffin, a reporter for the *Twin City Sentinel* in Winston-Salem. Her articles documented and publicized arts programs and organizing efforts, and a series of articles in July 1950 report the arrival of Elliot, executive secretary of the Vancouver arts council and, before that, Comer's secretary at the Junior League of America (Griffin 1950a). Griffin wrote: 'It is true—and entirely understandable—that the Vancouver Council differs to some extent from the Arts Council here. The Canadian city has a population of 500,000, compared with the 87,226-plus population of Winston-Salem. There are 85 member groups and 500 individual members there, compared with 11 member groups and eight individual members here ... The Vancouver Arts Council today is gaining recognition throughout this country and Canada as an example of community arts planning' (Griffin 1950a).

In Canada, the term 'arts council' gained an association with arts advocacy federations when the post-war Arts Reconstruction Committee in that country changed its name to the Canadian Arts Council in 1945, a few months after the news that CEMA would continue its work as the Arts Council of Great Britain (Tippett 1990, p. 174). Representing some 7000 artists and cultural advocates, the Canadian Arts Council was a federation of arts organizations and had voluntary officers and directors that lobbied for provincial and national arts funding and advocated for arts education throughout the Canadian provinces. Supported by private funds contributed by its member organizations, this council was not a national funding body and therefore lacked federal funding and prestige. Instead, the Canadian Arts Council was active in communities and provinces, and in North America, the title 'arts council' became associated with federations of arts and cultural organizations and with formal and informal advocacy activities, like the Community Arts Council of Vancouver.

In Winston-Salem, the leadership of the new council was shared by women and men. May Coan Mountcastle, remembered as an early and tireless advocate of the concept, was president when Elliot was hired (Griffin 1950a).

To help secure annual operating income, League members moved quickly to involve young men with business and corporate connections, recruiting R. Philip Hanes Jr. of the Hanes textile company and family to chair a fundraising task force in 1950. Hanes brought wealth, personal dynamism, and business contacts to arts advocacy in Winston-Salem, as well as a desire to transfer modern management practices to the management of cultural organizations. The Hanes family's interests in arts and education were not shared across the Winston-Salem business community. Tensions emerged early in the 1950s between arts advocates and business leaders who were solicited for donations multiple times by several arts organizations, leading to the business community suggesting a combined fundraising drive for the arts. Member agencies of the arts council agreed to combine their fundraising efforts in one annual 'ask'. Thus, the arts council shifted from a membership organization that coordinated a shared annual arts calendar, and promoted and publicized the arts, to orchestrating an annual fundraising drive that raised operating funds for all its member organizations, in addition to its existing coordinated services.

TWO STRANDS OF THE LOCAL ARTS COUNCIL MOVEMENT

To build Winston-Salem's profile nationally in the arts, Hanes joined the board of the American Symphony Orchestra League in 1956 and began attending its annual convention. According to Hanes, 'The handful of arts councils in this country met annually at the ASOL's convention. So I joined the board and thus began my life as a fulltime networker.' He recalled that he and Ralph Burgard, then director of the Winston-Salem arts council, always rented a hospitality suite in the convention hotel where the arts council representatives could meet and where Hanes entertained arts patrons and promoted Winston-Salem. In 1958, Hanes used his connections in New York to secure John D. Rockefeller III, who was then raising money to build Lincoln Center, as the guest of honor to dedicate the new James G. Hanes Community Center, a multi-purpose facility to house the Winston-Salem chamber of commerce, the city's united fund, the arts council, a community theater, a symphony rehearsal hall, and an arts and crafts teaching facility. Hanes later claimed that Rockefeller's visit to Winston-Salem and endorsement of the city's support of the arts gave the arts council new credibility and stature with the local business community. Indeed, Hanes promoted the concept of a local arts council 'as a multiple arts management organisation capable of

providing a wide array of services to its member organisations while at the same time attracting local business men who would bring their expertise to bear' (Hanes 2005, p. 7).

As led by Hanes, this strand of the local arts council movement advocated application of management practices to the operation of community arts organizations, establishing the arts as a 'business'. Managed by professionals like Ralph Burgard and Charles Mark, both executive directors of the Winston-Salem arts council who later held positions at the National Endowment for the Arts, these councils were positioned as the arts community's interface with the business community and largely focussed on urban centers. Taking inspiration from the redevelopment potential realized in New York by the Lincoln Center project, arts advocates linked to business and corporate interests argued for the place of arts facilities and organizations in urban planning and 'revitalization' or 'regeneration' planning. In 1960, Hanes was instrumental in organizing the Community Arts Councils Inc. (CACI), a consulting organization with a volunteer board of directors who provided advice and technical support to arts councils in the US and Canada and to communities looking to set up arts councils (Hanes 2005, p. 10; Americans for the Arts timeline at <http://www.americans-forthearts.org/about-americans-for-the-arts/50th-anniversary/50th-anniversary-timeline>). During the 1960s, CACI emerged as a national advocacy organization that merged the interests of business-minded arts advocates like Hanes and George Irwin of Quincy, Illinois, with representatives of the major foundations funding arts initiatives, represented by Nancy Hanks of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. Changing its name several times during the 1960s to reflect a changing membership base of local and later, newly formed state arts councils, by 1969, the organization was called the Associated Councils of the Arts and had offices in New York. Its growth mirrored the development of an arts council infrastructure across the United States at local and state levels. A national survey conducted by CACI in 1962 found 54 known arts councils; in 1963, the survey found 110 arts councils in the US and 35 in Canada, according to Americans for the Arts, its successor organization and the principal research and advocacy organization in the US for the arts today.

Another strand of the local arts council movement developed during the late 1940s and 1950s in the US and was articulated by Robert E. Gard, an author, playwright, and professor of creative writing at the University of Wisconsin. In a style of American theatre practiced at universities in New York, North Carolina, and Wisconsin, Gard's interest

was encouraging creative expression by people in rural settings and small communities largely through their own writing—poetry, plays, and fiction—drawn from their experiences of living in the American landscape. As described by his daughter, Maryo Gard Ewell (2012), this strand of community-based arts sought to recognize the value of and potential for creative expression by all individuals and made the arts central to community cohesiveness and democracy. Ewell traces these ideas to the early twentieth-century US settlement house movement, where immigrants were encouraged to practice their native music and crafts to share their culture with others as a means to integrate in their new home, as well as to the 1930s Federal Arts Project which encouraged and stimulated creative expression among minority urban and rural communities. Robert Gard's writing workshops for the Wisconsin public generated enough enthusiasm to result in the founding of the Wisconsin Writers Association in 1950. By 1966, his work with rural communities was recognized by the newly-founded National Endowment for the Arts with the first grant to develop arts councils in small communities in Wisconsin. Documenting that experience, Gard and his colleagues at the University of Wisconsin-Madison published *The Arts in the Small Community: A National Plan* in 1970.

Comparing Gard's publication *The Arts in the Small Community* to *Arts in the City: Organizing and Programming Community Arts Councils*, written by Ralph Burgard and published in 1969 by the Associated Councils for the Arts, provides a clear contrast in the approaches of the two strands of the US movement. *Arts in the City* documents the urban experience of the arts focusing on the development and funding of organizations and institutions; Burgard writes that local arts councils are formed to meet similar needs in cities of all sizes, needs which he defines as: developing new arts programs; financing the arts, often through a combined fundraising campaign; housing the arts in purpose-built facilities or buildings adapted to this new use; attracting larger audiences through shared or joint promotion; and 'improving urban design' (Burgard 1969, pp. 2–4). In this last category, he argues that city art commissions have moved beyond overseeing the design of public buildings and street furniture to influence the aesthetics of city planning. Responding to the social and political dynamics of a city, the administrative organization of arts councils he divides roughly into three categories: 'publicly sponsored councils or commissions, privately incorporated councils with full-time directors, and privately incorporated councils with volunteer staffs' (Burgard 1969, p. 5). Burgard further classifies in geographical terms

as ‘town arts councils, city arts councils, county arts councils, and regional (multi-county) arts councils’ (Burgard 1969, p. 5). The book is presented as a ‘best practices’ guide to establishing and operating an arts council, and chapters follow that describe the processes of conducting community arts surveys, setting up boards of directors, organizing central services like shared mailing lists and arts festivals, planning and fundraising for an arts center, and operating combined fundraising drives. The business model of a nonprofit organization overseen by a board of directors and reliant on corporate, foundation, and institutional funding sources, is explicitly described. The *Arts in the City* is a largely technical publication written for the professional arts manager or the professionalizing arts advocate and fundraiser.

In contrast, *The Arts in the Small Community*⁴ is a more evocative guide to organizing an arts council that documents the Wisconsin project funded by the NEA grant, which sought ‘ways of developing greater interest and participation in the arts in communities with populations of 10,000 or less’ (Gard et al. 1970, p. 5). The publication documents pilot research conducted in five communities in Wisconsin that ranged in population from 1100 to 7800, and offers recommendations based on successful, and unsuccessful, initiatives. Its editorial approach combines Gard’s romantic, evocative language about the power of art in village life, with interviews of individuals—a farmer, a community development extension agent, and a doctor’s wife—all of whom had started arts councils in their communities. Black and white photographs—portraits, unmistakably rural scenes in small towns and landscapes, and group shots of young people and ethnic groups—illustrate the document and evoke a sense of rural American community. The plan ‘endorses the organization of an arts council as the effective way to develop arts in all communities’ and defines the council as ‘a group of persons who care about the cultural life of the community and seek to express this concern by organizing to promote interest and activity in the arts’ (Gard et al. 1970, p. 8). It notes that ‘some six hundred recently formed American arts councils testify to its operational effectiveness’ and that each is ‘tailored to fit the need and opportunity of each community’ (Gard et al. 1970, p. 9). A ‘blueprint for action’ offers guidance to arts councils on how to develop goals and objectives in response to a community inventory of its environment, people, and organizations. Examples drawn from experience in each category are intended to be inspirational in their simplicity and practicality. The focus of this strand of the movement is the progressive development of American society: ‘The ideal goal of the arts

council movement is to create a society of qualitative excellence in which the resources of the nation may serve beneficial and creative purposes in community life through art' (Gard et al. 1970, p. 9).

These two strands of the arts council movement can be considered competing or complementary approaches; however, the most effective arts councils and professional arts managers sought to merge the two in practice. Many new arts council directors studied the writing of both men and drew on their advice as they established and developed their own local arts council. The local arts council as a source of technical and management expertise for the subsidized, nonprofit arts sector is central to the national arts infrastructure in the United States and the result of business, foundation, and state government interests focusing their attention on the sector in the 1960s. In North Carolina where the local movement emerged early, both Mary Regan and E'Vonne Coleman-Cook cited Gard's work as their early philosophical inspiration. Both women held public sector, policymaking roles: Regan was executive director of the North Carolina Arts Council from 1976 to 2012, and Coleman-Cook was a member of the NEA's Expansion Arts staff from 1985 to 1991, and later executive director of the Durham (NC) Arts Council from 1992 to 2001. After the early example of the Winston-Salem Arts Council, ten cities or counties in North Carolina started local arts councils by 1965 when the NEA was established.⁵

Nationally, an estimated 2000 local arts agencies existed by 1991, with most staffed by volunteers, however, an estimated 600 employed professional staff (DiMaggio 1991, p. 227). While this growth was initiated at the local level by women and sustained often by volunteers, during the 1960s and 1970s, policy responses by state governments and the NEA stimulated more growth in cultural organizations and local arts councils throughout the country. Led by New York, state governments began to establish state arts councils as grant-making and policy-setting bodies.

STATES ESTABLISH ARTS COUNCILS IN THE 1960s

In 1960, the New York state legislature established the New York State Council on the Arts (NYSCA) as the first state arts council in the country, with the support of Governor Nelson Rockefeller. Chapter 6 pointed to the role of the Rockefeller Foundation in funding the arts and humanities in Canada and the United States, and, in this case, a Rockefeller was involved in establishing arts policy in a state with a large population of artists and a

thriving cultural economy centered on New York City. Nelson Rockefeller was a politician, philanthropist, and art collector, whose brother, John D. Rockefeller III, was then leading the fundraising campaign to build Lincoln Center, which is discussed in the next section. Modeling itself as an arm's-length agency, the NYSCA evolved a number of programmes including a 'matching' grant program that required local arts organizations receiving their funds to raise money from private sources equalling their state grants; this model was later adopted by the NEA (Netzer 1978, in Mulcahy 2002, p. 68).

Six states followed New York's lead in the next few years: the Minnesota State Arts Board was established in 1961; the Missouri Arts Council in 1962; the California Arts Council and the Illinois Arts Council were established in 1963; and the Georgia Council for the Arts and the North Carolina Arts Council were established in 1964 (Lowell and Ondaatje 2006, pp. 53–55; Mulcahy 2002, p. 68). This nascent growth in state arts councils expanded dramatically after 1965 in a policy response from the states to new federal arts policy. State legislatures created arts councils to take advantage of federal funds that were included in the legislation that established the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities, which was envisioned as the umbrella organization for the NEA and NEH (National Endowment for the Humanities). The legislation authorized annual block grants of up to \$50,000 to each state, creating a Federal–State Partnership Program in line with the principle of shared authority of the country's federal system. The block grants were intended to give each state the funds to establish a state arts council and required a partial match from state funds, thereby guaranteeing the state's continuing financial commitment to provide arts facilities and programmes to its citizens (Mulcahy 2002, p. 68; Dimaggio 1991, p. 218). Between 1965 and 1967, 37 more states established state arts councils, often very small agencies with one or two staff members to receive and administer the federal and state funds (Lowell and Ondaatje 2006, pp. 53–55). Initially, many states accepted partial 'planning' grants that did not require a match as they established administrative offices and structures (Lowell 2004, p. 5fn6).

This sharing of funding and authority with the states was in line with general trends in American federalism, which have expanded the role of the states by devolving funding and responsibility to the states since the second world war (see Dimaggio 1991, pp. 216–256 for a history and discussion of decentralized arts funding in the U.S.). Other influences may have provoked the federal–state sharing arrangement, in addition to these

trends. In arguments that echoed those made in Great Britain, U.S. critics of national arts legislation in the early 1960s were opposed to creating a ministry for culture located in Washington, DC, because of concerns that it might inhibit artistic diversity. Yet they were also concerned that ‘a centralized arts bureaucracy would widen existing cultural disparities between the big cities and smaller cities and rural areas’ (Lowell 2004, p. 5). In response to these concerns, the federal–state partnership was included in the legislation and ‘had three main goals: to ensure access to quality arts experiences for all Americans; to maintain a degree of local control over public funding of arts and culture; and to achieve broad-based political support for public funding of the arts’ (Lowell 2004, p. 5). Indeed, Philip Hanes of North Carolina, identified earlier as a national leader in the local arts council movement, was a critic of national legislation, believing that funding for the arts should come from private sources, meaning individuals, businesses, and foundations, and that national funding would do little more than create a bureaucracy (Biddle 1988, p. 110). His views were well known in the US Congress at the time, where he lobbied against the national legislation; however, after his appointment to and service on the National Council on the Arts, an advisory body to the President, his position softened, as recounted in his memoir by Livingston Biddle, who helped draft the legislation and served as chairman of the NEA from 1977 to 1981 (see Biddle 1988, pp. 109–111 for a discussion of Hanes’s views). Hanes’s position that sources other than the federal government should fund the arts—indeed that a publicity campaign to promote arts attendance and donations would stimulate increased funding from individuals, businesses, and foundations—was shared by other business and foundation leaders as discussed in the next section.

This chapter has thus far traced the emergence of the local arts council movement in arts advocacy work by American women and their collaboration with corporate and business interests in cities and communities, focusing on the roots of the private sector support that characterizes arts funding in the United States. The chapter also briefly traces the corresponding policy response by the states to the establishment of the NEA to understand how the system of local, state, and national arts agencies emerged in the United States. The next section will trace the influence that foundation philanthropy had on the establishment of the cultural infrastructure and on arts policy and will demonstrate that foundation philanthropy preceded national funding, just as in the two countries considered in the previous chapters.

FOUNDATION PHILANTHROPY AND THE ARTS IN THE 1950s AND 1960s

The 1950s and 1960s saw advocacy and funding programs for the arts initiated by the large general purpose foundations in the United States, which reinforced use of the nonprofit organization model (see DiMaggio 1982 for a case study of the history of the nonprofit organization in the United States) and adoption of business management practices in the arts. As discussed in Chap. 3, Andrew Carnegie supported culture in towns and cities through his grants of church organs and libraries in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. However, as the Carnegie Corporation and other general purpose foundations developed approaches to ‘scientific philanthropy’ their attention had focussed for decades on institutions and program development in public health, medicine, education, and social welfare. As discussed in Chap. 5, the Carnegie UK Trust focussed its attention on museums and the performing arts in the United Kingdom in the years prior to the establishment of CEMA, acting ‘like an arts council in all but name’ (Witts 1998). In the United States, the Ford Foundation assumed this role beginning in the mid-1950s with arts funding programs led and overseen by W. McNeil Lowry. Ford’s activity began in 1956, with a five-year, \$10 million program in the arts and humanities that funded a series of studies and conferences to understand the needs of the arts sector (Smith 2010). Beginning with this systematic research, the Ford Foundation began to support cultural organizations across the country, first as a patron, through orchestral and operatic commissions, but later, with a vision to strengthen the financial positions of the arts organizations. In 1962, the foundation budgeted \$8 million to \$10 million annually for grants to arts organizations that strategically targeted disciplines—ballet, orchestras, and regional theatre companies for example—for organizational and artistic development. Ford was also one of the leading contributors to the development and construction of Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts in New York, one of the largest cultural projects undertaken in the United States at that time, contributing a total of \$25 million to the \$125 million raised by 1966 (Smith 2010, p. 273).

Indeed, the Lincoln Center project focused foundation attention on the status of the performing arts in the United States. Beginning in 1955 and led by John D. Rockefeller III, the campaign to build Lincoln Center was part of the city’s initiative to clear slums and regenerate the West

Side of Manhattan. Located on 16 acres with concert halls and buildings housing institutions such as the Metropolitan Opera, the Juilliard School, and the New York City Ballet, Lincoln Center demonstrated the urban redevelopment potential of the arts to create cultural districts. The scale of the project stimulated the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund—which gave \$15 million—to make grants that exceeded their previous cultural giving. Additionally some 160 foundations gave more than \$62 million to build the project, focusing philanthropic attention on the performing arts and their relationship to urban social conditions (Smith 2010, p. 273).

For research to support arts advocacy initiatives, foundations funded three book-length studies about the performing arts and arts policy during the 1960s that were influential among arts advocates and policy circles. Two were authored by academics interested in encouraging a national arts policy. The first to be published in 1964 was titled *Commitment to Culture: Art Patronage in Europe, Its Significance for America* by Frederick Dorian, professor of music at Carnegie-Mellon University. In the book, Dorian, a musicologist who had experience of performing and teaching in Europe, describes arts policies and infrastructure in nine European countries: Austria, Italy, Switzerland, France, West Germany, The Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, and England, concluding with his recommendations for arts policy in the United States. Published by University of Pittsburgh Press, the research was funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.⁶ The book circulated among national arts advocates and policymakers (Biddle 1988, p. 90) who were then designing federal arts policy and programmes at the NEA. The second academic study was commissioned by the Twentieth Century Fund and had immediate and ongoing influence on arts advocates. Titled *Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma*, it was published in 1966 by two economists, William J. Baumol and William G. Bowen. The book, which makes a case for the ‘cost disease’, studied the economics of orchestras and was extremely influential in making the case for government subsidies to the performing arts (see Besharov 2005 for a discussion of this study and its influence).

The third study was undertaken by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and is examined here to illustrate the continuing influence that the Rockefeller family had on the arts and cultural sector through its various foundations and trusts, and to articulate the dominant policy position in the United States that funding the arts should be the responsibility

of the private sector. The Rockefeller Brothers Fund was established in New York in 1940 by five Rockefeller brothers: John D. Rockefeller III, Nelson Rockefeller, and Laurance, Winthrop and David Rockefeller, all sons of John D. Rockefeller Jr. Established by the brothers as a foundation through which to channel their philanthropic interests, it was and is independent of the Rockefeller Foundation. In line with its interests to develop Lincoln Center, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund launched a study of the performing arts in the US that was published in 1965 by McGraw-Hill and titled *The Performing Arts—Problems and Prospects*. The Arts Planning committee that oversaw the study was chaired by John D. Rockefeller III; the project staff was directed by Nancy Hanks, who would later become the Chairman of the NEA in the 1970s during President Richard Nixon's administration.

Comparing the Rockefeller Brothers Fund report to the arts policy research documents in England (published by the Arts Enquiry and discussed in Chap. 4) and Canada (the Massey Commission's report discussed in Chap. 6) presents some similarities and also some notable differences. There are similar arguments for the position of the arts in society as civilizing and educative forces for citizens with excessive leisure time and to demonstrate national prestige. While the Rockefeller report acknowledges the lack of consensus about the value of the arts among American citizens, it argues that social conditions in the United States and a crisis in the arts justify concern for and attention to the sector. In an argument unique to the US, the report links the 'civilizing' argument to national prestige, claiming that support for the arts would 'counter the widespread view that the United States is interested in little except material values' (Rockefeller Brothers Fund 1965, p. 8), an idea voiced by many intellectuals at the time, that Americans were obsessed with material values in the post-war decades of rising household income and prosperity (see Binkiewicz 2004, pp. 38–43 for a discussion of leading intellectuals and their arguments about American prosperity and materialism). Also unique to the US case is the report's point that, to achieve a 'well and safely balanced society', development of the arts should occur alongside the country's investments in science and technology (Rockefeller Brothers Fund 1965, p. 7).

All the reports emphasize the structural, social, and financial problems faced by trained, professional artists and professional arts organizations. In fact, the Rockefeller report is very clear and unapologetic about its interest:

Our study is limited to the *live performing arts*, and we concentrate on the *professional organizations* that sponsor and present opera, drama, instrumental and choral music, and dance. We do so because this is where the need is greatest and because the problems presented in the performing arts are uniquely susceptible to solution by public interest and action... [italics in original].

Our concentration on the professional performing arts bespeaks no disdain of the amateur and quasi-professional performing arts. We recognize that they can attain the highest level of artistic excellence, can provide fine entertainment, and can play a vital role in developing a larger and better audience for the arts. We do, however, feel it is on the professionals that we must primarily depend for the development and maintenance of high standards of artistic performance, which is a paramount concern. (Rockefeller Brothers Fund 1965, pp. 9–10)

As illustrated in earlier chapters, the emphasis on ‘standards’ and ‘excellence’ were concerns also of advocates and policymakers in Great Britain and Canada. Yet while the Rockefeller report points to tremendous growth in audiences and income, stating that ‘admissions to the performing arts, now running well above \$400 million a year, has approximately doubled during the past decade and a half’ (Rockefeller Brothers Fund 1965, p. 14), it continues; ‘Next to this glowing picture must be placed another, more sobering one: *Almost all this expansion is amateur.* The American people may have experienced an extraordinary awakening to the performing arts, but comparatively few are ever exposed to any *live professional* presentations’ (Rockefeller Brothers Fund 1965, p. 14; italics in original). Strikingly, the ‘crisis’ in the performing arts that the report seeks to address is a crisis in the nonprofit, professional sector. And the list of problems are similar to those found in the Massey Report: inadequate pay for artists, poor working conditions, scarce employment opportunities due to short performance seasons, ‘second-class training’ opportunities, a lack of adequate facilities in which to perform, a lack of strong organizations to provide stability and development, ‘crisis financing’ as organizations run up deficit after deficit in attempts to rely on box office income, and little to no time for careful planning and research activities to drive stability and development (Rockefeller Brothers Fund 1965, pp. 17–20). In contrast to the Gard approach discussed earlier in this chapter, this is not a report that celebrates the creative expressions of Americans in their communities, as ‘amateurs’; indeed, it reads as a

veiled attack on that creativity. Paradoxically, the report argues that the arts should be central to social life, but ‘In the panel’s view, this status will not be widely achieved unless artistic excellence is the constant goal of every artist and every arts organization, and mediocrity is recognized as the ever-present enemy of true progress in the development of the arts’ (Rockefeller Brothers Fund 1965, pp. 11–12).

While all the reports share similar themes and concerns, their differences are striking and illustrate their different purposes. Where the studies published by the Arts Enquiry and the Massey Commission—even by Dorian and Baumol and Bowen—attempted to make the case for government subsidy and national arts policies, the Rockefeller report is concerned with analyzing the financial and organizational structure of production and promotion for the arts and with recommending refinements and innovations in this system. This approach is a hallmark of ‘scientific’ philanthropy as practiced by the general purpose foundations: to conduct research into the structural issues of an identified problem, in this case a ‘crisis’ in the performing arts, and to posit recommendations that might include establishment of new institutions and organizations. Yet this report is largely about a *business* approach to supporting the arts and is organized by chapters that analyze and assess the various sources of income for arts organizations, such as box office and earned income, individual giving, corporate giving, and foundation giving, with government acknowledged as one of multiple players in the sector. It is a report produced for, and by, the corporate and foundation sectors. The foreword and preface set out the methodology for the study, which was largely based on interviews, surveys, and reviews of existing studies by a panel of 30 individuals who held senior positions in the arts, higher education, corporations, and foundations. The first indication of the intended audience for the report is found in the preface: ‘From the beginning, the panel had particularly in mind a study that would be useful to those responsible for the direction and management of performing arts institutions’ (Rockefeller Brothers Fund 1965, p. vi), indicating the panel’s interest in informing boards of trustees and senior managers. Following in order of importance, the panel hoped to ‘be helpful to foundation and corporate executives who are considering support for the arts’ and that the study might be ‘of value to local, state, and federal officials as the arts become increasingly important to the well-being and happiness of the people’ (Rockefeller Brothers Fund 1965, p. vi). Finally, ‘we wished to serve private citizens who are working to enhance the quality of life

in their communities' (Rockefeller Brothers Fund 1965, p. vi). This is a report intended for community leaders, whether in business, politics, or the voluntary sector. The initial problem that the panel encountered was an information gap about the sector, leading to their conclusion that 'among the key problems of the performing arts in America today are the lack of sufficient data and a central source of information' (Rockefeller Brothers Fund 1965, p. ix). To gather evidence, like the Massey Commission, the panel heard presentations from experts, a total of 40 from the arts, government, education, management, and labor. An additional 400 people were interviewed by the project staff either individually or in groups; 100 corporations were surveyed by questionnaire 'to determine corporate attitudes', and 75 representatives of foundations and performing arts organizations 'presented their thoughts and observations on foundation programs' with no indication if this information was gathered in interviews or surveys (Rockefeller Brothers Fund 1965, p. x). Information about government policy and support was limited to surveys of eight states and 47 municipalities, with no indication of involvement by national policymakers (Rockefeller Brothers Fund 1965, p. x). Thus, their evidence was largely gathered from performing arts organizations, businesses and corporations, and foundations, with no indication of how many artists were interviewed or consulted, if any at all.

Like the Arts Enquiry and the Massey Report, this report includes recommendations to build new arts organizations and strengthen existing ones; however, unlike the studies in Great Britain and Canada, a new national arts council implementing policy and allocating funding is not its goal. Indeed, the chapter about individual donations opens with the claim that, 'The private donor—the individual, the foundation, the corporation—has the major responsibility for insuring the survival and growth of the performing arts organisations' (Rockefeller Brothers Fund 1965, p. 65). This statement is followed by an analysis of individual donation patterns to all charities and nonprofits in the US, with a detailed analysis of individual donations to symphony orchestras and opera companies which shared their annual fundraising reports with the study. It points to the tax deduction—whereby donors are able to deduct charitable contributions from their annual federal income taxes owed—as a 'powerful incentive', as well as the exemption of charitable bequests from federal estate tax (Rockefeller Brothers Fund 1965, p. 75). The recommendations in this section stress the need for arts organizations to demonstrate their organizational reliability and stability, to focus on community needs

and education campaigns that convince their communities of the social impact of the arts, and to create ‘a climate of opinion in which corporate and government leaders are encouraged to raise their contributions, too’ (Rockefeller Brothers Fund 1965, p. 77). The chapter ends with a discussion of the benefits of united fundraising campaigns, or a ‘community chest’ approach as developed by social welfare charities in the US, whereby donations from individuals are solicited by a central fundraising organization on behalf of a group of charitable ‘client’ groups. The report notes that this approach was adopted by 14 local arts councils, including Winston-Salem’s (the report noted that 100 local arts councils existed at that point, p. 167). Similar overviews and recommendations follow in chapters about corporate and foundation donations to the arts.

Finally, the report sets out a role for government support of the arts that is limited and circumscribed; no ‘Arts Council of the United States’ is envisioned: ‘The panel believes no form of government aid to the arts should vitiate private initiative, reduce private responsibility for direction, or hamper complete artistic freedom. These must remain the prerogative of the citizens who direct performing arts institutions and of the artists’ (Rockefeller Brothers Fund 1965, p. 113). Singling out the Arts Council of Great Britain and the Canada Council as national initiatives that have ‘been much on the minds of Americans concerned with the arts’, the report finds that these policies are not applicable to the US, due to the country’s different attitude to government and its ‘strong tradition of voluntary association to support community activities’ (Rockefeller Brothers Fund 1965, p. 111). Instead, the report looks carefully at the current and possible roles for each level of government, beginning with local government. At local level, government should provide concert halls, theaters, and cultural centers, as well as operating funds, so that local arts organizations have spaces to perform and to host professional touring companies. At the state level, the report finds ‘one of the most encouraging signs on the American cultural scene’ in the actions of state governments, singling out New York and North Carolina as examples where state policy leads national policy (Rockefeller Brothers Fund 1965, p. 123). The state’s role is to ensure accessibility (or, in policy terms, the ‘democratization of culture’) to all its citizens, seeing ‘that presentations of high professional quality are made available to citizens throughout the state, particularly where local arts organisations cannot...’ (Rockefeller Brothers Fund 1965, p. 123). It points to the New York State Council on the Arts making grants to sponsoring organizations in cities and towns

to subsidize performances and exhibitions of touring shows in the performing and visual arts. The state of North Carolina took a different approach, establishing and funding its own professional orchestra, the North Carolina Symphony, to tour the state annually. These two states were among ‘more than twenty’ that were establishing state arts councils through legislative action or executive order, and although most still existed largely on paper, the report saw the potential for technical assistance to the performing arts and regional cooperation among these councils in the future.

Its discussion of the federal government’s role in arts development applauds the establishment of the National Council on the Arts in 1964 as an advisory body to the President, a year before the NEA was established by Congress. Prepared between 1963 and 1965, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund report was published soon after the Council was established, but before the NEA was fully operational. Therefore the report’s discussion of direct financial subsidies to arts organizations is muted, citing concerns about artistic freedom, but countering those concerns with the example of the Arts Council of Great Britain as a partnership between government and expert citizen panels where artistic freedom was not compromised (Rockefeller Brothers Fund 1965, p. 146). The report cites the practice of making matching grants as a tested means of support to higher education and the arts and recommends that federal funds be restricted to matching grants for buildings and capital needs of arts organizations initially. It argues that this practice will serve as a stimulus to state and local funding to provide facilities, while also developing agency experience in making matching grants to the arts (Rockefeller Brothers Fund 1965, 147). Indeed, over the years the NEA established a practice of making matching grants for project support, rather than ongoing annual operating support to arts organizations as practiced by the ACGB.

The Rockefeller Brothers Fund report (similarly to the Arts Enquiry reports in the 1940s in Great Britain) provides an overview of the arts infrastructure and its financial support in the early 1960s in the United States. It emphatically asserts the policy position that the arts should be supported by the private sector, working in collaboration with local, state, and federal governments in a limited way. It argues that a system of private sector support requires arts organizations to develop their management and fundraising capacity to survive and thrive. The funding system that it describes is the system that characterizes funding for the arts in the United States today. Finally, in its discussion of the federal role in arts funding, the

report credits President Kennedy for policy leadership, and this chapter will conclude with a brief examination of President and Mrs. Kennedy's influence on national arts policy.

ARTS POLICY LEADERSHIP BY THE KENNEDYS

Elected at the end of 1960 and taking office on January 20, 1961, President John F. Kennedy served only a portion of his four-year term, being assassinated in Dallas, Texas on November 22, 1963. Arguably, one of the legacies of his brief term in office was the NEA, although national arts policy was enacted during the first term of his successor, Lyndon B. Johnson. As is well known, President and Mrs. Kennedy brought youth and glamor to the White House, invited artists to entertain foreign dignitaries there, and invited artists to be their guests. While these actions may be understood as skillful public relations by the image-conscious Kennedys, a policy intention emerged as President Kennedy gauged the success of this inclusiveness, which began at his inauguration when the poet Robert Frost was invited to read a poem composed for the occasion (Binkiewicz 2004, pp. 44–45). The guest list for the event included artists and intellectuals, and a central theme of Kennedy's inaugural address called on Americans to unite 'in a struggle to redefine the United States as the world leader not only in military force but also in scientific progress and aesthetic excellence' (Binkiewicz 2004, p. 44). This responded to Cold War politics by 'joining social and cultural advancement to the single-minded militarism' of the 1950s, and marked 'an attempt to instill a calmer tone' in the Cold War (Binkiewicz 2004, p. 44). The Kennedys' inclusiveness towards artists and the leaders of cultural institutions, and their interest in the nation's cultural life, also publicly repudiated the effects of the anti-Communist campaigns of the 1950s led by US Senator Joseph McCarthy, when thousands of Americans, including artists, were accused of being members of the Communist Party or sympathizers and had their reputations destroyed by the accusations and accompanying publicity. Rather than feeling manipulated for political gain by the Kennedys, the artists and writers invited to the inauguration were honoured to be included, given this history (Binkiewicz 2004, p. 45).

Both Kennedys were patrons of the arts, and Mrs. Kennedy suggested that artists be invited to the inaugural ceremonies; later, she also planned and organized arts events at the White House and influenced policy discussions (Binkiewicz 2004, pp. 46–47). One of these events included a reception for the French minister of culture, André Malraux,

in 1962, which featured chamber music and French cuisine. Guests included the painter Andrew Wyeth, playwrights Arthur Miller and Tennessee Williams, and choreographer George Ballanchine in a gathering of American artistic talent. In 1963, Malraux assisted in arranging a rare tour of Leonardo da Vinci's *Mona Lisa* from the Louvre to the National Gallery of Art in Washington and the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. When the Kennedys were honoured at a reception at the French Embassy before the painting was exhibited in Washington, the president expressed his appreciation for the loan and France's generosity, stating that the United States would continue to develop a singular and distinctive culture (Binkiewicz 2004, p. 51). By this time, he had already taken steps to develop national arts policy by appointing August Heckscher from the Twentieth Century Fund (the foundation that sponsored the Baumol and Bowen study of the performing arts) as a special consultant on the arts to the President.

Heckscher spent a year in the role (which was part-time to avoid attracting unwanted attention to it) evaluating federal arts programmes and developing recommendations that served as the basis for federal arts policy. His recommendations included the appointment of a full-time, permanent special consultant on the arts to advise the president and to implement policy, along with the appointment of an advisory council on the arts, also reporting to the president. The advisory council would review existing programs and policies, develop new policy, and encourage participation from the arts community. Finally, he recommended the establishment of a National Arts Foundation to administer grants, on a matching basis, to the states and for projects proposed by cultural organizations which would encourage 'artistic innovation and excellence' (Binkiewicz 2004, p. 57). Rather than waiting for the US Congress to act, President Kennedy issued an executive order creating the advisory council in June 1963; however, he had not appointed its members before his assassination later that year.

In the American system, the executive branch often provides legislative leadership, and the Kennedys' support and enthusiasm for national arts policy encouraged US congressmen who had for years been advocating for federal funds for the arts. During his administration and after his assassination, these efforts continued, with advocates linking arts policy to foreign policy. They argued that arts policy would demonstrate American freedom of expression and democracy as an ideological and cultural weapon of the Cold War with the Soviet Union, then powerful arguments that drew bipartisan support (see Binkiewicz 2004,

pp. 60–68 for a discussion). And these arguments were more than policy rationales, because, by the early 1960s, the United States government had been engaged since 1950 in a campaign of cultural propaganda in Western Europe managed by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). The campaign was operated from 1950 to 1967 through an organization in Europe called the Congress for Cultural Freedom, which at its most active ‘had offices in thirty-five countries, employed dozens of personnel, published over twenty prestige magazines, held art exhibitions, owned a news and feature service, organized high-profile international conferences, and rewarded musicians and artists with prizes and public performances’ (Saunders 1999, p. 1). Championing freedom of expression and ‘the American way’, the Congress sought to move intellectuals and artists in Western Europe away from any interest in Marxism and Communism towards views favourable to democracy and the US (Saunders 1999). By the 1960s, even the rhetoric around domestic arts policy reflected these international Cold War concerns.

Ultimately, President Johnson pushed the legislation for the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities through Congress as part of his ‘Great Society’, the extensive social welfare programs intended to eliminate poverty and racial injustices in the United States. Indeed, Johnson’s interest in national arts policy was not so much to support artists and cultural organizations as to help extend arts provision to the general population, to expand the benefits of the country’s prosperity more broadly (Binkiewicz 2004, p. 77), and to improve access to the arts.

CONCLUSIONS

This chapter ends as the other studies have ended, at the establishment of the national funding agency, the National Endowment for the Arts, in 1965. Despite the initial ambitions for the agency, for political reasons, the NEA was and has been eclipsed by the state and local cultural infrastructure whose origins are the focus of this chapter. The dominance of the private sector in funding the arts in the United States—funding largely from individuals who donate or who purchase tickets and services—can be traced to the local arts council movement, to volunteer activism in the arts, and to the influence of foundations. Indeed, Toepler (2013) offers interesting insights on the role of foundations in funding culture in the ‘post-NEA era’ (p. 168). US economist Tyler Cowen has argued that a

market economy presents opportunities for the entrepreneurial artist and that the system of indirect subsidies through tax incentives has made possible a thriving cultural life in the United States (Cowen 1998, 2006). Other commentators disagree, however, and see the cultural infrastructure of funding agencies and arts organizations at grave risk and requiring a new direction more focused on community-building than audience development (Borwick 2012) which suggests a return to the approach promoted by Robert Gard.

In the final chapter, the book closes with an evaluation of the arts council model and a discussion of the relationships of power that continue to influence policy.

NOTES

1. For a history of the NEA, see Binkiewicz, 2004.
2. Two arts councils make the claim of being the first established in the United States, Winston-Salem, NC, and Quincy, Illinois. The Quincy Society of Fine Arts dates its founding to 1947, with that city serving for a time as the headquarters of the national movement. However, Winston-Salem was nationally recognized for its arts policies and support and served as a training ground for policymakers and consultants.
3. The Junior League expanded to Canada in 1912.
4. Access a copy at <http://www.gardfoundation.org/windmillprojects.html>.
5. The ten cities or counties in the order in which they established arts councils were Winston-Salem, Durham, Alamance county, Mecklenburg county, Hickory, Greensboro, Halifax county, High Point, Goldsboro, and Kinston.
6. The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation was known as the A.W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Foundation at that time.

REFERENCES

NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS

- Bean, Margaret. 1948. Jr League Aids Community Art: National Consultant Tells of Vancouver, B.C., Project. *The Spokesman Review*, October 29, Spokane, Washington.
- Griffin, Frances. 1950a. Arts Council Expert Arrives: Local Officials Study Prospects. *Twin City Sentinel*, July 10, Winston-Salem, NC.

PUBLISHED SOURCES

- Bauerlein, Mark, ed. with Ellen Grantham. 2009. *National Endowment for the Arts: A History 1965–2008*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.
- Besharov, Gregory. 2005. The Outbreak of the Cost Disease: Baumol and Bowen's Founding of Cultural Economics. *History of Political Economy* 37(3): 413–430.
- Biddle, Livingston. 1988. *Our Government and the Arts: A Perspective From the Inside*. New York: ACA Books.
- Binkiewicz, Donna M. 2004. *Federalizing the Muse: United States Arts Policy and the National Endowment for the Arts, 1965–1980*. Chapel Hill, NC: UNC Press.
- Blair, Karen. 1994. *The Torchbearers: Women and Their Amateur Arts Associations in America, 1890–1930*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Borwick, Doug, ed. 2012. *Building Communities, not Audiences: The Future of the Arts in the United States*. Winston-Salem, NC: Arts Engaged Inc.
- Burgard, Ralph. 1969. *Arts in the City: Organizing and Programming Community Art Councils*. New York: Associated Councils of the Arts.
- Cowen, Tyler. 1998. *In Praise of Commercial Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . 2006. *Good and Plenty: The Creative Successes of American Arts Funding*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Cummings, Milton C. Jr. 1991. Government and the Arts: An Overview. In *Public Money and the Muse*, ed. Stephen Benedict. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.
- DiMaggio, Paul J. 1982. Cultural Entrepreneurship in Nineteenth-Century Boston: The Creation of an Organizational Base for High Culture in America. *Media, Culture and Society*. 4: 33–50.
- DiMaggio, Paul J. 1991. Decentralization of Arts Funding From the Federal Government to the States. In *Public Money and the Muse*, ed. Stephen Benedict. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.
- Ewell, Maryo Gard. 2012. Arts-Based Community Development: Where Did We Come From? In *Building Communities, not Audiences: The Future of the Arts in the United States*, ed. Doug Borwick, 279–295. Winston-Salem, NC: Arts Engaged Inc.
- Gard, Robert E., Ralph Kohlhoff, Michael Warlum, Kenneth Friou, and Pauline Temkin. 1970. *The Arts in the Small Community: A National Plan*. Madison, WI: Office of Community Arts Development, University of Wisconsin.
- Gordon, Janet, and Diana Reische. 1982. *The Volunteer Powerhouse*. New York: The Rutledge Press.
- Hanes, R. Philip. 2005. Development of Arts Councils in USA: A Personal History. Typescript Obtained From North Carolina Arts Council.

- Jackson, Nancy Beth. 2001. *The Junior League: 100 Years of Volunteer Service*. New York: Association of Junior Leagues International.
- Junior League of Winston-Salem. Annual Report 1947–48. Winston-Salem, North Carolina.
- . 1948–49. Winston-Salem, North Carolina.
- . 1950–51. Winston-Salem, North Carolina.
- Katz, Stanley N. 2006. Philanthropy. In *Handbook of the Economics of Art and Culture* 25, eds. V.A. Ginsburgh and D. Throsby, 1300–1321. Vol. 1, Chapter 37.
- Lowell, Julia F. 2004. *State Arts Agencies 1965–2003: Whose Interests to Serve?* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- Lowell, Julia F., and Elizabeth H. Ondaatje. 2006. *The Arts and State Governments: At Arm's Length or Arm in Arm?* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- Mulcahy, Kevin V. 2002. The State Arts Agency: An Overview of Cultural Federalism in the United States. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 32(1): 67–80.
- Rockefeller Brothers Fund. 1965. *The Performing Arts: Problems and Prospects*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Saunders, Frances Stonor. 1999. *The Cultural Cold War*. New York: The New Press.
- Smith, James Allen. 2010. 'Foundations as Cultural Actors', in Anheier, Helmut K. and David C. Hammack, eds. *American Foundations: Roles and Contributions*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Stanbridge, Alan. 2007. The Tradition of all the Dead Generations: Music and Cultural Policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 13(3): 255–271.
- Tippett, Maria. 1990. *Making Culture: English-Canadian Institutions and the Arts Before the Massey Commission*. Toronto, University of Toronto Press.
- Toepler, Stefan. 2013. Shifting Cultural Policy Landscapes in the USA: What Role for Philanthropic Foundations? *Cultural Trends* 22(3–4): 167–179.
- Witts, Richard. 1998. *Artist Unknown: An Alternative History of the Arts Council*. London: Little Brown & Co.

Conclusions: Towards Social Justice and Equality in the Arts

What can we learn about arts policy formation in a period before professionals—special advisors, lobbyists, think-tanks, and consultants—dominated the process? Graham (1993, pp. 35–36) has argued that ‘Understanding the institutions that drive the policy process—their personality and culture, their values and memory, the legacy of their leaders—this above all demands historical analysis, and this task lies at the heart of policy history.’ Understanding contemporary policy, and the values and assumptions embedded in it, requires an understanding of its history and the individuals and groups involved in its formation. Through an examination of the particular social, political, and cultural conditions in three countries, this book considers arts policy development from the second world war to the mid-1960s, following the transatlantic movement of the ‘arts council’ idea from Europe to North America to track the assumptions embedded in the policy idea.

In his analysis of arts policy in Great Britain, McGuigan (1996, p. 54) identifies distinct ‘discursive moments’ when central government subsidies were rationalized by arts advocates. He identifies these moments as (*italics in the original*): ‘*social control* (from mid-nineteenth century to mid-twentieth century), *national prestige* (from early 1940s to early 1960s), *social access* (mid-1960s to late 1970s), *value for money*, characterized by an increasingly pervasive *market reasoning* and *managerialist rhetoric* (late 1970s to the present and foreseeable future)’. Before 1945, state

intervention in the arts was justified explicitly or implicitly as a means of social control of the population, for the ‘civilizing influences’ that libraries, museums, art galleries, and other cultural activities provided to the lower classes. McGuigan cites Matthew Arnold’s published writings in the nineteenth century (see Chap. 3 in this book) as a key discourse in the social control arguments (1996, p. 55). Keynes’s announcement of the establishment of the ACGB in July 1945 marked the discursive moment at which state intervention was justified by both social control and national prestige: ‘the architects of the mid-century policies articulated a sense of constructive advance towards a more cultured nation with a set of state-sponsored alternatives to Hollywood and Tinpan Alley’ (McGuigan 1996, p. 57). By ‘national prestige,’ we can infer that McGuigan means that Great Britain’s reputation in Europe and the world would be enhanced by state-sponsored, professional, fine arts institutions. That the ACGB in its earliest years sought to establish and strengthen national performing arts companies in opera, ballet, theatre, and classical music, demonstrates the policy model’s purpose to enhance the country’s cultural image.

The discursive moment of ‘national prestige’ can also be observed abroad; as Chaps. 6 and 7 demonstrate, arts advocates in Canada and the United States cited concerns about their countries’ international reputations in their rationales to justify national arts funding. As we saw in Canada—a former British colony seeking to establish itself as an independent nation—the arguments about international cultural prestige were explicit. Leaders at the Canada Council sought to establish national performing arts companies in the earliest years, modeled on those in Europe. Training artists and replicating European high culture, rather than developing native Canadian cultural production, appear to have been the goal in the early decades of that council. Indeed, Dowler (1999, p. 352) has remarked on the ‘emergence of an aesthetic internationalism in which the specificities of indigenous cultural production give way to a trans-national set of criteria for aesthetic and cultural production. Regional practices take a back seat to international aesthetic norms’. In the early years, indigenous art—the regional and local expressions of the population—took a back seat and didn’t receive funding initially. Although Canada has an official policy of multiculturalism instituted in 1988, funding preferences that favor fine arts institutions continued well into the new century, as Stanbridge demonstrated in a 2007 study. Stanbridge examined the Canada Council’s funding to musical institutions for the fiscal year 2004–05 and found that one opera company and four symphony orchestras received 25

percent of the Council's total budget for music. Out of 1054 organizations and individuals receiving grants that year, only twenty received half the total music budget; those twenty focused on Western classical music (Stanbridge 2007, p. 262). As in Great Britain, the beneficiary institutions in the performing arts received a large percentage of the available funding. However, the Council's committed attention to building these institutions achieved what the Massey Commission intended, to create a publicly financed culture as an alternative to Hollywood. Yet whether or how individual citizens accessed that culture was a personal choice; the creation of the institutions was what mattered to the arts advocates. The United States did not establish a national arts funding body with the same funding practice as the UK and Canada; as we saw in Chap. 7, the NEA offers grants rather than continuous annual funding to organizations. Yet foundation and corporate leaders made arguments about enhancing the country's international prestige to justify greater levels of private sector support to the arts.

This book examines the legacy of privilege that gave rise to arts policy: 'privilege' in the sense of the advantages of wealth and education enjoyed by a small group or class. This study argues that two privileged groups—philanthropists and intellectuals—were allies in the process of arts policy-making in the UK, Canada, and the US. The symbolic sphere of human life was a cause that united and activated them to attempt political action. Collaborating with intellectuals who provided the policy prescriptions, the philanthropists soaked up their ideas and then mobilized money and people around their recommendations. The two groups shared beliefs about their roles in creating structures and solutions to social problems, and they allied to form and support organizations—foundations, universities, libraries, museums, and arts councils—a cultural infrastructure that would shelter and encourage their humanist values. They argued for arts councils to provide reliable funding for the arts organizations, especially the performing arts, through government subsidies and fundraising from private sector sources. Yet how much influence on cultural policy do these groups continue to have today? Following his account of the 'intellectual aristocracy' (see Chap. 2), Annan argued in subsequent books that this elite 'came to dominate its age. The expansion of universities, the success of the BBC, the effective deployment of state funding for the arts and culture, and the deference of government and public opinion, led him to define the cultural elite as the *Generation that Made Post-War Britain* (italics in the original; Griffiths et al. 2008, p. 189). Indeed this book has

sketched out their activities in creating a post-war cultural infrastructure in Great Britain. Yet Annan considered that this Oxbridge, white male elite had been eclipsed during the Thatcher era, when intellectual expertise was replaced by a different kind of policy expertise that emphasized instrumentalism, targets, and specific outcomes, and ‘market logic allowed a different mechanism for allocating resources and values’ (Griffiths et al. 2008, pp. 189–190), reflecting policy based on *value for money* (McGuigan 1996, p. 54). Griffiths, Miles, and Savage examine this ‘rise and fall’ argument with a sociological analysis of all board members of quangos (quasi-autonomous, nongovernmental organizations) within the Department of Culture, Media and Sport during 2007. They find that while the ‘neo-liberalization’ of cultural governance diminished the ‘power of an old boy network’ they found ‘a process where traditional intellectual elites have proved able to remake their authority through playing key roles as brokers in more dispersed social networks. We argue that, within this process, a distinctive ‘metropolitan formation’ continues to be highly strategically effective in the organization of cultural life’ (Griffiths et al. 2008, p. 190). Looking further at their study, especially their findings about the board membership of the Arts Council, illuminates the specific nature of power and influence that this social group held at the end of the twentieth century.

Griffiths et al. first contextualize their social analysis with a brief historical review of the intellectual elite’s power in state institutions in the twentieth century and the growth of arts and culture quangos after the second world war. They find that, despite Annan’s concerns, very few quangos were formed and none were eliminated from the late 1940s to the early 1980s. Griffiths et al. also found ‘an intense wave of ‘quango formation’ (2008, p. 194) from the mid-1990s, demonstrating extensive government intervention in culture by the Major and Blair governments, as the National Lottery was instituted as a source of funding for culture and sport, and as regional cultural policies emerged with central government support. By the time of their study in 2007, there were many more positions for staff and board service in the ‘mature’ cultural infrastructure of the United Kingdom, than had existed in the immediate post-war era, suggesting that there are *more* opportunities for power and influence to be exercised by a cultural elite.

Griffiths et al. conducted a detailed examination of the social and educational backgrounds of board members of the Arts Council, comparing the characteristics of council and panel members who served in the 1960s and 1970s with those who served in the 1980s and 1990s; they identified

a shift in the composition of the Arts Council executive in the late 1970s and early 1980s (2008, p. 198). Their study found some evidence of democratization in the gender profile of members, with the numbers of women members increasing from 11 percent to 23 percent between the 1960s and 1990s. They found a decline in the number of members who held honours, from 72 percent to 43 percent, as well as a decline in the members who belonged to private clubs, from 41 percent to 25 percent. In occupations, their study found ‘a decline in artists and artist academics, the kind of people who Keynes recruited in the 1940s’ from 46 percent (1960s/70s) to 24 percent (1980s/90s) (Griffiths et al. 2008, p. 199). However, in educational background of members, the study found less of a shift: ‘Oxbridge graduates remain very prominent,’ with 47 percent having attended Oxford or Cambridge in the 1960s/70s, and 40 percent in the 1980s/90s (Griffiths et al. 2008, p. 199). Their conclusion is that the while ‘old, intellectual, gentlemanly elite’ is still overrepresented on cultural boards, ‘they clearly do not monopolize membership. Even the Arts Council shows shifts towards more open recruitment’ (Griffiths et al. 2008, p. 200). Yet they go on to argue that these looser networks create opportunities for individuals to acquire ‘increased strategic power’ in their ability to connect groups which otherwise would not be connected, acting as power brokers (Griffiths et al. 2008, p. 200). They conclude that these conditions have allowed the ‘reworking’ of elite powers ‘so that they now provide the key ‘bridges’ and ‘connections’ in a much sparser network of power,’ indeed ‘it is mainly those who come from elite backgrounds who perform this linking and straddling role’—in theory (Griffiths et al. 2008, p. 207). And their analysis of all boards points to the ‘continued dominance’ of the ‘metropolitan formation’ represented by the London-based museums into the 1990s (Griffiths et al. 2008, p. 207).

This class dimension and the continuing power of a cultural elite into the twenty-first century and its implications for policy have been critiqued thoroughly by scholars in the United Kingdom, most recently by Jancovich (2015). Writing about the British system, she argues that the cultural elite who control the country’s national institutions works to maintain the status quo by funding the performing arts companies and arts organizations that historically attract educated, relatively affluent, white, older professionals as arts patrons. She finds that policy initiatives to broaden arts participation to other socioeconomic groups have been stymied by this elite. Jancovich argues for widening the range of voices and individuals involved in arts funding decisions using practices of participatory budgeting as

a means of redistributing funding, and power, and thereby potentially increasing levels of arts engagement from different socioeconomic groups.

Debates around the ‘metropolitan bias’ have been energized in recent years in the United Kingdom by the publication of a study by Stark et al. (2013) titled ‘Rebalancing our Cultural Capital’, which documented the disparity between per capita spending for culture in London (£65.18 per person in 2012/13) as compared to the regions (£4.91 per person in the rest of England). This well-publicized study shocked media commentators, elicited a public response from Arts Council England, and led to parliamentary hearings and policy responses to spread funding more equitably. The United States, with its devolved approach to policy-making and funding from the outset, may seem to offer a notable exception, and indeed, while debates have emerged periodically about NEA grant decisions that favored New York artists over those in other states, the same concerns do not exist about regional disparities in the distribution of public funds for the arts. Differences among state-by-state expenditures are considered to reflect the funding priorities of state governments. Yet even in the devolved policy situation in the US, early government subsidies favoured organizations producing fine arts and high culture, and it took the leadership of the NEA in the 1970s through a program called ‘Expansion Arts’ to broaden national and state funding to African-American and other non-white recipients around the country.

What this book has more explicitly pointed to is the gendered process of early policymaking in the arts. The policy actors in this narrative are nearly all male, as well as white, educated, and wealthy, especially in the United Kingdom and Canada. Dorothy Elmhirst’s singular difference from her fellow philanthropists is her gender. While her wealth gave her mobility and the means to start and fund organizations, she was constrained by social conventions and demonstrated her leadership primarily in the arena of women’s voluntary work. Other notable exceptions to the male dominance are Mary Glasgow, the first Secretary General of the ACGB in the United Kingdom, Hilda Neatby, the history professor and intellectual who served on the Massey Commission in Canada, and Nancy Hanks, who led the Rockefeller Brothers Fund research in the United States and was director of the NEA during the Nixon administration. All three offer notable exceptions as women openly engaged in visible positions as national policymakers. While women weren’t wholly absent from the policymaking process, they were most active and numerous at the local level as volunteers through their cultural activism and organizing. Chapter

7 highlighted the influence of middle-class, white women in the United States in establishing and running voluntary cultural organizations and arts councils; women were similarly active in the United Kingdom where the National Federation of Women's Institutes assisted CEMA's early 'Music Travellers' program wherein music teachers traveled throughout England giving lessons (Witts 1998: 58–62). Virginia Lee Comer in the US was a paid advisor who traveled nationally and internationally, but she worked within the context of a woman-centred voluntary organization, the Junior League of America. In all three countries, it appears that men led national policymaking initiatives while women were most active in organizing and encouraging the 'amateur' arts, especially arts education and training experiences in their communities. This suggests that women could lead in community settings where their work might be considered an extension of their duties at home, as mothers, or if they were employed as teachers. The gendering of policymaking points to potential new research in arts policy, alongside concerns about social class and access. The theory of 'the clerisy' which, Chap. 3 argues, shaped the elite male identities of men like Keynes and Massey, assured a social and intellectual basis for male dominance of the symbolic realm. A focus on women and gender in arts policy would contribute to research about and understandings of patriarchy and how male power has come to be understood and exercised in the arts and in human symbolic life. In particular, a focus on women's history in cultural policy would respond to Judith M. Bennett's (2006, p. 54) challenge to historicize patriarchy: 'Patriarchy might be everywhere, but it is not everywhere the same, and therefore patriarchy, in all its immense variety, is something we need to understand, analyze, and explain'.

Turning now to the policy model, how has the 'arts council' model fared over the past seventy years? Reviewing the reforms, reorganizations, and threats to the national arts councils in the three study countries is well beyond the scope of this book or this chapter; Bell and Oakley (2015, pp. 109–140) have published a useful overview of concepts and literature about national cultural policies that includes policy changes in the UK. Surely the most influential cultural policy of the past 15 years have been cultural and creative industries policies, at least as popular and influential with governments today as the arts council model was after 1946. Emerging in the late 1990s, these policies emphasize the role of creativity and culture in the economies and trade policies of cities and countries and demonstrate McGuigan's argument about post-1970s policies based on *value for money* and *market reasoning* (1996, p. 54).

While the sectors included in these policies vary from country to country, they can include the subsidized arts along with commercial sectors such as film, social media, advertising, and design (see Hesmondhalgh et al. 2015 for a history of the emergence of these policies in the UK prior to 2010). There is a large policy and academic literature about cultural and creative industries policies which is beyond the scope of this chapter to review (see Bell and Oakley 2015, pp. 25–38 for an overview and references). However, one case bears discussion, because it involves the dissolution of an arts council in the United Kingdom in favor of an agency with a combined policy agenda. The Scottish Arts Council was established in 1967 as a committee of the Arts Council of Great Britain, and operated as such until 1994, when it became a fully independent body. Stevenson (2014) has documented and analyzed the policy shift that occurred, when, in 2010, the Scottish Arts Council was merged with Scottish Screen to create a new funding agency named Creative Scotland. In effect, the Scottish Arts Council was dissolved and its funding and operation merged with a creative industries development initiative. Creative Scotland's mission is to support 'the arts, screen and creative industries across all parts of Scotland on behalf of everyone who lives, works or visits here' (www.creativescotland.com/what-we-do). In the creation of the new agency, arts funding was reorganized, and funding for the five national performing arts companies was transferred to the Scottish Government, a devolved executive accountable to the Scottish Parliament. Later, Creative Scotland planned to withdraw a source of flexible funding for 60 arts organizations, with no alternative funding proposed. Stevenson recounts and analyzes the protests made by Scottish artists and advocates in response, through online blog postings and open letters written to the news media, including one letter signed by 100 advocates. Much of the protest was organized by theatre artists. Using discourse analysis, Stevenson writes that the clear target of the protest was Creative Scotland and its perceived attempt to 'manage' the 'cultural community' that it was intended to 'support' (2014, p. 3). He writes that the protest, or 'discursive event' relied on the 'well-established discursive knot (Wodak and Meyer 2009, p. 47) that entangles the discourse strands of cultural value and public accountability with those of artistic freedom, expertise and excellence' (2014, p. 4). The arts advocates positioned the dispute as an ideological struggle between 'artists' and 'managers', however their reliance on the 'discursive knot' actually 'supports the status quo and obscures the power relationships

at work in the distribution of cultural subsidy' (Stevenson 2014, p. 5), a status quo, he argues, which favours continued funding of established organizations and the influence of senior artists in Scotland.

The shift that occurred in Scottish policy was also considered in England under the Labour Party, which, in opposition, considered merging the Arts Council, the Crafts Council, the Design Council, and the British Film Institute into a 'Council for Creativity' (Hesmondhalgh et al. 2015, p. 143). However, all four agencies survived the New Labour era and the Coalition and Conservative Governments that followed (as of early 2016).

What about the role of philanthropy in funding the arts? This book has argued that philanthropists were a shaping force in policymaking and arts and culture in all three study countries for the past century, most notably in the United States. And we can argue that all three countries embrace private philanthropy as 'policy', because although the UK and Canada instituted national government funding for the arts through their arts councils, many arts organizations in both countries have not been wholly reliant on government funds but have operated a 'blended' funding model wherein they have responsibility for raising some earned and contributed income along with their government subsidies. UK governments, at least since the Conservative governments in the 1980s, have encouraged arts organizations to look to the private sector for more funding from business and corporate sponsorships, foundation philanthropy, and individual giving. This emphasis has continued in all three countries. Yet private sector funding is not stable, reliable funding, because of its dependence on flourishing economic conditions. Experience in the United States since the financial crash of 2008 has shown that corporations and individuals withdraw from funding the arts when profits and paychecks are not growing; similarly, foundations reduce their giving when stock prices and interest rates fall and the income earned on investments stops growing. The three philanthropists profiled in this study understood these limitations of the private sector and argued for government support as a more stable source of funding. Only in the United States was the argument made in reverse by the Rockefellers: that private sector funding should dominate, to be complemented by government funding.

In evaluating the arts council model, we need to ask: what should be the purpose of arts policy in a democracy? McGuigan (2004) has argued that the social justice promised by democracy is undermined in cultural policy by the ideology of capitalism. Recent evidence in the United Kingdom indicates that the ideology examined in this book that informs the arts

council model has nurtured a ‘culture’ that is consumed by a minority ‘15 % of the general population, who tend to be of higher socio-economic status’ (Warwick Commission 2015, p. 33). In terms of social justice and equality, the arts council model has failed to support the arts that the majority of citizens choose to enjoy. Yet on two measures the policy *has delivered*. In national prestige, the country’s ‘museums, theatre, dance, popular and classical music and visual arts are internationally recognised as world class’ (Warwick Commission 2015, p. 12). And the arts represent value for money, because these sectors are part of the cultural and creative industries that ‘make a significant contribution to the British economy and are the fastest growing industry in the UK. The Gross Value Added (GVA) of the sector was estimated by DCMS [Department of Culture, Media, and Sport] at a global £76.9bn in 2013, representing 5.0 % of the UK economy’ (DCMS 2015 in Warwick Commission 2015, p. 20).

If the model has failed to enhance democracy and creative expression by a wide diversity of citizens, then what should be the focus of an arts policy? In 1984, Raymond Williams argued that government should have ‘the prime responsibility of keeping the means of production in art publicly available’ and that ‘there is a possibility of defining a principle of holding the artistic means of production in public trust’ (Williams 1984, in McGuigan 2014, p. 310). He placed artists and communities at the center of his policy of the future, suggesting that the state might lease the means of production to ‘self-managing groups of artists of all kinds’ (Williams 1984, in McGuigan 2014, p. 310). And he argued for a focus on the local, rather than the national, in cultural policy, of ‘relating a cultural policy to an actual community rather than to a relatively abstract and centralized state’ (Williams 1984, in McGuigan 2014, p. 310). Both possibilities point to the potential for achieving greater social justice through cultural democracy.

To make the means of production accessible to all citizens to make and engage with art will require *more* government funding for the arts, not less. It will require increased public expenditure on education at all levels and on the sites and facilities where the arts are produced and presented: art schools, community centres, theatres, cinemas, art galleries, arts centres, craft studios, concert halls, and digital platforms, to name only a few. It is time to embrace cultural democracy. Local governments should consult their citizens, then establish and fund the sites, the programs, and cultural expressions, in neighborhoods and city centers, that their communities want, on the same terms as libraries, parks, and leisure centers. The arts

should not be forced to compete with each other and scramble for scarce public resources, and funding redistributions should be taken with care for the artists whose livelihoods are at risk. The controversy around Creative Scotland erupted partly because the agency was reorganized with a new mandate yet no added funding, so that community-based groups lost their funding as it was reallocated elsewhere. The incomes and lives of artists and creative producers are notoriously precarious. ‘Austerity’ measures imposed on the arts are counterproductive, because they diminish the potential to use the arts to enhance democracy and social justice.

Arts policy has demonstrated its usefulness to policymakers on two measures. Now is the time to increase public spending on the arts in local communities, to work for cultural rights, and to give citizens the means to live flourishing lives on their own terms.

REFERENCES

PUBLISHED SOURCES

- Bell, David, and Kate Oakley. 2015. *Cultural Policy*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Bennett, Judith M. 2006. *History Matters: Patriarchy and the Challenge of Feminism*. Manchester: University of Manchester Press.
- Dowler, Kevin. 1999. Early Innis and the Post-Massey Era in Canadian Culture. In *Harold Innis in the New Century: Reflections and Refrlections*, eds. C.R. Acland, and W.J. Buxton, 339–354. Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press.
- Graham, Hugh Davis. 1993. The Stunted Career of Policy History: A Critique and an Agenda. *The Public Historian*, University of California Press 15(2): 15–37.
- Griffiths, Dave, Andrew Miles, and Mike Savage. 2008. The End of the English Cultural Elite? *The Sociological Review* 56(1): 188–209.
- Hesmondhalgh, David, Kate Oakley, David Lee, and Melissa Nisbett. 2015. *Culture, Economy, and Politics: The Case of New Labour*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jancovich, Leila. 2015. The Participation Myth. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. doi:[10.1080/10286632.2015.1027698](https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2015.1027698).
- McGuigan, Jim. 1996. *Culture and the Public Sphere*. London: Routledge.
- . 2004. *Rethinking Cultural Policy*. UK: Open University Press.
- Stanbridge, Alan. 2007. ‘The Tradition of all the Dead Generations: Music and cultural policy’, *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 13(3): 255–271.

- Stark, Peter, Christopher Gordon and David Powell. 2013. 'Rebalancing our Cultural Capital: A contribution to the debate on national policy for the arts and culture in England'. Available at <http://www.gpsculture.co.uk/rocc.php>
- Stevenson, David. 2014. Tartan and Tantrums: Critical Reflections on the Creative Scotland "Stooshie". *Cultural Trends*. doi:10.1080/09548963.2014.925283.
- Warwick Commission on the Future of Cultural Value. 2015. *Enriching Britain: Culture, Creativity and Growth*. Coventry, UK: University of Warwick. Available at <http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/research/warwickcommission/futureculture/>
- Williams, Raymond. 1984. 'State Culture and Beyond' in *Raymond Williams: On Culture and Society, essential writings*, (2014), Jim McGuigan, ed. London: Sage Publications. Pp. 305–311.
- Witts, Richard 1998. *Artist Unknown: An Alternative History of the Arts Council*. London: Little Brown & Co.

INDEX¹

A

- Americans for the Arts, 178
Annan, Noel, 12, 13, 21, 44n2, 44n4,
51, 58, 82, 98n13, 201, 202
Apostles, 12–15, 43
Arm's length principle, 2, 103, 112, 115
Arnold, Matthew, 29, 50–3, 56–9, 62,
63, 69, 73, 104, 118, 122, 142,
156, 200
The Arts Enquiry, 9, 34, 42, 95–7,
186, 188, 189, 192
Arts Council of Great Britain, v, vii,
1–3, 6, 11, 25, 26, 74n4, 82, 96,
98, 98n2, 103–27, 131, 139,
143, 153, 163, 166, 169n11,
176, 190, 191, 206
Arts Council of Vancouver, British
Columbia, 3, 7, 147, 173,
175, 176
Arts Council of Winston-Salem and
Forsyth County, 173
arts policy clique, 6, 81–4, 95, 97,
98, 118

B

- Bell, Clive, 2, 12, 15, 79, 80, 104, 115
Bissell, Claude, 27–32, 45n14, 71, 84,
98n3, 98n6, 98n8, 99n26,
99n27, 132, 133, 145–9, 151–3,
169n7
Bloomsbury Group, vi, ix, 12, 14,
24, 26
Burgard, Ralph, 173, 175, 177–80
Butler, R.A., 81–4, 86, 87, 89, 91, 93,
98n2, 98n3, 107, 108, 110, 114,
125, 127n12

C

- CACI. *See* Community Arts Councils
Inc (CACI)
Cambridge, viii, ix, 5, 12, 14, 17–19,
21, 26, 39, 43, 44n3, 45n9, 49,
50, 55, 71, 82, 104, 108, 112,
114, 117, 118, 126n1, 126n2,
127n12, 127n14, 127n15, 203
Cambridge Arts Theatre, 18, 19

¹Note: Page number followed by n refer footnotes

Canada,, vi–ix, 1, 11, 45n11,
45n17, 49, 77, 109, 131–69,
171, 195n3, 200, 201, 204,
205, 207

Canada Council, vii, ix, 4, 6, 27,
125, 126, 131–69, 169n2,
190, 200

Canadian clerisy, 6, 131–69, 169n7

Carnegie, Andrew, 7, 36, 50, 62–74,
74n3, 109, 110, 126, 136–40,
148, 161, 162, 165, 166,
184, 185

Carnegie Corporation, 7, 69, 70, 126,
137–40, 148, 161, 184

Carnegie Trust UK, 126

CEMA. *See* Council for the
Encouragement of Music and the
Arts (CEMA)

Clark, Kenneth, 33, 81, 83, 85–7,
92, 93, 97, 98, 98n2, 98n4,
107, 115, 118, 121, 125,
126–7n4, 143

clerisy, 5, 6, 8, 49–61, 74, 104, 107,
131–69, 169n7, 205

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, 50–61,
74n1, 104

Comer, Virginia Lee, 174–6, 205

Community Arts Councils Inc.
(CACI), 178

Council for the Encouragement
of Music and the Arts
(CEMA), 3, 25, 79, 83, 84,
93–7, 104, 107–10, 114,
116, 120, 123, 126, 126n4,
176, 184, 205

Courtauld, Samuel, 18, 81–7, 89, 94,
98n2, 98n7, 99n17, 107, 110,
126–7n4

Cox, Peter, 40, 41, 45n19, 96

Creative Scotland, 206, 209

D

Dartington Hall, viii, ix, 34, 39–43,
45n19, 77, 92, 95–7, 108,
135, 157

E

Elmhirst, Dorothy Whitney Straight,
5–7, 34, 35, 37, 39–44, 45n18,
45n19, 49, 50, 61, 73, 95,
97, 204

Elmhirst, Leonard, 39, 41, 42, 95, 97

F

Federation of Canadian Artists (FCA),
138, 139, 164

Ford Foundation, 184, 185

Forster, E.M., 80, 81

Fry, Roger, vi, ix, 18, 25, 83,
104, 112

G

Gard, Robert E., 179–81, 188, 195

Glasgow, Mary, 25, 26, 95, 97, 204

The Gospel of Wealth, 50, 62–9

H

Hanes, R. Philip Jr., 173, 177, 183

Hanks, Nancy, 178, 186, 205

Harrod, Roy, 14

Heckscher, August, 193

I

intellectual aristocracy, 12–14, 21,
44n2, 44n4, 50, 58, 72, 82,
98n13, 104, 117, 120, 201

J

Junior League, vii, 7, 34, 36, 38, 73,
173–6, 195n3, 205

K

Kennedy, President John F., 192–4
Keynes, John Maynard, vi–ix, 5, 6,
11–27, 29, 31, 34, 35, 43, 44n1,
44n3, 44n6, 49–51, 60, 61, 71,
74, 77, 80–5, 92–5, 98,
99n29–31, 103–26, 126n1,
126n2, 127n5, 127n10, 127n12,
127n14, 127n15, 136, 143, 153,
163, 200, 203, 205
King, Mackenzie, 30–3, 45n14, 93,
99n29, 145, 146
Knights, Ben, 50–4, 56–9, 74n1

L

liberal, ix, 6, 21, 23, 24, 27, 30–2, 43,
45n9, 51, 52, 55, 58–60, 71,
72, 104, 108, 110, 113, 127n11,
133–6, 143, 145, 146, 168,
174, 202
Lopokova, Lydia, 17, 18, 44n7,
82, 93
Lowry, W. McNeil, 184

M

Massey, Vincent, vii, viii, 5, 11,
45n12, 49, 77, 98n3–6, 107,
131, 169n3–5, 169n7, 186
Massey Commission, 27, 132–4, 137,
139, 145, 148, 150, 151, 164,
165, 186, 188, 189, 201, 205
Massey Committee, 86, 89, 91
Massey Foundation, 28–30, 71
Maurice, Frederick Denison, 55, 56

Mill, John Stuart, 13, 50–3, 59–61,
72, 104, 114
Moggridge, Donald, 12, 23, 25, 44n6
Moore, G.E., 14–16, 19, 20, 26,
44n8, 104
Moravian church(s), 173, 174

N

National Endowment for the Arts
(NEA), vi, 4, 7, 43, 168, 171,
178–86, 191, 192, 194, 195,
201, 204, 205
National Gallery, 27, 33, 34, 45n17,
79, 84–91, 98n9, 107, 138,
144, 193
The New Republic, 35, 37–9, 73
New York State Council on the Arts
(NYSCA), 182, 191
North Carolina Arts Council, v,
181, 182

P

philanthropy, theory of, 5, 49, 50
Pilgrim Trust, 79, 107–9, 120, 121, 126
Porter, John, 136, 148–50, 169n6,
169n7

R

Rockefeller Brothers Fund, 178,
185–92, 205
Rockefeller Foundation(s), 7, 28, 148,
161, 162, 165, 166, 182, 186
Royal Commission on National
Development in the Arts, Letters
and Sciences, 27, 133. *See also*
Massey Commission
Royal Opera House, Covent Garden,
79, 93, 167

S

Sadler's Wells, 18, 93–5
 Siegfried, André, 141–3, 152
 Skidelsky, Robert, 12, 19, 21, 44n1,
 50, 82, 83, 93, 94, 99n29, 110
 Spencer, Herbert, 63, 69
 Straight, Michael, 43
 Straight, Willard Dickerman, 37

T

Tagore, Rabindranath, 39, 40

U

United Kingdom (UK), 1, v–x, 3–7,
 8n1, 11, 26, 32–4, 38, 44, 49,
 50, 58, 61, 69, 73, 74, 77–99,
 103, 106, 108–10, 123, 124,
 126, 127n10, 127n11, 133, 135,
 137, 157, 171, 184, 201, 203–8

United States, v–ix, 3–5, 7, 11, 28, 30,
 31, 34, 36, 39, 41, 43, 44, 45n9,
 49, 50, 62, 63, 68–71, 73, 77,
 97, 105, 109, 113, 122–6,
 127n8, 133, 135–8, 141, 148,
 151, 156, 157, 159–61, 168,
 171–95, 195n2, 200, 201, 204,
 205, 207

Universal Declaration of Human
 Rights, 1

University Grants Committee, 114,
 115, 125, 135

W

Williams, Raymond, vi, 12, 24, 25, 54,
 55, 58, 78, 106, 116, 117, 126,
 126n3, 208

Winston-Salem, North Carolina, vii,
 7, 173i

women in arts advocacy, 7, 11