The Arts as a Weapon of War: Britain and the Shaping of National Morale in the Second World War

JÖRN WEINGÄRTNER

I. B. Tauris

The Arts as a Weapon of War

The Arts as a Weapon of War

Britain and the Shaping of National Morale in the Second World War

JÖRN WEINGÄRTNER

Tauris Academic Studies
LONDON • NEW YORK

Published by Tauris Academic Studies, an imprint of I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd.
6 Salem Road, London W2 4BU
175 Fifth Avenue, New York NY 10010
www.ibtauris.com

In the United States of America and in Canada distributed by
St. Martin's Press, 175 Fifth Avenue, New York 10010

International Library of War Studies 5

ISBN 1 84511 036 6
EAN 978 1 84511 036 9

A full CIP record for this book is available from the British Library
A full CIP record for this book is available from the Library of Congress

Library of Congress catalogue card: available

Printed and bound in Great Britain by TJ International Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall
from camera-ready copy edited and supplied by the author.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The thesis on which this book is based was accepted as *Inaugural-Dissertation* under the title "The State and the Arts in Wartime Britain – CEMA and the Discovery of Cultural Policy During the Second World War" by the Fachbereich Philosophie und Geschichte of the University of Hamburg, Germany in autumn 2002.

It is a common place that success has many mothers and fathers, and this book does not prove an exception to the rule. Although, of course, it is entirely left to the discretion of the inclined reader to decide whether this book actually qualifies as a success, I would like to acknowledge the debts incurred in the course of the years this book took to materialise.

First of all, I would like to thank Dr. Jeremy Crang who rendered a helping hand in many ways. Although our original plan for a PhD project based at Edinburgh University underwent changes in many respects, he paved the way for this book by advising on literature and experts to contact. I very warmly thank Prof. Dr. Gabriele Clemens for the excellent supervision of the thesis on which this book is based. Furthermore, the *Kolloquium* of her PhD students was an excellent forum for fruitful discussion and the testing of ideas. The greatest debt, however, is owed to Prof. Jeffrey Richards, who in a case without precedent agreed to serve as a co-supervisor of my thesis thus making it a truly Anglo-German project. His comments, advice and support have been invaluable to the materialisation and eventual publication of the book.

On the British side, my warmest thanks go to Dr. Andrew Monaghan and Richard Allen who always offered help, a roof over my head during my numerous stays in London, linguistic inspiration, and a glass of red wine when necessary. On the German side, my very special thanks go to Gerhard Wille for innumerable discussions, thesis-related and less so, shrewd comments and awkward questions, in short: for being there when needed. For reading parts of an early draft and helpful comments thereupon, I am indebted to Martin Krispin and Alexander Reinfeldt. Finally, I would like to thank Inês Brandao for her help in procuring articles which were difficult to get hold of in Germany.

Without the generous aid of the Landesgraduiertenförderung Hamburg, the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst, most of all though of the Studienstiftung des deutschen Volkes, this project would not have come to fruition. The same applies to the Arts Council of England who granted their kind permission to consult the files of the

Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts and reproduce archive material hitherto unpublished; to the Public Record Office, Kew, and the Archive for Arts and Design at the Victoria and Albert Museum, London; to the Provost and the Scholars of King's College and King's College Library Archive, Cambridge, in particular Dr Rosalind Moad, for kind permission consult and to reproduce extracts from the John Maynard Keynes Papers; to Adrian Glew of the Tate Gallery Archive, London; to the staff, in particular Julie Snelling, of the BBC Written Archive Centre, Reading; furthermore the staff of the Archive of the National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth; of the Archive of Birmingham University, in particular Martin Killeen; of the Labour History and Study Centre, Manchester; and, of course, of the British Library, London.

What, are they children? Who maintains 'em? How are they escotted?[1]

It will be seen that the Theatre we propose would be a National Theatre in this sense, that it would be from the first conditionally – and, in the event of success, would become absolutely – the property of the nation. It may be asked why, in that case, we do not suggest going direct to the Government (which would, of course, mean Parliament) for the money required. The reason is simply that we believe it would be waste of time.[2]

It would be a poor thing if, in the process of resisting barbarism, we lost our own civility. (...) 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.[3]

I. INTRODUCTION

At the time when Shakespeare put the above lines concerning the wandering theatre in the mouth of Hamlet, the theatre throughout Europe was solely dependent on private patronage and the receipts of engagements. In the course of the seventeenth century, in many continental European countries, especially France, the German states, and Austria, state funding of the arts, visual and performing, emerged culminating in the foundation of state funded cultural institutions like the *Comédie Française* which was established in 1680. This kind of state patronage developed out of the practice of court patronage, which in absolutist countries – if we think of the famous dictum 'l'état, c'est moi' ascribed to Louis XIV – was identical with public patronage. Britain, by contrast, with its clear division between the monarch as private person and the monarch as head of the state, followed a *Sonderweg* in terms of cultural policy,[4] marked by a far-reaching and widely accepted neutrality.

Only in the second half of 1939, two articles in *The New Statesman and Nation* indicated that the principle of state neutrality was facing a serious challenge in Great Britain. In the edition of 29 July 1939, the art editor Raymond Mortimer stated that British painters, hitherto entirely dependent on their income from sales on the private market, needed public encouragement, since 'at the moment there is an emergency due to a violent diminution in the demand for works of art. The cultivated patron who liked to spend anything between £20 and £500 per annum on pictures has been obliged to reduce or cancel this expenditure.'[5] In order

to remedy the situation for the artists, Mortimer developed the following plan:

> 'I suggest that not all painters should be State-supported, but only that the State (...) should afford them some recognition and encouragement. The best way of doing this, I suggest, is to stimulate the demand for their work. At present pictures by living British artists are seen rarely outside London. I should like to see an exhibition of contemporary work in every provincial museum – the pictures to be purchased by the State, to be lent in turn to the various cities, and to be on sale to any purchasers. The chief purpose of such a scheme would be to create a whole new public for pictures.'[6]

Some weeks later, the art critic and member of the Bloomsbury group of artists, Clive Bell, moved a bit further along the lines of state intervention:

> 'The first and most pressing need is to save the artists; the second, not to discourage those who are able, even in present conditions, to enjoy art; the third, to see to it, that in the vast undertakings of construction and reconstruction which are inevitable, people with some sense of beauty and public decency shall have a say. To achieve these ends, the creation of some public authority – not necessarily a ministry – is essential. It must be armed with great powers, and, if not a ministry, must at any rate be in close contact with the Government. Clearly, a ministry would be best. (...)'[7]

Even before these two authors spoke on behalf of the arts and the artists in Britain, John Maynard Keynes, one of the leading minds behind the beginning of state sponsorship in Britain, had written for the BBC's print magazine *The Listener* in 1936 that

> '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 worser [sic] crimes of present-day capitalism. How the State could best play its proper part in it 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.'[8]

On the background of strict neutrality by the state in the field of the arts, it was not to be expected that these suggestions could be seen as a

blueprint for a political experiment in Britain starting only a few months after the appearance of the articles by Bell and Mortimer, not even by the authors themselves. A long tradition of mistrust against state intervention into the realm of arts had to be overcome, especially facing the far-reaching intrusions of totalitarian states in their arts scenes. Bell himself was a recent convert to the cause. Indeed, only three years before, in an article for *The Listener*, Bell had condemned every influence of the state on all matters artistic. 'Compromise art,' he wrote, 'the work of mediocrity, is the best we can expect from even an enlightened Government. For State art is committee art.'[9]

Even until today, the term 'cultural policy' is somewhat foreign to the English language. Whereas *Kulturpolitik* found its way as a technical term into the dictionaries of the German language,[10] the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* still denies *cultural policy* an entry.[11] Tellingly, even 'culture' was not a part of this prestigious compilation of knowledge until very recently. In its fourteenth edition of 1969, 'Culverwell, Nathanael' followed 'cultivation' without any reference to 'culture' in its various meanings. By contrast, 'cricket' was dedicated twelve pages.[12] In his book *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, Raymond Williams diagnosed a general hostility in Britain towards the terms 'culture', 'cultural', 'aesthete' and 'aesthetic', which gathered force in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.[13] This statement can be illustrated with a contemporary example of the British aversion towards the term 'culture'. In 1934, the *Times* congratulated the newly founded British Council for avoiding the word 'culture' in its title, a word that was supposed to come 'clumsily and shyly off the Englishman's tongue'.[14] Even the chairman of the Arts Council of Great Britain from 1965 to 1972, Lord Goodman, claimed for his fellow countrymen and women that 'People have a right not to be cultured (...) Perhaps the last freedom left is the freedom from culture.'[15]

Culture itself is a most elusive concept and notoriously difficult to define. In their work *Culture: a critical review of concepts and definitions*,[16] Clyde Kluckhohn and A.L. Kroeber presented no fewer than 164 different concepts. Generally, concepts of culture can be divided into two categories, anthropological concepts concentrating on a whole way of life of a social group, and narrower humanist concepts which usually embrace theatre, music, painting, literature and film.[17] Leslie A. White made a helpful point by suggesting that 'Culture is not basically anything. Culture is a word-concept. It is made and may be used arbitrarily to designate anything; we may define the concept as we please.'[18] In this study, 'culture' is defined by the concept of the British intellectual élite represented by Matthew Arnold, George Orwell, E.M. Forster and T.S. Eliot, which will be analysed in the third chapter, and the political élite, which will emerge in chapters five and six. These concepts comprise what

can be termed highbrow culture, i.e. classical music, straight drama, opera, ballet, painting and sculpture.[19]

Despite the aversion towards anything which could be termed 'cultural', in 1939 the British government decided to take part in a privately instigated initiative to fund the arts, originally classical music, theatre and visual arts. The body through which the public money was dispensed was originally the Committee, later Council, for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts (CEMA). This institution, which remained administratively independent of the government, though it was sponsored by the Treasury through the channels of the Board of Education, was transformed into the better known Arts Council of Great Britain by Royal Charter in 1946. Whilst the Arts Council's history has been the subject of a number of larger works,[20] CEMA has only been treated briefly as an introductory episode in these histories of the Arts Council and in two articles by F.M. Leventhal[21] and Janie Mortier[22]. Apart from these studies, CEMA is mentioned in various social and political histories of wartime Britain, which often prove ill informed,[23] starting by a wrong deciphering of the acronym.[24] Both mentioned articles cover a variety of aspects, though fall short of a comprehensive presentation of this remarkable body and the political developments that led to its setting up. Hence, this study does not necessarily reject the interpretations by Mortier and Leventhal, but takes them as a starting point for deeper analysis. The most recent publication on CEMA, Richard Witts's *Artist unknown: An Alternative History of the Arts Council,*[25] is an enjoyable read. But despite extensive research within the Council's archives it is laden with factual mistakes and marked by the antipathy of the author – a former member of Arts Council committees and panels – towards the institution and its policy, which undermines his forceful arguments to a considerable degree. To show in greater detail the political aims of cultural policy in wartime Britain, the shifts and developments of policy, within CEMA and the government, and the complex discussion about the perpetuation of CEMA after the end of the war will be the aim of this study.

In the introductory paragraphs of this chapter the terms 'cultural policy' and 'state sponsorship' of the arts have been used almost synonymously in order to describe state action on behalf of the arts. In general, a differentiation between both terms is rather important. Cultural policy is the wider concept and includes both 'positive' and 'negative' interventions by the state into the field of culture. The most common and important negative interventions are censorship and political control of the arts.[26] 'Positive' cultural policy, on the other hand, consists of encouragement and assistance to the arts, most often in the form of grants or tax exemption. As a rule, this study will focus on positive

cultural policy. Hence, when the term 'cultural policy' is used in this study, it is to be understood as the narrower concept of encouragement and fostering of the arts. Arts sponsorship and cultural policy will be used interchangeably henceforth.

Generally speaking, cultural policy can pursue a wide range of different purposes and aims. In his study *Freedom and Culture in Western Societies*, Hans Blokland defines seven motives for dissemination of culture: the intellectual improvement of the citizens, social integration, social justice, the political advantage of societally shared knowledge, the appeasement of revolutionary forces within society, the (pecuniary) self-interest of the producers and finally equal opportunities in participation of cultural activities.[27] This list shows that cultural policy usually is not confined to the preservation of national cultural heritage and encouragement of the arts as an intrinsic end. Rather, as Gabriele Clemens points out, it is a 'complex construct which can be used as a tool of political, economic and social interests'.[28] Of course, it is not necessary that all these motivations or aims coincide; nor is Blokland's list – although covering the most typical purposes of cultural policy – conclusive.[29]

Four hypotheses form the analytical frame of this study:

1. Active, programmatic and institutionalised arts sponsorship through the state in Britain began only in winter 1939/40 with the setting up of the Committee/Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts, during the 'Bore War'.

Although some examples of state sponsorship can be found before 1940[30] – most notably the grants made to the Victoria and Albert Museum – there was no guided government policy behind these financial contributions, no political programme and no regular budget. This hypothesis has to be qualified in one respect. Nicholas Pearson shows in great detail that patronage of the *visual* as opposed to the performing arts has had a much longer history and tradition.[31] Indeed, as the following chapters of this book will show, there has been public patronage of several facets of culture and arts in Britain before 1940. However, one might argue whether – as Pearson suggests – the use of architecture by the kings as heads of the state 'to promote their authority and power has a long history, as long as the history of governments and States'[32] can indeed be seen as state sponsorship. In the English case with its parliamentary monarchy, one has to differentiate between the king as head of state spending *public* money sanctioned by consent of the parliament and the king as a 'private person' spending money from his own coffers.[33] With his highly elaborate concept of state,[34] Pearson can subsume even the latter case under the concept of state patronage. In the

more modest concept of the state of this study – confining itself to the aggregate of Parliament, Civil Service and most of all the Government – state patronage necessitates not only the spending of money of parts or institutions of the state irrespective of their actual function, but the spending of public money raised by taxes and rates and being dispensed through the channels of the Treasury.

2. The beginning of cultural policy was a direct result of the repercussions of the Second World War.

According to Robert Hewison, it is not accidental that public funding of the arts began at this 'pivotal moment in British history'.[35] Unfortunately, he does not elaborate this thought, which certainly is worth deeper analysis. Hewison calls the establishment of CEMA the turning point of cultural policy in Britain.[36] Still, only few historical events take place without prior 'warning' and a shorter or longer prehistory. This certainly also applies to the beginning of cultural policy in Britain. Still, in many cases, a catalyst is needed for the eventual occurrence, and in this particular case, the beginning of cultural policy can hardly be analysed without the direct context of the Second World War. The setting up of CEMA as a state sponsored body in 1940 was strongly influenced by the Second World War and its repercussions on British politics and society.

Although the destructive force of war and the creative forces of art seem to be irreconcilable at first sight[37] and although it seems to be 'an astonishing time for Britain to begin wholesale financial support for the Arts'[38], arguments for the connection between the two aspects of human life can easily be found. The most obvious and hence the most often quoted original reason for the setting up of CEMA was the apprehension on the part of the Government that public morale was likely to falter during the strains of the war and that entertainment of various kinds including classical music and even opera was apt to sustain it.[39]

The question over the extent the war indeed influenced social development and left a mark on society has been controversially discussed in historical science for more than thirty years now, dividing social historians into two camps. The first, with Arthur Marwick as the main proponent of this strand of thinking, contends that the World Wars had a lasting impact on society, social behaviour and organisation.[40] According to Marwick,

> 'War, the most destructive of all human activities, does not create anything new. It does, however, provide a tremendous incentive to exploit and develop existing knowledge. It tends to give wider currency to ideas previously held only by a tiny minority.'[41]

On the other side, a group of historians, most notably Angus Calder, José Harris, Kevin Jefferys, Henry Pelling and Penny Summerfield, argue that the war merely brought about changes which would have occurred without the exceptional situation of the war as well.[42] Alternatively, if they accept the fact that changes occurred, they argue that the changes did not last and were reversed in the direct aftermath of the war.[43] The main arguments are that there had been gradual change already before the war,[44] so that, as Angus Calder put it, 'the effect of the war was not to sweep society on to a new course, but to hasten its progress along the old grooves.'[45] José Harris especially doubts that attitudes changed during the war or, if they did, that they changed in direction of more state intervention.[46] Still, she admits that it was the war that offered a 'golden opportunity' to think about and probably test new instruments of the state in terms of social policy,[47] which eventually were apt to change the outlook of the state in Britain. Henry Pelling stated in his book *Britain and the Second World War* in best Humean sceptical tradition, that

> 'Too frequently it was assumed, at the end of the war or shortly afterwards, that changes which had occurred since 1939 were the direct outcome of the war. As time goes by, however, we are able to get a clearer picture of the long-term trends, and in many cases we then discover that what has more deep-seated causes. All too often the observer has failed to avoid the commonest of historical pitfalls, the fallacy of post hoc, ergo propter hoc.'[48]

In the same vein, Janet Minihan stated in her study *The Nationalization of Culture* that cultural policy had been on the political agenda long before the war, but that 'the economic catastrophe effectively destroyed all chances of significant support for the arts between the wars.'[49] However, only few indicators could be found for this hypothesis, and the government documents consulted reveal a marked disinclination towards arts sponsorship. If at all, grants were only grudgingly given during the war years and even at the end of the war, when arts sponsorship grew to be an established principle and acknowledged governmental responsibility.

In 1986, Anthony Aldgate and Jeffrey Richards described the debate still as 'fruitful',[50] whilst Andrew Thorpe saw it in 1992 as a 'stale and self-serving' affair, which deserved and needed a fresh new approach focusing on the civilian in war rather than on society as a whole.[51] Whether or not the debate and its participants deserve this critique, to narrow the focus on special aspects of the impact of war appears helpful to a better understanding of the actual role of the war and to differentiate between fields of policy and the degree of impact the war might or might not have

had on them. Thus, this study will confine itself to analysing the changes of official attitudes regarding state funding of the arts that became clearly visible in 1940 and the outcome of the change, i.e. the executed arts patronage. With this limited range it is possible to evaluate and to pin down more easily the impact of the War in this particular field.

Although a full-scale argument for the general relationship between war and social change is not aimed at, the method and approach employed hitherto to this question will be used to sustain the arguments or to put them to a test. The most elaborate arsenal of instruments has been developed by Arthur Marwick in his so-called 'four-tier model' building on Arnold Toynbee's model of challenge and response.[52] For Marwick, there are four dimensions or aspects which show the direct and indirect impact a modern mass war has on society:

> '*destruction/disruption*, including direct damage, dislocation and disruption of peace-time patterns of behaviour, but also as some 'disaster' studies have suggested, involving a 'reconstructive' effect, a desire to rebuild better than before; the *test* dimension, which arises from the challenge war presents to society, imposing new stresses upon it, and inducing the collapse of some institutions and the transformation of others; *participation* in the national cause by hitherto underprivileged groups who thereby make social gains; and the *psychological* dimension – total war is a great emotional experience and tends to reinforce 'in-group' feelings and, in general, to render change acceptable.'[53]

All four of Marwick's dimensions appear to be applicable to and helpful for the understanding of the special case of the arts. The disruption of civilian life in Britain even before the 'Blitz' caused the government to rethink old positions and to find instruments to fight expected and apprehended wartime phenomena like boredom during the black-out, faltering morale and a complete breakdown of the entertainment business. Hence, the disruption gave inspiration to the setting up of CEMA as an *ad hoc* organisation to do emergency work in a double way: to keep up public morale and to give employment to artists who had lost their work during the first weeks of war. The dimension of participation and social inclusion was one motive for the original work of CEMA to spread sweetness and light and to offer 'the best for the most', as CEMA's own ambition and programme was summed up.[54] Two of the three art forms which CEMA propagated, straight drama and classical music including opera, were forms of entertainment of the higher strata of society, from which the working and lower middle classes were excluded.

The test dimension is probably the most important for the question of war impact. Of course, to what extent social and political structures were put to a test is best seen in countries like Germany and Russia after the First World War – in the case of Germany as well after the Second World War – where radical constitutional changes took place. However, also in Britain certain changes are visible and it is rather unlikely that developments, which radically changed their pace in 1940 after floundering for decades, were not influenced by the war. Accordingly, it is necessary for this approach to develop a clear picture of 'before' and 'after' the war. Secondly, it will be indispensable to identify the other social forces independent of the developments brought about and conditioned by the war, if the role of the war is to be closely defined.[55] For the picture 'before the war', the two following chapters will concentrate on the attitudes held in political and artistic quarters in a chronological view from the first half of the nineteenth century until the 1940s. The fourth chapter, then, deals with political and social processes in which the idea of state sponsorship of the arts has to be embedded.

3. Originally, the Government and CEMA linked different and occasionally conflicting sets of aims with CEMA's work.

Whereas the most obvious motive for the beginning of state sponsorship on the part of the government was the steadying of morale on the home front, a second general aim of CEMA's work was the democratisation of highbrow culture. The idea of public education in the arts has had a longer tradition than the setting up of CEMA in 1940 would suggest. Earlier tender attempts to spread culture had already aimed at a democratisation of knowledge and understanding of cultural heritage. Also the BBC with its original programmatic agenda of broadcasting is part of this tradition.[56] As will be shown in greater detail in Chapter 2, even the reforming impetus of the mid-nineteenth century proponents of cultural dissemination was not free from second thoughts. In most cases it included a strong idea of social control and the idea of arts patronage was paired with the idea of patronisation of the lower classes.[57] Thus, it is not surprising that similar aims were also part of the cultural policy during the Second World War. Still, although a democratisation of what was hitherto seen as highbrow culture might at first sight have been apt to lead to a social inclusion and to tear down class barriers which manifested themselves in differing tastes of leisure pursuits, at second sight, it reaffirmed the differences between highbrow and lowbrow and discriminated against those with allegedly lowbrow tastes thus counteracting a desire to create a socially and culturally united populace. Whilst CEMA itself originally focused on the educational and social aspect of its work, the government pursued different – and

occasionally conflicting – political aims and utilised arts sponsorship to attain them.

The list of general aims of cultural policy given above must therefore be supplemented. Not only on the background of the instrumentalisation of culture in Nazi Germany, it is obvious that cultural policy can easily be utilised for propaganda. As Gabriele Clemens pointed out, the setting up of the British Council in 1934 as well as the utilisation of cultural policy as a measure of re-education in post-World War Germany was strongly influenced by the British self-perception as a great power in decline.[58] The same rationale applies to arts sponsorship. Jim McGuigan contends that 'at some subterranean level, this [i.e. arts sponsorship, JW] was a compensation for Britain's declining economic and political power in the world'.[59] But also on the domestic side, cultural policy can serve propaganda purposes.

Varying from the different government departments involved, cultural policy was employed as a means to reach certain aims of war policy. The Board of Education hoped to improve public morale in wartime, especially during the black-out in the first winter and to show the population that there were cultural values worth fighting for.[60] The main incentive for the Ministry of Labour and National Service was the expectation to increase industrial output by offering a variety of recreational facilities during lunch breaks in munitions and other factories important for the war effort. What is important here, though, is the fact that neither the government departments involved nor CEMA tried to propagate an intrinsically British culture. Quite on the contrary, the works of Beethoven and even Wagner, a composer favoured by the Nazi Government in Germany, formed a core component of the musical programmes of CEMA. The emanations of Western culture, in a definition to be explored in chapter 3 of this study, were the object of CEMA's policy whilst the Government styled itself as defender of the Western civilisation in a crusade against Nazi barbarism. Therefore, the criticism by Richard Weight and Nick Hayes that CEMA was an insufficient diffuser of national culture seems ill-constructed since no responsible body involved in the endeavour aimed at the diffusion or even creation of a national culture.[61]

Although the greater conflict of aims occurred between CEMA and the government departments involved, CEMA's own aims, generally summed up as the spreading of culture and the raising of standards, were also self-contradictory to a certain extent. During the first two years, CEMA mainly concentrated on the amateur side of the arts such as amateur drama groups and amateur musicians as well as on war emergency and salvage work. From January 1942 on, CEMA changed its policy and shifted the emphasis on standard and artistic performance.

This also implied a change in the perspective of democratisation. Whereas CEMA had originally aimed at gaining new audiences by making music and drama more accessible to people of all strata, this kind of 'vertical democratisation' finally ceded a 'horizontal democratisation': Highbrow arts and entertainment were geographically spread rather than made accessible to wider audiences including the lower strata. Usually, it is the figure of John Maynard Keynes, chairman of CEMA from 1942 to 1946, who is identified with the change.[62] Against this interpretation, it can be shown that Keynes was merely a partner in framing this policy. He executed and developed in particular what R.A. Butler as President of the Board of Education and his senior officials and others within CEMA had perceived and conceived in general. This change of policy also entailed changes in government policy connected with CEMA. In the course of the war, CEMA emancipated itself more and more from governmental policy and political strictures and established itself as the quasi-autonomous non-governmental organisation (quango) as which it has been known since its incorporation by Royal Charter in 1946.

4. From a more sociological point of view, the way in which cultural policy was executed in Britain allows for some conclusions on the political culture in Britain.[63]

In the path-breaking study of political culture by Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba, political culture was defined as 'the particular distribution of patterns of orientation toward political objects among the members of the nation.'[64] In this theoretical pattern, orientation refers

> 'to the internalized aspects of objects and relationships. It includes (1) 'cognitive orientation', that is knowledge and belief about the political system, its roles, its inputs, and its outputs; (2) 'affective orientation', or feelings about the political system, its roles, personnel, and performance, and (3) 'evaluational orientation', the judgments and opinions about political objects that typically involve the combination of value standards and criteria of information and feelings.'[65]

Almond and Verba distinguish between three objects of orientation, notably 'specific roles or structures, such as legislative bodies, executives, or bureaucracies; incumbents of roles, such as particular monarchs, legislators, and administrators; and particular public policies, decisions, or enforcement of decisions.'[66] Methodically, this would necessitate the development and evaluation of polls and ballots, in order to come to exact statements on the political culture of a country. Unfortunately, statistical material of this kind is not available to form the basis for

scholarly statements satisfying the requirements of social science. The nearest approach to the political culture of the Britain of the time seems to lie in the scrutiny of political writings and statements by politicians on the one hand and by persons of public life on the other. This, of course, has the limitation of representing only opinions of political and social élites, which runs counter to the original programme as set out by Verba and Almond. However, social scientists assume that societies are stratified and that every society is governed by élites. Hence, it is an important part of studies of political culture to examine the orientations and beliefs of the political and social élites.[67] The second step, which would be the comparison of the political culture of the élites – however identified – with the political culture of the masses, is missing in this study for the given reasons. The only correcting factor for this necessarily blurred picture is the press, which will be dealt with more extensively in the chapter on the second phase of CEMA's existence from 1942 to the end of the Second World War.

Two main aspects of political culture will be viewed with emphasised interest, one a more strategic, the other a more operational pattern of the execution of cultural policy in Britain. In almost all studies on political culture in Britain, two features are stressed as characteristically British, notably a distaste for abstract concepts and over-organisation. It is the method of 'muddling through' that often proves to be the approach of choice.[68] This operational code is met on the higher level of political beliefs by a general mistrust in the state and the reliance on individual enterprise. In his book on British society in the twentieth century, A.H. Halsey summed the position up by stating that

> '(...) most fundamentally, British culture is deeply individualistic. It is no accident that Hume and Locke are its philosophers rather than Hegel or Marx. The deeply embedded cultural assumption is that ultimate values are individual, that society is in no sense superior to the sum of the people who make it up; that collectivism can only be instrumental and that the state is best when minimal.'[69]

Hence, the second aspect of political culture under scrutiny is the British concept of the role of the state and its changes in relation to the arts. Although the state assumed a financial responsibility for the arts, no generic Ministry of Culture was established. In fact, a largely autonomous body whose ranks were filled with amateurs was set up to dispense the money allocated by the Treasury. A third specificity of British political culture which links both other aspects is the adaptability of the British constitution, the ability to put old wine into new bottles and thus to

combine the modern with the traditional or, in the words of the Walter Rosenbaum:

> 'The British have developed a talent for absorbing needed social innovation, often with profound consequences, into the fabric of their traditional political and social orders. In this way problems of continuity and change, so often confounding to other national regimes, have been largely managed; in English terms, it is the business of 'muddling through'. Consequently, British political life and culture, like other facets of the English nation, are a blend of modernity and tradition evolving within a national setting where a strong sense of community and civic consensus prevail.'[70]

The first step for the analysis of British political culture in relation to cultural policy is an analysis of political attitudes concerning the arts and the founding of the arts. This will be the task of the following chapter.

> *The preceding are the principal reasons, of a general character, in favour of restricting to the narrowest compass the intervention of a public authority in the business of the community: and few will dispute the more than sufficiency of these reasons, to throw, in every instance, the burthen of making out a strong case, not on those who resist, but on those who recommend, government interference. Laisser-faire, in short, should be the general practice: every departure from it, unless required by some great good, is a certain evil.*[71]

II. THE POLITICAL REASONS FOR STATE NEUTRALITY IN THE SPHERE OF ARTS IN GREAT BRITAIN

In a conversation with the artist Benjamin Robert Haydon in 1834, Lord Melbourne in his capacity as Prime Minister of the day neatly summarised the political attitude concerning state promotion or financial encouragement of the arts in Great Britain:

> 'I said for twenty-four years I have been at all the Lords of the Treasury without effect. The First Lord who has the courage to establish a system for the public encouragement of High Art will be remembered with gratitude by the English people. He said, 'What d'ye want?' '£ 2000 a year.' 'Ah,' said Lord Melbourne, shaking his head and looking with his arch eyes, '*God help the Minister that meddles with Art.*'[72]'

Even though the last words of this quotation mainly refer to expected opposition from members of the Royal Academy who would not admit any kind of financial aid to artists other than themselves,[73] they clearly illustrate the official attitude of the time towards state aid to the arts, which was to last for almost another century and, in some cases, even until today.[74]

In many central-European countries, especially in France, Austria and most German principalities, absolutism had introduced a system of far-reaching interventionism including state patronage of the arts as a measure to glorify the reigns and the rulers.[75] In England, later in Great Britain, the monarch, depending on the consent of the Parliament to use public money, was more limited in his range of action and spending. Hence, a different tradition of arts sponsorship was founded on the

British Isles, which remained as powerful as the state interventionist tradition in France, Austria and Germany, until the Second World War.[76]

Even if the foundations of this tradition were laid in the late 17th century, it is not necessary to go back quite as far in history to explain the reluctance of British politicians and governments to fund the arts. In his book *Culture and Society: Coleridge to Orwell*, Raymond Williams sets the beginning of his analysis at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth century, which brings us back to Lord Melbourne and Benjamin Robert Haydon.[77] According to A.V. Dicey, Lord Melbourne's favourite expression was 'Why can't you let it alone?'.[78] This certainly referred to politics in general, but it can be shown with the help of Haydon's diaries that it applied to interventions of the state in cultural matters as well. Lord Melbourne is reported to reply to Haydon's question whether the Prime Minister would admit the necessity of state support for the arts with a blunt: 'I do not, (...), there is enough private patronage to do all that is requisite.'[79]

Consequently, the arts were treated in the same way as all other aspects of social life, there was no special treatment of the production of beauty as opposed to the production of cotton and steel.[80] With laissez-faire as the guiding principle of British politics, the arts had to take care of themselves and were regarded as a branch of the national economy, which had to work on a commercial basis as all other branches.[81] With this in mind it seems worthwhile to have a closer look at the implications of the laissez-faire principle and its modification in the course of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century. This will also allow for some conclusions about the political culture in Britain, the understanding of which is indispensable for the explanation of the forms state patronage of the arts have taken.[82] Furthermore, changes in the cultural policy of a country can be explained and set in relation with changes of the political culture – within the limited concept of political culture as set out in the introduction, i.e. in the concept of the state and its role and task.

One of the most influential proponents of Liberalism in the nineteenth century was John Stuart Mill. In all his major works, Mill sought to justify the utmost individual freedom which he saw based in the limitation of the power of the state.[83] In the Lockean tradition, the main functions of the state were the protection of life, liberty and estate.[84] Hence, in Mill's theory the role of the state was mainly defensive. In all areas of social life, especially in affairs of commerce, the state was supposed to merely 'maintain a vigilant control.'[85] Since art and the production of art traditionally belonged to the private and also commercial sector in Britain,[86] this law of non-interference also applied to matters artistic. The reason for this laissez-faire attitude in terms of commerce was for Mill

that 'it is now recognised, though not till after a long struggle, that both the cheapness and the good quality of commodities are most effectually provided for by leaving the producers and sellers perfectly free (...)'.[87] Even if it is difficult for the connoisseur to regard art merely as a profane commodity, it is important to keep this wide-spread British view of the arts in mind, as it will return again as an argument against the setting up of CEMA in the 1940s. Thus, simply the fact that the production of arts was a niche branch of the national economy would have been a sufficient reason for the predominant strand of political thought to dismiss state intervention in the arts sector. However, Mill reinforced his case for state neutrality with further arguments. The argument set out so far focused directly on individual liberty and Mill's general ideas about the role of the state. A second, and in the case of the arts even more important aspect, is Mill's theorem that

> 'every increase of the functions devolving on the government is an increase of its power, both in the form of authority, and still more, in the indirect form of influence. The importance of this consideration, in respect to political freedom, has in general been quite sufficiently recognised, at least in England'.[88]

Mill generally feared state interventions as intrusive and limiting, but there is another less direct aspect of intervention, notably control and censorship. According to the proverb 'He who pays the piper calls the tune', influence of the patron on form and content of the respective piece of art is seen as the reverse of the medal of financial aid.[89] This kind of influence, however, is incompatible with Mill's deeply inbred individualism. He claims that

> 'there is, or ought to be, some space in human existence thus entrenched around, and sacred from authoritative intrusion, no one who professes the smallest regard to human freedom or dignity will call in question: (...) I apprehend that it ought to include all that part which concerns only the life, whether inward or outward, of the individual, and does not affect the interests of others, or affects them only through the moral influence of example.'[90]

Even if Mill is not particularly clear in his statement as to where to draw the line, it seems obvious that the enjoyment of art as well as the artistic freedom belong to the individual sphere, where no government intrusion is justifiable. This suspicion against state influence are by no means restricted to the mid-nineteenth century. According to Dick

Netzer in 1978, only a minority of people connected with the arts in the Anglo-American sphere have ever seen public subsidies as an 'unmixed blessing'.[91] Public spending on the arts evoked apprehensions of 'philistine legislators and elected officials (...) who would seek to censor avant-garde program choices, witch-hunt for obscenity and subversion, and generally favor the bland and mediocre over the exciting and distinguished.'[92] It is difficult to see how an active government policy on behalf of the arts could be matched with such a concept of the state and its functions.

The situation slightly changed in the last decades of the nineteenth century. By the turn of the century, the 'heyday of laissez-faire economic and social theories had unmistakably passed'.[93] Already in the 1880s, a change within British Liberalism and liberal thought had taken place from the Millian individualism to the new idea of collectivism,[94] which shifted the focus away from the individual as a self-contained entity to the individual as part and member of a society which came to be seen more and more as the central regulating agent.

Generally speaking, the very restrictive concept of the state as a night watchman was modified, more and more functions were added to the government's range of activities. Stuart Hall and Bill Schwarz saw the boundaries between the state and the society markedly redefined in the last two decades of the nineteenth century, visible in the 'sharply increased tempo' of state intervention.[95] Most emerging political groups sought for an increased range of action of the state and its executive bodies.[96] Although the main sphere of intervention was social policy, there was no notable 'spill-over' effect which would lead to interventionism on behalf of the arts.[97] Moreover, even if collectivism became the fashionable political creed at the end of the nineteenth century and replaced a pure laissez-faire thinking as the most influential strand of political thought this did not imply that the state became overnight responsible for vast areas of social life. A 'capacious Liberalism'[98] held its position as the factor of influence determining the role of the state. Collectivism was merely a modification of the old liberal laissez-faire creed. The New Liberals retained many beliefs of the Millian school and remained mainly concerned with the individual. Accordingly, Leonard Trelawney Hobhouse was justified in noting that the rather restrictive 'conception of the relations of the State and the individual long outlived the theory on which it rested.'[99] Thus, even if collectivism replaced laissez-faire as a label, many facets of Old Liberalism were saved, including a noble reticence on the part of the state to fund the arts.

That the arts still formed a realm outside the benefits of state funding after the turn of the century, reveals the debate about a British National Theatre.[100] In 1913, the matter was brought to the House of Commons.

A group of Members of the House submitted the motion: 'That, in the opinion of this House, there should be established in London a National Theatre, to be vested in trustees and assisted by the State, for the performance of the plays of Shakespeare and other drama of recognised merit'.[101] The background of the motion was the imminent tercentenary of Shakespeare's death in 1916, which the Members thought sufficient reason for the building of a National Theatre in honour of the poet and playwright. A private initiative had been started, but facing financial stringencies, this initiative had applied to the London City Council and to the Treasury for pecuniary help. H.J. Mackinder, who submitted the motion, expressed his hope that a grant made by the Treasury would add to Britain's national prestige and would stimulate the theatre throughout the country, would cultivate the public and would raise the standard of acting.[102] The direct reply from the Treasury benches by the Under-Secretary of State for Home Affairs, Ellis Griffith, however, made it clear that such a request would not pass without opposition:

> 'I think it necessary to state (...) that I am speaking for myself, because the Government, as such, have nothing to do with these theatrical enterprises. It is perfectly well known that the Members of this Government are not so well acquainted with theatrical affairs as to be able to speak on the subject raised in this Debate.'[103]

Furthermore, in Griffith's private opinion it did not belong to the role of the state to assist the setting up of such a venture, but rather to give it a gilded edge once it materialised:

> 'I am rather inclined to accept what was said by the Mover of the Motion, when he stated that the duty of the Government was not to initiate but to crown a project of this kind. The time for crowning has not yet come. The hon. Member admits that only £100,000 out of £500,000 has been subscribed voluntarily. I think the hon. Member, on consideration, would agree that until, at any rate, by far the greater part of the £500,000 has been subscribed voluntarily, the time for crowning has not arrived.'[104]

Apart from the flat rejection of the motion by the under-secretary, it is an interesting side notice that he was the only member of the government who attended the debate. Neither Lloyd George nor Winston Churchill as declared supporters of the National Theatre[105] credited the motion such an importance as to appear and take a stand on behalf of it.

Griffith was not the only one in the debate who spoke up against a grant on the arts. Sir Frederick George Banbury, representing the City of London, added further arguments, which were repeated and revived in the debate about the establishment of CEMA throughout the Second World War and on occasion of the question of its perpetuation after the war. At the end of the debate Banbury offered the following arguments against state grants:

> '(...) apparently the Debate this evening might result in a very considerable burden being put on the taxpayers of the country, unless the hon. Gentleman desires to put it solely on the payers of Super-tax, in which case I should not agree with him. (...) I am very fond of the theatre when the Government give me the opportunity to attend it, which is not often; but I think we shall reach the limit of extravagance and foolishness if, with an expenditure of £ 195,000,000 a year, instead of thinking how we can retrench, we spend more money in this direction.'[106]

His argument is a logical inference from the principle of individualism: He who wants theatre – or the arts in general – is free to enjoy it, if he is prepared to pay for it, art lovers could not expect that private enjoyment was to be financed by the taxpayer. Taking the reduction of state expenditure as an end in itself, he was more committed to cut spending rather than spending public money on a – in the eyes of the movers – worthy cause. As a conclusion of his argument, Banbury stated that after the country had existed for more than 2000 years without a National Theatre, it might be advisable to carry on as before.[107]

Ironically, the motion carried the day and the division was won by 92 Ayes as against 32 Noes. Still, it remained a token victory on the side of the movers, because the vote was of no avail: not enough Members were present as to make it a valid decision of the House. Although one might say this vote showed a change of attitude, the impression remains that the staunch supporters of the motion attended the session in full numbers and voted for it, whereas the majority of the House including most cabinet members was too indifferent to go into the lobby. The fact that Churchill and Lloyd George supported the initiative as private persons and theatre lovers, as it were, but denied the motion their support in the House, seems indication enough for the second interpretation.[108] Obviously, the time was not yet ripe for a direct grant of public money from the Treasury to the arts. No further representation in Parliament on behalf of the National Theatre was made before the Second World War and the Committee struggled on without any support from the Treasury for the time being.

Although the turn of the century had brought about a certain change or modification of the British perception and conception of the role of the state, the arts did not directly profit from it. They remained basically unaided and left to themselves, which not even the repercussions of the First World War – bringing about a marked increase in state activity in general – changed. Other aspects of social organisation and human life were placed higher on the agenda than the encouragement of artists and the spread of artistic knowledge.

Even left-wing proponents of the new brand of liberalism like the Fabianists Sidney and Beatrice Webb thought the arts a minor and subordinate problem compared with more pressing problems as the universal supply of gas, water and transport in Britain.[109] However, even though Ian Britain correctly holds that this prioritisation was not due to a political programme marked by cultural philistinism on the side of the Webbs, but was based on their priorisation of basic needs over niceties of life such as the arts, it can be shown that the Webbs did not qualify as ardent interventionists in artistic matters either. In her book *My Apprenticeship*, published in 1926, Beatrice Webb wrote:

> 'The collectively controlled enterprise may be, as experience has demonstrated, quick to adopt a new invention, enterprising in experiment, and courageously patient in trial until success is attained. But invention, like artistic production, must be the work of an individual mind; or, very occasionally, of the free interplay of the minds of two or three co-workers, untrammelled by any 'management', whether co-operative or governmental or capitalistic. How far and by what means social organisation can promote and increase either invention or artistic genius deserves further study. (...) Nor can we conclude that governments or co-operative societies are more successful patrons of inventive or artistic genius, especially, when it breaks out in new and unexpected lines, than profit-making capitalism.'[110]

Staying for a while in this political camp, the book *Socialism* by Ramsay MacDonald dating from 1924 is quite illuminating in terms of the cultural programme of the Labour Party in the nineteen-twenties and thirties. The keyword 'art' appears only twice in the index and refers more to the problem of arts and crafts under Socialism. In the concept of this book, art is almost equivalent with industrial design:

> 'A thousand firms working to supply the same market no doubt produce a variety of designs and models, and a thousand shops open for profit allure customers by exhibiting them. In passing I

> remark that the bulk of them are unnecessary for anything but whimsical use and are nearly all bad - bad art, bad workmanship. Still the substance of the objection must be met. If art is to be restored to life, it can only be under conditions of joy and freedom.'[111]

Apart from the Webbs' Fabian essays this passage is one of the few documents in which a prominent Labour politician expressed his opinion on the arts and their relationship to the state and vice versa. In the wider context of provision of worthwhile recreation and entertainment, MacDonald shows himself in favour of more home-made recreational 'activities (like games, singing and dancing) finding an outlet for artistic and social instincts'.[112] More interesting than what he suggested as a political programme, is what he did not suggest. With his focus on arts and crafts and rural culture, the former being competitive on the free market, the latter easily amenable without financial or allocational problems, the provision of theatre, music and visual arts other than design did not seem a problem to MacDonald, at least none worthwhile discussing in his book. If this lack of official interest in the arts can merely be guessed as the main attitude of Labour representatives, the leading figure of the Conservative Party in the 1920s and 1930s, Stanley Baldwin, developed a clearer vision of funding of the arts and its possible sources in a speech at a dinner of the Royal Society of British Sculptors in 1926:

> 'We are living, perhaps, in rather difficult times. We have long passed through the days of the noble patron, the days of the Medici. The days of the Medici are no more, and the new day has not yet been born, but it almost seems to me that the natural successors of the Medici are the great corporations and municipal authorities of this country.'[113]

Funding from the Treasury, hence, was not to be expected from a government that put more stress on a balanced budget than on flourishing of the arts and the higher education of its populace. On the other hand, a few sentences later in his speech Baldwin allowed for some doubts whether the government was indeed a proper judge, of which artistic causes were to be fostered: 'Your art is one of the most glorious that can be, because it is more directly creative than any other art. And it is eternal. There is no other art which it can be said that specimens of it may be forgotten and dug up two thousand or three thousand years after they have been lost, and reappear to the delight and edification of humanity.'[114] A politician who was unable to distinguish between the durability of the raw material of an artefact and its artistic durability

painfully betrayed the limits of his artistic expertise and justified doubts about the suitability of representatives of the state to interfere in matters artistic.

Six years after this Baldwin speech, a similar example of official philistinism was given by the House of Commons in the debate about the Import Duties Act. Whereas paintings were exempt from tax 'partly because they are media of culture, but also because we have a very valuable re-export trade in works of art',[115] sculpture was not granted the exemption 'because there has not been any possibility of defining where granite stops and art begins.'[116] As Janet Minihan correctly concluded, '[a] Government unable to distinguish art from granite, and preoccupied with its re-export value, was not likely to forward a constitutive policy.'[117]

The last two examples of official treatment of the arts show that there had not been any considerable progress in the time between the rejection of a public grant to the National Theatre – which was solidly based on liberal creeds dating from the mid-nineteenth century – until the 1930s. Although Stanley Baldwin admitted that the arts had a hard time after the First World War with its repercussions on private patronage, the political paradigm of state neutrality remained generally unchallenged by the political parties. Two developments – and their acknowledgement by the political class – were needed to change this deeply inbred attitude: a further increase of state responsibilities and the transition from the partially interventionist to the welfare state and the notion that reception and enjoyment of the arts was not confined to the 'intellectuals who can well afford to pay for their own theatre', as the honourable member Booth alleged, but wider masses. It took the Second World War to accelerate the first and bring to notice the second of these developments.

When a national culture becomes governmental, it is always falsified. For it never quite suits the official book.[118]

III. THE CULTURAL ÉLITES AND STATE INTERVENTION

The purpose of this chapter is twofold. On the one hand, it is intended to supplement the argument set out in the previous chapter by the view of art theorists and artists such as Matthew Arnold, E.M. Forster, T.S. Eliot, George Orwell and J.B. Priestley. On the other hand, this chapter will attempt to illuminate the concepts of culture held by the authors involved, which had an impact on the cultural policy of the British government and CEMA respectively. It is obvious that the group of people whose views are put under scrutiny here do not form a representative cross-section of the British society of the time. They belong to the educated, cultured and in some cases also monied élite of society. This, however, is not necessarily a limiting factor, for CEMA was founded by people coming from this social stratum and educational background. Moreover, their political allegiances range from the conservative T.S. Eliot to the socialist George Orwell, and thus form, if not a cross-section of the society, a representative cross-section of the existing political creeds held within that society. What can be shown is that the political principle of cultural laissez-faire, from the financial point of view by the Treasury, was complemented by a very similar line of thought by a large number of artists with only few exceptions – the most striking ones being Matthew Arnold and J.B. Priestley.

In some studies,[119] the political theorist Edmund Burke serves as a starting point for an analysis of the relationship between the arts and the state with his classical statement: 'It [the state, JW] is a partnership in all science; a partnership in all art; a partnership in every virtue, and in all perfection.'[120] However, a closer look at the text passage reveals that Burke does not express a vision of state patronage in Britain far ahead of his time, but rather uses the terms 'society' and 'state' synonymously as a social unit being based on a contract. That patronage was a social task was undisputed even in most rigid laissez-fairist circles. With such a statement, Burke saw eye to eye with Lord Melbourne's already quoted opinion that private patronage is sufficient to render public patronage unnecessary.

A more valuable source than Burke are the works of Matthew Arnold. According to Arnold's essay *Culture and Anarchy*,[121] culture is

> 'a pursuit of our total perfection by means of getting to know, on all the matters which most concern us, the best which has been thought and said in the world; and through this knowledge, turning a stream of fresh and free thought upon our stock notions and habits, which we now follow staunchly but mechanically'.[122]

Culture, thus, is a means to 'the study and pursuit of perfection; and (...) of perfection, as pursued by culture, beauty and intelligence, or, in other words, sweetness and light, are the main characters'.[123] This pursuit of perfection is not limited to a social group or certain aspects of human development, but 'leads us to conceive of true human perfection as a harmonious perfection, developing all sides of our humanity; and as a general perfection, developing all parts of our society.'[124] Hence, culture is an educational process pervading and including the entire society transgressing all social barriers and cleavages. However, Arnold did not stop on this rather theoretical level, but gave an expressed opinion on arts patronage, in this particular case of the theatre, in his essay *The French Play in London*.[125] In this essay he analyses a 'complete estrangement of the British middle class from the theatre.'[126] Arnold alleges that the deplorable situation of the theatre is partly due to deep-rooted moral creeds of the middle class, whose life, 'long petrified in a narrow Protestantism and in a perpetual reading of the Bible'[127] solely focuses on business life and the church.[128] This is, needless to say, the individual perception of a man with a political programme.[129] Later in his essay, Arnold pinpoints a second problem of the theatre, which correlates directly to the political beliefs set out in the previous chapter:

> 'So far as we have had a school of great actors, so far as our stage has had a tradition, effect, consistency, and a hold on public esteem, it had them under the system of the privileged theatres. The system had its faults, and was abandoned; but then, instead of devising a better plan of public organisation for the English theatre, we gladly took refuge in our favourite doctrines of the mischief of State interference, of the blessedness of leaving every man free to do as he likes, of the impertinence of presuming to check any man's natural taste for the bathos and pressing him to relish the sublime. We left the English theatre to take its chance. Its present impotence is the result.'[130]

As a remedy to this 'impotence of the theatre', Arnold suggests that on a social level that 'we have to unlearn, therefore, our long disregard of the theatre; we have to own that the theatre is irresistible.'[131] To increase the

irresistibility of the theatre, he makes a suggestion on the political level modelled on the French example of state funding of the arts:

> 'Form a company out of the materials ready to your hand in your many good actors or actors of promise. Give them a theatre at the West End. Let them have a grant from your Science and Art Department; let some intelligent and accomplished man (...) be joined to them as Commissioner from the Department, to see that the conditions of the grant are observed. Let the conditions of the grant be that a repertory is agreed upon, taken out of the works of Shakspeare [sic] and out of the volumes of the Modern British Drama, and that pieces from this repertory are played a certain number of times in each season; as to new pieces, let your company use its discretion. (...) The people *will* have the theatre; then make it a good one.'[132]

These suggestions, unheeded at the time, anticipate a great deal of CEMA's policy later on. However, they came too early at the end of the nineteenth century – as could be seen in the parliamentary debate on the National Theatre – and did not remain unchallenged, not only from the Treasury benches. Whereas Matthew Arnold clearly propagated state sponsorship of the arts, at least where the theatre was concerned, most authors of the first half of the twentieth century rejected this idea on the same grounds as were put forward by the parliamentary opponents of the National Theatre. All of the following authors wrote directly before the outbreak of the war or during the war, so their arguments are contemporary to the setting up of CEMA. This is important, inasmuch as it shows that the principle of state intervention in the arts was by no means a universally accepted one at the beginning of the war.

One of the most vivid combatants for artistic freedom from state intervention was the novelist Edward Morgan Forster, who based his argument on the background of experiences and developments in the Soviet Union, Italy and Germany, where totalitarian regimes strongly intervened into the realm of arts. Like Arnold, Forster is a very valuable source, because he not only expressed his opinion on arts sponsorship, but also gave some hints as to what he understood as 'culture'. A very revealing and typically British comment on culture can be found in the essay 'Does Culture Matter?'[133] dating from 1935/1940: 'Culture is a forbidding word. I have to use it, knowing of none better, to describe the various beautiful and interesting objects which men have made in the past, and handed down to us, and which some of us are hoping to hand on.'[134] In Forster's view, it is a heritage that one has to take care of for the time being and to hand on, if possible: 'We have, in this age of unrest, to

ferry much old stuff across the river, and the old stuff is not merely books, pictures and music, but the power to enjoy and understand them.'[135] In this essay, Forster sets out to define the 'old stuff'. Although he admits that he does not 'mind an occasional croon or a blast in passing from a Wurlitzer organ, and Sir Richard Terry's[136] speciality, madrigals, bore me; nevertheless, *the music represented by him and his peers is the real thing*; it ought to be defended and it has the right occasionally to attack. As a rule, it is in retreat, for there is a hostility to cultural stuff today which is disquieting.'[137] 'Cultural stuff', hence, does not include popular forms of entertainment,[138] but is restricted to 'Brandenburg Concertos, (...) solitary treadings of Dante, (...) the mosaics of Santa Sophia',[139] 'Sophocles, Velasquez, Henry James'[140] and, to complete the artistic name dropping, 'Racine, Stravinsky, Cézanne'.[141] With this list, Forster clearly suggests a hierarchy of élite culture and mass entertainment. Certainly, the named artists of the three classical faculties of music, literature and the visual arts, would have also met Matthew Arnold's taste of sweetness and light. Still, Arnold put some stress on 'turning a stream of fresh and free thought upon our stock notions and habits, which we now follow staunchly and mechanically'[142]. The Arnoldian aspect of perpetual perfection and improvement of human faculties, of which the enumerated artefacts and their enjoyment are a means, not an end in themselves, is lost in Forster who put stress on the aspect of conservation of acknowledged masterpieces of former times.

This focus leads him to the second aspect of this chapter, the funding and promotion of arts. Forster's view of the developments of arts funding is quite ambiguous. While he acknowledges that the cultural tradition rested on the shoulders of the aristocracy, he admits that 'they often did not know why they paid, much as they went to church; it was the proper thing to do, it was a form of social snobbery, and so the artists sneaked a meal, the author got a sinecure, and the work of creation went on.'[143] Although the patron had been a philistine in former times, at least he had been a patron in a 'diffuse society', in which the arts could flourish.[144] According to Forster, however, this time of friendly philistinism seemed to have come to an end giving way to a 'hardened and centralized society',[145] where the members of the new governing class – like the governed – are less bound to the arts as symbols of social status and 'refuse to pay for what they don't want; judging by the noises through the floor, our neighbour in the flat above doesn't want books, pictures, tunes, runes, anyhow doesn't want the sorts we recommend.'[146] The problem, now, for Forster to preserve the cultural heritage and to hand it on to other people and following generations, is a twofold one. The first problem is his diagnosis that in England, 'still the abode of private enterprise, indifference predominates. I know a few working-class people

who enjoy culture, but as a rule I am afraid to bore them with it lest I lose the pleasure of their acquaintance.'[147] Hence, he resigns at this end of the problem and leaves it to the individual to either discuss the advantages of certain paintings or to argue 'over (…) the quickest way from Balham to Ealing'.[148] It is an interesting aspect of Forster's sight of the matter that he alleges that it is a decision of the working-class people to ignore art; apparently, it did not strike him that the average member of the working-class did neither have the money, nor the education nor the leisure to enjoy culture in Forster's sense of the word.

The other problem Forster faced and tried to remedy is the supply of arts, a prerequisite of which is the encouragement and funding of the artist. As indicated above, Forster had depicted a sort of golden – albeit philistine and snobbish – age of patronage which had irretrievably terminated. In this age of the 'diffuse society', the artists had various possible patrons, according to artistic style and abilities as well as religious confession, who catered for almost all artists.[149] This society, according to Forster, underwent radical changes implying serious repercussions for the artist and his freedom of expression: 'That society, after lasting for thousands of years, has suddenly hardened and has become centralized, and in the future the only effective patron will be the State.'[150] Still, although the situation is not as rosy as it used to be for the arts, and the state already takes on responsibilities which had been left to the individual before, public funding does not seem to be a viable solution to encourage the arts. He offers two lines of argument for why the state is a most unfit patron of the arts. Firstly, he sustains his argument by a fictional dialogue between a representative of the government, Mr. Bumble, who wants to commission a mural painting in a police station, and a candidate to take on the job, in which the artist, insisting on his artistic freedom, rejects the ideas and wishes of the patron as limiting his creativity ending in the following lines:

> 'But here Mr Bumble holds up his hand. His patience is exhausted, he really cannot waste more time over this flibbertigibbet. "I can do nothing for you," he says. "You don't fit in. And if you don't fit into the State how do you expect to be employed by the State?" The artist retorts: "I know I don't fit in. And it's part of my duty not to fit in. It's part of my duty to humanity."'[151]

Although Forster certainly exaggerates the limitation of artistic freedom as a necessary component of state sponsorship – especially when compared to royal and aristocratic patronage, not to mention the Church, which certainly was no less obtrusive in its wishes and constraints on the artist's creativity – he strikes an important key in displaying the problem

where artistic freedom ends and the patron's influence begins. Moreover, considering the wish of British politicians to retrench public spending and the stress on financial efficiency, the government committed to education and recreation as the two main fields of employment of the arts was not very likely to spend money on artists whose products at the end of the day expressed the artists' sentiments, but did neither amuse nor educate: 'The State does not believe in experiments, in the development of human sensitiveness and directions away from the average citizen. The artist does, and consequently he and the State – who will soon be his sole employer – must disagree.'[152]

The second line of argument bases on the experiences of state interference in the arts in totalitarian states, which Forster contrasts as horror visions with liberal Britain: 'My belief is that, if the Nazis won, culture would be destroyed in England and the Empire.'[153] Although he notes that Germany still believes in literature and art, 'she has made a disastrous mistake: she has allowed her culture to become governmental, and from this mistake proceed all kinds of evils.'[154] Having a closer look at Germany's level of artistic production he comes to the conclusion that whereas the general level of civilisation was rising throughout Europe in various degrees, the German contribution to cultural development had been 'contemptible'[155]. Alleging that even the slightest intervention of the state as a possible patron, not to mention the complete taking-over of the cultural sector in Nazi Germany, was detrimental to artistic production and creativity, Forster put an important reason against state patronage in Britain on the agenda, which had to be proved negligible by any proponent of state sponsorship of the arts.

With Forster, the study has already reached the time of the Second World War and the beginning of state sponsorship on a low key level. Still, the idea of state intervention was not universally accepted even by artists themselves. A similar view of the problem of state influence on the arts as a corollary of state funding before and during the Second World War was taken by authors of such differing cultural and political backgrounds as George Orwell, Cyril Connolly and T.S. Eliot.

Orwell's idea of culture – although less clearly defined – is close to Forster's concept of culture. He differentiates between an anthropological and an aesthetic sense of the term. The anthropological sense is given on an 'island somewhere in the South Seas where people practice cannibalism and worship the sun; that is "a culture".'[156] Aesthetic Culture, on the other hand, is to 'buy a copy of the *Oxford Book of English Verse* and learn quotable bits by heart'.[157] Orwell's concept of culture, if one dares an interpretation of this fragment, apparently is a highbrow concept including the arts and excluding for instance sports or other forms of popular entertainment, which he regards as 'dope to keep the masses

from thinking.'[158] Although Orwell and Forster did not belong to the same political camp, these two representatives of the British cultural élite seem quite agreed about their artistic values and their concept of culture.

The more important aspect of his thinking remains his attitude towards cultural policy. Orwell's name is closely connected with his famous anti-totalitarian novels *1984* and *Animal Farm*. In the world of universal horror he created in the former, he invented a government department, the Ministry of Truth, responsible for the – in the very literal sense of the word – production of news, entertainment, education, and the fine arts.[159] It is needless to say that Orwell thought the government, or at least this kind of government, the wrong institution to take care of any of these fields. Orwell did not confine his criticism to his fictional production, but concerned himself as well – and as outspoken – in non-fictional texts with the problem of the interventionist state, the arts and of the relation between the two objects. Orwell goes d'accord with Forster in much of his analysis, although he identifies the golden age of artistic independence with the time of laissez-faire capitalism as opposed to Forster's idea of the 'diffuse society' dominated by the landed aristocracy and the church.[160] In the times of change brought about by the outbreak of the Second World War with the introduction of state planning, Orwell diagnoses the passing away of laissez-faire capitalism which will entail the end of the independence of the artist: 'He must become either a spare-time amateur or an official.'[161] Both, in Orwell's view is detrimental to the arts and the creative production of a country, the latter, though, – with the experience of the totalitarian countries to sustain his argument – will reduce the artist to a 'cab-horse whose individual creativity is robbed and turned into a sort of conveyor-belt process'[162] by institutions such as the Ministry of Information, the BBC and the film companies. Orwell neatly formulates the socio-political dilemma of the arts in the current situation: '(1) society cannot be arranged for the benefit of the artists; (2) without artists civilisation perishes. I have never yet seen the dilemma solved (...), and it is not often that it is honestly discussed.'[163] Unfortunately, Orwell himself does not offer a solution to the dilemma either, but he makes it clear that in his opinion state patronage is at least no unmixed blessing, and, in the case of the totalitarian states, a Trojan horse.[164] The main argument against state patronage reappears: state patronage implies censorship.[165] Although Orwell admits that state patronage was a better safeguard against artistic aridisation than sporadic private patronage,[166] he tends to prefer an artistic desert to oases where the state decides who is allowed to feed and water.

The poet and dramatist T.S. Eliot published his book *Notes towards a definition of culture* in 1948, but it was the fruit of a four or five years' labour,[167] so it is contemporary to the political processes that will be

looked at in the next chapters. Although Eliot's concept of culture as a whole is almost inextricably linked with his christian believes, this aspect, important though for a study of Eliot's cultural theory in general, will be excluded. The analysis focuses directly on his canon of culture and the role of the state as a patron and as a factor of education which is very important to the problem of state funding. Eliot divides his concept of culture into three 'Senses': 'the culture of an *individual*, of a *group* or *class*, or of a whole *society*.'[168] As one example for British culture, Eliot offers the following list: 'Derby Day, Henley Regatta, Cowes, the twelfth of August, a cup final, the dog races, the pin table, the dartboard, Wensleydale cheese, boiled cabbage cut into sections, beetroot in vinegar, nineteenth-century Gothic churches and the music of Elgar.'[169] Hence, culture apparently forms a whole way of life.[170] As Raymond Williams points out, any list to define culture would be incomplete, but Eliot's enumeration is particularly restricted with its focus on 'sport, food and a little art – a characteristic observation of English leisure.'[171] With this definition of culture, Eliot apparently broadens the Forsterian and Arnoldian canon of culture by including aspects of popular culture. However, Eliot is not consistent in this conception. He points out in the introduction of his book that there might be a future period that 'will have no culture'[172], which, as Williams correctly puts it, can only mean that it 'will have nothing recognizable as culture, in the sense of religion, arts and learning.'[173] To avert these cultural wastelands, Eliot admits that '"culture" is recognised both as an instrument of policy, and as something socially desirable which it is the business of the State to promote.'[174] Even though Eliot adopts this general recognition for himself,[175] he only favours state intervention as a temporary measure restricted to a few areas.[176] The danger he sees in state patronage is that increasing centralisation of control and politicisation will have detrimental effects on arts and sciences, which some safeguards should be introduced against.[177]

These qualifications of the principle of state support mostly focus on the supply side of arts and culture, i.e. the influence on artists and their work. Additionally, Eliot identifies further problems on the demand side, the audiences. He rejects the idea of state promotion of the arts as an educational measure, which is a constitutive characteristic of cultural policy. He admits that to

> 'treat the uneducated mass of the population as we might treat some innocent tribe of savages to whom we are impelled to deliver the true faith, is to encourage them to neglect or despise that culture which they should possess and from which the more conscious part of culture draws vitality.'[178]

Furthermore, he fears that

> 'there is no doubt that in our headlong rush to educate everybody, we are lowering the standards, and more and more abandoning the study of those subjects by which the essential of our culture – of that part of it which is transmissible by education – are transmitted; destroying our ancient edifices to make ready the ground upon which the barbarian nomads of the future will encamp in their mechanised caravans.'[179]

In Eliot's view, it is an 'essential condition of the preservation of the quality of the culture of the minority, that it should continue to be a minority culture. (...) A 'mass-culture' will always be a substitute-culture.'[180] Although not as strictly against state funding as Forster, Eliot identifies two problems of state patronage: additionally to the re-occurring problem of control where control is detrimental, he fears that spreading élite culture to wider masses will not result in enlightenment and lifting of general educational standards but in the corruption of artistic standards and élite culture.

The next contributor from the ranks of the cultured élite in Britain is Cyril Connolly, author and editor of the literary magazine *Horizon*. In his essay *Writers and Society 1940-43*,[181] he described the deplorable situation artists faced after the breakdown of the system of private patronage[182], when patrons 'willingly gave a hundred pounds away, not for a picture or for a dedication, but to enable an artist to carry on. The practice is almost extinct. (...)'[183] Again, like Forster, Orwell and Eliot, the state does not appeal to Connolly as a possible source: 'The danger is that the state will take over everything; (...) The effects of State control are already apparent in art. We are becoming a nation of culture-diffusionists. Culture-diffusion is not an art. We are not making true art.'[184] Even worse, Connolly identifies the entire British society as hostile or at best indifferent to the arts:

> 'But no political movement can have the art it deserves until it has learnt to respect the artist. The English mistrust of the intellectual, the brutish aesthetic apathy and contempt for the creative artist must go. But the intolerance of public schoolboys, the infectious illiteracy of the once appreciative gentry, the money grubbing of the Victorian industrialists and the boorishness of the Hanoverian court, our Philistinism, which also expresses the English lack of imagination and fear of life, should be made a criminal offence.'[185]

Although he displays the same distrust against the state as the other mentioned authors, he develops an interesting construction how to solve the problem of the artist through the help of the state. Since some kind of patronage is necessary for the production of 'true art' and the state cannot meet this demand without controlling it, but still remains the only source which has the necessary means at its disposal, Connolly suggests that 'any benefactions already made to the arts, to the furtherance of research, or to the betterment of conditions in any form would be deducted from tax.'[186] This, however, requires a 'bureaucracy friendly to the arts, and we are a long way from it.'[187] The implementation of this idea would have offered a solution to the problem expressed by Orwell as to how to encourage the arts and the artists without infringing the freedom of artistic expression. The idea was not entirely new at the time the article was published, for tax exemption of private donations on behalf of the arts already formed the core component of the cultural policy in the United States of America.[188] Connolly's analysis is far from unbiased, but it expresses an important opinion on the social and political circumstances an artist in Britain in the first half of the last century faced.

The last author, whose views will be analysed, is J.B. Priestley. Like T.S. Eliot, he did not write and publish his political ideas before the end of the war. The two most important works, *Arts under Socialism* and *Theatre Outlook* both appeared in 1947.[189] Although Priestley did not directly contribute to the public debate about state funding before the setting up of CEMA, his work helps to understand whether or not the idea of state funding indeed was an accepted practice at the end of the war, as Janet Minihan alleges.[190] Priestley was almost omnipresent on the cultural scene in London as novelist, playwright and one of the BBC's most popular broadcasters. Also, Priestley served for a time as a member of the Drama Panel of CEMA, but resigned over different ideas of policy later on.[191] If nothing else, his commitment on the CEMA panel shows that Priestley was more open to the idea of state funding than the previous authors and less fearful of the repercussions of state aid when compared to the advantages than the previous authors. Priestley sketched a picture of a socialist society in which the arts are to flourish under certain conditions. After stating that the 'Socialist State exists for the artists, and not the artist for the State',[192] he observed that in the current state of British society the arts did not yet take the place they deserve. Although state funding was already in practice since 1939, Priestley remarked in 1947 that this was not yet recognised as a generic government task, but that the arts still were a luxury commodity which the government chose to fund for the moment: 'The commonest mistake made about art is to assume that it is like the icing on a cake. Nearly all politicians take to this error as a duck takes to water.'[193] Despite his enthusiasm for state sponsorship, he was not blind

to the arguments instanced by the critics of this practice like Orwell and Forster. He, too, saw the danger that the bureaucracy might find itself in the position of the paymaster of the piper, i.e. the artist, and hence might wish to call the tune,[194] or, transcribed to the art of writing, the subject: 'Your next job, old boy, is a three act comedy about bottling fruit in the Women's Institutes. Sorry, old boy, but you must – it's a definite directive from the F.A.O. through the C.O.I.'[195] Differing from the other authors, Priestley weighed these disadvantages lighter than the gains and favoured the idea of state funding by insisting that it was up to the state, and not to other institutions, to create conditions enabling the arts to flourish, which as he saw it, did not occur in Britain at the time and were not likely to occur either.[196] In his book *Theatre Outlook*, he elaborated his case against the government and the political élite in general. He numbered the British government among the 'enemies of the Theatre (...), which, with the hearty approval of all parties, does not care whether the Theatre lives or dies so long as it pays the ferocious tax imposed upon it.'[197] In the view of the government as Priestley perceived it, the theatre was still regarded as a largely 'commercial affair, part of the entertainment business' with the consequence that 'playgoing, like smoking and drinking wine and spirits, is severely taxed.'[198] Hence, it 'would never occur to such persons that London ought to have Theatres as far removed from commercial speculation as the British Museum.'[199]

The most important inference from this essay by Priestley is that even if *de iure* the principle of state responsibility for the arts was accepted, the state *de facto* did not live up to its responsibility to encourage the arts which is due to a lack of interest on the side of the politicians, which apparently had not changed much since the time of Lord Melbourne or the fiery arguments of Sir Frederick Banbury and Ellis Griffith.

As a result, culture as a theoretical concept encompassed in a line from Matthew Arnold to J.B. Priestley mainly so-called bourgeois élite culture, including literature, the visual arts and theatre, forms of culture that were still the domain of the higher social strata, who had the leisure and the money to enjoy a performance or an exhibition. Secondly, most of the authors mentioned here had far-reaching reservations against state patronage on the grounds that the freedom of artistic expression would be infringed, that art would be politicised and utilised for purposes foreign to art, that bureaucratic philistinism would wipe out avantgardistic art and further mediocre artists and that state interference as an educational measure would lower the standards. Put together with the political side, which as a rule remained hesitant to spend money on the arts as the icing of the social cake, it is difficult to see that progressing collectivism in the field of social policy proper after the First World War

translated into state interventionism in the arts. Still, while the political and the cultured élites were far from unanimously agreed to embrace the principle of state sponsorship of the arts, there were piecemeal and tender beginnings of state interference on behalf of the arts and culture in Britain preceding the setting up of CEMA in 1940. This leads to the hypothesis that the misery of the arts alone did not suffice to evoke state patronage; further motivation on the government side was needed to extract money from the Treasury.

> *The only reason, or, at any rate the most important reason why those of us who do not tend in the direction of believing in State management, Government management or municipal management, have come to the conclusion that the scheme now here before the House is the only suitable in the circumstances, is that this particular Service differs fundamentally and essentially from almost any other enterprise that can be imagined. (...) Consequently, we who are not wedded to theories, but believe in practical business, come to the State and say: 'Without the aid of the State and Post Office machinery, this vast business cannot go on. We will use it on a rational and sensible basis.'*[200]

IV. INDICATORS OF EXTENDED STATE INFLUENCE ON THE ARTS

It is a commonplace that despite the noble British reticence in terms of state patronage before 1940, there have been solitary acts of arts sponsorship in Britain a long time before the outbreak of the Second World War.[201] The most notable examples are the creation of the British Museum in 1753 and the Reform Acts of 1845 and 1850, the Museums Act and the Public Library Act. However, these few examples show that there hardly was a thought out idea of state funding behind the respective interventions. They rather form a series – and not a very long one at that – of occasional state interference breaking with, though not upsetting the basic political thoughts of the day as shown in the previous chapters. Also, if the focus of interest lies with the arts *stricto sensu*, sponsorship before 1940 did not go beyond the funding of the visual arts. There had not been any financial aid to the theatre or to music in Britain on a national level, and in a very limited scale on the municipal level.[202] Finally, the introductory passage taken from a debate in the House of Commons about the setting up of the BBC by Royal Charter in 1926 shows that even this most far-reaching intervention in the sphere of culture before the Second World War, has to be distinguished in its form and content from other acts of state interference and was justified only by the fact that the BBC formed an entirely new service. Although this study concentrates on music, the theatre including opera and ballet and on the visual arts, the inclusion of museums in this chapter seems worthwhile because it sheds light on the motivation of the governing class to invest in culture in general. The development of state patronage is inextricably linked with the idea of public education and social improvement,[203] although during wartime these aims were at times pushed in the background of politics.

The two institutions that were privileged to receive occasional funds from the Treasury before the middle of the nineteenth century were the British Museum and the National Gallery in London. The provinces were entirely excluded from the financial spreading of sweetness and light by the state. Although both mentioned homes of art and culture were funded before, it was the Prince Consort Albert of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, coming from a German background where state patronage was accepted as a political principle, especially in states which could not compete in terms of economic or military power, who was a driving force in the encouragement of arts in Britain.[204] Both Reform Acts of 1845 and 1850 fell into his reign. Though temporal nexus does not necessarily imply a causal nexus it is noteworthy that the funds for the British Museum dried up in the 1860s, after Albert's death in 1861.[205] But even those days were hardly marked by lavish spending on the arts. Minihan reports of royal loans of paintings – though no financial donations – to the Royal Academy's British Institution for Promoting the Fine Arts, which led her to the unfavourable comparison of Britain with other powers in Europe: 'Great Britain, arbitrating the affairs of Europe in 1816, lagged sadly behind in the civilised arts, and the victor on the battlefield was threatened with dishonour in the art gallery.'[206]

Things began to change in 1845 and 1850, when Parliament passed the Museums Act and the Public Library Act respectively. Both pieces of legislation empowered municipalities of more than 10,000 inhabitants to levy rates of ½d for the establishment of museums of art and science or a public library with an admission ceiling of 1d. For Thomas Kelly, this act did not only aim at the education of the poorer classes who previously were debarred from access to such institutions of edification or as an attempt of the 'philanthropic and conscience-stricken middle class (...) to alleviate the lot of the poor', but also to 'circulate habits of honesty, sobriety and obedience.'[207] Especially sobriety was an aim pursued with state interventions in Victorian Britain. One of the reforming MPs, Henry Cole, gave his estimation of the moral value of museums and their accessibility for the poor:

> 'The working man comes to this Museum from his one or two dimly lighted cheerless dwelling-rooms, in his fustian jacket, with his shirt collar a little trimmed up, accompanied by his threes, fours, and fives of little fustian jackets, a wife, in her best bonnet, and a baby of course under her shawl. The looks of surprise and pleasure of the whole party when they first observe the brilliant lighting inside the Museums show what a new, acceptable, and wholesome excitement this evening entertainment affords to all of

> them. Perhaps the evening opening of Public Museums may furnish a powerful antidote to the gin palace.'[208]

From this fragment it is obvious that patronage of arts and the increase of their accessibility to the working people always entailed a moment of patronisation and social control of the audience. By 1940, the vocabulary had slightly changed, the 'gin palace' was exchanged for the cinema as the main enemy of culture,[209] and 'wholesome excitement' was replaced by 'worthwhile entertainment'. The spirit, though, basically remained the same.

Before turning to four examples of extended state influence in the realm of arts and entertainment, it seems appropriate to give a brief sketch of the political and social processes in the interwar years which form the context of these developments. In order to assess the impact of the Second World War for the taking up of cultural policy in Britain, it is – in order to avoid the pitfall of mistaking *post hoc* for *propter hoc* – necessary to assess also other possible origins and developments. This will enable a conclusion whether the war was merely an accelerator of existing processes – 'hastening a society's progress along its old grooves', as Angus Calder alleged – or whether the war caused a discontinuity with existing processes.

The most important process which might have paved the way for a more active role of the state in the sphere of culture is the wider context of the development of the interventionist state.[210] Roughly speaking, the genesis of the interventionist state began in the 1880s posing a challenge to the liberal ideal of the so-called nightwatchman state.[211] In the following years, further social legislature was introduced which gradually and slowly began to erode the liberal principle. The first acts of social legislation were the Social Insurance, Old Age Pensions and Unemployment Acts of the year 1908 and 1911, introduced by the Liberal Asquith government under the guidance of Lloyd George and Winston Churchill. Although these Acts represented a change in the outlook of the government and its responsibilities, interventions in terms of social policy remained piecemeal and attuned to the liberal concept of the state. It took the disruptions of the First World War to finally throw over this liberal ideal shared to various degrees by both great parties of the day.

During the interwar years, interventions by the state were confined to 'hard social facts' such as unemployment, health and old age pensions according to the financial needs of the day during a time of prolonged depression which put strictures on the government budget.[212] Art was excluded from such treatment as a luxury commodity or, in the words of J.B. Priestley, as an 'icing on the cake.'[213] Still, after the First World War with its vast nationalisation of industries and the increase of state

intervention which to a certain degree was retained in peace time, the state took a more active role in shaping society which eventually paved the way for the assumption of state responsibility for the recreation of its citizens and the proliferation of the arts in Britain. As an ironic side aspect one might suggest that the more active role of the state in the aftermath of the First World War including higher taxation for the redistribution of wealth helped to abolish the wealthy private patron of the arts and hence contributed to the beginning intervention by the state, replacing private benefactors, also in this field.

In the time between 1913 and 1934, four institutions were set up – or in the case of the National Theatre attempted to be set up – which might indicate that the principle of neutrality was already being eroded before the Second World War broke out. An analysis of the BBC, the British Council, the City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra and the National Theatre will show whether the establishment of CEMA only continued the trend of a state entering the field of provision of cultural recreation or whether the mentioned exceptions only proved the rule.

1. The BBC

In 1926, the BBC emerged as a public corporation from its private predecessor, the British Broadcasting Company founded in 1922. The Company was the result of the co-operation of the manufacturers of wireless sets, who had been granted a monopoly for broadcasting.[214] This was a rather surprising move facing the strong belief in free competition in Britain. Consequently, it was acrimoniously debated in Parliament whether such kind of organisation was suitable to the British way of doing business. The main reason why Parliament had opted for a monopoly of the Company was the fact that the precedent of the commercial broadcasting system in the United States had resulted in what was called 'chaos on the ether'.[215] With no control of wavelengths, the vast number of stations resulted in a '"jumble of signals" and a "blasting and blanketing of rival programmes"',[216] which raised criticism even in the United States.

The heated debate of 1922 became even more stormy in 1926 when the licence of the Company expired and the creation of a public corporation by Royal Charter was suggested implying the 'nationalisation' of the broadcasting service. This was seen as an act of socialism by a number of MPs[217] – although the Government of the day was Conservative with Stanley Baldwin as Prime Minister – and thus strongly rejected. The MP Harney compared the BBC with the press and came to the conclusion that

> 'there is not a single argument that can be used in favour of the liberty of the Press that is not equally applicable to the liberty of

> the wireless. There is not a single objection to censorship and interference with the dissemination of written words that is not equally applicable to the dissemination of spoken words.'[218]

Finally, an argument was reiterated that had proved to be the most powerful to prevent any government interference in the arts:

> 'However well the Civil Service can run the Post Office, and how well the Civil Service could, I believe, run the mines of this country, and many other great monopolies, the last thing they ought to have anything to do with is art, or the entertainment industry, or giving news, or an educational service. Those are the last things that a Government can run.'[219]

The assumption that the state would actually run the BBC was exaggerated, if not entirely wrong. It was not proposed to introduce a system under which the BBC would be reduced to a government department.[220] Rather, the BBC was assured by the then-Postmaster-General, Mitchell-Thomson, 'the greatest possible liberty, within the terms of the Charter, to do anything that comes within its terms of that they may think desirable in the best interest of the service as a whole.'[221] The construction, under which this greatest possible liberty was to be ensured, the public corporation, is a typically British form of administration, previously employed at the Central Electricity Board and the London Passenger Transport Board. The idea of a public corporation is to entrust a private concern to act on behalf of the 'national interest' in return for a guaranteed monopoly position. The looseness of parliamentary control guaranteed the BBC's 'virtual autonomy',[222] which it had gallantly fought for during the General Strike in 1926 against Winston Churchill's craving to take over the BBC as a government department.[223]

In the debate in the House of Commons it was the argument, that such a new service technology needed some policing by the state in order to work properly and in the interest of the nation, that carried the day for 'nationalisation'. Another aspect of the national interest was the preservation of certain standards of programmes. Since there was no advertisement on the ether in Britain, the sole source of income of the Company being the share in licence fees, the programme planners of the BBC could freely decide what to give to the public without any opportunity of commercial interference. The first Directing Manager of the Company, Sir John Reith, had a clear vision of the opportunities to lift cultural and moral standards by the choice of programme.[224] In his testimony to the Crawford Committee, the enquiry committee appointed to make suggestions for the future of broadcasting after its first five years,

Reith defended the monopoly system as necessary to ensure 'efficiency and economy in operation' of the service, but at the same time insisted on the ethical side of broadcasting which made it essential that 'one general policy may be maintained throughout the country and definite standards promulgated.'[225] Whether this was the real reason for the monopoly and the incorporation of the BBC by the government or whether it was indeed the prevention of ethereal chaos remains open to debate.[226] That it had an impact on the decision, however, is beyond doubt. Still, even six years after the incorporation of the BBC, the MP Richard Law could without contradiction state in the Commons in February 1933 that '[w]hatever the functions of Parliament and the Government may be, I do not think that the provision of cheap and innocent entertainment for the masses is one of them, although, of course, it is sometimes so merely incidentally.'[227] This implies that the idea to determine the programme structure was not to the fore in the government's decision to transform the BBC into a public corporation. Also, it reiterates an apparently solid position that the funding of the arts as one form of entertainment was not a government concern, neither for its own sake nor for charitable purposes: a position that was challenged and finally dropped only seven years later.

The programmatic approach of the BBC was not to give the public what it actually wanted – before Listener Research was introduced to ascertain the wishes of the public this was guesswork anyway – but rather what was 'good for them', or at least what the programme planners thought good for their audience. Just like the reformers in the middle of the nineteenth century who tried to educate the general public by administering an 'antidote to the gin palace' in the form of wholesome entertainment of art and science museums and libraries, Reith was determined to educate the taste of the listening crowds. In his 'final word to the old Company', Reith stated his basic creeds about the composition of a radio programme in order to attain the goal of acting in the national interest:

> 'That broadcasting should be merely a vehicle of light entertainment was a limitation of its functions which we declined to accept. It has been our endeavour to give a conscious, social purpose to the exploitations of the medium. Not that we underrated the importance of wholesome entertainment or failed to give it due place; but we realised in the stewardship vested in us, the responsibility of contributing consistently and cumulatively to the intellectual and moral happiness of the community. (...) We have endeavoured to exclude anything that might, directly or indirectly, be harmful. We have proved, as expected, that the

> supply of good things creates the demand for more. We have tried to found a tradition of public service, and to dedicate the service of broadcasting to the service of humanity in its fullest sense.' [228]

This passage shows that the spread of culture and the higher education and moral uplifting of the people was a central aim pursued already by the old company. It was the BBC's original plan to dispense the Arnoldian 'sweetness and light' amongst the British people. In his *Social History of Music*, Edward Mackerness acknowledged the fact 'that in the musical sphere broadcasting has finally broken down class barriers which at an earlier stage kept all but the wealthy from hearing the best music. Radio (and, still more, television) has given the listener a box at Covent Garden and placed him in the best position for hearing the finest orchestras and soloists.'[229] Indeed, the Reithian BBC had the ambitious aim that under its influence 'in five years time the general musical public of these islands will treble or quadruple its present size.'[230] However, research conducted by Winifred Gill and Hilda Jennings in 1940 revealed that the pure display of classical music did not automatically lead to deepened interest and understanding of classical music, since listeners stated in the survey that 'classical music with all problems of clear definition was the type of music most difficult to appreciate.'[231]

Still, the BBC put a lot of effort in reaching of their aims. In 1930, the Corporation founded their own Symphony Orchestra, which quickly won renown as one of the finest orchestras in Europe. Secondly, in 1927 the BBC took over the sponsorship of the Promenade Concerts organised by Sir Henry Wood, one of the pioneers of popularisation of classical music.[232] Both measures helped to democratise classical, and with the Proms even contemporary classical, music, but were not greeted with unanimous approval. In the bleak year of 1931, criticism of the alleged lavish spending by the BBC on the Proms and the more prominent members of the orchestra met with criticism from two camps. The chief conductors of two of the great British Symphony Orchestras, Sir Hamilton Harty of the Manchester based Hallé and Sir Thomas Beecham of the London Philharmonic Orchestra criticised the BBC for state aided intrusion into the free market of music promotion and production endangering 'private musical interests' and 'private enterprise'.[233]

The second quarter, from where criticism arose, was the conservative press. The music critic of the *Daily Telegraph*, Ferrucio Bonavia, referring to the difficult time the country was experiencing in the slump of 1931, claimed that 'National expenditure is undergoing strict scrutiny (...) and the economic policy of the BBC cannot expect to escape the general examination.' He drew the parallel with other great orchestras of the country, notably the named Hallé and the London Symphony Orchestra,

stating that as '[n]either of these is costing the Government a penny (...) there is ample justification for criticism.'[234]

Both strands of criticism easily fit into the picture drawn in the first chapters of this book, that performing arts were widely seen as commercial affairs which had to compete freely on the market, into which the state was not to interfere. Moreover, financial stringency served as a welcome explanation for the denial of public funding for the arts as the 'icing on the cake', when only bread was available.

On the whole, the criticism of the BBC did not carry very far. The BBC held on to its general policy, whilst its effort to educate a new audience for good music was widely acknowledged.[235] However, the high ambitions to widen the audience for 'good music' were not attained and the BBC modified the programme to a certain extent according to outward pressure by reducing the share of classical music, which nevertheless remained a notable item in the programme, until the BBC broadcast more dance or light music and variety shows than any other major station in Europe.[236] Still, through the unique position of the BBC as a public corporation largely independent of the state and independent of commercial competition, it was possible to broadcast classical music, talks and other educational items. In that respect, the state played a role in spreading the arts and offering a share in the cultural heritage of the country and the Western civilisation which had not been open to them hitherto.

However, two important qualifications of this point of view remain. First of all, the incorporation as a public body of the private Company only served as an administrative framework, whereas the programme policy which was responsible for the democratisation of highbrow culture was at the discretion of the BBC and its Director General. This is the more obvious when considering that the share of classical music and talks programmes was highest during the time of the privately owned and run Company. The standards were diluted the longer the BBC was in service and the take-over of the BBC under the administrative wing of the GPO did not stop, let alone reverse, this process. Hence, it seems a fair conclusion that the BBC was able to gain new audiences for classical music, but it was the heritage of Sir John Reith and his chosen few who planned and implemented the programmes according to their set of values rather than the governmental bodies or the civil service eventually responsible for the running of the BBC. During a hearing for the Parliamentary committee collecting evidence for and against the transformation of the BBC into a public service, Reith said, when asked whether the success of the BBC could be carried over into any kind of new constitution of the BBC, that

> 'the idealism and energy and enthusiasm of the staff would carry them through any change of organisation whatsoever, save only this, that we might have imposed upon us such restrictions, if we were to become a Government Department, that it would be impossible by any action or persistency of action on our part to rid ourselves of them. Save only that, I would suggest that the enthusiasm of the present staff would survive any change of constitution whatsoever.'[237]

This passage clearly shows Reith's estimation where the responsibility for the standard of the programme lay and where the dangers, rather than the benefits, to the service were to be seen. As a conclusion, it was the BBC that broke with the political paradigm that the state was not to interfere in any way in the entertainment business. Still, regarding the far-reaching autonomy in terms of programme and spending of the BBC and the fact that the transformation of the private business into a public corporation did not change the mode of financing the services – then as before the money was collected through the GPO in form of the licences of which the BBC received a share – it is difficult to describe this act as an act of arts sponsorship in Britain. Moreover, the incorporation of the BBC was motivated equally by the fear of 'anarchy on the ether' in Britain and the wish of the government to control this public service, but not by the wish to bestow it with engrossed financial aid to foster the higher education and the spreading of the arts among the populace. The encouragement given to arts and artists in Britain by the BBC were thus at best a by-product of governmental policy and mainly ascribed to the BBC itself which remained basically independent under the construction as a public corporation.

2. The British Council

Another possible precedent for arts sponsorship is the establishment of the British Council in 1934. Although propaganda as a weapon in warfare of morale ended abruptly with the termination of hostilities in 1918, in 1934 the British government decided to re-enter the field of propaganda, this time designed to show the world the riches of British national heritage. Just as in 1917, it took some outside pressure until British officials realised a need to disseminate knowledge of British culture abroad. In his report occasioned by the twenty-first birthday of the British Council in 1955, Harold Nicolson recalled that all forms of self-display had been regarded in a spirit of self-confidence verging to arrogance as 'obnoxious'[238], because '[i]f foreigners failed to appreciate, or even to notice, our gifts of invention or our splendid adaptability, then there was nothing we could do to mitigate their obtuseness. The genius of

England, unlike that of lesser countries, spoke for itself.'[239] This self-confidence lost in strength and conviction in the aftermath of the First World War and the ensuing economic problems. Moreover, British governments noticed that they were lagging behind other countries, most notably France, Italy and Germany, in their efforts to make their achievements known to the world.[240] Especially in Egypt, in British possession from 1882 until her independence in 1922, the 'French pen proved mightier than the British sword', as an American observer wrote in 1933. [241]

The establishment of the British Council in 1934 opened a new theatre of British diplomacy[242] and was also apt to open a new chapter in the relationship between the arts and the state. In a speech in his capacity as patron of the British Council, the Prince of Wales, later King Edward VIII and even later the Duke of Windsor, declared that of 'all the great Powers this country is the last in the field in setting up a proper organisation to spread a knowledge and appreciation of its language, literature, art, science and education – that is to say, let the world know what it owes to British achievements in these spheres.'[243]

Initially established as nothing more than an annex to the News Department of the Foreign Office,[244] the British Council soon developed a more autonomous status applying for increasing grants from the Treasury. Still, even though the need for cultural propaganda was accepted in the Foreign Office, the Treasury took a different view of the matter and was loath to dedicate the demanded amounts of money to such a 'nebulous'[245] enterprise lacking a visible return for the investment made by the state. It was feared that

> 'there is some danger that this object may be imperceptibly transformed into a general desire to spread British culture throughout the world; and .... [we] do not think it would be possible to defend in Parliament or its Committee expenditure for such a purpose – to which it would not be easy to assign definite limits.'[246]

As late as 1941, the then Minister of Information, Duff Cooper, confided to Churchill that '[t]he supposition is that the British Council exists only for cultural, and not for political propaganda, but this at the best of times was mere camouflage since no country would be justified in spending public money on cultural propaganda unless it had also a political or a commercial significance.'[247] British reticence of funding the arts and education as an intrinsic end reared its parsimonious head. The first government grant to the British Council amounted to no more than £5,000. Although the grants were considerably increased in the following

years, in 1937/1938 it was £60,000, the money spent on this kind of work of the government remained poor in comparison with France and Italy which earmarked about £5 million for cultural propaganda per annum.[248] Still, it is noteworthy that 'the Empire was given more state subsidy for the arts than the mother country.'[249]

This general parsimony, of course, had implications on the funding of the arts within the programme of the British Council. Even if the arts were explicitly included into the Council's orbit – as documented in the speech by the Prince of Wales –, the actual benefits for the performing and visual arts were very poor. Answering a parliamentary question in 1939 concerning names and number of companies which received subsidies from the British Council and the amount of money spent on them, Neville Chamberlain was able to reply that

> 'If, as I presume, my hon. Friend is referring to theatrical companies, the British Council has never granted any subsidies to such companies. From time to time, however, the council has contracted with the following theatrical companies to perform abroad, and has defrayed their expenses to the amounts set out below'

which is followed by a list of no more than five engagements amounting to a total of roughly £28,000, of which £4,000 looked promising to be refunded to the Treasury because the company in question conducted its tour through Canada at a profit.[250] As Chamberlain pointed out himself, subsidies, the very epitome of encouragement, were not granted, but the British Council 'booked' the companies for theatrical tours. Although unquestionably money was spent on theatre companies, it is not without difficulty to be qualified as sponsorship of the arts in a modern sense of the word. The money spent on the companies were not grants or subsidies, but fees for the engagement by the British Council. Hence, public money spent on the arts was restricted to contract fees for rather infrequent engagements.

3. Birmingham

Whereas Neville Chamberlain denied any sponsorship of the arts as Chancellor of the Exchequer, he was an active patron of the arts in his earlier function as Lord Mayor of Birmingham. In a letter to his sister Beatrice of 24 March 1916 he proudly reported to have 'dropped a little bombshell by suggesting that we should have a first class local orchestra and contribute to its support out of the rates!'[251] Clearly demonstrating that such kind of municipal support to music and the theatre were almost revolutionary in those days in Britain he adds in this letter that 'I have

been told that "only a Chamberlain would have had the audacity to propose such a thing" but really it has long been in my mind and I don't see why music should not be subsidised as well as art.'[252] Municipal support for the visual arts despite being an established principle in Britain since the Museums Act of 1845, still had to make its way in Britain and Neville Chamberlain was determined to get the idea of supporting also other forms of art sunk into the minds of the British people: 'Of course nothing can be done now but I thought I might as well start to get the people used to the idea.'[253] The most distinguished British conductor of the time, Sir Thomas Beecham, was approached as an expert in management and funding of symphony orchestras, but no co-operation materialised due to differences of policy between Beecham and Neville Chamberlain. Beecham recalled that although there was the declared wish to establish a permanent orchestra in Birmingham, 'of any idea how to put it into practical operation there was little evidence (…).'[254] Moreover, according to Beecham 'certainly no one seemed ready to spend any of his own money on it, and the Lord Mayor, Mr. Neville Chamberlain, was very clear that the present was not the time to add one farthing to the rates in the interest of the fine arts.'[255] Although Chamberlain himself assured his sister in the quoted letter that nothing could be done at the very moment, Beecham's account seems to include a misrepresentation of the state of affairs. After his first uttering of the plan to use the rates for the sponsorship of music in Birmingham it took Chamberlain only another year to put this plan into realisation. Already in 1917, he was able to attend the opening concert of the new orchestra. One year after the set-up of the permanent orchestra he set himself to a greater scheme including 'a permanent orchestra, a new school of music, an opera house and a concert hall. I believe the psychological moment for something of the kind has arrived and it only needs someone (...) to take the initiative.'[256] Modestly accepting that he was the man to undertake this task, he also explained in revealing language the programme behind his cultural policy:

> 'It all really works in with the CRL[257] for I believe it is necessary for success to interest the mob & I am convinced that this can easily be done if they are encouraged to take part in music themselves. Every club & and every big work should have its own orchestra and glee society and competitions should be held under the auspices of the City Council. Thus you would help to educate the public, you could introduce a new & engrossing interest into the lives of the working & lower middle classes and incidentally you would make it possible for the more educated and highly

> trained people with a musical background to get high class concerts & opera at a comparatively cheap rate.'[258]

As in the other examples of state intervention into the realm of arts, education of lower strata of the society or, in more abstract terms, social inclusion, was the major aim of this kind of subsidisation for the arts. Although taking a less benevolent approach to the target groups, Chamberlain's patronage of the arts set a clear precedent on a municipal level to the later work of CEMA. However, no city or town followed this early example of cultural policy in Great Britain before the Second World War. Apparently Chamberlain was right in claiming that only a Chamberlain could have suggested and implemented such a scheme. Birmingham remained an exception to the rule of cultural neutrality of the state be it on national or on municipal level where the theatre and music were concerned. Art museums, as was shown above, enjoyed in many places funding with public money on municipal level, though scarcely from the central administration in Whitehall.

4. The National Theatre

All three mentioned examples were initiatives of the state or, in the case of Birmingham, of a municipality which nevertheless offered and finally used public money to support the performing arts. A fourth example that the paradigm of neutrality of the state in cultural affairs was not unchallenged – though for the time being virtually unchallengeable – is the attempt of a private initiative to establish a National Theatre funded or at least aided by state subsidies, the application of which two founding fathers of the idea, Harley Granville Barker and William Archer, in 1907 still thought a waste of time.[259] The discussion in the House of Commons in 1913 was already quoted to show the arguments pro and contra state funding employed in the political debate. Although the case was not brought again into the House after the defeat until 1948,[260] the National Theatre committee remained alive and active in the quest for a home for Shakespearean productions. However, the committee under its secretary Geoffrey Whitworth faced serious problems in working out a suitable scheme. Still, realising that private patronage would not suffice to set up a National Theatre, the committee hoped for public funds, although the idea of a state aided National Theatre was not even universally accepted amongst theatre people themselves.[261] In his history of the National Theatre, Whitworth enlists a number of arguments he was confronted with when canvassing for the idea of a National Theatre which resemble the arguments represented in the previous chapter. The most frequent were that 'officialism is the death of Art'; 'that the public do not want a National Theatre, and will not subscribe the necessary funds' and 'that a

National Theatre would enter into unfair competition with private enterprise'.[262] Finally he reports that – parallel to the arguments of E.M. Forster, Cyril Connolly, T.S. Eliot and others – the 'fear of State control was rampant, and a nationalized theatre smacked of socialism, or at any rate of something out of tune with what would now be called the "British Way of Life".'[263]

That unanimity was lacking even in the ranks of the British Drama League became visible in 1929 on occasion of its conference in Northampton, when the MP Robert Young moved the resolution that 'this Conference of the British Drama League, believing that the Government is in sympathy with the idea and establishment of a National Theatre and would favourably consider a practical and agreed scheme to this end, requests the Council to take early and energetic measures to achieve this great object.'[264] George Bernard Shaw, otherwise an ardent supporter of the National Theatre, uttered his doubts concerning its feasibility since 'no one cared tuppence about a National Theatre', whilst Mr. Sladen Smith declared that 'the National Theatre would be dull and inefficient, an eyesore and an earsore.'[265]

What remains of this conference of the British Drama League is the fact, that although opinion was divided between the members of the League, a strong faction including the executive board thought the time had come to procure state aid for a National Theatre. This was endorsed in part by the then Home Secretary, J.R. Clynes, who sent a sympathetic letter to Whitworth compellingly stating that the Drama, 'first because it is Drama, and secondly because of its far-reaching educational value, deserves not merely recognition but co-operation and honour.'[266] The co-operation and honour he offered, though, consisted solely in his expressing his sympathy with the idea of state aid for the time being because the 'subject is, however, more than one of finance. It is one of Public opinion and Parliamentary disposition. I hope your Conference will do something to create the National support which is necessary for your purpose.'[267]

Two conclusions can be drawn from this episode. First of all, Whitworth underlined the difficulties of any attempt to procure public money for the performing arts in Britain for two reasons: the government was generally unwilling to subsidise the performing arts and it was against the British spirit and custom to fund arts. However, although the British Drama League and the National Theatre initiative realised these impediments to the scheme full well, they tried in more than one way to soften the intransigence of the government and Parliament of the day thus showing that political and also social change was – differing from Granville Barker's and Archer's pessimism – at least thought of as possible. Still, it is obvious from the remark by the Home Secretary of the

day, that the government only supported the National Theatre as long as no claim for money from the Treasury was staked. Clynes's idea of a national funding clearly meant raising of private funds on a national basis rather than granting public funds. Eventually, a state funded National Theatre found its permanent home on the South Bank in 1976, after the National Theatre Company had been formed in 1963.

All four examples show that the attitude as sketched theoretically in the previous chapters held good also in practice. The City of Birmingham, which established a municipal orchestra, remained a singular case and the occurrence of this exception from the rule was owed to the person of Neville Chamberlain in his capacity as mayor. As Chancellor of the Exchequer, he took a far less benevolent stance towards the arts and the widespread provision of cultural recreation options for the majority of the population. The setting up of the BBC by Royal Charter certainly came closest to prove the case that the government gave up its iron principle of neutrality before the Second World War. Still, although the Corporation enjoyed government protection through its guaranteed monopoly, it seems difficult to dub this a major step forward in terms of cultural policy, since the state did not fund the BBC, but rather collected the licence fees and – after deducting its share – merely handed them over. Furthermore, the decision to incorporate the private company was basically owed to reasons other than the government's desire to be responsible for the cultural contents of broadcasting. The establishment of a National Theatre, as was shown, did not materialise before the Second World War and the British Council hardly funded any purveyors of sweetness and light. In this case, hence, it seems that the relationship between government and society was indeed more static than in other aspects of social policy. It is difficult to create a line of continuity of acts of cultural policy into which the foundation of CEMA would neatly fit.

When Junker and Dornier
Fly over the house with horrible persistence
They remind us of the thornier
Side of existence.
And oh, the terrifying whine
Of Messerschmitts 110 and 109!

But when Sonata and Quartet
Are played at the National Gallery for our pleasure
They induce us to forget
War's horrifying measure.
And oh, the blessed boon to men
Of Opuses 109 and 110!.'[268]

V. THE CULTURAL BLACKOUT AND THE PHASE OF THE 'WELFARIST APPROACH'

1. The Cultural Blackout

The blackout at night began on the day before Neville Chamberlain declared the state of war with Germany, and with it one of the most tedious aspects of the first months of the War.[269] Under the assumption that lights would guide the expected German bombers to the population centres, all windows had to be blacked out and all events which implied the gathering of larger crowds were forbidden. As a consequence, all forms of public entertainment had to cease their activity, a governmental move which Bernard Shaw characterised as a 'masterstroke of unimaginative stupidity'.[270] As another consequence, most kinds of private entertainment within the field of arts, amateur drama, music and theatre, came to an abrupt halt. For Sir Kenneth Clark, then Director of the National Gallery, the blackout 'was symbolic. It extended to every form of pleasure, recreation or enlightenment'[271], which inspired contemporaries to term this situation as a 'cultural blackout'.[272] The first countermove came already a week after the declaration of war, when the complete ban on public entertainment was lifted and the entertainment business, especially the cinemas and dance halls, slowly took up their work again. The theatre, classical music and opera, though, suffered more severely from the restrictions of the first weeks. Almost 99 per cent of the theatrical employees were out of work in the first week and despite the lift of the ban on entertainment it appeared that many of them would remain without an engagement.[273] In the end, this did not prove to be true, but it

did take the theatre some time to adjust to the new situation. As late as December 1940, Ivor Brown, editor of the *Observer* and CEMA staff in various capacities during the war, wrote in the *New Statesman and Nation*, that only 26 members of the actors' trade union Equity in London were employed, whilst in the time before the war fifty times as many had had an engagement at a London stage.[274]

This, though, was not the worst part of the cultural blackout of the first war weeks, since by far the greater part of the British populace was not accustomed to the variety of the cultural scene of their capital. With no other entertainment left than the public house, people turned to the BBC to make the long and dark evenings at home more endurable. The BBC, however, had misjudged the situation. The programme directors had prepared for the immediate outbreak of hostilities and expected to fill the time with news. In the first report of the BBC Defence Sub-Committee, it was decided that the task of the programmes at the beginning of the war was twofold. The programmes should a) maintain public morale and b) serve as a 'vehicle for official announcements and the radiation of reliable news'[275]. The committee agreed that 'the period immediately following the outbreak of war would be concerned primarily with b). It is impossible to say how long this period would last, but a change over to complete war time programme planning could only come gradually over a period of some weeks. (...)'[276] Contrary to the expectations of the committee, though, nothing happened on 2 September 1939, nor on the following days which would have required official announcements or the 'radiation of reliable news', thus leaving the BBC with the problem how to fill the gaps and the audience with the problem of what to think of the fare they were given. Unsurprisingly, the latter solved the problem faster.

Mollie Panter-Downes commented in her regular contribution to the *New Yorker* magazine that the BBC 'desperately filled the gaps in its first wartime program with gramophone recordings and jolly bouts of community singing stiff with nautical heave-hoes and folksy nonny-noes.'[277] In an official publication, even the BBC themselves admitted that this situation, which Mollie Panter-Downes characterised as a 'curious twenty-five-per-cent warfare',[278] had caught the BBC unprepared.[279] Apart from playing records, it was the BBC theatre organist, Sandy Macpherson, 'who played the theatre organ (...) till his feet were numb and his fingers nearly dropped off.'[280]

The BBC failed to step in to fill the gaps of more serious entertainment that the black-out brought about and soon became the target of strong criticism. Mollie Panter-Downes noted on 1 October 1939, that everybody 'is slightly fed up with something or other: with the Ministry of Information, which doesn't inform; with the British

Broadcasting Corporation, which is accused of being depressing and – worse – boring'[281]. A widespread press campaign against the BBC programmes was launched, beginning on 11 September 1939 in the Birmingham Post which judged that the 'makeshift resorted to during the days of suspense before the declaration of war will not be looked upon as any sort of basis for a future broadcasting policy'.[282] A week later, the *Sunday Times* commented that: 'The BBC pours out into the air day after day an endless stream of trivialities and silliness, apparently labouring under the delusion that in any time of crisis the British public becomes just one colossal moron, to whose sub-simian intelligence and taste it must indulgently play down'.[283]

This diagnosis was shared by the findings of Mass Observation which criticised the BBC for its 'outbreak hysteria' and for operating through only one programme channel intended to cater for all, actually though catering for hardly anybody.[284] The BBC was not unaware of the sudden drop in the supply of entertainment in general and of classical music in particular due to the original ban and the ensuing problems in recovering the business. Still, the BBC's programme planning went along different lines. During the deliberations about a programme especially designed for the Forces, A.P. Ryan, soon to become Controller for the Home Service, presented the following argument:

> 'If we give them serious music, long plays or peace-time programme talks, they will not listen. We are quite entitled in peace time to say that we will leave the majority audience to the Luxembourgs[285] for long periods, because we know that we have important minorities who wish for better things, and who have every right to be catered for by a body like ourselves which should deal in cultural as well as entertainment values. But our peace-time argument (which we shall never, I trust, surrender) completely breaks down when faced with the conditions prevailing over this new programme. So long as you have a minority for Bach, it is your duty to put on Bach. But when you know perfectly well that your listening curve will go down to zero, then Bach would be sheer intellectual snobbery.'[286]

Although this passage referred to the future Forces' Programme, it is stated in terms general enough to give a hint of the general lines of policy in the wartime BBC. Consequently, when the BBC gave up its one programme policy and introduced the second programme, this was even lighter in its programme choice. Although the overall output of light music now greatly increased, the introduction of the Forces Programme relieved 'the pressure on the very limited programme-time previously

available for musical broadcasts of all types'[287] on the other programmes. The BBC justified its policy with the assumption that '[a] man sitting quietly by his own fireside can concentrate on a Beethoven string quartet or a Shaw play. No soldier, however intelligent, can listen in the same concentrated way in a crowded canteen with people calling for drinks, playing darts and keeping a cross-fire of talk.'[288] What the BBC did not and probably could not consider was that there actually was a demand for classical music – some suggested that it even increased in wartime, especially amongst the working population[289] – and that classical concerts in crowded factory canteens were later on to prove one of CEMA's most spectacular successes – at least in the eyes of those responsible for the programmes.[290]

This BBC's failure to fill the gap in the supply of culture opened by the closing down of theatres and concert halls is the more astonishing considering that it disposed of one of the finest orchestras and of a number of the most celebrated soloists of the country. The BBC Symphony Orchestra had been sent to Bristol in the very first days of the war which made recordings and live performances more difficult, but by no means impossible. Still, the BBC musicians remained out of work for a long time. The Orchestra's chief conductor, Sir Adrian Boult, described this curious situation in Bristol:

> 'We gathered at the office. We hung about. We waited. No orders. All our friends were saying 'Can't you at any rate play us a Beethoven Symphony between the News Bulletins?' But no! (...) so my friend Sandy Macpherson, the organist, who did a grand job, had a sixteen-hour day. The Variety Department ran out of jokes, while the Symphony Orchestra went along for long walks exploring the lovely country round Bristol.'[291]

In this Sandy Macpherson one-man-show, it was the London musical scene that made a start in cultivating the musical wastelands. According to Sir Kenneth Clark's account, Myra Hess, the acclaimed pianist, approached him with the idea of giving a weekly piano recital in the evacuated National Gallery.[292] Greatly enthused by the idea, Clark suggested that it should rather be a series of daily concerts at lunch time open to a wide public through popular prices,[293] an idea that Mollie Panter-Downes acknowledged as the supply of 'a few crumbs of nourishment to the intellectually starved public.'[294] Sir Kenneth Clark, himself a regular visitor of the concerts, confessed 'that, in common with half of the audience, I was in tears. This was what we had all been waiting for – an assertion of eternal values.'[295] Contrary to the government and the BBC, who were still struggling to adapt to the 'bore war' and its

corollaries, members of the artistic élite and the *Times*, observing that the British 'need the rectifying influence of music which can stand for an immutable order of being, unshaken by the shocks of politics'[296], discovered that classical music was one way of fighting the war on the home front and taking up its special challenges at this stage.

These observations by Sir Kenneth Clark and the *Times* were to set the agenda of highbrow entertainment for the duration of the war,[297] although it took the Government until December 1939 to realise that some effort on their part was necessary to cope with two major problems. Firstly, the blackout and the first measures of civil defence put the majority of employees in the entertainment business out of work, and they had to be taken care of to some extent. This problem also confronted the great Symphony Orchestras in the country, who got into even deeper financial trouble than before. The closing and, in the case of the Sadler's Wells Opera House, commandeering of concert halls restricted the opportunities to perform reducing their income.[298]

The second problem was the boredom of the people which was feared to have a disadvantageous impact on morale, especially as it considerably increased in the first weeks and months of the war. In the official history of the Second World War, Richard Titmuss states that '[i]n sifting the many thousands of papers, which passed through the Governmental agencies during the nineteen-twenties and nineteen-thirties, it is difficult to find even a hint that this fear of a collapse in morale was based on much more than instinctive opinion.'[299] Still, these fears were not entirely without foundation, as the documents in the collection of the Imperial War Museum and the findings of Mass Observation show.[300] The government was rather slow in dealing with the problems of boredom and faltering morale in the train of the blackout. In October 1939, the Commissioners of the Defence Regions were agreed that 'public morale has not been affected adversely by the black-out and that on the contrary the lighting restrictions engender a sense of security and a feeling that the authorities are paying attention to the security of the ordinary citizen.'[301] However, the Commissioner for the London Region, Sir Ernest Gowers, put on record 'that with the longer winter evenings morale may be affected'[302] which made some action on the side of the government necessary. The original plans and first attempts of the Government to keep morale steady were touchingly naive. In the Home Publicity Division of the Ministry of Information, Lady Grigg's suggestion that the best thing for the steadying of morale was to have a cup of tea and to talk things over – at least as far as women were concerned – was considered 'very valuable'.[303] Whereas this suggestion was only simply inept, the first actions of the Ministry of Information were sufficient to cause almost universal resentment.[304] In this time of coming to terms with the situation

of allegedly faltering morale and rapid decline of the cultural scene, the government was approached by the Pilgrim Trust with the idea of killing both birds with one stone by employing artists of high standard to entertain the people, which was the humble origin of state sponsorship of the arts in Great Britain.

2. The Setting up of CEMA

The Pilgrim Trust's Secretary, Dr. Thomas Jones, created an often repeated myth about the organisation's origins. He reported that the President of the Board of Education, Lord De La Warr, had called the chairman of the Pilgrim Trust, Lord Macmillan, to ask for a possible grant 'nothing much very much, £5,000 perhaps'[305]. According to this account, the reply of Lord Macmillan was an offer of £25,000. Jones recorded the reaction by Lord De La Warr in the following words:

> 'Lord De la Warr was enthusiastic. He had Venetian visions of a post-war Lord Mayor's Show on the Thames in which the Board of Education led the Arts in Triumph from Whitehall to Greenwich in magnificent barques and gorgeous gondolas; orchestras, madrigal singers, Shakespeare from the Old Vic, ballet from Sadler's Wells, shining canvasses from the Royal Academy, folk dances from village greens – in fact Merrie England! Lord Macmillan's grave judicial calm collapsed suddenly and completely. Supply and Demand kissed ... The Secretary blushed and fell off his stool .'[306]

However, no indication for such a development can be found in the sources.[307] It is more likely that the initiative came from no one else than Jones himself, who contacted the Board of Education for a partnership in the venture. What is correct in Jones's account, however, is the warm welcome by De La Warr with which the proposal met.[308]

The Pilgrim Trust was a private foundation by the American millionaire Edward Harkness. Ivor Brown, responsible for public relations of CEMA in its earliest days and later on CEMA's short term Drama Director, recalled that the 'magnificent thing about Harkness's gift was that it had no "strings". The Trustees were given treatment as good as their name. They were trusted. They had unconditional freedom to assist all causes deemed worthy.'[309] To Thomas Jones, the most influential figure of the Pilgrim Trust, and the Trust's chairman, Lord Macmillan, who coincidentally also served as Minister of Information for a short spell in winter 1939/40, the satisfaction of an 'urgent need for material and moral help to individuals and societies throughout the country' for all forms of entertainment deemed a worthy cause, to which it was decided

to dedicate no less than £25,000.[310] This generous offer – especially when compared to the first grant to the British Council in 1934/1935 of £5,000 – was presented to the Board of Education during the first informal talks under the condition that the Board devised a suitable scheme to direct the money to worthy initiatives and societies.[311]

The Board itself had put out its feelers in mid-December to develop some measures to counter the consequences of the blackout. On 11 December 1939, the Secretary of the Board of Education submitted a paper to De La Warr suggesting that 'the possibility of the Pilgrim Trust or one of the cognate institutions assisting such a project financially should be explored.'[312] Despite their general sympathy, the officials of the Board of Education were aware that such a scheme would probably involve the government to a new and unprecedented extent. The sounding of Treasury officials produced the result that this plan as presented by the Pilgrim Trust was 'one which deserved sympathetic consideration, but (...) the needs which had to be met and the ways of meeting them must be worked out with more precision'.[313] Hence, the Secretary of the Board of Education reported to De La Warr that the

> 'urgency of the need was very strongly stressed (…) and following your telephone instructions I took it on myself to say that you would be satisfied, so far as this aspect was concerned, if some money could be made available from now until the end of March without committing anybody to similar aid in the following year.'[314]

It is obvious from this passage, that neither the austere Treasury nor the more receptive Board of Education was willing to create a precedent of regular government spending on the arts. Any kind of support was seen as a one time *ad hoc* measure designed to remedy the direct results of the blackout in the first war winter.

After the general decision to explore the possibilities of a co-operation between the Board and the Pilgrim Trust, De La Warr set out his programme in a letter to Jones on 13 December 1939:

> 'I feel myself that in days like these of general mental blackout we need more of these activities rather than less. To take music as an example, the response to the National Gallery Concerts shows an almost pathetic hunger for such provision. Speaking for myself, however, I am less concerned with the provision of concerts in the larger towns than with those who are making music and acting plays for themselves, because I realise all that this means to their own morale and, incidentally, to those people in their localities who can be entertained by their efforts. (...) The last thing I want

> to do is to destroy their spontaneity by imposing a Government organisation or by making large grants of public money (which it would be very difficult to get.) (...) What I should like, therefore, is to have a small committee of people who have their confidence whose primary function would be to give them a lead and make them feel that work of this kind is really worthwhile even in these days.'[315]

Two aspects of CEMA's work in the early days of its existence find their roots in this letter by De La Warr. First of all, the focus of the work lay with the amateur side. The idea was to encourage the people to do things themselves instead of being merely passive audience to professional performances. Secondly, if Sir Kenneth Clark's words are taken into consideration that the National Gallery concerts gave the audience moral support by displaying 'eternal values' worth fighting for, concerts and theatre production as emanations of Western civilisation, which was threatened by German barbarity, gave some incentive to take up the challenge posed by the Nazi aggression. Apart from the political and social programme of this first public-private partnership in encouragement of the arts, the document is enlightening in another respect. Although the situation was regarded as an emergency, necessitating governmental assistance to still the 'pathetic hunger for music' in the country, the reservations against such provision were deeply inbred. Like the socialist Orwell, De La Warr thought that government intervention was ultimately detrimental to the enterprising spirit and artistic spontaneity of the people. Also, from the more administrative point of view, the Board of Education did not want to create cravings from private persons by making an exceptional move in an exceptional situation, which could be misunderstood as the taking over of permanent responsibilities. Hence, he insisted on financial caution.[316] The reason for this modest approach, as he explained, was twofold. Firstly, the government was entering an entirely unexplored field without the possibility to profit from earlier experience. Hence, he suggested that 'the best way of getting to grips with the problem is probably to start on a temporary basis. We can then later formulate a more regular and permanent plan in the light of the experience gained.'[317] The other reason, why modesty was necessary at the beginning, was the alleged opposition against this scheme by the Treasury: 'It is not easy to put up a case to the Treasury for contending that these activities should be part of the normal responsibilities of the Board of Education, though I feel myself that by these efforts some of the most effective educational work is being carried out.'[318]

Before such a vision could be put into realisation, however, first steps had to be taken to initiate state aid in the guise of moral and financial support. The very first step was a conference concerning 'Cultural Activities in War-time' with representatives of the Board of Education and the Ministry of Information on 18 December 1939 in the rooms of the Board. Expert guests invited by the Board included Sir Walford Davies, Sir Kenneth Clark and William E. Williams. The choice of the personnel involved made clear that the conception of 'cultural activities' was restricted to élite culture. Sir Walford Davies as Master of the King's Music was connected with classical music, whereas Sir Kenneth Clark as Director of the National Gallery and W.E. Williams as Secretary of the British Institute of Adult Education stood for expertise in the visual arts. The concept of culture shared by all persons involved was similar to the concept as derived from the writings by T.S. Eliot, E.M. Forster, George Orwell, Cyril Connolly and other members of the educated and ruling class in Britain. The guiding star was the National Gallery Concert idea. However, again due to the choice of personnel and the embryonic policy as set out by De La Warr, the far-reaching restriction to this highbrow concept of culture had a certain twist. The most influential members of the first conference who became responsible for the policy of CEMA, Sir Walford Davies, W.E. Williams and Thomas Jones, stood on common educative ground, with a more or less marked stress on adult education. Sir Walford was a very popular broadcaster for the BBC giving talks and lectures on classical music,[319] whereas W.E. Williams conceived art exhibitions for a wide audience touring places which usually were deprived of the enjoyment of fine art. Thomas Jones himself was an avowed devotee to the cause of adult education.[320]

The result of the first conference was recorded in a long memorandum which set out the framework of the early policy of the future Committee for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts. First of all, the conference acknowledged that

> '(a) There is no doubt of the existence of an urgent need for material and moral help to individuals and societies throughout the country.
> (b) This need comes from two sides which must both be considered and should, essentially, be complementary. They were variously described as the "consumer and the producer", the "amateur and professional", and may best be summed up by Lord Macmillan's introduction in which he said that he was speaking on the one hand as Minister of Information, in which capacity he was concerned for the morale of the people, and in the other as Chairman of the Pilgrim Trust through which he

> was concerned for the position of the arts in war-time. The problem, therefore, goes beyond the entertaining of the depressed evacuees. It is one of helping voluntary societies, and possibly in some cases individuals, to give leadership and inspiration to the many people who, it is certain, are only too anxious to take part in worth-while musical and artistic activities.'[321]

This passage contains a lot of information about the inspiration and motivation as well as the aims and hopes of the persons involved. As seen above, the policy aimed at two target groups, the audiences and the performing artists, with a preference for the former over the latter.[322] According to Mary Glasgow, a former school inspector soon to become the secretary of the Committee, this double target group which was to be served complementarily, caused a 'built-in conflict between the claims of art and those of social service', which was never really solved.[323] It is obvious that the aim of the work intended was not primarily to support the arts, but to steady morale during the long dark evenings in winter and to encourage the British population to keep themselves busy and carry on with life as normally as possible under the given circumstances. Government aid to the arts or rather artists only found its veiled expression in the qualified term 'possibly in some cases individuals'.

Under the heading 'Practical steps', which concluded the minutes of this first conference, Lord De La Warr's plan to install a small committee was implemented. The members of this committee were Sir Walford Davies, Sir Kenneth Clark, W.E. Williams and Thomas Jones under the chairmanship of Lord Macmillan. The name of this body was 'Committee for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts'. Furthermore, the Board of Education announced that the Treasury was willing to 'put up £ for £ in such an arrangement'.[324] Although no public money was handed over to CEMA before April 1940, this decision marked a change in governmental attitudes regarding the arts because it deviated from the practice to grant a certain sum to an institution like the Victoria & Albert Museum. Rather, a fixed sum was to be handed over to a third body which was empowered to spend the money on the general purpose of encouraging music and the arts at their own discretion.

The constituting meeting of the Committee took place on 19 December 1939. Apart from the already mentioned four members of the Committee, James Wilkie, the Secretary of the Carnegie UK Trust, which was seen as a possible partner in the programme, the Secretary of the Board of Education, R.S. Wood, and Mary Glasgow attended the meeting. All present were agreed

> 'as to the great importance of giving assistance to voluntary organisations in this field. These organisations have been severely handicapped and in some cases largely crippled by war conditions and assistance, including financial aid, is essential in order to enable them to maintain and, where opportunity occurs, to extend their activities.'[325]

The work was to be divided – according to the cultural consensus – into the three major art forms, classical music, drama and fine art.[326] Moreover, it was decided to co-operate in the field of music with established institutions such as the Rural Music Schools Council, the National Council of Music in Wales, another brainchild of Sir Walford Davies, the National Council of Social Service, the National Federation of Women's Institutes and the English Folk Dance and Song Society.[327]

Whereas the main emphasis was put on co-operation with social service institutions, the Committee decided to take the success of the National Gallery concerts as an inspiration for a second programme. Hence, it was recommended '[i]n order to cover ground fully (...) that there might be a second and concerted approach to the whole problem: that of providing not only encouragement for music makers but actual music of a first-class kind.'[328] To explore the possibilities of this approach it was decided to form a further sub-committee including Sir Kenneth Clark, Reginald Jacques, leader of a London based string orchestra of renown and CEMA's newly appointed honorary director for music, and a secretary, 'who would deal directly with individual artists by making arrangements for them to visit places where conditions seemed suitable or where there were bodies who were anxious to use their services.'[329] For the drama department, a co-operation with the National Council of Social Service was decided and Lawrence du Garde Peach was appointed as the Committee's co-ordinator for amateur drama. Finally, the art section was to focus on the circulation of three kinds of exhibitions, notably exhibitions of original modern work, reproductions of older work and of craftsmanship.[330]

Also some technical details were solved during that meeting. As the Board of Education feared that public expectations would rise too high were it publicly known that the government was one source and the distributor of financial aid to the arts, it was decided that the Pilgrim Trust was to dispense the money on recommendation by the Committee under the chairmanship of Lord Macmillan.[331] This caution was justified as the immediate reactions from the artistic scene proved. Only a few days after the very first meeting and two days after the constituting meeting of CEMA on 19 December 1939, the London Philharmonic Orchestra submitted a petition for a sum of no less than £10,000 to the

Board of Education.[332] Obviously, this particular request was turned down.[333] Still, De La Warr sketched how the great orchestras of the countries might be helped in future:

> 'The scheme which the Committee is at the moment reorganising is one by which some of the big orchestras (...) are to be given guarantee grants to go out and give concerts in some of the more derelict areas. (...) If this scheme works, it should do something to meet both sides of the problem – the needs of the ordinary population during the long dark evenings, and the financial distress of the musicians.' [334]

The aid to the Symphony Orchestras was not to be a simple *quid* without any *pro quo* on the side of the artists. The Symphony Orchestras were employed for CEMA's national aim to raise morale and to fight the consequences of the blackout as well as the cultural blackout. In better times, the London Symphony Orchestra had toured annually and taken up engagements in provincial centres like Bristol, Cardiff, Leicester, Birmingham, Sheffield, Edinburgh or Glasgow.[335] Now, the prospect of visiting 'more derelict areas' promised to bring Symphony Orchestras into smaller places which turned out to be 'rather more isolated industrial places, which are ordinarily difficult of access, and expanding housing estates which are so far without centre or tradition.'[336]

This double task of fighting the cultural blackout as well as giving the arts a wider audience was not a casual by-product of conflicting interests, but the set policy of the Committee and later the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts. In January 1940, the Committee characterised its two aspects of work as 'on the one hand there is the question of salvage – emergency relief, for the voluntary societies during this first winter of the war when so many sources of income have been summarily cancelled'[337] and '[o]n the other hand there are some suggestions of special extensions of work arising out of war-time opportunities: the needs for instance of large new industrial centres attached to war industries, the special needs of people who are bored and depressed by the long dark evenings and of large groups of evacuees.'[338] Both measures, the salvage as well as the so-called 'experimental work' were clearly facilitated by the occurrence of the war. Without the framework of depression caused by the blackout precautions, it is hard to conceive that the government would have been willing to advance money to such an enterprise.

Although the committee was fully aware that not only voluntary societies, but also professional artists were endangered, they felt unable to commit themselves to the problem with a wholesale programme for the

time being.[339] However, the problem of the professional artists seemed pressing enough that the Committee felt it necessary to consider also this field and, if possible, tackle it as well:

> 'There are then two possibilities for the future:
> 1. The Committee might stop here and confine its activities to the immediate relief of voluntary bodies and the immediate provision of some cultural activity for bored sections of the community during the first winter of the war. In this case the Committee's work would be probably come to an end in about six months' time having saved some voluntary societies from ruin and given a certain initial stimulus and encouragement. The Carnegie Trust would then take over its own work in the normal way while the rest would either continue of its own impetus or lapse. (...)
> 2. The Committee might envisage a more comprehensive programme which will go beyond the provision of interim assistance and of restricted experiment towards a national policy for the arts in war-time. Under this scheme not only would the professional orchestras of the country receive official support but the professional theatre as well, to say nothing of individual artists of all kinds. It might be that the machinery created by this Committee could be made use of by the War Office in its work for the troops.'[340]

The vision to start with emergency measures in war-time supplemented by work for the education of new audiences and the spread of culture in hitherto less privileged areas, but then to develop the service into a real cultural policy with support equally to amateurs and professionals, had been already tendered at the very beginning of CEMA's existence. For the time being, though, funds as well as life expectancy of this service remained short. Despite the possibility that CEMA was only a short-term experiment for the winter of 1939/1940 and the ensuing months, a view clearly put forward by the officials of the Board of Education and the Treasury, the members of the Committee lost little time to accompany the formulation of programme and policy by a proceeding institutionalisation. On 19 January 1940, the committee took its concrete form including Lord Macmillan as chairman, Thomas Jones as his deputy, Sir Walford Davies, Sir Kenneth Clark, W.E. Williams, Dr. Reginald Jacques, Lawrence du Garde Peach, and Mary Glasgow as secretary.[341] The general aim of this committee as set out was 'to rescue those cultural activities and interests which are threatened with extinction

by war-time conditions and to secure that the opportunities afforded by those very conditions are not wasted.'[342]

This passage illustrates that the war was not only seen as a purely destructive force but enabled those who were in a position to take up the challenge to experiment in more than one way with the opportunities the war offered them. This aspect of war and the changes brought about by it is covered by Arthur Marwick's first dimension of the impact of total war on society, the disruption/reconstruction dimension, implying a 'desire to rebuild better than before.'[343] For the time being though, it was mainly the salvage work that had to be tackled by *ad hoc* actions employing 'trial and error' as guiding principle or, as Ivor Brown described it: 'in a possibly fumbling, but happy and high-spirited way, we drove ahead. At least we were not guilty of burying the work in a load of planning.'[344]. The quotation above also reveals that the Committee was determined not to let the opportunity slip and to work for the institutionalisation of this aspect of governmental work. In the very first of CEMA's memoranda, the respective persons appointed as responsible for the three fields of music, the arts and theatre, laid down their plans concerning the taking up of the challenge.

2.1. Music

The original work in the field of music was divided into two different kinds of approach according to the division of CEMA's work into the amateur and the professional side. The work on the amateur side included the co-operation with, and assistance to, existing organisations operating in the provision of musical facilities in the country, such as the Rural Musical School Council and the National Council of Music for Wales. Thus the six 'pioneer organisers' of the Rural Musical School Council were taken under the CEMA wing, which decided to pay their salaries and their travelling expenses. Analogously, the National Council of Social Service concert organisers were given guarantees against loss for the provision of concerts. This scheme, assisting organisations by offering guarantees against possible loss, developed to be the usual way of subsidisation.[345]

On the professional end of the work, Dr George Dyson of the Royal College of Music thrashed out a plan covering two different 'experimental schemes.'[346] Although in this part of the work the beneficiaries of the grants were professional musicians, it is noteworthy that both experiments catered for the audiences in the first place and aided the employed orchestras merely as a by-product. The first kind included the already mentioned 'Orchestral Concerts in Industrial Areas.' As the great orchestras of the country such as the London Philharmonic Orchestra, London Symphony Orchestra, and the Hallé had lost most of their

engagements, orchestras as well as individual artists were 'very badly hit by the war.'[347] Dyson suggested helping the orchestras and the audiences at the same time by starting with an experiment of factory concerts in the area in the North of London.[348] London itself was originally left out of the programme because it was understood that despite the present limitations and hindrances there was a functioning or at least recovering cultural scene in the metropolis and other bigger places rendering further assistance unnecessary.[349] The first programme was very limited in scope covering a 'narrow band between 10 and 50 miles from London.'[350] Still, despite a conservative estimate of £100 expenses per concert[351], it is obvious that the funds originally allotted to CEMA would not last very long rendering a life expectancy of some months for CEMA to fulfil its immediate task. This left two possible options: either CEMA could implement the programme as set out by Dyson and then terminate its activities in the hope that further funds would be forthcoming after the exhaustion of the original grant. This, however, was not very likely in the face of De La Warr's announcements of December 1939. Alternatively, CEMA could try to stretch the grant as much as possible by only parsimoniously funding bodies like the London Philharmonic. In order to calculate the actual cost of such a programme and the number of engagements necessary to keep the Symphony Orchestras in existence, CEMA tried to gather information about the number of engagements of the respective orchestras, the source of information being the BBC.[352] For the BBC and the Symphony Orchestras concerned, this kind of help smacked dangerously of state control, rendering the promised financial aid at best a mixed blessing, while the expectable funds were seen as rather poor. The enquiries, thus, did not add to CEMA's popularity with potential partners.[353]

While the technical details of support to Symphony Orchestras were still being worked out, the practical side of the organisation of concerts for the benefit of the population was set afoot. The first exploration of this kind of work was made by Mary Glasgow at Dagenham in January 1940. In her memorandum dating from 12 January 1940, she reported that

> 'there exists in Dagenham a real need for some kind of cultural interest and a centre for activities. (...) Although many amateur societies exist and some of them apparently flourish, what is actually wanted is outside stimulus of a kind which would draw the various parts of the population together and also set a higher standard than most of the activities which are going on at present. (...) Apart from Settlement activities, the amateur societies referred to and the Sports Club of the Ford Works, all of which are

> confined to small and rather specialised circles, there are no social and educational activities and no places of meeting others than public houses and cinemas.'[354]

This passage summarises the social aims of CEMA on the one hand and its cultural mission on the other. The aims were a conglomerate of social welfare by offering cultural opportunities to places hitherto underprivileged in the supply of arts of professional standard, social inclusion, the education of new audiences and the replacement of the cinema and the pub by the concert hall as venues of entertainment. Especially the last aim fits into the British tradition of patronage of the arts in combination with a certain amount of social patronisation of the population and the utilisation of art for general improvement, rather than presenting the arts as intrinsic goods.

Already the first reactions to approaches by CEMA for the organisation of concerts showed that Lord De La Warr's diagnosed 'almost pathetic hunger' for the provision of such acts as the National Gallery concerts existed also outside London and outside the usual circles of concert-goers. This experience of interest in serious entertainment within all classes of the society was shared by the great Symphony Orchestras of the countries, whose concerts and tours usually proved very successful in terms of drawing audiences.[355] Montagu Blatchford's dictum dating from the beginning of the twentieth century that 'workers did not want 'high' art they did not understand: (...) No, they must have art of their own, art that is built upon their lives'[356] proved either outdated – after 17 years of influence by the BBC – or in its comprehensiveness simply wrong.

Although the present scheme seemed to serve the professional side at least as much as the audiences, it is necessary to stress the welfarist and educational idea behind these classical concerts. Sir Walford Davies, though leaving the operational part of the work to Dr. Jacques, the honorary Music Director, set out the policy of the concert scheme and the aims and ends pursued by them in a memorandum in January 1940. Davies insisted that

> 'While the passive enjoyment of good concerts (especially in drab districts) has in itself war-time value to the country; and while incidentally our Concert scheme brings most timely relief to hard-hit professional musicians, this latter value must needs take second place in a national scheme, and I think the Committee should as far as practicable plan that their Concerts should serve the double purpose (a) of giving passive enjoyment, and (b) of kindling amateur music-making in the districts where they take place.'[357]

Davies thought that whereas a normal symphony concert had only a limited impact, a symphony concert 'introduced as the apex of a musical effort in a locality where one of our approved workers had got small orchestras or string bands together at their own practices weeks beforehand, then a single visit, of the London Philharmonic Orchestra for example, might crown one whole season's musical work and stimulate the next.'[358] The financial help to the Symphony Orchestras, in Sir Walford's view, thus was merely a welcome by-product of CEMA's work as educator of the masses. In order to reach the maximum number of people, Davies suggested a certain care with the choice of pieces of music for such concerts. Since allegedly most of the audiences were novices to a concert '[n]o clever abstruse music nor long programmes will be wanted. Nor will cheap effect or showy music serve our aim. The simplest of the so-called 'great music', superbly given, is clearly to-day's vital requirement.'[359] Additionally, the CEMA organisers thought it necessary to trick the potential audience into these concerts. Since allegedly 'highbrow' music was expected to cut no ice with the working classes,[360] thus counteracting the educational aim of building up new audiences for classical music, Dr. Jacques decided to leave the audience in the dark about the programmes and only printed the names of the artists on the concert bills. When later asked about this policy of the 'veil of secrecy',[361] Mary Glasgow reported to the Music Panel of the Board of Education, that 'new audiences should not be frightened at the beginning by hearing what appear to be highbrow titles and difficult names.'[362] This equally populist and patronising touch also applied to the other kind of work that was to be started and that proved a cornerstone of CEMA's work throughout the war, the so-called Lunch-hour Concert.

These concerts were usually given by smaller groups of musicians in factory canteens at lunch time or during the mid-night break.[363] Whereas there was a small charge for admission to the Symphony Orchestra concerts it was agreed that admission to lunch-hour concerts was to be free for the workers.[364] Hence, this kind of work fulfilled all aspects of social welfare: the audience was invited to enjoy a performance of good quality, it was introduced to forms of entertainment hitherto usually preserved for the better off or inhabitants of the metropolis or larger provincial cities, and the entertainment was free. Besides, it would have been difficult to charge a fee for the workers to enter the canteen of their own factory. As will be shown below, both schemes, the lunch-hour concerts and the concerts in industrial areas, were to prove a success and marked CEMA's work in the musical sector in the first phase of its existence until early 1942.

2.2. Drama

Analogously to the music schemes, the other two divisions, fine art and drama, hammered out a provisional policy for the immediate time to come. The Honorary Director for Drama, Lawrence du Garde Peach, focused his interest entirely on amateur groups and suggested an 'approach to societies and individuals (...) on a really national basis. Care must be taken to see that it reaches the largest number of people.'[365] Hence, he suggested the use of all means of publicity open to CEMA and the division of the country into five regions in each of which a drama adviser was to be installed to take care of the amateur groups. One crucial part of the work was to advise the groups in the choice of plays 'which have got real entertainment value and which are suited to the society presenting them. Whilst not being merely frivolous drivel, they should be the kind of plays calculated to take people's mind off the war.'[366] This scheme was adopted in principle by the Committee on 18 January 1940 with the decision to appoint three full time organisers of amateur drama 'to keep in touch with existing amateur societies and give whatever help is possible and desirable through expert advice, loans of equipment and books, and, on occasion, guarantee grants to support individual performances.'[367] Although it was agreed that the 'entire field of professional drama remains untouched'[368], a tentative approach was made to explore the feasibility of a professional company touring the provinces under the CEMA flag. Despite a favourable reception of the idea by the manager of the Westminster Theatre in London in January 1940,[369] professional drama remained outside the provinces of CEMA's work for the moment.

2.3. Art

For fine arts, the approach was very similar to the idea of sending Symphony Orchestra or theatre companies into the provinces. By January 1940, Sir Kenneth Clark and W.E. Williams had planned a series of '12 Exhibitions of Oil Painting, Water Colours, Drawings, i.e. 4 Separate Collections visiting 3 Centres each' and '12 Exhibitions of Design, i.e. 2 separate Collections visiting 6 Centres each.'[370] This exhibition scheme built on the experience and used the infrastructure of the British Institute of Adult Education, which under the guidance of W.E. Williams had a record of successful travelling exhibitions since the mid-thirties.

3. CEMA's policy January – June 1940

At the end of January 1940, the originally modest idea of assisting societies and amateur groups during the times of cultural deprivation caused by the blackout had been subordinated to a more self-confident

rhetoric of national purpose. In the already quoted minutes of the Committee's second meeting the following could be read as the programme of the Committee's work and its self-perception:

> 'The Committee sees in such a programme an opportunity for enlisting and focusing the energies of great numbers of people in this country, who are at present not only cut off from their normal sources of inspiration but are actually disillusioned, without centre and conviction. *We are engaged in a War to defend civilisation, such a policy can only have meaning if the people behind it believe intensely in the value and reality of their own cultural roots.* It might be possible to make the country aware that its traditions are indeed bound up in conceptions of democracy, tolerance and kindliness. These things have little meaning in the abstract but are actual and concrete when expressed through national literature,[371] music and painting; and such consciousness might become the spearhead of national effort, both as a weapon of war and as a means of implementing a constructive plan. (...) *At a time when we are undergoing a profound dislocation of the national life, more than spasmodic efforts are required to keep alive the cultural life of the country and maintain the highest standards. War shows up the importance of things which have hitherto been neglected. It also endangers the pursuits and practices which in peace are the marks of civilisation and the Government must intervene and accept responsibilities which at other times it would leave to voluntary effort.*'[372]

It is important to note that this was a minute of a private initiative, the brainchild of the Pilgrim Trust and its secretary, Thomas Jones. However, with the involvement of Lord Macmillan in his 'second function' as Minister of Information and Lord De La Warr as President of the Board of Education, and the more concrete state influence through the envisaged matching grant from the coffers of the Treasury, the state already had an interest in this enterprise. With this in mind, the minute reveals that a semi-public indirectly criticised the hitherto practised noble reticence in the field of arts sponsorship and the hitherto parsimonious and irregular funds as insufficient by referring to them as at best 'spasmodic efforts'.

Furthermore, it is clearly indicated that it took the war to show this desideratum in government policy which in other times was legitimised in being left in private hands exclusively. This was a more self-confident account of the work and the task to which the Committee submitted itself. The next remarks illustrate the change of policy as envisaged by the Committee – though probably not by officials in the Board of Education, and certainly not by the Treasury – that had been initiated by the setting

up of the Committee: 'Private endeavours can light the candle but it needs the Government to fan the flame. (...) It is of practical importance as a part of war policy to show publicly and unmistakably that this Government does care about the cultural traditions of the country.'[373] Although CEMA remained a private committee for the moment, the state or at least one department of its administration decided to openly contribute to keeping the cultural flag flying.

The first fruits of this governmental-cum-private commitment became visible in very short time. One month after the first performances in industrial areas outside London, Dr. Dyson was able to report that

> 'We are in fact rapidly reaching the conclusion that there is an almost unlimited field for good music under these factory conditions. Many firms have excellent halls and canteens – in some cases fitted with splendid stages – and we are likely to be overwhelmed with applications. (...) There could be no more direct and immediate way of serving the cultural and recreational needs of these workers who today are most hardly pressed.'[374]

Following the advice by Sir Walford Davies given in his memorandum on musical policy in January 1940, the programmes were designed to educate the public as well as to entertain it. A typical programme of a symphony concert included Jean Sibelius's tone poem *Finlandia*, the *William Tell Overture* by Gioacchino Rossini, Ludwig van Beethoven's Fifth Symphony, Edvard Grieg's *Peer Gynt Suite*, the Scherzo from *A Midsummer Night's Dream* by Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, the *Gavotte in E for Strings* by Johann Sebastian Bach, Richard Wagner's *The Ride of the Valkyries* and the anthem-like *Pomp and Circumstance, March No.1* by Edward Elgar.[375] An interesting detail of this programme is that – differing from the practices of the First World War – works by German composers, even by Wagner, were performed instead of being banned from the musical scene. At least implicitly, CEMA made it clear that the war was not against Germany as a principle, but against the present German government. This echoed the tone of Winston Churchill's speeches at the beginning of the war[376] and underlined the self-assumed role as defender of civilisation, including the German contributions to it, although with state-aided theatre, opera and symphony orchestras in Germany it is more than doubtful whether Beethoven and Wagner ever qualified as endangered in their mother country.

The first concerts were staged in Rugby, Watford, Ipswich, Southampton, Grimsby and Gravesend, where the London Philharmonic Orchestra performed, and in Swindon, Reading, Bedford, Northampton, Barking and Luton where the London Symphony Orchestra gave its

début. Surprisingly uncritical when measured against the formulated educational aim of the work, the CEMA observers to these concerts were satisfied to state that the 'programme was not at all educative, in the sense that it included nothing unfamiliar or difficult to appreciate, but it seemed to an outside observer that it gave emotional relief and refreshment to those factory workers as well as the experience, however unconscious, of good singing.'[377]

This scheme of symphony concerts as well as the shorter factory concerts was so successful that Dyson recommended its extension in May 1940. After the original scheme had confined itself to the organisation of no more than ten concerts, five each by the London Philharmonic Orchestra and the London Symphony Orchestra, he proposed 'a national plan for the coming winter' which would have incurred costs amounting to £6,000.[378] Furthermore, he envisaged to increase the number of Factory Concerts to 300-500 concerts given nation-wide instead of regionally restricted to the South of the country. The estimated cost was between £6,000 and 10,000.[379] Although the amounts still seem small, they have to be put into relation to the sums spent on the arts hitherto. With additional costs of between £12,000 and £16,000, this scheme, representing only a part of CEMA's work, was far above and over the grant put at the disposal of the British Council in 1935. With the still prevailing difficulty in matching the financial needs of the orchestras and the limited funds of CEMA it is not surprising that Dyson's Symphony Orchestra scheme was not put into realisation. On the contrary, after the first series the Symphony Orchestra scheme was abolished until 1943.[380] From 1940 to 1943, CEMA only funded smaller ensembles, whereas the Symphony Orchestras were sponsored by the Carnegie Trust despite its otherwise exclusive interest in amateur music and drama groups.[381]

Parallel to the Factory Concert scheme, the idea of sending out musical advisers as requested by Sir Walford Davies in the mentioned programmatic outline of policy,[382] was set afoot. The musical advisers, formerly employed by the Rural Music School Council were taken under the wing of CEMA and renamed 'Music Travellers'. Administratively and officially they now belonged to the Pilgrim Trust. Starting in an area comprising Wiltshire, Rutland, Essex, Somerset, Norfolk, Suffolk and Cambridgeshire,[383] they visited amateur groups and societies of musicians and offered help and assistance in questions of artistic perfection as well as organisation. The music travellers had been Sir Walford Davies's original idea and epitomised the emphasis on adult education which marked the first phase of CEMA's work.

Hence, by March 1940, CEMA's work was on its way and planning over the first few months ahead had begun. However, with these plans for the future of CEMA and its work fresh money had to be procured to

finance the programme. Despite Lord De La Warr's assurance that the Treasury would be willing to put a matching grant at the disposal of CEMA, no money from the coffers of the state had as yet been forthcoming. So far, the Board of Education was involved in the work by seconding the Secretary, Mary Glasgow, and by giving accommodation for the CEMA administration and moral support by Lord De La Warr and his successors. This was changed in March 1940, when the government decided to put the promised matching grant at the disposal of CEMA by way of a supplementary grant-in-aid on the vote of the Board of Education. The financial commitment to the arts was announced by De La Warr's successor at the Board of Education, Herwald Ramsbotham, in the House of Commons on 10 April 1940.[384] Although this ultimately proved to be the definitive end of a policy of neutrality concerning the performing arts and of financial reticence concerning the visual arts, the officials of the Treasury expressed their restrictive concept of state aid to the arts in clear wording:

> 'The grounds on which you persuaded us to this grant-in-aid were that the assistance proposed to these various cultural activities is necessary, particularly in industrial areas, to provide mental relief from the strain and monotony of the war and the black-out. It is necessary to emphasise this because otherwise what we are doing would be inconsistent with the cuts which have been made in grants to other cultural activities, and *because we do not wish to create the impression that we are starting a new service which will be continued in times of peace. The war aspect of what is being done should therefore be brought to the fore in any public presentation of the scheme.*'[385]

Already with the first instalment of public money, the Treasury made it clear that the arts were and remained the 'icing on the cake' and that sponsorship of the arts was practised for reasons based on the specific needs of a country at war. This limited political programme behind the grant found an equivalent limitation in the life expectancy. As one form of contribution to the national war effort it was envisaged to restrict its existence to the duration of the war. Still, the request for more government intervention was now answered by deeds following the words of December 1939. This became even more openly acknowledged by the restructuring of the Committee for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts in April 1940. The Treasury official Eric Hale suggested that the present structure of the Committee would present certain difficulties:

> 'As regards the grantee, it would be possible to make a grant-in-aid to the existing Committee, but as that Committee is a Committee

> of the Pilgrim Trust and we do not want to appear to be making a grant-in-aid to the Trust, we agreed that it would be preferable that the Committee should be reconstituted as a Council which would cease to be a subordinated organ of the Trust.'[386]

On 23 April 1940, the new Council met for its constituting session in the rooms of the Board of Education. The new members of the Council were Lord Macmillan as chairman, Thomas Jones as his deputy, Sir Kenneth Barnes, Thelma Cazalet, MP, the Earl of Crawford and Balcarres, Sir Walford Davies, Miss Margery Fry and James Wilkie of the Carnegie Trust.[387] Ramsbotham read a letter from Neville Chamberlain who expressed his approval of 'this project which is excellent in every way'.[388] Following the ideas of the Treasury as set out by Eric Hale, Macmillan used the occasion to reiterate the point that the Council was not set up as a charitable organisation for the subvention of artistic enterprise in Britain, but put emphasis on 'the emergency nature of the Council's work' which only came into being under war conditions. This, he proceeded, 'was an example of how on rare occasions good may come out of evil, and help be given through the pressure of tragic events to activities which, in addition to their war-time urgency, have permanent peace-time value.'[389]

Although it is tempting to interpret the last sentence of this passage as an attempt by Macmillan to sneak out of the proviso by the Treasury and hence to envisage a bright future of cultural policy in Britain, it is certainly closer to the point to state that the peace time value of this emergency measure was to be found in the preservation of aspects of professional and amateur artistic occupation in wartime which otherwise would have been endangered. This interpretation is sustained by the ensuing remarks by the Accountant General of the Board of Education, who 'again stressed the condition laid down by the Treasury that the grant had been made as a special war-time measure (...) that the grant was a grant-in-aid, i.e. not an annual one, nor was it given for any specific period, but that it was unofficially understood that most of it would have been allocated by the Summer of 1941.'[390] The sum granted amounted to a maximum of £50,000, to be put up as a matching grant for any sum raised from private sources. In this arrangement, the state remained a share-holder of no more than 50 per cent in a business that was to be finished by summer 1941. A renewal or increase of the grant-in-aid was not envisaged and apparently not wished either.[391]

At this juncture it is worthwhile recapitulating the incentives, motives and hopes linked by the politically and artistically responsible. As could be seen, the original idea by the Pilgrim Trust and Lord De La Warr was to fight the blackout and its assumed implications on public morale as well

as to help artists who lost employment through the air raid precautions. For the masterminds of CEMA, Thomas Jones and Sir Walford Davies, the audience and the amateur side of the work had priority, the original idea being to keep the people busy with 'worthwhile entertainment' and at the same time to democratise high culture hitherto reserved for better-off strata of the population. Also the Board of Education, evolving to be the governmental partner of the Council, listed these amongst their aims. Still, if the 'Venetian visions' of Lord De La Warr as reported by Jones can be taken as historically correct, they give a clue that his heart beat rather for the professional side than the mostly educational work intended by Sir Walford and Tom Jones. Finally, the Treasury, from April 1940 on directly involved in the work, made its point of view almost painfully clear. Neither the general idea of encouraging the arts nor the dire straits of professional musicians and actors were apt to extract money from its coffers. The Treasury was solely preoccupied with CEMA as a wartime organisation of limited life expectancy giving remedy to some retrenchments on public entertainment in the first two years of the war with the aim of sustaining public morale and to a certain extent the cultural scene in Britain. The developments of summer of 1940, showed that CEMA had differing plans and planned for a far longer time ahead than provided and wished for by the Treasury.

In the summer of 1940, the time of the Fall of France and the miracle of Dunkirk, CEMA again decided to widen its scope of work. After performances by professional musicians had successfully flanked the work done by the Music Travellers, the Council considered doing the same with drama, where organisers had travelled the country and given aid to amateur groups without professional backing up.[392] According to an Honorary Organiser's report, 400 amateur productions had been staged during the first six months of CEMA's existence supported by its organisers, more than half of them owing their materialisation to the work and money of CEMA.[393] Now, the plan was taken up again to send a professional drama company through the provinces. The company envisaged for this scheme was the Old Vic's for a whole set of reasons: the Old Vic came closest to a national theatre, which still did not exist in Britain at that time. Moreover, it had the necessary experience and equipment and the name to draw large audiences promising to make the tour also a financial success. It was suggested to dedicate £1,200 to such an enterprise lasting twelve weeks.[394] The scheme was quickly put into realisation and the company under the direction of Tyrone Guthrie with star actors like Dame Sybil Thorndike and Lewis Casson toured through Lancashire, temporarily even setting up its headquarters at Burnley. The short term Honorary Director for Professional Drama, Ivor Brown, later reported that the tour visiting 'towns of secondary size in which good

professional drama is rare (...) broke entirely new ground undercharged.'[395] With this experience of success, Brown – here again differing from the Treasury view – drew the conclusion that 'the assistance given by C.E.M.A. to the Professional Theatre has been of considerable importance, not only as an emergency measure for the benefit of the players and audience in war-time conditions, but as a piece of social policy with big future possibilities.'[396] Hence, this kind of work was 'good for the emergency and, better still, as a preparation' because 'such tours serve splendidly to humanise the teaching of drama and literature and to persuade children that plays are not just school-texts but sources of living pleasure, and so to make an eager and intelligent audience for the theatre of to-morrow.'[397]

4. CEMA and the Ministry of Labour and National Service

This long-term vision of CEMA not only clashed with the wishes of the Treasury. CEMA's educational approach also stood in contrast to the ideas of the Ministry of Labour and National Service, which formed an uneasy partnership with CEMA on the operational side. Parallel to CEMA's programme of concerts in factories, the Ministry of Labour had entrusted the Entertainment National Service Association, ENSA, to stage entertainments in canteens of munitions factories.[398] ENSA was a privately organised association of artists, musicians and comedians under the aegis of the theatre producer Basil Dean originally designed to provide entertainment for the troops. In June 1940, Dean had approached the Ministry of Labour and suggested the inauguration of a programme of factory concerts and entertainments thus widening the scope of ENSA's action. While CEMA with its small funds only sent a small number of artists to the factories, ENSA had a long list of artists under contract and covered the ground intensively and extensively where CEMA made no more than occasional appearances. In his memoirs, Basil Dean recorded that CEMA indeed had ploughed the field first, but that in his opinion 'CEMA had neither the staff nor the administrative experience to undertake the far-flung national programme which Bevin[399] contemplated.'[400] Hence, ENSA started a large programme of factory concerts concentrating on munitions factories in co-operation with the Ministry of Labour. Since CEMA's own factory concerts had proved a great success[401] and an extension of the scheme was proposed and agreed to,[402] a closer co-operation between ENSA and CEMA was suggested to combine forces.[403] At the outset, Mary Glasgow assured the Ministry of Labour and National Service on behalf of the members of the Council of their readiness to co-operate with ENSA in any possible way. However, she added that CEMA

> 'might, perhaps, use their energies and resources more profitably in other directions than in the provision of dinner-hour concerts in munitions factories. Anything C.E.M.A. might do in this way must be comparatively limited and they are inclined, therefore, to think that they might well leave munition works concerts to your organisation through E.N.S.A. to see to.'[404]

These mental reservations against co-operation were reciprocated by ENSA. In a rather stiff letter, Basil Dean welcomed any co-operation with CEMA, 'in so far as it is practicable from the point of view of funds available'.[405] This led to a vague arrangement between CEMA and the Ministry of Labour concerning the provision of concerts in factories. The general line of policy of the Ministry of Labour was that ENSA was to monopolise the factory concert scheme, but might co-operate with CEMA under certain circumstances.[406] This, however, ran counter to CEMA's plan to convert its experimental factory concert scheme into a national programme. Hence, Mary Glasgow searched for and found means to counteract the wish of the Ministry of Labour. She encouraged the concert organiser of the National Council of Social Service, John Hollins, to go on with his work of concert organisation under the exclusion of munitions factories, which from now on were anathema to CEMA.[407] Officially, she declared that CEMA would not start anything new in terms of organisation of concerts, but would a) fulfil the obligations agreed to before ENSA entered the field and b) meet all demands made to CEMA either directly or through the channels of ENSA.[408] This, of course, caused irritation within the Ministry of Labour and National Service which came to the conclusion that they did 'not wish to discourage the C.E.M.A. as far as its activities outside the factories are concerned' but tried to deny CEMA the initiative to organise concerts inside the factory.[409] Still, some kind of co-operation between CEMA and ENSA materialised on a small level. The original arrangement was that two trios were to join the ENSA machinery and to judge by the response of the audience whether it was worthwhile to present this kind of entertainment in the hitherto 'art-free' zone of factory canteens. It was the inevitable figure of J.B. Priestley who perfectly summarised the social idea behind such an experiment in his famous radio series Postscripts:

> 'I say this idea of hard work and high jinks is so sound that it should be applied to much more than light entertainments in factory canteens. Just as the hard work can be handed out to more and more people, and we still hear them asking for it, so, too, the high jinks can be higher still. (...) So I say - Let us, by all means, have four young women in green silk playing 'Oh Johnny, Oh

> Johnny', but at the same time, let's have the great symphony orchestras peeling out the noblest music, night after night, not for the fortunate and privileged few, but for all the people who long for such music. Let's have comedians in the canteens, but at the same time let's have productions of great plays in our theatres, so that the people who work may also laugh, and weep, and wonder. We must all have at least a glimpse, while we labour or fight, of those glorious worlds of the imagination from which come fitful gleams to this sad, haunted earth. It may be possible yet, even, while we struggle and endure, and at last batter our way through to victory, to achieve what's long been overdue in this Island, and that is, not only to retain what's best out of an old tradition, but to increase that heritage by raising at last the quality of our life.'[410]

CEMA had put a humanistic approach similar to Priestley's on its banners at this stage of the work. The attitude was partly shared by officials of the Board of Education, but neither by the Treasury nor by the Ministry of Labour. At the beginning, the common purpose of workers' entertainment bridged the gap of policy and the Navy, Airforce, and Army Forces Institute, NAAFI, made an application to the Ministry of Labour 'to have as many C.E.M.A. concerts as they can afford to give us.'[411] This led to further friction with the Treasury whose officials had

> 'always conceived the main object of the C.E.M.A. grant to be to encourage people to do things for themselves. We are not in the least committed to putting down money to ensure that the public shall have entertainment provided for them, nor financing such bodies as Sadler's Wells, or the London Philharmonic, both of whom have actually made applications.'[412]

Almost immediately, friction arose also between CEMA and ENSA, as their respective concepts of entertainment markedly differed and both organisations viewed the other with a considerable amount of distrust and sometimes even contempt. CEMA criticised the low standards of ENSA shows,[413] whereas Basil Dean admitting that 'the average CEMA party was of a higher standard than our average' insisted that 'our parties came to be numbered by the dozen, whereas CEMA provided but few.'[414] Furthermore, his experience had led Dean rightly or wrongly to the conclusion that 'in general we found that comic stories and patter were as much out of place as the ultra-refinement of some of the CEMA artistes.'[415] Although CEMA's cultural standards seemed to be somewhat lowered for the factory concerts organised by ENSA as opposed to the symphony concerts in industrial areas,[416] the differing concepts between

CEMA and ENSA and between CEMA and the Ministry of Labour and National Service as to what kind of fare should be given to the workers rendered the co-operation difficult. While the rift between the Treasury and CEMA concerning the range of activities increased with CEMA's taking professional theatre under their wing, it became obvious in the second half of 1940 and the first half of 1941, that CEMA and the Ministry of Labour were not seeing eye to eye either.

The idea of presenting classical music alongside the ENSA variety shows had proved a great success, and many Regional Organisers and Divisional Welfare Officers of the Ministry of Labour recommended the extension of the programme.[417] Consequently, H.F. Rossetti of the Ministry of Labour contacted CEMA on 8 January 1941 asking for increased co-operation. The CEMA Council took a very favourable view of the idea and promised to do everything in their power to comply with the wish of the Ministry of Labour.[418] In the wording of the reply, though, CEMA put a strong emphasis on the educational aspect of its work,[419] which did not go down very well with the officials of the Ministry of Labour. H.F. Rossetti noted with a certain disgust that

> 'Generally, on the whole issue, I think it is important to note that the 'E' in CEMA does not stand for Entertainment as does the 'E' in ENSA. Their purpose is not to provide entertainment but to foster culture – for the moment I can think of no less objectionable word.'[420]

For the moment, however, the difference of purpose between CEMA and the Ministry of Labour still was of minor importance, because entertainment and education were delivered in the same style, by way of concerts in factories. The difference inflamed at another point, which however is closely linked to CEMA's ambitions as purveyor of 'good music'. Whereas the artists working for ENSA earned the equivalent to a soldier's pay, CEMA artists were paid a normal fee for musicians of high training. Thus, CEMA's offer to increase its share in ENSA shows implied increased costs to Ministry of Labour of about £12,000,[421] which CEMA was unable to cover from its own resources.[422] Despite the divergence of aims, Rossetti noted in a letter to his colleague at the Ministry F.W.H. Smith that

> 'were it not for this [the higher fees for CEMA artists, JW] my proposal would have been in favour of accepting the C.E.M.A. proposals, as it would merely have meant spending on C.E.M.A. concerts money which we otherwise would have spent on E.N.S.A. concerts. In effect, however it means spending a

> considerable amount more; and also to extend the C.E.M.A. concerts would, as indicated in my minute of to-day's date on F.W. 27/65, greatly increase the difficulties which we are facing as a result of these different rates of pay.'[423]

The combination of these two problems finally led to a severance of the co-operation between CEMA and the Ministry of Labour in the field of factory concerts. In March 1941, Rossetti noted that

> '[e]ither they [CEMA, JW] want to give concerts in factories because they think this will help our purpose, i.e. the concerts will entertain the workers & stimulate production (...). Alternatively, they may claim the right to go to war factories, as everywhere else, to do their own job of encouraging music & arts. We certainly are in no position to stop them from doing what they want in this field (though we can make suggestions) and they, by the same token, have no claim whatever to have our or ENSA's help in doing their own special (& quite different) job.'[424]

So, instead of intensifying the co-operation as planned in January, the common work in factories was terminated altogether. As an explanation, Rossetti put down in his notes for a Conference for Factory Concerts in the Ministry of Labour and National Service on 3 March 1941, that

> 'There is increasing evidence (much of it received since the date of our first letter suggesting an increased service) that the result of the arrangements just referred to is that many of the C.E.M.A. concerts are failures. They are being given to workers who don't want them, and who – as one factory manager said – feel they have been cheated of their weekly fun. Another factory manager said that many of his men would appreciate good music but not in their meal-break when they are tired and dirty.'[425]

Of course, this criticism was immediately challenged by CEMA which estimated that eight out of ten CEMA concerts were a success.[426] The favourable reports of CEMA concerts by the Ministry's own Divisional Controllers make Rossetti's statement in its comprehensiveness at least questionable. As a consequence of the criticism, it was decided that ENSA and CEMA should go separate, though not entirely independent ways from now on. The Ministry of Labour tried to limit CEMA's range of activity by requesting that CEMA was not to approach factories themselves but would only organise concerts after a special invitation by the factory management.[427] Mary Glasgow was quick in pointing out the

problems arising from such an arrangement which certainly suited ENSA and the Ministry of Labour:

> 'My Council notes your Ministry's decision that the policy which has been pursued up to now must be reversed, and that you wish C.E.M.A. to arrange these factory concerts independently of E.N.S.A. At the same time, you insist that we are not to approach Factory Managers concerning the provision of Concerts. This seems to us to be an impossibly hard condition, since the initiative is thus left to the agents of the Ministry of Labour, who may or may not be interested in C.E.M.A. work.'[428]

Although still wishing that no competition between CEMA and ENSA should arise and that CEMA 'should not go round to factories pressing their wares upon the owners', Rossetti acknowledged that CEMA had an 'undoubted right to do so'.[429] Hence, he suggested a new *modus operandi*: CEMA was not to approach factories directly, but was asked to submit a list of potential recipients of concerts to the Divisional Welfare Officer who in turn contacted the factories with a special advertising leaflet prepared by CEMA. Factory concerts remained an important part of CEMA's work and were dedicated by far the greatest share of the total amount allocated until 1944. Ironically, the money for factory concerts was earmarked by the Treasury at the special request of the Ministry of Labour for this purpose, which rendered it impossible for CEMA to use it for any other scheme.[430]

Two things become obvious from this chapter of CEMA's co-operation with the Ministry of Labour. First of all, for the Treasury and the Ministry of Labour the idea of funding artists and arts was acceptable only under the provision that it helped to further the national war effort, be it by giving short-term relief to workers in factories or by giving encouragement to private amateur societies to help themselves in the fight against boredom and sinking morale brought about by the war and the blackout. If culture did not fit into this scheme, its funding by the state lost its justification. Secondly, despite the consensus between the Ministry of Labour and the Treasury in this particular case, the government did not have any clear-cut policy as to what purposes were to be pursued by this kind of work. Different departments had different concepts and these also varied according to the needs of the day.

5. CEMA's policy June 1940 – January 1942

In order to show the relationship between CEMA and the government, represented by the Treasury and the Ministry of Labour, it was necessary to go ahead with the story already until March 1941. In the following part

the study will focus again on the day-to-day work of CEMA resuming in summer 1940. Until then, a machinery and routine had been established, the music policy had been hammered out and mostly implemented marked by three fields of action, i.e. factory concerts, the so-called lunch-hour concerts, symphony concerts in industrial areas and the encouragement of amateurs by the Music Travellers. The first exhibitions had been sent through the country in co-operation with the British Institute of Adult Education,[431] and amateur drama had been given material aid and personal encouragement through the drama advisers under the guidance of the Honorary Director for Amateur Drama, Lawrence Du Garde Peach. In late summer 1940, professional drama, following the precedent set by the support for professional orchestras, had been made part of CEMA's repertoire, with the Old Vic's company touring Lancashire and South Wales.[432] Even an opera tour of the Sadler's Wells Opera Company had been organised staging downsized versions of 'Le Nozze di Figaro' and 'La Traviata', in CEMA's own account 'given at popular prices and yet with no slackening of London standards.'[433]

In late summer of 1940, a new challenge was added to the work of CEMA. The beginning of the Battle of Britain reshuffled the social side of CEMA's work. Whereas in the first eight months fighting the boredom and a faltering of morale had been to the fore of CEMA's welfare approach, now an entirely different kind of work commenced which gave a new meaning to the term of 'salvage' or 'emergency' work. Already early in 1940, CEMA had put aside a sum of £1,000 for concerts in shelters and rest centres for people who had lost their homes in the air raids, which had been expected to come much sooner than they actually did.[434]

When the 'Blitz' finally broke out, it was perceived by many as a relief from the tension that the 'Bore' or 'Phoney War' had created. In August 1940, Mollie Panter-Downes noted that

> 'the general feeling seems to be one of relief that "it" has come at last, although there is no doubt in anyone's mind that the raids on the London area so far have been little more than reconnaissances. Still, the first round of the mass offensive in the air is over and the result has certainly been overwhelmingly in Britain's favor. The second round may bring some harder hitting, but the public is confident and cheerful.'[435]

On 23 September 1940, CEMA took up its work in shelters and rest centres and organised in the following five weeks no fewer than 150 visits in shelters and rest centres.[436] Usually, the concerts were given by soloists, vocal or instrumental, who visited the very places in London,[437] which now, after it had been left out from the other programmes, became the

centre of gravity. The experience gathered by ad hoc organised concerts were soon put down in a memorandum stating that

> 'From the experience of the past weeks the following points emerge: -
> (1) Music in shelters is appreciated to a degree which is almost pathetic in its eagerness.
> (2) Success depends very largely on the personality of the musician. The intimate personal appeal of people who are prepared to treat the occasion as a piece of social work, not simply to give a concert and go away again, is more important than anything.
> (3) The programme must include some parts in which the audience may join.
> (4) Although rousing tunes and popular choruses are certainly acceptable, quiet simple music is found to be more effective in holding people's attention, and leaving them in a tranquil state of mind.'[438]

These findings were based on the experience of concerts under very difficult conditions, certainly for the audience, but also sometimes for the artists themselves. A much quoted example for this kind of work and its positive effects on morale was a concert in Lambeth, where during the concert

> 'a large building opposite the shelter where music was going on was destroyed. Casualties were brought across and through the hall, and the unhurt refugees crowded in to join the audience. There were some ten minutes panic, distress and confusion. The singer, who had already been there for an hour, stayed for another three-quarters of an hour and left the people quiet, smiling and humming themselves to sleep.'[439]

This certainly seems a slightly too rosy and almost romantic picture of CEMA concerts. However, with the insoluble problem of quantification, the fact that such an intimate concert afforded a welcome diversion and a certain soothing effect can hardly be doubted. But even under these conditions unfavourable to any aspect of civilisation, CEMA did not forget its mission to educate the people and in the train of community singing[440] and the encouragement of members of the audience to perform themselves[441] some shelters formed their own choral societies. Additionally, so-called lectural recitals were organised. These comprised 'songs with short explanations, notes about the composers and (...) piano

solos'. As the demand for these recitals was increasing, the CEMA Headquarters were satisfied that whereas they had 'started Rest Centre and Shelter concerts as a purely emergency measure, the result is having a far-reaching educational effect.'[442]

Although the concerts usually created an atmosphere which made the situation in the shelters and rest centres more bearable and at times even 'very cheerful',[443] not to mention the seminal educational aspects of the work, it met with some scepticism from the Ministry of Health, which was responsible for the shelters and rest centres. In an exchange of letters between R.S. Wood of the Board of Education and Sir George Crystal of the Ministry of Health, the latter made his point that whereas concerts in rest centres were desirable, entertainment in public shelters was intolerable because it added further attraction to the public underground shelters which already were, much to the disapproval of the Ministry, more popular than private surface shelters.[444] Thus, Wood gave out the order that CEMA was welcome to stage concerts in rest centres, but not in shelters.[445] This was no real confinement to the work of CEMA which had noted before that '[t]he general opinion is that Music in Rest Centres is an even more valuable side of the work than music in Shelters. It is felt that these people who have lost everything are in even greater need of comfort and occupation than the people in the Shelters.'[446] That the concerts were more needed in rest centres than in the shelters was quite obvious. The rest centres usually were poorly if at all equipped and designed to give housing to bombed out people. Moreover, differing from official expectations, people finding a roof over their head in the rest centres after their own home had been destroyed tended to stay a couple of days or even weeks before rehousing was successful.[447] In this atmosphere of personal catastrophe and deprivation, CEMA gave mental relief, at least for a short time.

Although the so-called social work was in the fore and quickly regarded as CEMA's 'finest piece of work',[448] the professional side of the work had won ground with the employment of the Old Vic ensemble in late summer 1940. Initially, the co-operation proved to be very lucky for both sides. After the tours through Lancashire and Wales, i.e. regions where theatre performances were a rare pleasure, Ivor Brown diagnosed

> 'a tremendous appetite for this kind of visit of really first-rate drama among the people and I am more than ever convinced that building a National Theatre in London is a much less valuable idea than keeping a National Theatre Company in being where the Nation can see and hear it, which is really what C.E.M.A. is beginning to do now with the 'Old Vic's' aid.'[449]

Two problems arose from this departure in CEMA's work. So far, CEMA had followed the double aim of fighting the effects of the war and educating new audiences. Although these aims clashed at times, they belonged to the same side of the work, which has been referred to as the social aim. Taken together, the entertainment of evacuees, employees in factory, war related or other, and the policy of adult education through the Music Travellers and Drama Advisers, formed the so-called welfare or social approach, which characterised the first phase of CEMA's existence. With the funding of theatre productions of high standard such as the Old Vic's, CEMA added a new aspect to its work. Whereas the welfare approach sought to spread culture, this approach, from now on termed the standard approach, aimed at the raising of artistic standards. For the time being, the standard side had to subordinate to the welfare aspects of the work. Still, as will be shown below, with the extension of CEMA's work this policy of 'raise and spread' eventually led to increasing clashes of both aspects due to the limitation of CEMA's finances.

The second, rather operational problem, which arose with the encouragement of professional drama, was based in the fact that CEMA began with funding the Old Vic exclusively. Ivor Brown admitted that 'by putting most of its eggs into one basket, C.E.M.A. exposes itself to the criticism and even the ill-will of other basket-owners.'[450] Still, with the standard as opposed to the social aim in mind, the CEMA Council felt bound to keep standards high, and the artistic standard of the Old Vic was challenged only by very few other companies. All companies which applied for co-operation with CEMA were critically auditioned and not all companies proved good enough, as in the case of the Osiris Players: 'It would be disastrous to allow the Osiris players to carry the letter C.E.M.A. on their programmes and so claim some kinship with our best professional companies. Their standards are not ours.'[451]

To live up to the educational aim and to promote the Council's work, Drama Director Ivor Brown went on a speaking tour through the country in October 1941 and summed up his experiences in a report coming to the findings that:

> 'An important point urged was this: if C.E.M.A. is a forward-looking body and not merely concerned with emergency war-work, then it must appeal to the citizens of to-morrow in their most formative period, say 14-18, either by establishing touch with schools or collaborating with the Youth Movement. (...) This desire for more educational work was far more in evidence than distrust (on the artistic side) of a State connection. Only occasionally did anyone regret C.E.M.A.'s attachment to the Board. (...) C.E.M.A.'s work is undoubtedly popular and the scope

> for it is well-nigh unlimited (...) There is real and general fear of it all ending with the war.'[452]

To interpret this as a fundamental change of attitudes concerning the relationship of the state to the arts certainly is exaggerated. It is rather likely that the audience of these lectures by Ivor Brown were already in favour of a more active cultural policy by the state. Still, it shows that the principle of state aided art was not anathema anymore, at least with potential audiences.

Another interesting detail of this quotation is Ivor Brown's conviction that CEMA was a forward looking concern which conveniently met with the reported fear of the audience – another indicator that the people attending were not exactly unbiased – that a body like CEMA was only justified in its existence for the duration of the war, a view that was shared by the Treasury, the Board of Education and even by Lord Macmillan, the CEMA chairman.[453] That CEMA had been successful and that the Board of Education had been acknowledged for their effort and interest in the work of CEMA, was also felt by officials in the Board of Education, who saw a need to keep CEMA alive and not to let the work lapse after the original grant was exhausted. R.S. Wood stated that:

> 'As things stand, after June next, if the present rate of expenditure is maintained, there will be no more money. (...) C.E.M.A.'s activities have secured widespread approbation, and the Government has been given a great deal of credit for the attention it has paid to the preservation and spread of good music and the arts in war-time. I am clear that the Government cannot afford simply to let C.E.M.A. and its work fade out.
>
> If the work is to continue after June next – and on this I really think there can be no doubt – it would be convenient and desirable to bring the C.E.M.A. financial year into relation with the Government financial year for the purpose of the Estimates.'[454]

Already after one year of existence, CEMA had effected what the government represented by Macmillan and De La Warr had anxiously tried to avoid. CEMA was not regarded as purely a wartime body with a social aim of boosting morale and fighting boredom, but was on the way to establishing itself as a social service beyond the emergency situation created by the war. By June 1941, the first grant equally put up by the Pilgrim Trust and the Treasury on the vote of the Board of Education was exhausted and CEMA had to apply for new resources.[455] After the Treasury had insisted that the original grant of £50,000 matching any £50,000 that were procured from private resources was a grant-in-aid and

not automatically to be renewed, CEMA now sought to change the basis and applied for an annual government grant.[456] The grounds for such an application were seen in the immediate success on basically all fields of activity. The popularity and the success of CEMA theatre productions, concerts and art exhibitions had led to an increasing demand. In order to live up to the aim of setting and keeping up high artistic standards, more money was needed to meet this demand. However, as the application pointed out, CEMA was not a barrel without bottom if high standards were to be preserved. According to the application

> 'expert advisers in Music, Art and Theatre all say that it is impossible to meet the demand if the standard they have set for CEMA productions is not to be lowered. There are not enough first-class musicians, actors or pictures available. There is therefore a definite limit to the money that can be spent.'[457]

Still, the application implied an increase of the original grant of £50,000 to £85,000 for the financial year 1942/43 and the cancellation of the arrangement of putting up only a matching grant to all generated private funds. A fixed arrangement of annual grants did not materialise before the end of the war, but the principle of matching grants was dropped when the Pilgrim Trust withdrew its commitment in early 1942.

The withdrawal of the Pilgrim Trust was decided upon in July 1941, after the Pilgrim Trust's original grant was of £25,000 was repeated in two instalments, amounting to a total of £50,000. In his memoirs, Thomas Jones stated that the reason for the withdrawal from his brainchild was that it was 'unusual for the P.T. [sic] to become involved in administering grants and this has been an exception.'[458] This decision by the Pilgrim Trust inspired the Board of Education, which now became CEMA's sole sponsor, and CEMA itself to think about overhauling CEMA's organisation and policy. The process of re-thinking of CEMA's policy began in early autumn 1941. Prof. Benjamin Ifor Evans of the British Council, who was to play a major role in the work of CEMA as a member of the Council and co-authored the official history of CEMA, wrote to the freshly knighted Sir Robert Wood on 19 September 1941 that

> 'the work has reached a decisive stage in its development. It must either be converted into a regular institution on a national basis, or it must fall back from the stage which it has already reached. (...)
> I do feel that C.E.M.A. has been largely a creation of the Board of Education, and that the Board should take credit for it and should further regard the work that it is doing as a natural and normal aspect of the educational work of the country. If that is proper

> policy, then I think it would be fatal to hand over the major part of this work to other agencies, such as the National Council for Social Service, Rural Community Schools and the like. I can see C.E.M.A., as a body, possibly incorporated under Charter, working directly as an agency of the Board of Education, and maintained by a grant under that vote. In short, its analogy, constitutionally at least, might be close with that of the British Council, which has a similar relationship to the Foreign Office.'[459]

Furthermore, if CEMA's work was allowed to lapse, the Board of Education would lose 'one of the most powerful weapons by which the work of the Board can be brought home to large sections of the community.'[460] Wood answered very evasively but assured Evans that there was no 'great gulf'[461] between them. Wood transmitted his own ideas for future changes on 27 September 1941 to Thomas Jones. In the first part of this letter, he concentrated on the organisational side:

> 'While this is a war emergency organisation and the Treasury grant for its work only an emergency grant, I believe that some provision of this sort has come to stay as a permanent feature of our public educational service and that the Exchequer will, in fact, have to continue to support this sort of effort to bring the best to the most in Music, Drama and Art. While I should hope that E.N.S.A.'s activities are transient, C.E.M.A. has a very different mission to fulfil and a very different value, and its continuance in some form or other will, I think, be looked for and, indeed, demanded.[462]

If, he continued, the Chancellor of the Exchequer took the view that arts sponsorship was to be perpetuated beyond the end of the war, CEMA, as a body outside a governmental department, but closely related to the Board of Education, would be the natural channel for the distribution of public money.[463] For the Board of Education, such a continuation of the work implied necessary changes of policy. The duality of raising standards and catering for amateurs and audiences, which had been a trademark of CEMA in the early days, 'does not matter very much under present conditions – it may, indeed, be the right thing to do.'[464] Thus, Wood suggested the gradual handing-over of the amateur work to the Carnegie Trust and a concentration on the standard side.[465] In Wood's eyes, the amateur side of the work, which had been Jones's priority, was merely a necessity for the time being, but as soon as war conditions allowed for it, this part of the work faced its entire abolition, after it had gradually been eroded by the inclusion of professional drama and Symphony Orchestras. Jones replied by accepting Wood's ideas in

general, but stated that 'our moving away from the amateur field is against the original understanding with the Treasury who all along have stressed "making" by the people themselves.'[466]

Additionally to the ideas of the Board, the active Secretary of CEMA, Mary Glasgow, presented a list of suggestions as to a re-definition of policy and an organisational reconstitution of the Council to the Board of Education. In a first step, she recommended a change in personnel beginning with the replacement of Macmillan, whom she described as 'in any case quite useless', by Thomas Jones and the appointment of 'some distinguished name' to the Council. [467] Her own suggestion was John Maynard Keynes, who indeed was to become involved with CEMA in due course. Finally, she suggested the widening of the administrative organisation and the installation of specialist committees to deal with music, fine art, and drama.[468] These suggestions went along the general lines of policy set out in December 1939 by Lord De La Warr, to start at once and then to find an internal organisation by trial and error. Finally, she recommended ceasing CEMA's activities in the field of amateur drama, one of the original fields of work.[469]

Even before the reshuffle of personnel at the top of the organisation took place in April 1942, some of the organisational changes sketched in Wood's letter to Jones and in Mary Glasgow's memorandum were implemented. When the director for amateur drama, du Garde Peach, reported to the Council in September 1941 that one of the Drama Advisers had resigned, the opportunity to wind up this entire service was immediately grasped. It was suggested in the Council that this part of the work should be handed over to other bodies specialising in amateur work, like the Carnegie Trust or the Rural Community Council.[470] During the twelfth meeting of the Council on 3 December 1941, amateur drama as integral part of CEMA's work came to an end thus marking the beginning of increased emphasis on the standard side.

6. Conclusion

The wartime experience showed that there was an increased demand for 'serious' music and so-called highbrow entertainments in all strata of the society, which the war disclosed and probably also brought about. After the first weeks of the war had played havoc with the arts scene in Britain, private initiatives started ventures like the National Gallery concerts in order to recover the cultural terrain lost through the black-out prescriptions and the closing down of artistic venues. This, together with the fear of faltering morale in the 'Bore War', inspired the government, instigated by the Pilgrim Trust, to take a share in this enterprise by setting up the Committee, later Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts. The foundation of CEMA in December 1939 marked the beginning

of institutionalised state sponsorship of the arts in Britain and the end of neutrality of the state in the realm of the arts. The analysis of CEMA's humble beginnings shows that in all government documents the disruptions of the war were clearly identified as the sole cause for the government to take this step on behalf of the population in general and of artists in particular. CEMA's concept of culture in this early stage of cultural policy, comprised – in accordance with the cultural consensus as shown in the third chapter – aspects of highbrow culture exclusively. This narrow humanistic approach to culture was owed to the choice of personnel of the CEMA Council who were co-opted by the Pilgrim Trust and the Board of Education according to the cultural agenda.

Already at the early stage of the work it became obvious that CEMA and the three government departments involved, the Board of Education, the Treasury and the Ministry of Labour, pursued different aims with CEMA's work. Originally, CEMA aimed at the spreading of knowledge and understanding of the arts, whereas the Treasury and the Ministry of Labour saw CEMA's existence only justified through its contribution to the national war effort. The Board of Education, emerging as the government department responsible for CEMA, took by and large a middle position. Although it was said above that the establishment of CEMA marked the beginning of a more active role by the central government in Britain in the sphere of the arts, the differences between the governmental departments show that no clear cut policy was developed in the cabinet. Rather, cultural policy was a by-product of the government's response to the emergency situation of the war.

Finally, CEMA, following a method of trial and error, was conceived as a short term experiment with very limited grants and a limited life expectancy. Despite the unwillingness of the Treasury and the President of the Board of Education to create a precedent and to raise expectations for the future, CEMA quickly established itself as a governmental service which the government was given public credit for. Hence, the government was indirectly put under public pressure to continue this service at least for the duration of the war.

A lot of pioneering work had been done to create a demand, which had not previously existed, for professional music in villages centres. Owing to the impossibility in a village of finding a large enough audience for the fee of even one professional musician, the C.E.M.A. concerts seemed the gift of a fairy godmother.[471]

So when Sir Kingsley Wood told us that for staving
Off defeat, there was no saving grace like saving,
We took him at his word, and, strictly loyal,
For England's honour, saved the Theatre Royal.[472]

VI. JOHN MAYNARD KEYNES AND THE 'STANDARD APPROACH': CEMA'S POLICY FROM JANUARY 1942 TO SEPTEMBER 1944

As described in the previous chapter, the withdrawal of the Pilgrim Trust and CEMA's coming under the aegis of the Board of Education exclusively offered the opportunity to rethink and to remodel CEMA's outlook and range of activities. The starting point for the overhaul was the appointment of new council members including the council's chairman. Mary Glasgow's advice to secure the services of Thomas Jones as chairman was not heeded by the officials of the Board of Education, but it was John Maynard Keynes, whom she recommended as a general member, who was approached by the President of the Board of Education, R.A. Butler, for the position of chairman of the Council. Usually, the changes that set in in 1942 are identified with the person of Keynes.[473] However, the choice of Keynes had not been made without the idea of revising the work and scope of activities by the Board of Education.

1. John Maynard Keynes

John Maynard Keynes was an almost natural choice for the position. As a Cambridge don and economic adviser to the Treasury, he stood in high public esteem and had the necessary experience in matters of economy to meet the financial requirements of the position. He was renowned for his interest in artistic matters – apart from his attachment to the Bloomsbury Group of artists he was married to the famous ballerina Lydia Lopokova – and had a reputation as a generous private patron of the arts.

In order to win Keynes for the position, Butler drew a bright picture of the task ahead and CEMA's future role. In the first of his letters to Keynes, Butler suggested that CEMA's work so far 'has met a real need and has found a quite reasonable response, and while the Council's work will still remain emergency war work it does, I think, point the way to something that might occupy a more permanent place in our social organisation.'[474] Keynes did not immediately jump at the opportunity offered, but gave expression to his doubts about the work load implied.[475] More important, however, was the difference of his concept of state sponsorship of the arts and the welfarist principles which had hitherto ruled within CEMA as determined by Thomas Jones and Sir Walford Davies.[476] Keynes's own concept, or a nucleus of a concept was recorded in a minute of an interview between Keynes and R.A. Butler on 7 January 1942: 'He [Keynes, JW] is keen that C.E.M.A. should concentrate on standard and not on mere dissipation of any sort of music and art. He did not mean to say that the efforts hitherto made were not useful, but he objected to C.E.M.A. being a welfare organisation.'[477] This apparently met with the approval of Butler and coincided with Wood's plans for CEMA as explained in his letter to Jones of September 1941. In the same vein, Wood wrote to Benjamin Ifor Evans on 28 January 1942 that 'I may tell you privately that I had exactly the same reservations 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 standards generally.'[478] As in 1939, when the original organisation including its welfarist character was agreed upon between the then President of the Board of Education, Lord De La Warr, and Lord Macmillan for the Pilgrim Trust, 'supply and demand kissed'. Whereas John Maynard Keynes surmised that 'Clearly it is after the war that the big opportunities will come',[479] Butler was sure that 'the future of something rather important depends on your [i.e. Keynes's, JW] influence and I could wish for no better.'[480]

Both Butler and Keynes agreed that CEMA, although for the time being aspects of emergency work were to be retained, was not designed merely to cater for these needs, but that the social work so far only had been the beginning of 'something rather important', which in a transformed way should be carried over into peace times. On 19 January 1942, Butler finally passed the information on to the former chairman, Lord Macmillan, that Keynes would take over the chairmanship of CEMA.[481] This decision by the Board was greeted with warm approval by the founding fathers of CEMA and architects of its early policy. Jones assured Keynes that CEMA 'does need someone who is in London oftener than I am for though a healthy & promising plant it is still somewhat tender & could easily be "blown upon" in the House. With you

as Head Gardener it should grow strong & flourish in all three branches.'[482] In his polite reply, Keynes congratulated Jones on his work and his organisational skills in setting up CEMA and described his own concept of relation between public and private commitment:

> 'I had made sufficient enquiries to convince myself that the affair was so well and efficiently run and moving forward on its own wheels that there was little, if nothing, I should feel moved to criticise or seek to change. You have done a splendid job in getting the organisation going. 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.*'[483]

The last argument reminds the reader of the argument employed by Ellis Griffith in the debate about the National Theatre in 1913, in which he suggested that money by the state would not be forthcoming to enable a project to start off.

Keynes took office on 1 April 1942 and was welcomed in his position, although he was more respected than loved. In the last session of the Council, over which Jones had presided as acting chairman in lieu of Macmillan, Sir Kenneth Barnes 'expressed the Council's sorrow at the last appearance in the Chair of Dr. Jones, the Acting Chairman. He said that C.E.M.A. owed its beginnings and its whole character to Dr. Jones and that, although the Council would welcome Mr. Keynes as Chairman, they would never cease to regret Dr. Jones's absence.'[484] As can be seen from the memoirs of the persons involved, this precisely described the relationship between the new chairman and his Council. In a very distanced tone, Ivor Brown commented on Keynes's character that if

> 'we helped to work him to death, the blame was not ours. He did not take things up in a casual way, despite his primary obligation to the Treasury he went into every detail of the work and brought to it both his mastery of finance and a keen, exacting taste in all the arts. He was a severe, enchanting master with a personality compounded of silk and steel.'[485]

Although Keynes assured Jones that he was happy with the structure of CEMA as it was when he assumed the chairmanship, he immediately began to change the outlook according to his ideas summarily expressed in the letters to R.A. Butler. Mary Glasgow recalled that Keynes

> 'began at once asking awkward questions with alarming courtesy. He wanted to know why the council was spending so much money on amateur effort. Why was it missing this obvious opportunity to support artistic ventures of standing? Could it not see how many important things were waiting to be done? It was standards that mattered, and the preservation of serious professional enterprise, not obscure concerts in village halls.'[486]

One project which illustrates Keynes's ambitions and ideas for a cultural life in Britain was the reconstruction of the old Crystal Palace of the Great Exhibition of 1851. The first contact had been established between the general manager of the Crystal Palace, Sir Henry Buckland, and CEMA in December 1942, in which Keynes had registered his interest in the Palace 'as a centre for cultural activities of different kinds after the war'.[487] CEMA's commitment was restricted to a share in the prizes for architectural designs for the site,[488] but Keynes's plans for the Palace went further. After presenting the submitted proposals to his colleagues at CEMA,[489] he developed his plans in a letter to Ernest Barker in May 1943:

> 'I have a grand scheme – and there is a chance of something coming of it – to rebuild the Crystal Palace as a vast place of entertainment, where the British citizen of the future can spend a whole day, if he chooses, attending a cup-tie, swimming in the bathing pools, lunching at the British Restaurants, hearing the Messiah or Grand Opera, attending a vast spectacle and winding up with the fire-works. There is opportunity in that fine site for everything.'[490]

'Everything' in Keynes's view, comprising sport, food and classical music, seemed to mirror T.S. Eliot's concept of culture, as set out in his *Notes towards a definition of culture*.[491] In general, Keynes harboured a more élitist approach to culture than Jones and his friends and protégés, and accordingly set about to reconstruct CEMA. The Arnoldian phase with its reformist and educative approach – which already was in the process of gradual erosion – was to give way to a phase of cultural policy marked by fostering of *l'art pour l'art* and for the purpose of national prestige.

2. The changes in organisation

As early as February 1942, Keynes got in contact with Mary Glasgow and discussed matters of finance, especially the intricacies of the guarantee system, which hitherto had prevailed. In the case of the Old Vic, the

guarantees were rather large and long-termed which gave Keynes incentive to rethink this kind of financial aid:

> 'The only matter on which I am still unhappy is the locking up of so large a figure for the Old Vic. The dilemma seems to me to be that, if they are not going to lose all this money, it is a pity to lock it away from other deserving applicants. If, on the other hand, they are going to lose it, surely the programme ought to be reconsidered and the advisability of continuing it unchanged for so long a period before so much money has gone west. Is there really any necessity for a commitment for a year beforehand? Would not six months at half the figure be just as good?'[492]

Financial stringency, hence, was one of the most important features that Keynes brought with him when he took over CEMA. He felt it 'wrong in principle' to pay a guarantee grant to the Old Vic without any control over the actual requirements, a practice which he regarded as a subvention as opposed to a guarantee grant.[493] He also suspected the Old Vic to charge grants for equipment over and over again with the result that 'in the course of time, we may have purchased the same physical objects from them an indefinite number of times over.'[494] Whilst he turned to professionalism in the sponsored arts themselves, he immediately turned to professionalise the financial policy and measures of control of the sponsoring body. The pressure to spend public money on a cause in which it was easy to 'fritter public money away' without corresponding control and countable results led him to an inquisitiveness about the Old Vic which, as he explained to Mary Glasgow,

> 'is not due to any distrust, but to a feeling that we must have a system of financial control which would be applicable in other cases also. I believe it would be extremely dangerous to have the rather indefinite arrangements which exist with the Old Vic with nine-tenths of the people I have come across in the theatrical world. Even with the Old Vic we want, I think, to know exactly what the position is. You have to remember that under the present financial arrangement, which I do not like, they have no incentive to economy whatever, and, having once got their guarantee, can charge upon us whatever it comes to. We have little or no financial control, and they have little or no incentive. Not a safe arrangement as a general pattern.'[495]

Hence, to make this arrangement a safe one, conditions for the association of theatre companies with CEMA were drawn up. Generally,

the co-operating companies had to 'have before them the same ideals of service to the community', the wish to 'spread the knowledge and appreciation of all that is best in the theatre, and thus to bring into being permanent, educated audiences all over the country.'[496] The companies had to be 'properly constituted non-profit-making companies' or 'bodies functioning under charitable trusts'.[497] In return for the grants, the companies were obliged to pass on information about the productions in association with CEMA at the earliest possible moment, to admit the appointment of an assessor by the Council to the companies' boards of directors[498] and to forward accounts and programmes 'and other such particulars as may, from time to time, be required by the Council.'[499] The most important condition in the co-operation was that 'surplus funds accruing to a company (not working under a charitable trust) as a result of work carried out in association with C.E.M.A. shall be applied only to such purposes and for such objects as the Council may from time to time in writing consent.'[500] In other words, all profits derived from theatrical productions, were to be put under CEMA's control who decided as to how to reinvest it. Similar arrangements were made in due course for the co-operation between orchestras and CEMA.[501] To a certain degree, the fears that state patronage entailed a measure of control were justified with these conditions which gave CEMA a say in the further proceedings and financial transactions of the companies involved.

Although the educational aspect is again stressed in these conditions, there is a marked difference between the concepts of education as held by Thomas Jones and by Keynes. Whereas ideally Jones's concept implied bringing Shakespeare to the people by making them stage their own productions, Keynes's ideal of education was simply to offer high-standard theatre to existing audiences. In this, Keynes and his fellow councillor Sir Kenneth Clark completely agreed. In a lecture titled *Art and Democracy*, Clark described his idea of art education in the following way:

> 'We must not try to persuade people that art is a ripe plum ready to drop into their mouths, but that art offers such rewards as justify strenuous, individual efforts. No doubt it will be necessary to tempt people with scraps, but they must not be spoon fed or they will never learn to feed themselves and soon will be too lazy even to open their mouths. It goes without saying that they must not have art stuffed down their throats. *This was a common practice in the last century, arising partly out of the middle classes' genuine desire for self-improvement, and partly out of the Germanic influence of the Prince Consort. It was a mistaken practice, and apt to lead, in England above all, to repugnance and rebellion*; but perhaps it was less disastrous than the modern practice of asking people what they like.'[502]

Education, therefore, remained an important aim, but the method of teaching people to appreciate highbrow culture as offered by CEMA changed in the course of the war and through the change from Jones to Keynes. Still, Keynes did not single-handedly change the outlook of his organisation, but was carefully chosen by the Board to meet Butler's political ideas and plans with CEMA. Moreover, his ideas were not fresh within CEMA, but had so far been restrained by the dominance of Jones. Apart from Clark, it was Benjamin Ifor Evans and Ivor Brown,[503] who showed a preference for the standard side and the turning away from active the welfarist idea of teaching culture.

Not only the administration of co-operation with cultural bodies, also CEMA's internal organisation was put on a new basis. Even before Keynes took over the chairmanship, CEMA had begun to install offices in all Civil Defence Regions. This process began in December 1941, when the idea was first discussed with representatives of the Treasury, who approved of the plan 'if suitable people could be found'.[504] It took until May 1944 to complete the number of Regional Offices with the opening of the Welsh Office.[505] The purpose of the regional offices was to relieve the central administration in London from the task of organising factory concerts and theatre tours, in which they co-operated with the Music Travellers, who epitomised the welfare approach of CEMA. The offices were usually staffed with no more than three employees, the regional officer, his or her assistant and a secretary.

A more rigid administration was also introduced in the central office in London. The Honorary Directors, Dr. Reginald Jacques for Music, Philip James for Art, and Ivor Brown[506] for Drama, became fully salaried officers in the headquarters of CEMA.[507] In order to relieve the Council, which had no central executive organ,[508] from the day-to-day business, Keynes introduced three panels, one for each art form, of which Sir Kenneth Clark became vice-chairman for art, Sir Stanley Marchant for music, and Ivor Brown for drama,[509] whereas at least nominally Keynes reserved the chairmanship of the panels for himself. The members of the panels were appointed by the President of the Board of Education, though Keynes tried to keep control over the selection of members. In spring 1943, he rejected Butler's suggestion to invite the President of the Royal Academy, Sir Edwin Lutyens, to the panel, by less than courteously asking whether it was 'wise to start so early in our life on the vicious practice of filling up with respectable deadheads?'[510] In a second case, Keynes expressed his disapproval of Butler's appointment of the painter W.T. Monnington as member of the Art Panel.[511] In this rather negligible case of a nomination for a panel, the difference between a Ministry of Fine Art and the autonomous CEMA becomes obvious. Butler felt it

necessary to apologise for the by-passing of Keynes 'because of the importance of this particular case, but also because I have never interfered in the affairs of your Council and desire not to do so.'[512] Although ultimately responsible to Parliament, the President of the Board of Education refrained from any material interference into the work of CEMA, even from the appointment of members of the panels. The only, though important and influential, exception to this rule was the decision to appoint John Maynard Keynes as new chairman, which indubitably prejudiced a decision on profile and policy of CEMA in the nearer future.

The Panels were intended to carry out the operational end of the work, assisting the respective directors for art, music and drama in their executive functions as consultative bodies, whereas the strategic decisions remained with the Council. Problems of various kinds arose almost instantaneously. With the exception of the Art Panel which regularly met and constructively worked, the panels remained ineffective or, in the case of Drama, hardly ever met. In autumn 1944, Herbert Farjeon, playwright and member of the Drama Panel, noted that

> 'of the few members now constituting the Panel, one has never attended any of the meetings, and the other three have so many other engagements that it has not been possible to carry out the plan of meeting once a month, the desirability of which was agreed upon in a motion passed by the Panel some time back. Activities have, in fact, so lapsed that I gather last month no effort was made to call a meeting at all. (...) if this goes on, it seems likely that the Panel will soon be found to be suffering from dry rot.'[513]

This inability of the panels to carry out their task meant that the Council, in the first place Keynes himself, felt it necessary to keep an eye on all aspects of CEMA's work. The malfunctioning of the panels was apprehensively viewed by Mary Glasgow. In a letter to R.A. Butler, she promised to persuade Keynes to delegate work to the panels and at the same time to persuade the panels to show themselves competent to 'go to work in his absence'.[514] Throughout his tenure as chairman, Keynes complained that he had to have to do basically everything himself. In a letter to Samuel Courtauld, he wrote that

> 'The Art Section of which you have personal knowledge, is, in my judgment, a going concern, and the trouble involved there amounts to nothing. But the other parts of the business, undoubtedly, are not. (...) An added difficulty is that, outside Philip James, there is no-one who has any clear conception as to

> where the line is between the innumerable matters where the chap in charge must go ahead and those occasional commitments where no step can be made without higher authority.'[515]

This last remark was due to the problem of work division between the panels and the council. In some cases, the panels' advisory function was gradually extended thus poaching in the Council's territory of decisions concerning finance, which, of course, ran counter to Keynes' idea to keep financial matters in the Council's and ultimately in his own hands. Already in July 1943, R.A. Butler noted in a memorandum of a talk with Keynes that the latter

> 'felt that the Panels should have their own powers and duties revised, and should not usurp in any way the executive powers of the Council. I gathered that what he had in mind was so to arrange matters that the Panels did a great deal of the work, but that the important decisions were reserved for the Council. He said that in this way he would be able to retain the power in his hands, and get to delegate much of the work.'[516]

This, though, did not materialise. Keynes did not trust the panels to discharge their duties in the intended way and – despite his regular complaints about the onerous task and his threats to resign – kept things under his control, which some members of the panels were not slow to notice. When Keynes presented the Drama Panel with the decision that

> 'as the Panels were becoming overloaded with financial detail, they were unable to give as much time as had been hoped to the valuable work of expert advice for which they had been appointed. In future, therefore, financial detail, and major policy affecting all departments, would be handled by the Council, while the Panels would recommend but not decide the using of money,'[517]

J.B. Priestley, the panel's most prominent member, gave expression to his hope 'that the Council would take very seriously the recommendation of the Panel; and he also hoped the Panel would in future not be confined merely to adopting or rejecting plans already initiated, but would think ahead and make constructive suggestions.'[518] If this evoked the impression that the panels did not feel that they were taken seriously, another remark by Keynes illustrates how important the opinion of the panels and their members actually were. For the case of vacancies he suggested to Mary Glasgow that 'it is on the whole better, I think, not to

consult the members of the Panels too much, since one always gets conflicting views, but rather leave it to the President, you and myself and the Deputy Chairman.'[519]

Another idea to streamline the work of CEMA was to install a financial manager for the supervision of the accounts. According to Mary Glasgow, the tasks of the accountant were not confined to the task of keeping the books, 'but of the politics of it as well. He might be on the same footing as the other three Directors of Music, Drama and Art.'[520] It soon turned out that the person whom the office was conferred upon was incapable of discharging his functions and proved in Keynes's own words to be a 'complete washout'.[521] In the end, the installation of the panels – with the notable exception of the Art Panel – and the accountant remained a failure during CEMA's existence. Still, they documented the growing institutionalisation of CEMA in the years 1942/1943.

The final change of organisation in this phase was embodied in the foundation of a Scottish advisory committee. Ever since CEMA had come under the wing of the Board of Education, Scotland with its different educational system had posed a constitutional problem. The Board of Education had no responsibility for education and all related matters in Scotland, but was confined to England and Wales. This geographical limitation raised the suspicion within the Scottish Department for Education that the Treasury grant would be allocated by CEMA in Wales and England exclusively, leaving out Scotland as a possible beneficiary.[522]

At the end of 1942, Keynes planned to solve the latent problems by giving Scotland – at least superficially – more influence on decisions by installing a Scottish advisory committee. He consulted O.H. Mavor, better known as a playwright under his pseudonym James Bridie, about the idea, which did not meet with universal acclaim. Mavor reported to Keynes on 23 December 1942 that neither he nor the persons with whom he had discussed the matter were sure about the real powers and functions of the advisory committee, and that '[t]wo or three men whom I have approached tentatively are very much afraid of the word Advisory, as they have had some experience of the BBC and its polite manner of ignoring its advisers.'[523] This perception probably was not far off the mark, but it enraged Keynes to a point that he almost suggested dividing the Council into an Anglo-Welsh and a Scottish organisation:

> 'I would rather hand them over their share of the money adrift, leaving them to stew in their own feeble juice, rather than agree to a separatist precedent, which would allow them to get the best of both worlds, insisting on spending their share locally and also, in practice, getting a good deal of ours as well.'[524]

The conciliatory personality of Mavor, who was perceived as a help 'in civilising the barbarians' as Keynes chose to refer to the Scottish audience,[525] ultimately calmed the storm in the teacup. In March 1943, Keynes proposed the establishment of a Scottish Committee, which was unanimously agreed to.[526] Only two weeks later, the constituting session of the new body took place, where the powers of the committee were defined as 'to give added authority to the existing Committee of Organisers and advise the Council on Scottish matters.'[527] Hence, a 'separatist precedent' was avoided, whilst at the same time the Scottish voice on the Council was strengthened and the constitutional problems of the Scottish special educational situation lessened.[528] They reappeared at the end of the war, when discussion set in, under which governmental department CEMA or its successor should come if it was perpetuated.

3. The changes of policy

While Keynes's first actions were of a more administrative nature, he immediately turned to matters of policy as well. From the beginning, CEMA had concentrated on the three fields of drama, art, and classical music. In April 1942, on the occasion of the first meeting of the Council over which he presided, Keynes suggested the inclusion of opera and ballet into the range of activities of CEMA,[529] which was generally approved. Although also the Ballet Jooss and the Ballets Rambert became grantee of CEMA, it was again the Old Vic through the administratively connected Sadler's Wells Opera and Ballet in the Vic Wells company, that was the closest collaborator and recipient of the largest grants in this field.[530]

After CEMA had worked for more than two years with little public comment on its existence, work and policy, the close connection between the Old Vic/Sadler's Wells organisation and CEMA raised the first serious criticisms of its policy. The Conservative politician Lord Esher deplored the privileged position of the Old Vic, which came close to a monopoly as recipient of government grants.[531] In his reply, Butler explained to Esher 'that all C.E.M.A. desired to do was to help the Old Vic and Sadler's Wells through difficult times. (...) There would, however, never be any question of the Government giving a monopoly to one theatre.'[532] This was true only to a certain extent. The Old Vic was not the only company that received grants for provincial tours, but the Old Vic received by far the largest share of the drama allocation. It is interesting that the first criticism CEMA faced was not directed at the fact of arts sponsorship by the state in general, but only limited to its ways and means. Indeed, Esher, later a member of the Council himself,[533] had

written to Keynes in March 1942 warmly approving of this new practice of state aid to the performing arts:

> 'It appears clear that the patronage system has been at last destroyed by the war, & that, for better or worse, the Lady Cunard method of art production is over. The disappearance of her & and 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. (...) I am convinced that in C.E.M.A. we have the embryo of the required organisation. The B.B.C. & and the L.T.B.[534] are the English compromises with State Socialism & C.E.M.A., under your Chairmanship, should, in my opinion, take command over the artistic world, & administer the state subsidies. For this purpose its organisation would, I think, need strengthening, & I would commend to give notice to the construction of the British Council (...). It seems to me very important, & that is my excuse for this long letter, that our infant steps in Socialism should start on the right path, & not be led away by that wretched German, Carl [sic] Marx, into the desert of timid & tasteless bureaucracy.'[535]

Before analysing the letter, it is necessary to note that this is merely the private opinion of an admittedly public person of some renown. It is not an official paper representing a political majority, nor does it represent *vox populi*, or a representative part of it. However, it is a brilliant source to illustrate the phenomenon of war as progenitor of social change. It gives plausibility to Arthur Marwick's thesis that although war as the most destructive force of all does not create anything new, it tends to give wider currency to ideas which had been held only by a minority before the outbreak of hostilities.[536] Esher, a Conservative and member of the political and social élite, reconciles himself without too much difficulty with the idea of 'Socialism', in a very idiosyncratic definition of the term, in some areas of public life due to changed circumstances, which he identifies as a result of the war. Whether this was the case or not, is ultimately not important and almost impossible to judge. It is sufficient

that the people involved in the change of policy and political ideas regarded it as such and derived the inspiration for a re-thinking of old ideas and their adaptation to the needs of the days from this perception of the war and its consequences. At the beginning of the previous chapter it was shown, that the arts in Britain were already in a precarious state before the outbreak of hostilities, but certainly the war reinforced the reduction in artistic patronage of the arts which in wartime were seen more than ever as the 'icing on the cake'. The kind of socialism as advocated by Esher, however, does not imply some revolutionary reconstruction and constitutional remodelling of the British political system. It resembles the collectivist ideas of the early twentieth century that had to accommodate to the liberal creeds of the day, which obviously had not died in the meantime.

There are two aspects in this letter, which are particularly apt to illustrate why cultural policy was taken up so late in Britain and why it was executed in the administratively uncommon way of establishing a body outside government to which the task of distributing the grants was conferred. Firstly, the necessary condition of state sponsorship of the arts – according to Esher – is the diminution of private wealth in general, brought about by both World Wars, and the unwillingness of private benefactors to spend money on behalf of the arts in wartime in particular. If wealthy individuals, the pillars of the British patronage system hitherto, were unable to discharge this task, a collective body had to step in, if a rich cultural scene was to be preserved.

Secondly, the problem of how to spend public money without implying public control had to be solved, because state control over the arts was incompatible with the prevailing liberal concept of state, especially on the background of a far-reaching nationalisation of the arts sectors in the totalitarian countries. Although public money was involved in funding the arts, the form of 'Socialism' as advocated by Esher did not allow for a governmental bureaucracy to administer the grants, but suggested a largely autonomous body in close co-operation with a governmental department. Esher was not the only one to discuss and then dismiss the idea of a Ministry of Fine Arts in Britain, in fact, there was far-reaching consensus in the arts scene.[537] Keynes himself, on the other hand, was not quite as averse to a fully-fledged Ministry. In a letter to Munro Wheeler of the Museum of Modern Art in New York of 12 October 1943, he described CEMA as 'a Government institution under the Board of Education, entirely financed by the Treasury, and might be regarded as humble beginning of the Ministry of Fine Arts which may one day come into existence.'[538] He went so far to write in a letter to the Soviet Ambassador in London that he 'can almost boast that I am Commissar for Fine Arts in my country!'[539] Like his economic concepts

set out in the *General Theory* published in 1936, Keynes's conception of a Ministry of Fine Arts was clearly ahead of his time. However, as can be seen from other contributions to the discussion and the letter by Lord Esher, the idea of state aided arts became more firmly established.

Although Keynes did not radically change the profile of CEMA and its scope of action, he gradually shifted from the welfare work as put forward by Thomas Jones and Sir Walford Davies to the standard side. In August 1942, the *Times* published an article on CEMA's work from the beginnings to the date in which the shift was already anticipated. The article was headed 'How a growing popular demand has been met: The work of C.E.M.A.',[540] which gives another hint that the principle of arts sponsorship by the state became more widely accepted in public. After a brief discussion of the work and merits of the first phase of CEMA's life, the author observed that

> 'In fact C.E.M.A., under the early inspiration of that loveable optimist, the late Sir Walford Davies, gave special encouragement to amateur music-making. The policy of encouraging local communities to make their own music continues, but the models provided for them, in C.E.M.A.'s touring orchestras and performers, are bringing about higher standard; and the present musical director, Dr. Reginald Jaques, is fully conscious of the truth that mediocrity, however well-meaning, is ultimately fatal to art.'[541]

This article anticipated in its own patronising style the changes of policy in the next months to come. After bringing ballet and opera into the orbit of CEMA's activities and stressing the factor that also entertainment of high cultural value has to follow the laws of economy, the successor on the Council of the 'loveable optimist' Sir Walford Davies, the composer Ralph Vaughan-Williams, felt it necessary to lay emphasis on CEMA's educational mission and on behalf of the amateur side of the business. In September 1942, Vaughan-Williams raised 'the question of amateur work in general, and made a special plea that the Council should not dissociate themselves from amateur music-making activity.'[542] The council accepted this proposal for music, where a mixture of amateurs and professionals was often successful in providing 'easily and cheaply the very thing in music which the more isolated parts of the country demanded', but not for drama.[543] Although the welfare approach had legitimised CEMA's coming into being, this part of the work began to fight its battle of retreat.

3.1. Art

From the beginning, art had been the smallest of the three pillars music, drama and art. The budget for the year 1943/44 showed that out of a total of £122,893, a mere £15,000 were allocated for visual art as compared to roughly £62,000 for music.[544] By far the largest share of the art allocation was given to the British Institute of Adult Education under W.E. Williams, which had before the war begun to create new audiences for the visual arts with its 'Art for the People' exhibitions, many of which were now presented in co-operation with CEMA. The British Institute of Adult Education and W.E. Williams were closely identified with the social side of the work, which began to decline in spring 1942. In September 1942, W.E. Williams complained that

> 'Try as I will, I can do nothing right for the Glasgow and the James, both of whom seem animated by the increasingly obvious determination to push the B.I.A.E right out of C.E.M.A. In a hundred years from now it might have made an audience for painters and linked up with your vision of the new Patronage. C.E.M.A. isn't thinking that way, any more [sic], and poor old James wouldn't know what I'm talking about. He's just a mere exhibition-monger as I am a mere educationist!'[545]

Despite close co-operation in the field of fine art, the relationship between the British Institute of Adult Education and CEMA proved difficult,[546] so that Keynes, who disliked Williams's educational approach, considered winding up the relation between the Institute and CEMA.[547] This, however, did not occur for Mary Glasgow herself and Philip James, the Council's Art Director, opted for a continuation of co-operation,[548] which was endorsed by Sir Kenneth Clark, as the art expert on the Council and personal friend of Williams.[549] Still, although the relations were not severed in late summer 1942, the British Institute of Adult Education felt the change of attitudes concerning their work only half a year later, when new allocations were discussed. In the First Art Panel Meeting in January 1943, a reduction of the allocation for the Institute to the amount of £5,000 per year was recommended to the Council despite Sir Kenneth Clark's intervention on behalf of the Institute.[550] Eventually, though, the British Institute of Adult Education received a further grant, though not reaching the original sum on aggregate.

Rather than handing the money over to the British Institute of Adult Education, the Panel decided to produce original lithographs and lithographs of designs by contemporary artists themselves.[551] The production, in this case reproduction of art, continued a policy taken up two years before.[552] The current collection of about 1,200 reproductions,

however, had proved insufficient to meet the demand already in 1941, when no more than eight exhibitions had travelled the country. [553] New developments since the beginning of 1942 had made it necessary to increase the numbers of pictures and of exhibitions. Hence, CEMA began to pile up its own collection by purchasing works of art by living British painters.[554] The start, as had been with all beginnings of CEMA and its work, was very modest. £750 were dedicated to the acquisition of paintings. However, it was here that the foundation for the still existing Arts Council's collection was laid.

At the first meeting of the Arts Panel on 13 January 1943, Philip James was able to report an increasing demand from various sides for the presentation of art productions by CEMA. One remarkable quarter which had expressed a demand for pieces of art were British restaurants and hostels of Royal Ordnance Factories for the decoration of recreational rooms and canteens.[555] Keynes had seen the opportunity in these requests to justify the services of CEMA to the British society at war on the one hand and to the cultural values which the country fought for against Nazi Germany on the other. Hence, at a time when in Britain austerity closed its grip and rationing reduced the variety of the daily diet,[556] Keynes wrote in July 1942 that

> 'It is familiar practice to say grace before meat: C.E.M.A. now seeks to add grace of another kind of meat. Eating being a necessary, and sometimes enjoyable occupation, and being also in this case a social matter, it is especially desirable that it should be carried on in premises which are relieved from dullness or gloom, and show that "taste" is a word not limited to victuals merely. C.E.M.A. by adding to the simple war-time fare, a sweet or savoury, if not a banquet, for the eye, is doing its proper work of enhancing a hum-drum business and reminding people, even as they ponder the less than romantic possibilities of a contemporary menu, that even total war cannot cheat all the senses. The satisfaction of the eye may compensate for the austerity inflicted on the palate.[557]

Education of taste and spreading cheerfulness and courage formed in this context a natural unity and demonstrated that CEMA saw the necessity to justify its work as war related in a wider sense of the word and to perform a social duty. Art was, at least on the surface, not funded for art's sake. On the other hand, also within the realm of the visual arts, the social side did not outweigh the standard side. Whilst demonstrating the function of art for the raising of morale, Keynes also expressed his conviction that art was something intrinsically valuable which had to be

defended from the threat posed to the Western culture by Nazi Germany.[558] As CEMA's contribution to help artists survive the dire times of the war, Keynes suggested to pay 'generous fees' for the acquisition of designs for the lithographs to be produced by CEMA.[559] Keynes suggested that submitted designs could be and should be rejected if they did not meet the standard set by the panel. However, even in case of rejection, artists should be paid for their 'initial work'.[560]

In autumn 1943, another new departure took place in the work of the Council. For a probationary period of six months between 1 October 1943 and 31 March 1944, three expert guide lecturers were engaged to accompany the CEMA collections following the model of the British Institute of Adult Education.[561] For Keynes, this smacked too much of patronisation and he tried to wind up this service after its trial phase.[562] Whereas all other measures to keep the educational aspect marginal had been accepted by the Council, in this field Keynes was challenged by Philip James, who thought that the 'success of the temporary guide lecturers warrants the permanent establishment of this service on an increased scale. This is an expensive service, but it is, in my opinion, worth every penny being spent on it.'[563] Consequently, he asked for the Council's approval of the allocation of £3,000 for the employment of guide lecturers out of an art budget totalling £22,000.[564] At the ninth meeting of the Art Panel, the decision was finalised to continue employing the guide lecturers on a full-time basis despite Keynes's doubts.[565]

Although the criticism that arose against CEMA's art policy was not as vociferous as it proved to be in the case of drama, CEMA had to face serious opposition from two quarters. First of all, the Fine Art Trade Guild made a representation to CEMA criticising CEMA's entry into the field of colour reproductions, which had been the Guild's domain so far. As a compensation for this intrusion, the Guild asked for a representative on the Panel in order to influence policy.[566] As in all other cases, this request was rejected and the criticism remained without any results.

More serious opposition came from the House of Commons. In a Parliamentary debate on 15 February 1944, Alan Graham, MP expressed his anxiety about the choice of artefacts for the exhibitions. The touring of modern paintings especially met with his disapproval. A part of CEMA's exhibitions was dedicated to modern painting[567] and its CEMA's collection consisted of contemporary art exclusively. This parliamentary criticism was backed up by an open letter by a group of MPs and artists, printed in the *Times* on 11 March 1944. The undersigned criticised the 'baleful influence of what is known as "modernistic" art. This is a subversive movement which, with its several "isms", has been for many years endeavouring to undermine the traditional glories of painting and

sculpture' which were devised to 'lower the standards of artistic ideas and technical performance. '[568] This was a challenge which could not go without answer and Keynes was quick to give it. On 14 March 1944, he defended the policy of presenting modern as well as classical art and the selecting body as a 'Panel (...) as mixed a bunch of fogeys of respect as you could reasonably hope to collect. We have undoubtedly reached, on the average, the age of discretion.'[569] In his defence, Keynes was seconded by the *New Statesman and Nation*, which regularly reported favourably on CEMA's work and efforts.[570] In the edition of 18 March 1944, the author of the regular column *London Diary* derided the criticism and vitriolically commented that '[o]ne of the words they apply to the pictures of which they disapprove is 'subversive'. An echo of Hitler and Goebbels on Kulturbolschewismus? I am sure the dear old gentlemen never thought of such a thing. They were just feeling a touch over-excited.'[571] In the end, the criticism remained without consequence, whereas CEMA could bank on increasing support of its work even in the conservative and liberal broadsheets of the country.

3.2. Music

Whereas the shift from welfarist approach to arts funding *sui generis* was rather slight in the field of visual art, it was very obvious in the field of music. The equivalent to the amateur drama work in the field of music was the work of the 'Music Travellers', who assisted amateur ensembles and organised concerts. From the original welfarist angle, the travellers were a valuable force to fight boredom by assisting the people to make music themselves, broaden the understanding of classical music, and at the same time to create new audiences by concert-giving, which rendered their work in the eyes of the Regional Officers 'inestimable'.[572] Indeed, the Travellers were so successful with their work, which – after the typical ad hoc beginning – led to increased work on the organisational side and thus entangled them in administrative work. This hampered the original idea of the work of travellers in a way to defeat their own ends: by 1942 they, being musicians by profession, were unable to fulfil their generic task of concert giving and at the same time to discharge the administrative duties which arose from the organisation of concerts.[573] But it was not only the organisational problems that rendered the continuation of the position of the Travellers precarious. This idea by Sir Walford Davies ran more and more counter to the new policy of CEMA with its emphasis on professional standards. Shortly after the reshuffle of 1942, the Council wished to 'hand over' the Music Travellers to the organisational network of the Carnegie Trust, with whose County Music Organisers they were expected to co-operate. However, the negotiations with the Carnegie Trust about the transfer, which had begun in summer

1942, proved difficult[574] and the future of the Music Travellers became doubtful. In June 1943, it emerged that the Carnegie Trust would not take over the Travellers and their work, for its trustees were not interested in educating audiences and in giving encouragement to future professional musicians which had also been part of the Travellers' work.[575] A new scheme to retain the services of the Travellers, though in a different function was devised in the train of the establishment of Regional Offices as described above. Mary Glasgow suggested the appointment of Music Travellers as Regional Officers. As a consequence, the 'term Music Traveller would lapse, together with much of the amateur work which had so far been undertaken.'[576] This plan was finally agreed upon at the following meeting of the Music Panel in September 1943 and implied that the work of the Travellers ended on 31 March 1944.[577] Some of the Travellers quickly changed positions and became Regional Officers, others like Sybil Eaton and Molly Lake took the opportunity to be relieved from their administrative burden in order to fully concentrate on their musical career.[578] Of course, this radical moving away from original ideas which to a considerable extent had made CEMA's name and fame, did not pass without opposition from within the Council. It was again Ralph Vaughan-Williams who spoke – ultimately without success – on behalf of amateur music-making in general and on behalf of the Travellers in particular.[579] Vaughan Williams was throughout his term on the Council a rather inconvenient voice who advocated all forms of amateur work contrary to the majority of the CEMA staff including Keynes and Clark.[580] Although the general shift of policy away from social work in direction of raising professional standards was not the only reason for the lapse of the work of the Travellers, it clearly demonstrated that CEMA readjusted its perspective away from a day-to-day approach. Already in summer 1943, Keynes had written to Mary Glasgow that he did not

> 'think some of them [i.e. the members of the Council, JW] fully appreciate what a very large part of CEMA's activities will necessarily wilt away when the war comes to an end. That is why I think it so important to strengthen our hands by showing our capacity to perform new activities if there is to be good hope of CEMA's becoming a permanent body.'[581]

In March 1944, the shape of the things to come became more clearly visible and also the members of Council realised that some functions would wilt away. With the political programme that led to the installation of Keynes as chairman of the Council, it was obvious that these lapsing functions would mostly concern the welfare side of the work.

The Travellers disappeared for various reasons, the administrative reasons being the most pressing. Other measures, however, that accompanied the abandonment of the Travellers' work were due to purely political decisions on the part of Keynes and the Council backed by the Board of Education. The Factory concerts, which had been planned to give mental relief to workers under wartime conditions and which had been considered valuable in educating new audiences, began their decline in terms of financial allocation and number in 1944. Hitherto, their share in the budget had been steadily increased to an amount of £45,000 in April 1944 as opposed to £10,000 for general concerts and £24,000 for Symphony Concerts,[582] which had been recovered from the Carnegie Trust in 1943. From the beginning, the Factory concerts had been a pillar of CEMA's work and one of its trade marks. Consequently, their decline gave rise to a discussion about policy in general within CEMA revealing a division of opinion between the Regional Officers – standing in the tradition of the welfarist approach – and the Headquarters in London. This discussion can be reconstructed from the correspondence between the Regional Offices and the central administration in London and in the reports by the Regional Officers on their work between 1942 and 1944, in which most of them deplore the change of policy.[583] As early as in summer 1943, Sybil Eaton, a Music Traveller of the first hour, had complained that the general cuts for directly organised concerts were

> 'a shattering blow. (...) Now, having created a demand, mobilised the enthusiasts and built up audiences, the cut has come, without warning. (...) It will strain all our loyalty to CEMA to explain the sudden change without causing bitter resentment, and it will take all our courage to go on, refusing people we have taught to ask, breaking promises wholesale, with out [sic] dream of taking music to our whole region shattered.'[584]

The Regional Officers felt by far a greater responsibility towards the audiences, especially in what was called 'unexplored regions' in CEMA vernacular, than about the arts and the artists. Eve Kisch, Regional Officer in Regions 10 and 3, a former Traveller, believed 'most strongly, that it is thoroughly wrong for Cema [sic] to provide public concerts in cities where there are already the means and the organisation for giving the best symphony, chamber and recital concerts.'[585] Peter Crossley Holland, Eve Kisch's successor in Region 10, suggested that

> 'CEMA concerts should be primarily considered as a form of Service to the community. During hostilities, CEMA work may well be regarded as honourable war work. (...) The purpose of

> these concerts is not exclusively that of entertainment as such, but the making available for public enjoyment as much good music as possible, in an effort to promote a deeper interest and understanding of an art, and to encourage amateur activity locally.'[586]

Their colleague Helen Munro also stressed the point that the provision of cheap concerts was one way of flattening class differences. Whereas live performances of classical music had been an exclusive form of entertainment of the rich before the war, the 'well conceived policy of those organising C.E.M.A. events in the early days has done much to bring these sections of the population together.'[587] Although the other reports did not go as far as to ascribe a unifying function to music they stressed the importance and necessity of CEMA's cultural mission. Anne Carlisle, who has been quoted in the motto section of this chapter, gave a drastic example in the context of a drama tour of the Old Vic, why CEMA should further concentrate on audiences rather than the arts and artists: 'Most of the village had never heard of Dame Sybil Thorndike, so that there was no halo of a big name to impress them. But they had heard of Shakespeare and knew it was something to be avoided.'[588] This statement seems a late justification for the early policy of the veil of secrecy devised by Reginald Jacques to keep the audience in the dark about the fare they were about to get thus reducing psychological barriers and prejudices against highbrow entertainment.

The representatives of CEMA in the provinces, either being former Music Travellers themselves or working in close co-operation with the Travellers, therefore, strongly emphasised the second half of CEMA's self-chosen motto, 'The best for the most', whereas the London headquarters, certainly still committed to the idea of increasing knowledge and understanding of the arts in Britain, were concentrating on the first part. The quoted recommendations and suggestions of the Regional officers found their champion on the Council in Ralph Vaughan Williams who recommended a co-operation with the Carnegie Trust for financial assistance to amateur and semi-amateur orchestras in June 1944.[589] This suggestion was checked by Dame Myra Hess who asked 'whether this would be consistent with the Council's policy of maintaining standards and reminded the Panel of local string orchestras which had been refused further help last year.'[590] Unsurprisingly, Myra Hess's view prevailed in the end and the aid to amateurs was abandoned.[591]

Although the moving away from the amateur side evolved more and more clearly and the idea of giving incentive to 'the-man-in-the-street' to make music himself died with the Travellers, the principle of giving aid to self-aid was applied in a different context. Instead of directly organising

concerts, CEMA developed a scheme to financially help music and chamber music clubs, some of which were set up in the course of CEMA's work in the provinces. Here, old and newly gained music lovers met and enjoyed live performances for a monthly or annual subscription. According to the Regional Report by Helen Munro, CEMA could rightly claim to have greatly encouraged these clubs. Whereas, the Durham Music Club had had an average membership of 90 in pre-war times, it boasted 170 members by 1944. In Darlington the membership increased with CEMA's help from 80 to 285 plus a waiting list.[592] The idea to fund such clubs was not entirely new, for CEMA had already given small grants to existing chamber music subscription clubs at the request of the National Federation of Music Societies from 1941 on.[593] Now, CEMA carried the idea further and conceived a Music Club scheme implying a considerable increase of the grant. In the final scheme, CEMA guaranteed 20 clubs, which met the requirements of having at least 100 members paying a regular subscription, of disposing of suitable accommodation and a piano fit for concert-giving, a matching grant of £150 per year for the organisation of a concert series.[594] The original scheme devised in November 1944 had been on a much larger scale,[595] but apparently other projects ranked higher on CEMA's agenda, which reduced the help to self-help on the grassroots level.

Another feature of this period of CEMA's work was the intensified co-operation with the BBC. So far, the BBC had broadcast a series of CEMA chamber concerts from historic buildings and a number of factory concerts. Whereas the former were seen as particular success, the latter had not always been to the satisfaction of the BBC.[596] Hence, representatives of CEMA and the BBC met for an exchange of ideas in September 1944, in the course of which the BBC assured that the Corporation was 'anxious to act as a shop-window for C.E.M.A.'s music activities'.[597] The upshot of the meeting was the setting up of a BBC-CEMA Joint Committee, which met for the first time on 19 October 1944.[598] The series of concerts in cathedrals and churches was slightly modified to a new series of concerts of one hour length in historic buildings, which commenced with a concert in Salisbury Cathedral.[599] As partner in popularising classical music, the BBC reported very favourably about CEMA's work and gave representatives of CEMA a platform to advertise themselves in a favourable light.[600]

3.3. Drama

The summer of 1942 brought about developments which demonstrate the changes in policy also in the field of drama, although in this field new tasks of a more welfarist nature came within the orbit of CEMA's work at the same time. The most striking feature of this latter development was

CEMA's contribution to the 'Holidays at Home' Scheme of the Ministry of Labour and National Service.[601] This scheme had been started in 1941 after travelling opportunities had been restricted to reserve fuel and means of transportation for the war effort.[602]

In summer 1942, CEMA decided to contribute to this scheme by funding theatrical open air productions in parks, which was repeated in the following years.[603] In this scheme, almost all aims of all parties involved in the work in CEMA were reached: CEMA supported theatre companies of considerable standard and brought straight drama to the people, the audiences were compensated for the restrictions in their choices for holidays and were given the opportunity of recreation necessary to return to work with fresh energy according to the wishes of the Ministry of Labour. Finally, probably even morale was boosted by such efforts. In return for their contribution, CEMA was favourably mentioned in the official leaflets issued by the Ministry of Labour as one way of spending agreeable holidays at home.[604]

Despite these commitments in measures closely connected to the war effort, CEMA looked ahead to the time after the war and developed drama programmes independent of the needs of the day. Directly on becoming chairman, Keynes had suggested to include opera and ballet into the ambit of CEMA. The inclusion of ballet productions posed a almost no problem – ballet companies like the Ballets Jooss or the Ballet Rambert existed and could be employed in the same way as theatre companies. In fact, ballet unexpectedly proved a great success in CEMA's work.[605] Problems of greater scale arose in the staging of opera, which still remains the most expensive and complicated form of performing art. Some kind of operatic production had already been staged within the framework of the first tours of the Old Vic in Wales. These productions, though, had been downsized and restricted in scope and personnel in order to suit travelling and local stage conditions.[606] Now, it was planned to fund opera in its full splendour. For this idea, Keynes favoured again a close co-operation with the Vic-Wells organisation in London.[607]

Hitherto, performances in the capital had been outside the remit of CEMA's activities, because it was supposed that the West End was sufficiently supplying the demand for drama. Also, from the social point of view, the provincial areas were regarded as being in greater need of thespian diversions, which from the educational point of view perfectly fit into CEMA's general policy of building up new audiences.[608] However, certain problems arose from this practice. In his report on Drama of June 1942, Ivor Brown wrote that after the highly successful tours two kinds of problems emerged with the Old Vic and its engagement for CEMA:

'(1) Artists of the right calibre are not prepared to be indefinitely away from London.
(2) It is important for maintaining the drawing power of our leading players that they should appear in London from time to time.
(3) The provinces still accept London as the standard: Business is better if we can announce a tour as prior to, or succeeding, a London presentation.'[609]

Consequently, the Council decided to formally waive the ban on the capital and to fund productions in London. The first production to receive a grant for a London season was the Old Vic's production of Shakespeare's *King John*.[610]

Whereas this gave just a hint that the original wartime emergency work was to give way to a policy pointing to the post-war future, the second departure was a small revolution in the work of CEMA. At the end of 1942, CEMA became aware that the oldest playhouse in the country, the Theatre Royal, Bristol, was about to be sold and turned into a warehouse. Keynes, who deplored that 'as yet the Council had little authority for controlling buildings',[611] took the opportunity to save this architectural gem for the British public.[612] In September 1942, the proposal to take over the Theatre Royal, Bristol went through the Council and CEMA took a 21-year lease of the building. Whereas eventually a repertory company was formed by the Old Vic,[613] which gave the Theatre Royal, Bristol its present name, the original idea was to offer bricks and mortar to touring companies, while CEMA directly managed the financial affairs of the theatre. The opening performance on 11 May 1943 was a production of Goldsmith's *She stoops to conquer* by the Old Vic. In his opening speech, Keynes said in a remarkable mixture of apology and provocation that

'in an undisciplined moment we accidentally slipped into getting mixed up with a theatre building. Making the best of a bad job, we shall come clean to-night, without shirking publicly, in hope of public absolution. And, the precedent having been once created, it will, I hope, be officially improper not to repeat it.'[614]

Unsurprisingly, the step to take over the Theatre Royal, Bristol raised criticism from various quarters, most of all the commercial theatre. Its press organ, the *Theatre Managers' Journal*, gave expression to its doubts and fears:

> 'Surely, a State Theatre must desire to make the plays it presents as much a success as would be a commercial theatre. If the plays do not pay or persistently fail to attract the public, either in a Commercial or a State Theatre, what is the sense in continuing to produce such plays? If the audience amounts to nil there will be nobody to educate. And we might ask would not the Commercial Theatre be able to present as good, even, if not better entertainment?'[615]

CEMA were well aware of the dangers implied in this experiment, and the flank that was opened to criticism of state sponsorship by way of direct management. Keynes basically saw them in the financial intricacies. Already in the first session of the Drama Panel he calculated that under present estimations the Theatre Royal, Bristol would run at a weekly loss of between £40 and £85.[616] Hence, he suggested raising the ticket prices and negotiating with the Old Vic, which he and the Drama Director considered as 'greedy and unco-operative', about the terms of business.[617] With this move to put his theatre on a sounder financial basis by raising ticket prices, Keynes demonstrated that the direction of spreading knowledge and understanding of the arts was ultimately horizontally. Making the theatre available for a wider audience stood back in this desire to make the arts pay their way themselves. Generally, however, Keynes was satisfied with the experiment in Bristol. In the quoted opening speech at the first night of the new Theatre Royal, Bristol, Keynes had announced that this take over of a building was supposed to create a precedent for other acquisitions. Soon after the opening of the Theatre Royal, Bristol, similar opportunities arose in Bedford and Luton. After a sounding of officials in July 1944, Keynes felt able to report a favourable reception of the idea by Sir Alan Barlow and Eric Hale of the Treasury.[618] In a discussion of October 1944 between Sir Robert Wood, Keynes, Sir Alan Barlow, and Eric Hale, however, Barlow made it clear that the Treasury were not at all inclined to allow CEMA to continue acquiring and directly managing theatres throughout the country. In the view of the Treasury, already the 'existing Bristol precedent was not quite in line.'[619] Moreover, the plan to repeat the Bristol precedent in Bedford and Luton was checked by Ralph Vaughan-Williams on the Council, who put on record that 'it was not the function of the Council to provide a setting for the arts, but rather to foster the arts themselves. He did not, for instance, want to see money diverted from the provision of concerts in places starved of music to the acquisition of buildings.'[620] For want of money, the plan to eventually create a chain of theatres was shelved, although Keynes had found support for his idea by such powerful allies as Lord Esher, Thelma Cazalet and Sir Kenneth Clark.[621]

So far, the criticism of CEMA and its work had – with the exception of the Parliamentary question by Alan Graham and its brief aftermath in the press – exclusively come from interested quarters like the managers of commercial theatres or the Fine Art Trade Guild. With these new departures in cultural policy in Bristol and the intrusion into the London theatre scene, CEMA became more prominent and equally more vulnerable for criticism.

The lifting of the ban on the capital for CEMA productions had opened new opportunities of co-operation between CEMA and London based theatre companies. The first company to apply for a co-operation with CEMA was H.M. Tennent under the manager Hugh Beaumont, which at that time had the most famous actors under contract, amongst them John Gielgud and Laurence Olivier. This splendour and proficiency Keynes could not resist. Moreover, friction over the financial arrangements had arisen with the Old Vic. In October 1942, he contemplated terminating the co-operation as he thought the 'Sadlers [sic] Wells and Old Vic people (...) difficult, reluctant and aloof.'[622] Even though he never put this thought into action, the co-operation with the Old Vic, which remained an important pillar in the drama section of CEMA's work, was a source of contention throughout the war,[623] and Keynes took the opportunity to put some pressure on the Old Vic by starting a co-operation with its commercial rival, H.M. Tennent Ltd.

The original initiative had come from H.M. Tennent Ltd. which saw a new source of income in the association with CEMA. Most productions supported by CEMA were in the privileged position of being exempt from Entertainment Tax, a heavy duty which had to be paid to H.M. Customs and Excise on all income derived from the purveyance of entertainment. According to the Finance New Duties Act of 1916, Section 1(5)(d), theatrical productions could be exempt from Entertainment Tax, if they were of an educational or partly educational character and given by non-profit making bodies. The decision whether drama was of educational character or not lay with H.M. Customs and Excise. The original idea of this section had been to relieve institutions like the London Zoo from the tax burden, but the wording allowed all other purveyors of entertainment to apply as well, if they were accordingly constituted. The particular intricacies of tax exemption and their implications on the work of CEMA will be discussed below. In this section, it is more important to see how the theatrical world adapted to the new situation which made it possible to save money which otherwise had to be paid to the Treasury. The first theatre which had made use of this legal possibility had been the Old Vic, being organised in the described way and their productions being regarded as at least partly educational,[624] already a long time before the war. The Old Vic had thus

set a precedent and opened the floodgates. 'But, curiously enough,' CEMA officer Charles Landstone diagnosed, 'no flood came through. "Culture" had not yet become a public attraction – that change of attitude was to come only during the war – and so far no one had envisaged the brilliant possibilities of this new legal ruling.'[625]

In summer 1942, the management of H.M. Tennent Ltd. realised these 'brilliant possibilities' and approached CEMA to associate themselves with a season of *Macbeth* which had just completed a successful provincial tour.[626] The clearly expressed intention of Tennent was to qualify for tax exemption, which it hoped to obtain by co-operating with CEMA.[627] In return, Tennent promised to forward the tax exemption to the public by reducing seat prices.[628] This obviously complied with CEMA's original policy of giving the best to the most. Hence, CEMA agreed to co-operate with Tennent though explaining that tax exemption would not automatically follow the association, but that the legal requirements had to be met by constituting a non-profit making organisation. Accordingly, Tennent Plays Ltd. came into being, a non-profit making organisation with its own Board of Directors and no assets of its own.[629]

The association with Tennent proved to be an unqualified success for CEMA, for the productions were highly successful and neither a direct grant nor a guarantee was asked for by Tennent Plays, which was entirely funded by its commercial twin, H.M. Tennent Ltd.[630] The independent financial position pleased Keynes and his desire to make productions pay. However, this move of association with highly successful companies which seemed to shamelessly make use of a loophole of the law by enjoying tax exemption whilst making large profits raised criticism from various quarters.

As Tennent was a direct rival of the Old Vic, who had been the beneficiary of the largest share of CEMA's drama budget, representatives of the Old Vic were the first to give expression to their dissatisfaction as they feared that the association of Tennent with CEMA would provoke a conflict with the commercial theatre[631] as the 'distinctions between this non-commercial company and the commercial H.M. Tennent Ltd. would not always be known and accepted.'[632] The apprehension proved to be justified after it became known that Tennent Plays, the alleged non-profit company, made an estimated profit of no less than £4,314 in the time from summer 1942 to April 1943.[633] This sum, contrary to Tennent's promise, was not used to reduce ticket prices, but was, since no profit was to be made, distributed amongst the actors. This use of the money was not against the words, though certainly against the spirit of the law and equally contrary to CEMA's intentions when co-operation had been discussed. Mary Glasgow wrote to John Maynard Keynes in April 1943, that she had thought

> 'it always wrong that the actors should benefit in their salaries from tax exemption. I ought to have realised the implications of this earlier. But it was never contemplated that such large profits would be made so quickly, and that alone calls for readjustment. (...)
>
> 1. We must revise the salary conditions so that no actor gets the benefit of exemption, i.e. all the tax goes straight into the Company's reserve funds and the salaries are paid out of the net profits.
> 2. We must put a ceiling to the salaries so that none may exceed a given sum (£150?) in one week.
> 3. It is time to consider the immediate use of the Tennent Plays profits as a whole, which now amount to £4,314 (estimated)'[634]

In order to remedy the wrongs of the arrangement, Mary Glasgow only suggested rearranging the salary system of Tennents. The fact that she missed to reaffirm the principle of passing on the amount saved by tax exemption to the audience by way of ticket reduction, allows for the conclusion that also for CEMA the social aim of vertically spreading drama took the back seat. A few weeks later, Mary Glasgow was able to report to Keynes that 'all the proposals I outlined to you in my letter went through.'[635] At this juncture, however, CEMA had already become the target of a press campaign. The most vociferous press organs were the Beaverbrook papers *Daily Express* and *Evening Standard*, which both attacked CEMA throughout the summer of 1943.

The *Daily Express* opened the season in an article on 19 June 1943, in which Walter Payne, the spokesman of the Theatre Managers' Association, criticised the situation regarding the Entertainment Tax as 'farcical'.[636] Only one week later, the attack was repeated. In an article headed with 'The case against tax free culture', the editor of the *Daily Express* quoted the commercial theatre managers alleging

> 'that C.E.M.A. is using the state backing unfairly in the commercial market. C.E.M.A. productions pay no Entertainment tax because they are "cultural". They are presented all over the country. Recently they have invaded the West End with important productions and star casts.'[637]

This probably would have been acceptable, if the playgoer had benefited from tax exemption by way of reduction of ticket prices. This however was the case in neither the provincial nor the London

productions, which the author of the article was neither slow to realise nor to rub it in:

> 'In many cases the tax exemption is not passed on to the playgoer, who pays the usual West End prices, the tax being considered legitimate profit. Inquiries I have made about C.E.M.A.'s growing influence on the theatre would make it clear that objection is not taken to plays and ballets being presented in the remoter parts of England where entertainment is hard to get.'[638]

A week later, the *Daily Express*, in an interview with the West End theatre manager George Wood, came to the conclusion that under the present conditions

> '"You pay the same money whatever you see, whether it's 'The Lisbon Story' or 'The Moon is Down'. In the first case it goes to the Exchequer; in the second it goes to finance further plays of a similar kind." I pointed out that in going to see a tax-free show the profits of which are applied to the next production, the playgoer contracts himself in advance to a play he may not want to see.'[639]

These accusations were reiterated in articles in the following days in which it was generally stated that CEMA entered by its appearance on the London scene a strong competition with unfair means, paid higher fees to the actors[640] and intruded a market, where the commercial theatre against all odds 'had kept the flag flying for the show world right through the war'.[641] As was shown above, in the case of co-operation with Tennent Plays Ltd., the criticism was not without foundation and the appeal to the original aims of making theatre and opera available for people so far deprived of enjoyment of these forms of art was cutting. On the other hand, it showed that the principle of state subsidies to the arts, be it in the form of direct grants or in the form of tax exemptions was not yet universally agreed, especially when it clashed with private interest, of which the *Daily Express* and the *Evening Standard* made themselves the advocate.

The *Evening Standard*, following suit in the attack of the *Daily Express*, opened another theatre of war and mainly attacked CEMA for providing indirect government subventions for plays and productions that made large profits. In a series of articles in August 1943, the *Evening Standard* accused CEMA of simply wasting tax payers' money.[642] A few days later, CEMA's grown and growing administration in London and in the

Regional Offices was put under scrutiny and represented in a way which led to only one possible conclusion: CEMA was entertaining itself and some others at the expense of all good tax payers while there was a war going on:

> 'It then [at the time of its foundation, JW] had a staff of one – Miss Mary Glasgow, lent by the Board of Education. She had a small dark one-room office.
> After three months, the Treasury stepped in. They doubled all the income received from voluntary sources (...) In addition, the Board of Education provides a spacious house on the sunny side of Belgrave Square. C.E.M.A. has come up in the world since its early days. Miss Glasgow is still the Secretary, but she now has an impressive office and a staff of 23 to help her; there are 30 others up and down the country.
> They work in pleasant surroundings. Dr. Reginald Jacques, the musical director, occupies an office with a grand piano beside his desk. At intervals he opens the double doors which connect his office with an even larger room and holds an audition. When Dr. Jacques holds an audition, it goes on all day.
> The rest of the C.E.M.A. knows this too well. Mr. Philip James, the art director, revenges himself by decorating Dr. Jacques' room with samples of the more distracting modern art. (...) The drama director, Mr. Lewis Casson, has not only an office but a warren of attics where the smaller touring companies rehearse. (...) The profits of C.E.M.A.'s West End shows are a drop in the bucket compared with the expenditure – most of which sends music, drama and pictures up and down the country. The money for this comes from the tax-payer.'[643]

As a conclusion, the article offered the apprehension, that CEMA, established as a wartime emergency body, would not terminate its work with the end of the war but would instead go on spending good tax payers' money.[644]

The final attack came on 10 August 1943, when not only the practice of tax exemption as a principle, but also the criteria for such exemption were criticised in a moralising tone alleging that CEMA was the judge over tax exemption.[645] These massive and well-timed attacks and allegations in the *Daily Express* and the *Evening Standard* caused no little anxiety in the CEMA headquarters in Belgrave Square, because the criticism – at least on the surface – laid open certain deficiencies of CEMA's policy. If it was a body designed purely to cater for the audience, especially for the poorer strata of the populace and the inhabitants or

rural areas, then the ticket prices had to be reduced and the London scene should be left out as it had been in the first two years of existence. If CEMA was to help the arts, especially the drama, in projects that could not pay their productions by themselves, then it was impossible to fund highly successful productions.

In the situation of July/August 1943 it took Keynes hardly more than one statement to silence the criticism for the moment. CEMA published a press statement which was printed in the *Daily Express*. The statement aimed at the allegation that tax exemption for partly educational plays was granted by CEMA, which would indeed have weakened its position.[646] In fact, it was H.M. Customs and Excise who decided on exemption, and, as will be shown below, did not automatically spare productions in association with CEMA. After this statement, no further serious attack appeared in the press. Mary Glasgow, enquiring about the hostility that had been expressed in the articles, came to the findings that 'that the "Standard" and the "Express" too are in general policy favourably disposed to CEMA. The people they cannot stand are Tennents and they mean to pursue them relentlessly.'[647] However, the criticism expressed in the articles, especially in the *Evening Standard*, aimed directly at CEMA and its alleged waste of taxpayers' money. What became obvious in this press campaign was the still existing rift in the political programme of CEMA between the social and the standard aim which remained hard to bridge. This was due to CEMA's ad hoc founding as a wartime emergency body without clear terms of reference and without a clear constitution. Efforts in both directions made CEMA vulnerable on almost all sides and criticism became the louder the more CEMA grew and the more the shift from the welfare to the standard side became obvious.

Whereas the press attack was directed against CEMA leaving its social work of giving mental relief to war workers and spreading knowledge of the arts and intruding the field of commercial entertainment, the criticism inside CEMA arose in the opposite direction. Almost simultaneously to the campaigns in the *Evening Standard* and the *Daily Express*, Ashley Dukes, director of the Mercury Players, a company working in close association with CEMA, began a personal crusade against the welfare side of the work and its poor standard:

> 'I am certainly not the only member who is unwilling to serve on what I may call a Decorative panel (...) apart altogether from my own good reasons of resigning. The Mercury Players desire nothing but to get on with their special kind of work in their specialized and admittedly highbrow sphere. Above all, they don't want to be mixed up with other C.E.M.A. activities which their director is bound to disapprove. (...) I hold the view that

> C.E.M.A. must either be the nucleus of a Ministry of Fine Arts or nothing.'[648]

Although Keynes himself supported this view, it was impossible to implement it in the war situation, in which cuts were introduced on all fields not directly related to the war effort, to which CEMA's work in the official view was regarded as a contribution. This side of the work still legitimised CEMA's existence, although the Board of Education and R.A. Butler did not only approve the shift to the standard side, but had intended it. Still, work in the provinces and in factories was an integral and important part of CEMA's work for the duration of the war. The critique by Dukes, however, was no more than a storm in a tea-cup. Although Dukes temporarily severed relations with CEMA in May,[649] no further discussion emanated from this single-handed move by the Mercury Players. More weighty was the criticism raised by the most famous member of the Drama Panel, J.B. Priestley. Priestley, strongly committed to both ends of the work[650] assured that he was in 'keen sympathy' with CEMA's work for 'creating new audiences and generally spreading the theatre'.[651] However, he stated that 'on the London end of the work', they were not seeing 'eye to eye'[652]: According to Priestley, CEMA's

> 'recent Repertory schemes will not, in my view, help the serious Theatre, if only because they tend to make the task of the serious British dramatist more difficult still and do little or nothing to build up those teams of good keen players that seem to me far more important than star performers splashing about in plays of their choosing.'[653]

In a memorandum on the Theatre situation in Britain he deplored the fact that the Old Vic and Tennents were, despite their indisputable style and taste, 'floundering along without a policy', whereas '[m]ost of the others [were] hopeless.'[654] Some months later, his tone became even sharper. He diagnosed that – contrary to Mary Glasgow's observation in the CEMA Bulletin of September 1944, that there was a theatre renaissance in Britain – the situation of the theatre grew worse and worse,

> 'because the strangle-hold of the theatre owner is worse. (...) Again, new plays find it hard to get into the big provincial theatres, which take bad revivals of old musical shows in preference to new plays; the owners caring nothing about the future for the Drama but only for immediate returns, most of the profits of which they have to hand to the Government.

> Moreover, the effort of the two non-profit repertory companies playing these theatres will be bad for the rest of us, just because, not paying tax, they have accepted lower percentages. Theatre owners have made gigantic profits already out of these two companies – the Vic and the Haymarket – and not one penny goes back into the Drama.
> Again, these recent developments, which you welcome so warmly, seem to me to be taking us back to the actor-manager Theatre. Now, if that is what is wanted, well and good. But I believe that you get the best drama out of dramatist's theatre. (...) What we want are fine teams playing new vital work (as well as some revivals) and not star actors choosing "vehicles".'[655]

To put this programme into realisation though, was outside the powers of CEMA, which acknowledged the critique, but more or less unimpressedly carried on with their work.

More successful than the press and the dissatisfied members of the Drama Panel was the commercial theatre in its attempt to influence the work of CEMA. After the criticism in their press organ of January 1943 had amounted to very little, Walter Payne wrote a letter on behalf of the Theatre Managers' National Committee to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Kingsley Wood. In this letter, Payne stated that the commercial theatre viewed CEMA's work with apprehension.[656] The intensification of its activities, sponsored by the Treasury through the Board of Education in form of direct grants and tax exemptions 'at a time when economic conditions for the living stage may be very much more difficult than they are in the present at normal period,' were perceived as 'a serious menace and injustice to our Industry.'[657] To emphasise their determination to oppose such a development, a deputation of the Theatre Managers' National Committee followed an invitation to the Treasury Chambers on 12 November 1943,[658] where they were received by the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Frank Assheton, and a number of representatives of the Treasury, H.M. Customs and Excise and the Board of Education.[659] Payne reiterated his anxiety about the Government committing themselves to a policy of building theatres at the public expense.[660] Although Assheton was reputed to be 'tender-hearted towards the theatres',[661] he rejected this allegation and assured that 'no decision about the future had been taken', but it 'was unlikely that there would be room for theatre building in the building programme for the immediate postwar period.'[662] Still, the intervention of the commercial theatre did not end in their 'blowing off steam' at the Treasury. Instigated by the Committee's letter in October, the Treasury had decided to install an independent committee under the chairmanship of Sir Ernest Pooley to

safeguard the categorisation of plays applying for tax exemption as educational, partly educational or not educational at all with the aim to immunise the government and CEMA against criticism arising from tax exemption. The decision was announced in the House of Commons on 19 October 1943 by the new Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir John Anderson.[663]

4. Entertainment Tax

The question of exemption from Entertainment Tax had been a problem for CEMA and its associated companies right from the beginning. The minutes of the inter- and intradepartmental discussions of this problem within their political context are a very helpful source to shed light on the relationship between the arts and the state with CEMA as an intermediate body between them. Especially the financial aspect of arts sponsorship within the context of the ongoing war clarifies the position of CEMA and the political idea of arts sponsorship.

The first trace of the problem of Entertainment Tax within the CEMA Papers can be found as early as January 1940.[664] After three years of practice with exemption from Entertainment Tax of theatre companies in association with CEMA, Mary Glasgow put down in a minute in February 1943 that

> 'The Council are aware that when plays tour the provinces under CEMA auspices it is *not customary to reduce the prices of seats to the public in spite of the fact, that exemption from Entertainments Tax has been granted.*
> CEMA's part in sending the plays on tour is, of course, primarily to make them available to places which otherwise they could not afford to visit. It should also be clearly realised that all profits made by the visiting companies must be used for further work of the same kind.'[665]

This was exactly the position that was criticised by the *Daily Express* in July 1943. The major problem in this context had arisen through the co-operation of CEMA with Tennent Plays Ltd. who had paid their star actors on a percentage basis calculating from the gross receipts, i.e. before deducting the amount saved by tax exemption, which was changed immediately after its discovery in April 1943. The discussion about exemption, though, went on, and Mary Glasgow reiterated CEMA's position in August/September 1943 in her correspondence with Sir Archibald Carter, G. Wheeler and E. Bertenshaw of the Treasury and H.M. Customs and Excise respectively.[666] Here, she stated four possible uses of the money saved by tax exemption: a) the passing on to the

audience by way of reductions of ticket prices, which was demanded by the press, b) the building up of reserves for 'expensive pioneer and national service work' which did not pay, the use that CEMA preferred, c) the subsidisation of unprofitable plays, which appeared to be the most obvious cause, and finally d) the augmentation of actors', landlords' and managers' income, which was unacceptable but which had happened with Tennent Plays till the change of agreement.[667]

As the Treasury had received a letter of complaint against the practice of tax exemption in March 1943,[668] the government was fully alive to the problems arising from the exemption of productions from Entertainment Tax. Before the installation of the Pooley Committee in October 1943, H.M. Customs and Excise had undertaken the task to decide whether a play was partly educational or not. The newly installed committee under Sir Ernest Pooley had *prima vista* offered the chance to make a fresh start with the problem and to set down clearer rules defining the requirements a play had to meet to qualify for the categorisation of 'partly educational'. Consequently, they felt able to classify the most often staged plays in the two categories of educational or partly educational in 'List A' and of not educational in 'List B'.[669] This appeared to be a viable solution to simplify the decision, but it proved to be a further source of irritation and – in the eyes of those concerned – misjudgements, especially since the criteria for decisions of the committee remained in the dark. Ashley Dukes, the director of the Mercury Players, who had temporarily severed all connections with CEMA, now drew up a memorandum, in which he presented the case of the theatre against that of the Treasury. He admitted that the committee's task was ingratiating and that hardly two persons alive would agree on the educational merit or its absence of a play.[670] 'All of us', he stated, 'would make similar or even greater mistakes if we were invited (which God forbid) to assist in or advise on the compilation.'[671] This inherent operational problem, however, could not and did not immunise the Treasury against criticism of the root problem of policy embodied in the practice of tax exemption by the H.M. Customs and Excise. Dukes perceived that by this administrative practice, the government actually disposed of two bodies of cultural policy with very different powers:

> 'If a member of Parliament moved that CEMA should be given a million pounds a year to spend on music and drama, there would be an outcry in the House of Commons. Yet CEMA, as an off-shoot of the Board of Education, receives the modest and limited subsidy, while Customs and Excise has added to its normal duties that of remitting vast and unlimited sums. More than £100,000 of what would normally be taxpayer's money is given in a full year to

> two or three theatres alone, provided that they have full houses, as they fortunately have. (...) This immense largesse is welcome to all of us engaged in the arts, but the public should realize from whom it comes. Customs and Excise pays the piper, in the main, and has authority to call the tune. (...) These are surely fantastic powers to be conferred in the routine of Departmental practice, and not by any special act of the Legislature, on a branch which has not hitherto been concerned with cultural matters. The fact that such powers are used for good should not blind us to their casual and irrational nature. In effect, a Ministry of Fine Arts has been created departmentally in this country and it has come into being not as a branch of the Ministry of Education, but in the vaults and among the barrels to which H.M. Customs and Excise formerly gave its undivided attention. (...) I suggest that it is time that the whole benevolent business should come into the light of the day. It is also time that CEMA, as the expert body charged with the administration of the declared subsidy to music and drama, should exercise its influence in the disposition of the much larger undeclared subsidy.'[672]

It seems questionable whether the exemption from tax already can be seen as an act of sponsorship, but Dukes's argument remains intact that the Treasury and H.M. Customs and Excise disposed of an instrument to control the entertainment industry of the country to a great extent. Dukes illustrated this power in his memorandum by showing the paradox situation created by the possibility of tax exemption for partly educational plays:

> 'Until recently, all enlightened theatre people favoured the abolition of Entertainments Duty on the living stage, and believed that given such freedom from a tax on turnover, the art of drama could embark on manifold and rewarding adventures. (...) To-day the position is quite different. Should the Treasury contemplate removing the Duty and letting the living theatre work on its own destiny on its varied intellectual and cultural levels, its action would be opposed by the present tax-free companies, CEMA-associated or otherwise, for the reason that they cannot afford to forgo the thirty-per-cent advantage that has been given them at the box-office over their commercial competitors.'[673]

In the train of Dukes's memorandum the complaints submitted to CEMA or directly to the Treasury caused further discussion about the role of CEMA and the state in the context of arts sponsorship. The

correspondence between Sir Archibald Carter of H.M. Customs and Excise and Keynes is an excellent source to show that the government had once again put itself in the position of Goethe's sorcerer's apprentice, who had evoked spirits he was unable to master. In a letter by to Keynes dating from 12 January 1944, Carter confessed that

> 'The root difficulty is, I think, that there is no clear, reasonably permanent Government policy about assisting the drama and other arts. It was more or less by accident, and not of set policy, that Section 1(5)(d) of the 1916 Act came to be used to give assistance to music and the drama by means of relief from taxation, and as I understand it, for the moment the purpose of C.E.M.A. is to deal with the wartime lack of desirable recreation. If we once could get C.E.M.A. recognised, with Parliamentary approval, as a permanent institution, then it would clearly be natural to use it as the sole channel through which Government assistance to the drama and the arts was given, and if part of that assistance to the drama and the arts was still to be given in the form of relief from taxation (against which a good deal could be said), to make C.E.M.A. the judge in cases of doubt as to what entertainments should qualify.'[674]

This root difficulty, a lack of policy and an accidental beginning, applied as well to CEMA, which came into being through the initiative of a few interested men from the Pilgrim Trust, the arts and arts education in Britain, which the government undertook to subsidise without a clear policy of its own. Rather, all involved, the representatives of the Pilgrim Trust, the Board of Education, the Ministry of Labour and National Service had differing concepts as to what should be the aims of CEMA. These differences had not been solved yet, although some *dramatis personae*, most notably the proponents of the welfarist approach, had left the stage.

Finally, although Carter envisaged a future of arts sponsorship, he made it clear that whereas CEMA's direct future was secure as a wartime organisation, the decision for the post war future was still pending. Thus, despite his sympathy for the idea of CEMA as sole channel of state aid to the arts, he underlined the temporary position in which it was designed at the outset.

In March 1944, Carter wrote a letter to Keynes expressing his being at a loss about the future of CEMA in the context of Entertainment Tax. In this letter, which was read at the 26th meeting of the Council, Carter 'asked the Council to bear with the awkwardness of existing conditions and "rub along as best we can for another year or so."'[675] Any thought

about the perpetuation of CEMA was postponed for the time being. The government again was muddling through and only tried to remedy the most apparent symptoms of the problem instead of tackling the whole problem of arts sponsorship which involved solutions to the conundrum of exemption from Entertainment Tax in combination with direct grants allocated through CEMA. This included that the Pooley Commission continued to preside over the difficult decision of tax exemption despite numerous complaints about the results of its judgements. Already Ashley Dukes had put down his doubts as to whether the procedure devised by the Pooley Committee was apt to reduce 'mistakes' in classification. These doubts were constantly reiterated on the CEMA Council. Keynes himself complained to Carter that the decisions by the Pooley Committee were 'sometimes so very provocative to any person of taste and knowledge, and so lamentable' that he alleged that the 'Committee is ignorant of the matters with which it is dealing to the point of illiteracy'[676], as they

> 'applied for a synopsis of Ibsen's "Wild Duck". I do not know what other inference you would draw from this application. When it was proposed to put on Gilbert Murray's translation of the "Trojan Women" of Euripides, whilst of course exemption was ultimately granted, this alone, amongst a series of items, had to be deferred for further examination; presumably while they conducted an exploration into the question as to who Gilbert Murray might be, whether there really was a person with such a queer name as Euripides, whether the Trojan Women were persons of good reputation!'[677]

In order to clarify the legal position Keynes suggested his drafting an amendment to the Finance Act,[678] but was immediately stopped in this enterprise by Carter.[679] Although the Pooley Committee did not prove to be an optimal solution, or any solution at all, to the problem of tax exemption, Carter finally put a seal on the discussion about its merits and deficiencies by declaring that the problem was not to be tackled under wartime conditions and had to wait until a policy concerning the role of the state as arts sponsor could be decided upon. In reply to Keynes's letter of 12 May 1944, he explained that only three ways would lead out of the present impasse: either to abolish the Committee and go back to the Customs' liberal interpretation which had categorised almost any 'straight' play as 'partly educational', to replace the Pooley Committee by CEMA or to amend the statute altogether, as Keynes had suggested in January.[680] The first solution was out of the question because he did 'not see how the Government could be expected so quickly to reverse the policy announced to Parliament not so very long ago.'[681] To make CEMA the

judge over exemption would 'produce, at the present time, a far wider outburst of criticism than anything that could be alleged against the Committee',[682] whilst a '[f]undamental alteration of the statute must obviously wait until we know what the post-war policy is to be, and this must, I think, turn mainly on the question of the post-war rôle and functions of C.E.M.A.'[683] Hence, the question of CEMA's perpetuation remained closely linked with the problem of Entertainment Tax, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

5. The Ministry of Labour and deferment

Another example of departmental obstruction of – or at least of lack of co-operation in – CEMA's work was the attitude of the Ministry of Labour and National Service, whose relations with CEMA were problematic since the end of the common effort in the field of factory concerts in early 1941. Here, as in the case of Entertainment Tax, the problems found their roots in the lack of a thought-out and clearly defined governmental policy for arts patronage. In both cases, the organisational structure of a largely autonomous body, only loosely attached to the Board of Education dispensing government grants, backfired. As much as it gave freedom from red tape and political influence where political influence was neither deemed helpful nor without danger, it made the work more difficult at times. Despite the living interest R.A. Butler took in the work of CEMA, the makings of CEMA were supervised on a senior administrative rather than on a political level. Although and simultaneously because no guidelines were issued by the cabinet, the political aims were left vague, which opened the possibility for top level politicians to interfere with CEMA's work in their very own interest. In May 1943, Ernest Bevin, the Minister for Labour, confessed his doubts to R.A. Butler 'about the position in the live entertainments including particularly from the point of view of whether the existing arrangements ensure that it meets properly and equitably the need for entertainment of the various classes of the community.'[684] This, being sent to Butler as the minister responsible for CEMA was, of course, an indirect criticism of CEMA and its mission to equally entertain and educate, especially as the scales increasingly moved to the 'standard' side of the work, whereas CEMA originally had been founded for the welfare side which was more to the liking of Bevin.[685]

Work of the welfare kind had been done by ENSA, which concentrated on troop entertainment, but by now also staged variety shows including classical music in factory canteens. After the initial problems had been sorted out in early 1941, CEMA's and ENSA's work overlapped only in this very limited field of activity. Still, in 1943 new problems arose from this rivalry. In his memoirs, Basil Dean complained

about 'a general impression that, whereas ENSA might be a large, perhaps over-large, purveyor of the lowest common denominator of taste, CEMA was synonymous only with the highest artistic integrity. Maynard Keynes, the Chairman of CEMA, did little to counteract the misapprehension.'[686] Indeed, the CEMA Council decided that with CEMA's reputation depending almost exclusively on the standard of the performers and CEMA's standards differing strongly from ENSA's, no opportunity should be given to the public to mix them up. Hence, the Music Director, Reginald Jacques, and the Council's concert organiser, Gladys Crook, issued the ruling that no artists working for ENSA should be employed by CEMA,[687] which was endorsed by various members of the Council, notably Thelma Cazalet, MP, and Benjamin Ifor Evans, because the distinction between CEMA and ENSA 'was already firmly established in the public mind and it was essential for the educational objects of the Council that it should be preserved.'[688] Although ENSA and CEMA ploughed the same field of classical music in factory concerts, the concepts and motivations varied and instead of co-operation between both bodies, rivalry came into the open causing bitterness on both sides. In May 1943, Mary Glasgow wrote to Sir Kenneth Clark that co-operation with ENSA was not only difficult, but virtually impossible:

> 'I don't want you to think me dog-in the-mangerish about E.N.S.A. (...) What I said yesterday about E.N.S.A.'s Music Panel was not said in the spur of the moment – or as a reflection of the mood I was in. It is a result of three and a half years of trying very genuinely to work with that body, always without result or with actually bad consequences for CEMA. (...) Again at the beginning, Basil Dean told me personally that he was not interested in our highbrow stuff, and that there would be no question of wanting the same musicians. He now complains that we are stealing serious artists whom he wants, and his people in the provinces are saying openly that they are out to beat CEMA at its own game.
> *This is a libellous letter and it probably looks pretty trivial when set out in words, but I do feel most earnestly that clear-cut enmity between CEMA and E.N.S.A. is easier for everyone who attempts at co-operation which, I am convinced, will never be other than one-sided.*'[689]

The distancing from the entertainment side of the work in factory canteens, which had caused a termination of co-operation between ENSA and CEMA and some friction between CEMA and the Ministry of Labour and National Service in 1941, now had more important political consequences. Entertainment, when regarded as a contribution to the war effort, was one field of work which qualified performing artists for

deferment from war work in the forces or in factories. Entertainment as part of further education, however, did not enjoy this privilege.[690] The decision upon deferment lay with the Ministry of Labour. Since artists who wanted to work for CEMA avoided working for ENSA, the latter had increasing difficulty in finding sufficient numbers of artists to meet the demand, especially after the end of intense German air activity had led to an unexpected revival of the entertainment industry.[691] In order to remedy this position and to define the different scopes of activity between CEMA and ENSA, the Ministry of Labour installed a committee under the chairmanship of Sir John Forster to enquire on 'Man and Woman Power in the Entertainment Industry'. On 17 December 1943, Forster presented his report to Bevin, in which he put on record his satisfaction that

> 'at present there is no real competition between C.E.M.A. and N.A.A.F.I./E.N.S.A. In the main it is true to say that N.A.A.F.I./E.N.S.A. serves the Forces, C.E.M.A. the population at large and both of them factories and hostels, so that only in this last group is their sphere of operation the same. C.E.M.A. claims – and, I think, rightly – that at all times the functions of the two organisations are distinct, N.A.A.F.I./E.N.S.A.'s being one of entertainment and C.E.M.A.'s educational.'[692]

In the recommendation section of his report, Forster had suggested the favourable recognition of applications for deferment and the increase of the number of available artists to ENSA by offering the option to join the ENSA colours instead of enlisting either in the army or in vital war industry after the period of deferment had elapsed.[693] Although CEMA was not mentioned *expressis verbis*, Mary Glasgow expected that this applied to CEMA as well.[694] This impression was partly endorsed by a letter by Bevin to R.A. Butler, in which the former assured that artists who worked for CEMA 'will receive the same sympathetic consideration as hitherto.'[695] Having said this, he left himself a little gate open in which CEMA and ENSA were not on the same footing. Whereas he agreed to treat CEMA in the same way as ENSA in terms of deferment, he drew a line at the question of joining CEMA instead of military service or war work.[696] Indeed, CEMA had to face problems in application even for deferment of artists, the most famous case was Jack Skinner, solo dancer of the Ballet Jooss.[697] Culture was good, when it served the clearly limited purpose of contributing to the war effort. If it aimed at education at the same time, it had to subordinate other purposes: all forms of entertainment were equal, but some were more equal than others.

6. CEMA and the audience

So far, the study has concentrated solely on the work of CEMA and its relationship with governmental departments and institutions. In a very brief chapter, the focus will now be shifted to the relationship between CEMA and its audience. Since no representative polls were conducted, the basis for an analysis of CEMA's actual success with the audiences is admittedly shaky. Apart from the usually encouraging reactions of the Ministry of Labour's regional controllers and officers quoted above, the only place where critique can be found is the collection of letters in the correspondence files which give – with due caution – at least a small clue, how CEMA's work was perceived and appreciated.[698]

According to the letters by members of the audience, CEMA could feel reassured in its policy of spreading the best for the most. As a reaction to his first visit to a CEMA concert, a member of the audience wrote to CEMA that he

> 'could not help contrasting the whole enterprise while it was in progress with any government sponsored affair in any other country – in particular Germany. (...) Fancy a government missing the chance to impress on its hearers the supremacy of their composers, etc., we had no national barriers and it was all natural and proper. A splendid example of state administration without Red Tape or any ulterior motives.'[699]

Although the absence of ulterior motives is disputable in view of the wishes of the Ministry of Labour and the Treasury, it is clear from this letter that not only politicians and artists feared a politicisation of the arts by state interference, but also 'normal' members of the public felt it necessary to point out CEMA's relative freedom from government intervention in matters of policy. In the previous chapter, it was shown that CEMA met with criticism from some parts of the press and the Ministry of Labour that they were doing the right thing – i.e. offering highbrow entertainment to workers – though at the wrong place and at the wrong time.[700] Since criticism of the educational approach of CEMA was seldom, and the Ministry of Labour's criticism not free from second thoughts, especially when compared to the reactions of Divisional Welfare Officers who recommended CEMA's concerts,[701] it seems a fair comment that the concerts organised by CEMA in the factories were by and large successful. This can be illustrated by letters from factories where CEMA had staged a concerts thanking the concert organisers and offering contributions to the expenses[702] as well as by touching letters from workers themselves such as this:

> 'I am writing you these few lines, explaining to you how we workers here at Raleigh Hall. Do so much appreciate all your C.E.M.A. and E.N.A. [sic] shows. After working at the factory all day. It is so nice, to come back to the Hostel, and Look forward to the evening. To see an E.N.A. or a C.E.M.A. Apart from enjoying their shows. We also enjoy their company, for the week. As they always stay here as gust's [sic] when they have finished putting over their shows, both at the other hostels, and the factory. I myself am an [sic] munonition [sic] worker, and I do think, that their work should be well admired, as they are playing such a fine part in this war, which I am sure must be greatly admired, and appreciated by thousands of war worker like myself all over the country. (...) For I am sure with out [sic] their shows, This war would not seem to end, and I think Cheerfulness is half the battle. It helps us to carry on, and keeps up our spirits, when we know there is always an E.N.S.A. or C.E.M.A. to look forward to.'[703]

Although it must have been gall and wormwood for the CEMA staff to be mentioned in the same breath with ENSA after all the pains taken to separate themselves from this organisation, the letter shows that the perception of the Ministry of Labour, expressed in the memorandum by H.F. Rossetti quoted in the last chapter, that CEMA did not entertain but educate the people was not correct in all cases. The concepts were not necessarily mutually exclusive, although even CEMA struggled to reconcile them at times. The rightfulness, though, of CEMA's own claim to have brought light to places which had been in utter cultural darkness – comprised in the term 'pioneering work'[704] – seems a matter of conjecture. John Pick is certainly right in his general critique that there was a certain amount of overstatement in CEMA's rhetoric.[705] Still, even though it is very likely that the CEMA audiences were not entirely unfamiliar with drama and pieces of classical music through the BBC and arrangements for brass bands, the presentation of live performances was a further step into educating an active interest and developing a liking of aspects of highbrow culture thus tearing down class barriers of leisure pursuits to an admittedly small extent. The fact that CEMA rhetoric might have overstated their case does not automatically invalidate the influence of CEMA concerts and dramatic performances in the provinces and in factory canteens, and does not justify Pick's critique that the CEMA staff revelled in 'at best, a kind of amiable self-delusion by the stranded cultural sahibs of West One about the importance of their work.'[706]

Consequently, voices were raised already at the end of 1943 to induce the government to increase the grant to CEMA, because

> 'the public, since the commencement of the War, have gradually but markedly moved towards a higher standard of musical and theatrical entertainment and the demand for good music, art exhibitions and theatrical productions has increased considerably. (...) The forms of entertainment supplied by this organisation are the best form of education that could be supplied in that they teach people to appreciate the beauty of the arts and of music; without such appreciation the world will never enjoy peace and understanding but will continue to be a hard brutal place full of strife and greed. Your Department I know, like every other Government Department, is looking ahead to building up a better world after this war and it is felt most strongly that one of the best steps that could possibly be taken to secure this better world is to encourage the better things in life.'[707]

For the time being, the last assurance about the building of a new future including the encouragement of the 'better things in life' was a plan held at the CEMA headquarters and at the Board of Education. The perspective of a future of government sponsorship of the arts however, cannot be stated for the government as such, as the Treasury was very cautious in its respective statements and the Ministry of Labour subjected arts sponsorship to the political aims of the day. Furthermore, the discussion about CEMA's future within the respective government departments show that the government may have had plans for the building of a better world, but that this did not automatically include the carrying over of a wartime service like CEMA.

7. Conclusion

In 1942, CEMA came entirely under the wing of the Board of Education after the Pilgrim Trust had decided to pull out of its own creation in summer 1941. Under the new chairman, Lord Keynes, CEMA developed a more differentiated and professional administration, although the results of this streamlining did not necessarily meet with the expectations connected to it. Whereas the inclusion of professional theatre into CEMA's ambit in summer 1940 had merely entailed a slight erosion of the original policy of giving aid to the people to make their own theatre and music, the move to put Keynes at the head of CEMA radically changed the policy and reversed the preference held by the Pilgrim Trust of amateur over professional effort. The most obvious sign of the change was the funding of opera and ballet from April 1942 on and the taking

over of the Theatre Royal, Bristol. The original attempt to democratise highbrow culture and to vertically diffuse its enjoyment had given way to a purely horizontal proliferation. Culture, formerly taken as a means for moral uplift, now became an end in itself. Although Keynes was the driving force within CEMA of this change of emphasis, the decision to turn away from the 'Pilgrimist' beginnings of adult education and the welfare approach was not only sanctioned by the Board of Education, but obviously intended. However, as the examples of governmental obstruction of CEMA's work by the Ministry of Labour in terms of deferment and by the Treasury/H.M. Customs and Excise in terms of Entertainment Tax show, the British government had no clear-cut idea of its cultural policy even after five years of state patronage, but 'muddled through' on a day-to-day basis. Still, although it was still a long way to go before cultural policy became properly institutionalised in 1946, the idea of state sponsorship became more and more established in the course of the war.

> *At the most, it is a temporary arrangement, made at a time when Old Britannia suddenly realised that she would need more than a trident and a shield to keep her reputation. The pen and the paintbrush had their part to play as well. But a change of Government might well stop the C.E.M.A. subsidy from the Treasury, and I am most pessimistic about the whole affair.*[708]

VII. FROM CEMA TO THE ARTS COUNCIL OF GREAT BRITAIN, SEPTEMBER 1944 TO JUNE 1945 AND BEYOND

1. The discussion on CEMA's future within the Treasury, September 1944 to January 1945

In the course of the year 1944, marked by the emerging prospect of a British victory in the war, especially after the Allied invasion in Normandy, planning for the reconstruction of Britain after the war gained momentum. The most famous document in this context was undoubtedly the Beveridge Report on Social and Allied Services in Great Britain, published already in 1942, which triggered off the so-called White Paper Chase. Although in a very lowly prioritised position, the discussion about CEMA's future or termination also has to be seen in this context. With CEMA's moving away from the original *ad hoc* wartime body to a future peace time body of state sponsorship, the first foundations of a transformation and final institutionalisation had been laid. This, however, had occurred within the safe harbour of the Board, now the Ministry of Education, without a general decision on cabinet level, and under the still valid justification of CEMA's work as a contribution to the war effort. These welfare efforts, however, were envisaged to lapse with the cessation of hostilities. Hence, the changes of the political context after the imminent end of the war and the changes in policy with its emerging exclusive emphasis on raising standards and encouragement of artistic perfection did not only affect CEMA's outlook, but made a different approach to arts sponsorship necessary. Although, or probably because CEMA had earned its merits during the war, especially through the shelter and factory concerts, it was held in some quarters that CEMA would either terminate its activities with the end of the war, or the wartime funding of the arts had to be revised under the changed conditions. In November 1943, the civil servant in the Treasury, Eric

Hale, had written that it 'will, of course, be necessary, when the war is over, to consider the whole future of state assistance to the arts (including the drama). If C.E.M.A. is to go on at all, it cannot go on as an unincorporated body, dependent on an annually voted grant.'[709] Whereas Hale, generally in favour of the idea of arts sponsorship by the state, was not sure whether this concept would be considered worthwhile also in peacetime, there were voices that demanded an end of CEMA, which were based on the perception that it still was a body designed for the single purpose of steadying morale in Britain during the war.[710] If CEMA ever served such a single purpose, which is doubtful considering the early beginning of support for professional theatre companies and Symphony Orchestras, it had changed its outlook from 1942 on at the latest. On accepting the post as Chairman of the Council, Keynes had suggested to R.A. Butler, that it was 'clearly (...) after the war that the big opportunities will come'.[711] Even though this was not necessarily the accepted view even of Treasury officials favourably inclined to the idea of state sponsorship of the arts, the abolishment of CEMA was equally undecided upon as its perpetuation.[712] The revision of the position as predicted by Hale began with a discussion about CEMA's future between representatives of the Treasury and the newly created Ministry of Education in October 1944. When asked whether the Treasury would in general favour the idea of perpetuating CEMA in peacetime, the Treasury official Sir Alan Barlow evasively answered that 'in his view the question was tied up with that of Entertainments Tax exemption. We should have to do both [i.e. perpetuate C.E.M.A. and repeal exemption from Entertainment Tax, JW] or neither.'[713] The automatism that had led to an increase in CEMA's grant from the modest beginning of £25,000 in April 1940 to £175,000 for the financial year of 1944/45, could not be expected to survive the transition from wartime to peace. Facing the administrative problems that had appeared in the day-to-day work of CEMA and the various government institutions dealing with Entertainment Tax and exemption from it, the Treasury now planned to find a comprehensive solution before deciding upon the details

Sir Archibald Carter of H.M. Customs and Excise prepared a long memorandum in November 1944 discussing the pros and cons of 'Entertainment Duty on "Living Entertainments"' – thus excluding a discussion of tax relief of the cinema – and its abolition which also highlighted the Treasury position concerning public patronage. In this document, Carter took a larger view of the political and social problems involved. He stated that from the administrative point of view, the abolition of the tax on living entertainments would create no problems at all, since 90% of the revenue came from the cinema, where the tax was easy to collect. This stood in contrast to the tax collection from 'non-

mechanical entertainments, and especially the theatres, a frequent source of argument and complaint both inside the House of Commons and outside.'[714] This administrative argument in favour of abolition, however, could in Carter's view easily be checked by two political arguments of more weight:

> '(a) the argument that the cinema is the poor man's and the children's entertainment and the theatre the rich man's; and
> (b) suggestions that if there is at last money to spare from the National Exchequer, the theatres, football matches, dog and horse racing are not in the first queue from relief.'[715]

Two conclusions concerning CEMA's work during the war can be drawn from this statement. Although CEMA had been successful in bringing productions of Ibsen, Shaw and Shakespeare plays to places hitherto without a chance to receive a drama company of considerable standard, hence in a horizontal spread of culture over the country, it had not managed to democratise of the theatre by way of reduction of seat prices, in other words to make the theatre also the 'poor man's entertainment', i.e. to vertically proliferate the arts. The exceptions, of course, were productions in Factory Hostels and the open air performances in the 'Holidays at Home' scheme, but these features of CEMA's work were doomed to cease at the end of the war. Otherwise, CEMA guaranteed the respective co-operating companies against loss, in case that not enough people should buy tickets at regular prices, rather than subsidising reduced prices thus appealing to a wider audience. The social division was probably decreased, but surely not bridged by CEMA's work, and the future programme of CEMA was not auspicious in that direction either. The second conclusion to be drawn is that the Customs, simply stating that problems and criticism might arise from the decision to terminate the taxation of live performances, saw the tide of the times rather going against the funding of the arts, with other more pressing problems requiring public expenditure. Carter saw a problem arising from the distinction between the cinema and the performing arts. In his view, a lifting of tax on theatre and live music could be justified only with great difficulty if the cinema still had to pay the tax, whereas it was impossible for the Treasury to lose the entire revenue from Entertainment Tax. The administrative advantage of tax abolition was thus outweighed by the political intricacies of the problem. Furthermore,

> '(...) every cigarette-smoker, male or female, knows perfectly well why twenty cigarettes cost 2s 4d now, as compared with 1s before the war. And the honest fellow having his pint in the local in the

> evening knows very well why it costs so much more than it did before the war – and wallop at that! We suggest that entertainments duty – living or otherwise – will have to wait its turn. –'[716]

Although all this sounded like a general unwillingness by the Customs to financially help the arts, the concluding recommendation not to abolish Entertainment Tax on living entertainments,[717] ensured that CEMA's future was more secure due to a nexus between the levying of Entertainment Tax and the perpetuation of CEMA. The entire abolition of the tax

> 'would for all practical purposes wipe out all the difficulties in administration to which this particular exemption gave rise. It would, of course, expose the "cultural" type of entertainment, including those sponsored by C.E.M.A. as well as several hundred amateur dramatic societies, to the full blast of commercial competition. If this is considered undesirable, the solution is presumably to give direct Government subsidies for those entertainments which are acknowledged to have an educational value and deserve financial assistance from the Government.'[718]

This, however, would have implied even greater financial commitments by the Treasury for it meant a loss of tax revenue for the Treasury plus further expenditure on the arts to help 'cultural' entertainments, which could not face commercial competition. As a consequence of this dilemma, the Memorandum of H.M. Customs and Excise strongly recommended not abolishing Entertainment Tax. This recommendation was followed by the Treasury,[719] who consequently concentrated on the ensuing problem of tax exemption. One factor endangering CEMA's future, the complete abolition of Entertainment Tax, was thus ruled out early in the discussion. The question of abolition of Entertainment Tax had entailed a double paradox for the performing arts in Britain: the keeping of the tax was doubly necessary for purveyors of commercially less successful but artistically valuable productions. Directly, the Entertainment Tax put them in a position to compete with commercial rivals[720] and indirectly, the levying of Entertainment Tax was regarded by the Treasury as a *conditio sine qua non* for state sponsorship which again came to the benefit of organisations like the Old Vic as can be seen in a memorandum of December 1944:

'(...)

5. In the view of the Customs there are two possibilities: (a) to base the tax on the objects of the producing society and not on the nature of the single entertainment, or (b) to abolish the exemption altogether.
6. We and they regard (b) as the more satisfactory, but politically it would probably be impossible to carry unless it could be said that the assistance which the arts would thus lose was being restored in a more intelligent form, e.g. by the perpetuation of C.E.M.A.
7. But if the unsatisfactory exemption can only be repealed if C.E.M.A. is perpetuated at the same time, it may also be that Treasury Ministers will think that C.E.M.A. can only be perpetuated if the exemption is repealed. The Treasury have to stress more than ever our impoverishment as a result of the war and the need for caution in entering into financial commitments. *A new long term commitment to assist the arts, which can easily be represented as a luxury, may seem inconsistent with limits on other expenditure.* Thus it may be easier for Treasury Ministers to agree to a perpetuation of C.E.M.A. if it can be represented not as requiring new money, but as giving back to the arts in a more intelligent way the subsidy which they have been getting from the exemptions.'[721]

Thus the danger remained that the nexus between Entertainment Tax and CEMA worked to the disadvantage of CEMA due to the Treasury's just argument that the strains on state finances brought about by the war were such that the state had to concentrate on absolutely necessary expenditure, such as reconstruction of destroyed homes, before turning to more fanciful items like funding the arts, which could 'easily be represented as a luxury'. This argument had been one of the major arguments against any funding of the arts before the war and apparently held good within the ranks of the Treasury after the experience of almost five years of successful sponsorship. These years, however, had not passed without some readjustment in argumentation about the justification of state grants to the arts. The purely financial view that naturally prevailed in the Treasury met with political counter-arguments in other departments, most notably in the Ministry of Education. Already in February 1941, in a situation when the original Treasury grant was on the verge to exhaustion, Wood had noted that

'C.E.M.A.'s activities have secured widespread approbation, and the Government has been given a great deal of credit for the

> attention it has paid to the preservation and spread of good music and the arts in war-time. I am clear that the Government cannot afford simply do let C.E.M.A. and its work fade out.'[722]

The political aim of prestige which had been described as one valid justification of government sponsorship of the arts in the first chapter, was now to be weighed against the purely fiscal thinking of the Treasury. This gave further strength to the argument to reinvest into the deserving 'cultural types of entertainment' what had been taken from the entertainment industry in general by the tax. Consequently, Barlow suggested the perpetuation of CEMA which in his view

> 'is a "good thing" and ought to be continued on a permanent basis, and Sir Archibald Carter agrees with us that the "partly educational" exemption ought to be drastically modified and that any subsidy to music and drama ought to be given directly and openly and not through the very unsatisfactory and arbitrary side-channel of the exemption (...)'[723]

Two things are striking in this short fragment. First of all, the casualness of tone in which a senior civil servant puts forward his opinion that a government sponsored body should be put on a permanent footing is remarkable. In this style, a government official less inclined to the arts than Barlow might have suggested just the opposite – with strong political and fiscal arguments on his side. Again, as in winter 1939, a mere coincidence of interested people being in the right place at the right time seemed to secure the survival of CEMA.

Secondly, the nexus between the termination of tax exemption and the perpetuation of CEMA was loosened. Both addressees, Osbert Peake, the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, and Sir John Anderson, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, put down their ideas in short hand-written notices on this suggestion in due course. The more interesting remark was Peake's, who agreed that

> 'C.E.M.A. is a good thing – and should be maintained, and (within reason) extended in peace-time. We are extinguishing the wealthy patrons upon whom good art has so largely depended hitherto – and we should therefore, I think, be forthcoming to a venture which has proved a success. (...)'[724]

In this statement Peake suggested that the redistribution of private wealth in the train of the war was mostly responsible for the perpetuation of a government service which had its origins in the emergency situation

of the 'bore war' of 1939/1940. He echoed the argument by Lord Esher quoted in the previous chapter, who had alleged that the 'Lady Cunard method of art production is over.'[725] Indeed, income tax and especially surtax had steadily risen in the course of the war, the latter to an almost prohibitive rate of 19s 6d in the pound in 1941.[726] It is obvious from this passage that the war was perceived as a major force for this kind of government activity, which had appeared almost impossible before the war. Whereas in the nineteen-thirties the slump was seen as an argument against government involvement into the realm of the arts, since the state would have to restrict expenditure on core sectors of government policy, now the very argument was turned around. Since the financial position of the wealthy patrons, who had kept up the arts before the war, was seen as declining to such a degree that they were unable to live up to their traditional task, the state had to step in in their stead. Although the arts and their funding from the coffers of the State were still perceived or seen to be perceptible as a luxury, they had gained an increased importance at the end of the war than they had before.

Consequently, Sir John Anderson, and the Lord President of the Council, Clement Attlee, agreed to the proposal and ruled that reference to the whole cabinet was unnecessary.[727] The decision to perpetuate arts sponsorship by the state, hence, was taken without any publicity or discussion in the cabinet, but as an agreement of two powerful cabinet ministers on suggestion of a small group of Treasury officials who recommended the organisation and its work as a 'good thing'.

This general assent by the Treasury and one of the most influential members of the cabinet did not imply a problem-free conversion of the wartime CEMA into its peacetime successor. First of all, the reform of exemption from Entertainment Tax remained an open question. Furthermore, the policies involved were neither entirely left to CEMA itself and nor were they decided upon yet. Lastly, and most importantly for CEMA, it was still undecided whether CEMA was simply to be continued on the same insecure footing as hitherto or whether it was to be established as a recognised government institution through legislation by the House of Commons.

2. CEMA's work in the transitory period September 1944 to December 1945

Despite the insecurities, CEMA went on with its work and with its conversion from the emergency body into a peace time institution. The next steps in the transition from a wartime to peace time organisation were taken and the enthusiasm for the welfare aspects of the work, most notably the factory concerts and performances in the ROF Hostels, formerly seen as one of the most important pieces of CEMA's work,

greatly decreased. In Circular 29 for the Regional Officers of March 1945, the London headquarters finally announced the end of the strict earmarking of the allocation for hostel concerts.[728] Despite the prospect of giving up the factory and hostel side of the work, Mary Glasgow could not conceal her joy about the looming termination of CEMA's old rival ENSA and the prospect of taking over some of its activities. ENSA, identified with entertainment of troops and war workers, was to be abolished and the Ministry of Labour now turned to CEMA instead.[729] Keynes, however, was not too pleased with the prospect of spending money on purposes which had been accepted as adequate in the exceptional situation of the war, but which did not deem him suitable for the postwar CEMA.[730] This scepticism was justified as a new financial arrangement was in planning. So far, CEMA's grant had been annually awarded by the Treasury on the basis of a budget presented by CEMA. Thus, CEMA's budget had been increased to £175,000 for the financial year 1944/45. Now, with the prospect of becoming a permanent body receiving grants from the Treasury for a long-term policy as opposed to the ad-hoc measures of war-time other ways of finance had to be thought out. The discussion about the mode of financing the work of CEMA lasted throughout the whole year of 1945. Keynes surmised that the financial organisation of CEMA would considerably change in the nearest future and that payment according to the needs of the day was a thing of the past. In future, CEMA was not likely to get its grant increased by the amount of extra cost.[731]

Keynes had begun to remodel CEMA in September 1944 with drafting an outline of the new body which he presented to the CEMA Council on the occasion of its 30th meeting on 26 September 1944.[732] The key points of this draft were the incorporation of the organisation as the 'Royal Council of the Arts' by Royal Charter, a considerable increase of the grant by the Treasury over a reasonable period of years to enable the Council to make long-term promises and the placing of the new body under the administrative wing of either the Ministry of Education or the Treasury. Furthermore, Keynes put down that an immediate change in the activities and the personnel was as unnecessary as a exact definition of the Council's activities in the Charter.[733]

Before presenting it to the Council, Keynes had discussed the document with R.A. Butler, 'who had welcomed it and agreed to it in principle'.[734] Although Keynes did not think it essential to exactly define the functions of the new peace time body in September 1944, he drew up a list of tasks the new CEMA, which he provisionally termed Arts Council, was to discharge. These included

'(a) to increase the accessibility of the arts to the public throughout the country;
(b) to improve the standard of execution of the arts;
(c) to encourage and aid proficiency in the arts;
(d) to improve and maintain the status of the artist;
(e) to advise and co-operate with Government Departments (as before).'[735]

Although the widening of accessibility remained the top priority of the work on paper, the future Arts Council was to concentrate on aims b) and c), which seemed more easily attainable. The greatest self-imposed task ahead for the Arts Council was the 'rescue' of opera in Britain. Both great opera houses in London were out of use at the end of 1944, the Royal Opera House at Covent Garden had been transformed into a dance palace during the war under the lease of Mecca Dance Halls, and Sadler's Wells had first been requisitioned, then heavily damaged by enemy action. During the war, CEMA had closely co-operated with the Sadler's Wells opera and ballet and had thus helped to keep both art forms going, although the financial contribution had actually been very small.[736] In summer 1944, first attempts were made to ensure a future of operatic production in the Royal Opera House in Covent Garden. As usual, it was a private initiative in the beginning, instigated by the London music publishers Leslie Boosey and Ralph Hawkes, who tried to recover the present dance hall and turn it into a home for international opera productions. Boosey and Hawkes approached CEMA and Keynes personally early in the process and were warmly welcomed. In July 1944, Keynes presented the idea to his fellow councillors who agreed with him that it 'was very desirable for them to co-operate as fully as possible with the Covent Garden venture (...).'[737] As indicated in the introduction of this study, dissemination and/or creation of a national culture had at no time been a particular aim of CEMA. The interest of CEMA and Keynes was in grandeur of art in general without any national discrimination, a policy which had enabled the inclusion of works by Bach, Beethoven and Wagner into the programmes of CEMA sponsored concerts.

International productions of opera, though, had been only one possible option at the time. The alternative would have been to back the plans of the Sadler's Wells Opera Company to produce opera in English whilst reserving Covent Garden as the stage for foreign operatic productions and ballet. Tyrone Guthrie, director at the Old Vic, and Edward J. Dent presented a memorandum to the Council, which unfolded a panorama of advantages for an 'English solution'. First of all, they assured the Council that since 1939 '[t]he Financial Position has been revolutionised by (...) State subvention through CEMA, with the result

that 'Box office' need no longer dominate "Policy"'.[738] Furthermore, according to the paper, the establishment of CEMA had created favourable conditions for the opera in Britain in three ways:

'(a) Economically
1. Unprecedented public demand for music and for drama
2. Alliance of CEMA and Sadler's Wells – a combination representing on the one hand intelligent disinterested patronage, on the other, practical experience and a considerable degree of public goodwill

(b) Socially
The revolution in financial and social values caused by the war creates a unique opportunity to demolish the demonstrably false preconception that Opera is solely for the wealthy and aristocratic

(c) Artistically
1. The war has made us more than normally conscious of the value of a local heritage
2. There are at the moment an exceptional number of talented young native composers'[739]

Again, the war was seen as the prime force of change in this social and political development and as an incentive to remodel the future on the changes brought about by the war.

Up to this point in the memorandum, that is in the analysis of the state of opera in Britain, the Arts Council and Sadler's Wells concurred. But the practical conclusions differed remarkably. Instead of the creation of a new opera company in Covent Garden, Prof. Dent and Tyrone Guthrie thought along more British lines than Keynes. They suggested the gradual development of a truly British opera out of 'the British tradition of poetry and drama. We must encourage our own singers to speak their own language properly, and understand it, and then to sing English as they speak it, not to try to "make a big noise like a foreigner".'[740] Moreover, in order to make full use of the Covent Garden stage, a large orchestra would have been needed, with the disadvantage that the company installed at Covent Garden would be too large to tour the country for there were, according to Guthrie and Dent, only three further theatres in Britain to house opera of such scale.[741] This, naturally, was an argument which might have been expected from the Arts Council rather than from the Sadler's Wells' management since it perfectly fell into CEMA's self-chosen ambition to disseminate the arts throughout the country. But the war-time arguments, if they had been taken seriously, had given way to other deliberations within the Arts Council. In view of their emphasis on

'local heritage' and the potential of British composers, Benjamin Britten, Michael Tippett and, later, Harrison Birtwistle surely fulfilled the expectations thus formulated, Guthrie and Dent suggested a trial period of five years for the development of English opera at the Sadler's Wells, at the end of which 'the governors can have no reasonable objection if CEMA, or any supporting body transfers its support elsewhere', 'if the Sadler's Wells ensemble is not of creditable standard.'[742]

Despite the closeness of this programmatic approach to opera to CEMA's own formulated aims, Keynes opted for the funding of an international solution at Covent Garden. In an internal memorandum, it was suggested that:

> 'In early thinking of a policy for Covent Garden it was clear that Sadler's Wells Ballet had in normal times reached a high standard, and if a British Ballet Company were to be used at Covent Garden, then collaboration with Sadler's Wells was desirable. It was realised that the Opera Company had not reached the same standard. (...) There is no doubt that the company has achieved a considerable standard of stage presentation, although much of the production work disregards the fact that the artists are to sing. (...) There is no conductor of importance, strength or outstanding musical capacity in the company. Guthrie is rightly insistent on the English character of the Sadler's Wells Company. The Covent Garden Committee would insist that they are to found a first-class British Opera Company, but that does not mean the total exclusion of foreign assistance. We must, in fact, make considerable use of foreign talent, in the early days of the venture.'[743]

Hence, CEMA decided to make a fresh start at Covent Garden without the opera company of Sadler's Wells but with the result that Covent Garden is until today the biggest single customer of the Arts Council and – as predicted by Guthrie and Dent – continuously facing financial problems.[744] Immediately, Keynes, uniting the functions of CEMA chairman and newly installed member of the Covent Garden Board of Directors,[745] began to drill the wells of the Treasury for state subsidy for opera. R.A. Butler offered his assistance, but remained sceptical about the success of the plea, as there was 'a long background of Treasury hesitancy about assisting the Opera'.[746] Undauntedly, Keynes impressed the importance of a government grant upon the Treasury officials. In his view, the Covent Garden project was 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.'[747] What is interesting about this letter is the fact that Keynes thought it worthwhile to counter the purely financial argument not only with an assurance that the grant would not be excessive but also with an argument that had cut no ice in the comparable case of the National Theatre in 1913, only 32 years before, i.e. the argument of national prestige. Despite Butler's doubts and the usual hesitancy of the Treasury to make money available for operatic productions, the Treasury agreed to put a grant of £25,000 into CEMA's hands, which finally put the seal on the Treasury's general decision to perpetuate CEMA. As the Accountant General of the Ministry of Education correctly perceived: 'this opera item is, of course, a reconstruction, not a war-time, item, and the Treasury approval of the inclusion of provision for it in the Estimates carries with it Treasury agreement to our proceeding on the basis that C.E.M.A. will be a continuing entity after the war.'[748]

This commitment by the Treasury and CEMA on behalf of the Covent Garden scheme entailed two problems. Although it was widely accepted that without state aid opera could not survive, the help on behalf of Covent Garden in order to make it the home of opera in Britain created an atmosphere of competition in this field. With Sadler's Wells Opera and Ballet and the renewed Covent Garden Opera, two large companies competed in a relatively small field. As a solution to this problem, Mary Glasgow had suggested the division of the work between Sadler's Wells and Covent Garden in such a way, that Covent Garden was the place for Grand Opera and ballet, whereas Sadler's Wells should stage 'a definite type of opera – Opera Comique, – Chamber Opera – or what you will' with a generous financial injection from CEMA.[749] This plan implied a transfer of the Sadler's Wells ballet company under Ninette de Valois to Covent Garden. The aim of this Covent Garden scheme, as Keynes emphasised, was to create a shop window for achievements in music, theatre and their combination, opera, and thus to consolidate London's position as a European centre of music.[750] Thus, the general aim of national prestige gained importance in the reconstruction period, whilst the popularisation of opera remained basically a side aspect of the Arts Council and the Covent Garden scheme:

> 'The International Seasons of Opera at the Covent Garden were made possible through the patronage of the few and a scale of prices for admission which restricted the opportunity of hearing Opera to a small circle. Admission to Covent Garden should be made possible to the greatest number of people and the Committee will probably adopt a range of prices from 2/- or 2/6 to 1/6 or 20/-.'[751]

Both mentioned statements of this memorandum again give strength to Marwick's four-tier model, especially the reconstruction dimension, for it was – again at least on the perceptual level – the war that abolished aristocratic patronage of the opera and made public sponsorship necessary.

The concepts by the Sadler's Wells and CEMA for Covent Garden seemed irreconcilable and made a merger of the two enterprises, which had been the CEMA's hope until June 1945[752], impossible. In the end it was agreed that the Sadler's Wells ballet company under Ninette de Valois was to be transferred to Covent Garden whereas the opera company remained independent.[753] Furthermore, the whole opera grant of £25,000 was handed over to the new Covent Garden Trust.[754] As a compensation for the loss of the ballet company, Sadler's Wells received a long-term guarantee against loss for the new Ballet School and the new Sadler's Wells ballet, to be known as Opera-Ballet Company.[755] Before the guarantees were made to the Sadler's Wells, the Treasury had given a green light concerning CEMA's future although 'no promise could be given until the New Year'[756]

This episode reveals two things. First of all, it was obvious that without state money and support in the negotiations, operatic production in Britain after the war would have taken a very different turn and that the recovery of the Royal Opera House in Covent Garden would not have been possible, at least not in the way described, with all its implications. John Christie and his Glyndebourne Opera in Sussex, though, had shown that also without state funds it was possible to stage music theatre in Britain.[757] Secondly, it shows the new scope of work of the Arts Council and also the self-confidence linked with this work. Although the Arts Council had not taken its place in the cultural scene in Britain yet, for no formal decision on the form of state sponsorship had been taken by the Treasury, despite the promising assurances, it had forcefully claimed it. In the draft budget for 1945/46, this claim was clearly formulated:

> 'An application has come, for 1945-46, for assistance to the new, non-profit-making company established to present opera and ballet at Covent Garden. The lease of the theatre stands in the name of Mssrs. Boosey and Hawkes, who have taken considerable responsibility for the new venture, *but the view is taken that Covent Garden as a national home for Opera and Ballet is too important a thing to be left to commercial enterprise and that it should be controlled by a Board of disinterested public men, with due representation by the State.*'[758]

In order to put this plan and ambition into realisation, it was necessary to come to terms with the Treasury.

3. The financial arrangement

So far, the Arts Council/CEMA had received a green light from the Treasury to provisionally go on with its work and was allowed to enter a long-term commitment with the Sadler's Wells and Covent Garden. The details, i.e. how the future Arts Council was to be constituted, incorporated and, most importantly, financed by the government, was not decided upon yet. The deliberations and negotiations about the concrete future of the Arts Council of Great Britain took the whole year 1945.

Under head (iii) of his already quoted draft Charter, Keynes had suggested that a considerably increased government grant should be made available to the Arts Council, which should come either on the vote of the Board of Education or directly from the Treasury. In an additional paper, Keynes submitted a more detailed plan of finance to the Treasury, which suggested a share of finance between the Treasury and the Ministry of Education. Keynes's suggestion of a general grant from the Treasury plus a supplementary grant on an annual basis on the vote of the Ministry of Education[759] was immediately ruled out by Sir Robert Wood and the Accountant General of the Ministry of Education.[760] Keynes's idea to fix a grant for a period of five years, though, was more warmly welcomed by the government.[761] The Treasury official Eric Hale stressed the advantages and desirability of a long-term arrangement very early in the process of intradepartmental and interdepartmental discussion. By such an arrangement, both sides would have more planning security than hitherto, for if the 'Council are to be given an assurance for a period that the grant will not be reduced, the Treasury must have an equal assurance that they will not be pressed to increase it.'[762] With this stabilisation in both ways, the government could prevent the grant from 'varying wildly according to the political climate of the moment.'[763]

The new financial organisation was greatly complicated by the uncertainties concerning the still pending arrangement of Entertainment Tax. Although CEMA's future was no longer directly linked with this tax, the Treasury still felt it necessary to find ways and means to justify patronage in relation to it. Sir Alan Barlow suggested in November 1944 in his already quoted paper for Osbert Peake and Sir John Anderson that it 'would be much more rational and should be simpler to give whatever help the State can afford through a direct subsidy administered by C.E.M.A. than through "partly educational" exemption.'[764]

This left two possible options for CEMA's future role. Either, as Barlow had suggested, to abolish the practice of exemption and reinvest at least parts of this increased revenue of the Exchequer into the arts

through CEMA as 'sole channel' or to retain the present system, but to make CEMA the judge over exemption. Keynes, on the contrary, made it clear that he was not interested in abolishing tax exemption, but wished to make the present system more transparent and easier to deal with.[765] This rendered only the second of the two options hoped for by the Treasury and H.M. Customs and Excise viable, i.e. to keep tax exemption, but to involve CEMA in the decision-making process about educational merits. Again, Keynes rejected the idea to put the management of tax exemption solely into CEMA's hands.[766] He 'took the view that such a course would give C.E.M.A. too much power and lay it open to criticism over too wide a field before it had time to grow in strength enough to sustain such criticism (...)'.[767] Keynes could draw from his experience with the press in the summer of 1943, when CEMA had come under harsh critique by the Press, which had wrongly alleged that CEMA not only profited from tax exemption, but also was the body deciding upon it. That Keynes's fear was not without foundation was proved in a conversation of officials of H.M. Customs and Excise with representatives of the British Drama League on 19 February 1945. The latter group expressed its preference for retaining Entertainment Tax, since 'British drama as a whole would on a broad view gain enormously from the suggested change in the basis of taxation, for it would facilitate the production of plays which the commercial manager was not prepared to risk.'[768] Whilst accepting to swallow Entertainment Tax in general, they were strictly opposed to the idea that CEMA would be made the judge over the educational merits of productions and hence over exemption. The arguments employed ranged from the doubt that 'the drama panel of C.E.M.A. was anything like representative enough to occupy a permanent place in the theatre' to the thought 'that the suggestion would involve C.E.M.A. in a heavy administratively burden for which it was not well suited.'[769]

The result of these consultations was termed by Carter as the 'least unsatisfactory solution'[770] and comprised the following conclusions:

> '(1) Retain the present system of tax exemption for all non-profit-making bodies with "partly-educational" purpose, but amend the wording of the section so as to avoid having to determine whether each particular performance is "partly educational" or not.
> (2) Make C.E.M.A. our advisers on the question whether societies which can reasonably be regarded as partly-educational, though the statutory responsibility would remain with us. (...)

(3) Abolish Sir Ernest Pooley's Committee which, on this lay-out, would become superfluous.[771]

The Treasury had a good reason to simply accept Keynes's objections without insisting on their original plan of abolishing tax exemption and refunding the arts through CEMA. In a letter to Carter, Keynes estimated that – additionally to the envisaged grant amounting to £235,000 for the financial year of 1945/46 – CEMA would need a considerable sum to adequately reimburse the producers of educational and partly educational entertainments for the loss incurred by the now imposed tax which he thought in the region of £300,000. Furthermore, he envisaged that at 'the end of the war there would doubtless be a considerable multiplication of applicant societies. I should surmise that the date would soon arise when CEMA would be needing something of the order of £1,000,000 a year, if we were to operate on these lines.'[772] A grant of even nearly this range was not contemplated in the Treasury.[773] Even the Ministry of Education, a spending department as opposed to the Treasury as the central revenue department, thought that an amount of even half of Keynes's suggestion was neither feasible nor desirable, since it was doubted that the Arts Council was 'a body which will expend a larger sum entirely wisely. It may be, therefore, that a somewhat more modest beginning would be wiser, but this would be open to the objection of "half measures".'[774] Hence, Sir John Anderson accepted the compromise agreed upon by Keynes, Carter and Barlow, but made it clear that he thought of this arrangement as transitional.[775] Nothing being so long-lived as a provisional arrangement, this set-up remained unchanged until a long time after the war. The only difference to the pre-war and war situation was that the Treasury and H.M. Customs and Excise tried to minimise the problem of the decision whether a production qualified as partly educational by employing CEMA as advisory body and by more clearly defining the term of 'partly educational'.[776]

Although a general decision about CEMA's future had been prejudiced by the agreement of Sir Alan Barlow, Osbert Peake and Sir John Anderson that it was a 'good thing', manifest results for CEMA's perpetuation did not yet materialise. In January 1945, Keynes wrote to Barlow describing

> 'the increasing difficulties through the uncertainty of our future. At the moment the technical position is that no-one has a right to his job after March 31st next. When you have approved our budget, then they will have one more year of life, but that is all. My feeling (…) is that the organisation will fall to pieces if the personnel is not stiffened very soon.'[777]

Contrary to this wish, Barlow advised Sir Robert Wood of the Ministry of Education, not to make any kind of announcement concerning CEMA's future, before the future policy concerning Entertainment Tax had been settled.[778] Still, Barlow gave CEMA a green light to continue on a provisional basis and to make the necessary appointments for a period of one year.[779] On 12 June 1945, Sir John Anderson formally announced the perpetuation of CEMA under the name Arts Council of Great Britain[780], which gave the necessary 'stiffening' asked for by Keynes.[781] In his announcement, Anderson told the House that

> 'The present Council was set up to maintain the standard and the national tradition of the arts under war conditions. The experience thus gained seemed to us to show that there will be a lasting need after the war for a body of this kind to encourage knowledge, understanding and practice of the arts in the broad sense of that term.'[782]

With this announcement, the *quod* of CEMA's future was secured. What remained to be defined was the *quomodo*, especially the size of the grant that the Treasury was prepared to put at the new body's disposal. So far, the Treasury represented by Barlow had suggested that the grant was expected not to go much beyond £200,000 – 250,000.[783] This sum, though, was already reached in the first post-war grant for the financial year 1945/46, and CEMA had announced that more money would be needed in the future rather than less, since the number of applicant societies would multiply at the end of the war.[784] The first draft budgets for the following financial year mirrored this prediction by Keynes. In early December 1945, Mary Glasgow informed Keynes that

> 'Adding together the rough estimate of all the departments we get a figure of £458,000 as an annual average for the five years, and this is without the cost of the house or its maintenance. Mr. Hale did not like this when I mentioned it to him unofficially, and you yourself have accepted my first suggestion of £400,000 as reasonable. I shall, therefore, try to get our present total cut down to nearer £400,000.'[785]

Keynes, on the contrary, seemed less complaisant with the wishes of the Treasury and directly asked for a considerably increased grant in the future. He suggested a grant in the size of £400,000 per annum plus an aggregate amount of £500,000 for the five year period for 'non-recurrent expenditure too large to be met conveniently out of the annual grant.'[786]

In the end Keynes prevailed and – after a modest start as announced by Anderson – the Treasury made an annual grant of over £500,000 very soon after the war.[787]

4. The departmental responsibility

Apart from the financial intricacies, the quoted drafts for the Arts Council's Charter and its scope of activity raised two closely intertwined questions. First of all, Keynes took the view that there was no automatism to continue the work of the future Arts Council in close connection with the Ministry of Education. He also thought a direct grant from the Treasury possible. This implied at least a departmental severance of the work of the Arts Council from education, a fact that gave rise to discussion on policy between the Ministry of Education and the Treasury, equally between the two Conservative ministers, R.A. Butler and Sir John Anderson, and the incoming Labour ministers after the general election in June 1945, Ellen Wilkinson and Hugh Dalton. Secondly, a political decision on the scope of governmental influence on the new body was triggered off by this draft charter.

The question under whose aegis the future Arts Council was to operate was more than a question of political power and jealousy, as F.M. Leventhal in his article on CEMA alleges.[788] The problem whether the Minister of Education or the Chancellor of the Exchequer was to speak on behalf of the arts in the cabinet was at least equally a question of policy and of British political culture, as the debate in the first half of the year 1945 and again at the end of that year shows. In the first drafts of the new body's constitution, Keynes had left the question open. The Treasury itself opted for a change of departmental responsibility. In a letter to Barlow, Eric Hale subjected the financial set-up as agreed upon in relation to Entertainment Tax to 'the hypothesis that the Council is under the Treasury (...) aegis, that Government should be fairly remote – as remote as is consistent with being the main source of finance – from a body of this kind.'[789] The Treasury officials wanted to restrict the influence of the government to at best 'an informal arrangement that we should be consulted about any development involving a) commitments on the ensuing quinquennium, or b) liable to give rise to any Parl.y [sic] difficulty; but otherwise I should like to leave them to "paddle their own canoe".'[790]

R.A. Butler, though, was not at all in favour of handing over this prestigious body to the Treasury despite weighty counter arguments from within his own department. In a memorandum for Butler, Sir Robert Wood weighed the advantages and the disadvantages of a handing over of the Arts Council to the Treasury. Differing from Butler, Wood thought the administrative advantages of the change of departmental responsibility overwhelming. In his view, the future Council would

become involved much closer with Treasury finance, for 'it will in effect derive its monies (...) as an offset to the Entertainment Tax which would be charged on partly educational entertainments which may now secure exemption'. On these grounds, 'in addition to the fact that as a chartered body the Council will have an even more complete freedom and entity of its own', Wood recommended the transfer of the Council to the Treasury.[791] Another reason for the handing over resulted from Scotland's special position in terms of education. Since the Ministry of Education had no authority over Scotland, the remaining of the Council under the Ministry's wing was liable to provoke demands for a separate Scottish Council, which eventually might result in a break-up of the existing organisation.[792] This was neither wished by the Council nor by the Ministry. Although there was consent between the Treasury and the Ministry of Education on the administrative level about the transfer,[793] Butler, acting on the political level, remained strictly opposed to this idea.[794] He put his full political weight behind his wish to keep the Ministry of Education as responsible for arts sponsorship also in the future.

Although Butler himself had always tried to keep out of the day-to-day business of CEMA, as could be seen in the appointment of the members of the panels and his New Year's message for 1944,[795] he still thought that there was and should be a closer relation between the field of education and the arts than between the Treasury and the Arts Council. This closer relationship between CEMA and the government, however, was exactly what the Treasury tried to avoid.[796] Barlow alleged in a letter to the Chancellor of the Exchequer that Butler thought about turning the Arts Council in the long run into a sub-department of the Ministry of Education – 'to the horror of his officials'.[797] The distance between the state and the arts, later known as the 'arm's length principle', was in danger once the Minister of Education took too warm an interest in these matters. Eric Hale gave expression to his apprehensions of too close a relationship between the government and the Arts Council in a memorandum for Barlow, in which he summed up the state of discussion between the Ministry of Education and the Treasury:

> 'It became apparent, at the very beginning of the discussion, that what is really at issue is the relationship between the State and the new body. (...) Any Minister of Education who was responsible to Parliament for C.E.M.A. would naturally wish to be closely concerned with it, whereas any Chancellor of the Exchequer would have too many preoccupations to intervene in its affairs unless they obtruded themselves upon him. (...) If one could be sure that every future Minister of Education would have Mr.

> Butler's qualifications for guiding C.E.M.A. there would be much to be said for this point of view. But it cannot be assumed that this will always be so; (...). Our view has been that, considering the matter without regard to the personalities now concerned, the balance of advantage lies with Ministerial aloofness. There are other considerations pointing in the same direction. If the permanent C.E.M.A. is under "control" of the Ministry of Education, it will be connected in the public mind with education, which may not be to its advantage. The things which C.E.M.A. has to offer should make an appeal as being pleasant rather than wholesome.[798] Finally, there is the question of Scotland. (...)'[799]

Hale's arguments clearly contradict the interpretation that it was mostly a 'classic study of departmental rivalry',[800] implying that it was merely jealousy between the responsible departments involved. To place the Arts Council under the Treasury was basically a decision on the extent of state interference. The Treasury opted for less intervention, which was consistent with the British tradition and the original idea to keep CEMA out of government machinery and routine as far as possible. Although there might have been jealousy on the part of the Minister of Education, who fought – and ultimately lost – an uphill battle against his own civil servants and the Treasury to enhance his department's political prestige by keeping the Arts Council under its umbrella, the reasons given by the Treasury and Ministry of Education officials were based on policy.

Although the decision finally was taken in favour of the Treasury, Butler won a token victory in the arrangement that the Minister for Education was to be consulted in the appointment of the Council and that, as before, the Ministry of Education could nominate an assessor to the Council. Since the Ministry of Education, responsible only for England and Wales was made part of the process, the same applied to the Scottish Office for Education.[801]

Although taken and announced in parliament, the decision to put the Arts Council under the administrative wing of the Treasury remained a bone of contention between the Treasury and the Ministry of Education. It is questionable whether Keynes's wish to remain with the Ministry of Education had been equally firm under Butler's successor after the General Election. The Labour victory brought Ellen Wilkinson in office, an avowed devotee to adult education. Even before she took over the Ministry of Education in July 1945, the CEMA headquarters were alarmed by political utterances from her side concerning the policy of the future Arts Council. In May 1945, Mary Glasgow informed Keynes, that the Treasury underestimated 'the weight of the possible criticism from the educational side – I mean the "adult educationalists who regard CEMA as

part of their post-war programme".'[802] The most prominent and influential of these adult educationalists was Ellen Wilkinson. Although the Treasury was now in charge of the Arts Council, she tried to exercise her influence to the possible maximum. The Arts Council had a first taste of her lively interest in its work in the question of re-appointment of Thelma Cazalet-Keir. Thelma Cazalet-Keir had been a member of the Council since 1940, but had resigned when she became Parliamentary Secretary of State in the Conservative care-taker government. Her place on the Council had been kept vacant in case of defeat in the election, which allowed her to resume her work on the Council. Ellen Wilkinson accepted the proposal of re-appointing Thelma Cazalet-Keir without reservation, but gave expression to her general impression that the Council was not balanced in its choice of personnel:

> 'As regards Mrs. Cazalet Keir, of course, I should have no objection whatever to asking her to resume her former place in a body to which she has given so much time and energy. I would, however, point out that you have already a Conservative ex-Minister in Lord Harlech, a very well known and energetic Conservative in Lord Esher and though I recognise that these have not by any means been political appointments I cannot help being surprised that there is no representative whatever of the working class point of view, although the appeal of CEMA has been so largely to the mass of the people.'[803]

The perception that CEMA had appealed to the mass of the people was certainly true in the first two years of its existence and remained so to a lesser extent in the period following Keynes's appointment. Still, it had never been the policy of the Council to expressly appeal to the working classes, but to spread the appreciation of high class entertainment, with an emerging preference of horizontal proliferation over a vertical one. Hence, in the eyes of the Arts Council, it was out of the question to broaden the outlook of the Council's policy by inviting representatives of a 'working class point of view', which necessarily entailed a strong element of adult education. Accordingly, this last comment on the Arts Council's outlook rang the alarm bells in the London headquarters.[804] Ellen Wilkinson did not stop at criticising the personal outlook and policy of the new Arts Council, but tried to reverse the decision to put the Arts Council under the aegis of the Treasury. In a letter to the new Chancellor of the Exchequer, Hugh Dalton, she recapitulated the whole argument and expressed her qualms about the administrative distance between the government and the Arts Council:

> 'What I feel about this is first, that we are handing over a quarter of a million pounds to the Council with only a very general statement of the purposes for which it is to be spent; and second, that there is no sufficient provision of co-ordination with our work here. As the schemes of Further Education anticipated under the 1944 Act become realities, the work of the Arts Council in fostering wider diffusion of the arts among the public is bound to become more and more involved with that of the Local Education Authorities, and very close co-ordination will be needed to avoid overlapping grants, to apportion responsibility, and to make the most effective use of the facilities provided.'[805]

Her suggestion to remedy this problem was to give the 'Education Department more direct concern with its [the Arts Council's, JW] work than is now proposed. I would like to see, for example, some members of the Council, and perhaps one of its Executive, appointed with special reference to experience and interest in further education',[806] which she wished to ensure by clearly defining the qualifications for the Council membership. This short passage shows that the interpretation offered by Fielding, Thompson and Tiratsoo that the 'incoming Labour ministers (...) had no complaint with such an autonomous body directing state funds to approved cultural endeavours'[807] must be qualified. At least Ellen Wilkinson and the left 'adult educationalists' were not too pleased with the heritage of the outgoing government. The new Chancellor, Hugh Dalton, though, clearly rejected these ideas.[808] He was against any narrow definition of qualification for Council membership – which smacked of too much institutionalised influence on the part of the government – and suggested to 'leave our judgment free play.'[809] Despite the frustration of her attempt to influence the policy of the Arts Council in favour of adult education, Wilkinson remained critical of the choice of personnel and repeated her suggestion to 'broaden the basis of the membership, which she thinks is at present a lot overweighed on one side.'[810]

It is obvious from this dispute between Ellen Wilkinson and Hugh Dalton that – despite the general consensus that a body like CEMA had a value also in peace time – there was a political division about the policies involved. This did not run along party lines, but along the lines of educational and social backgrounds. There was a broad consensus between the old ruling élites in Britain, people who had been educated in leading public schools and Oxbridge Universities, like Sir John Anderson and R.A. Butler for the Conservatives and Clement Attlee and Hugh Dalton, son of a tutor of Royal Princes, for Labour, who favoured the detached, autonomous set-up of the Arts Council with standard and national prestige as predominating aims. These matched with the political

programme and beliefs of the Arts Council's more important members such as Keynes himself and Sir Kenneth Clark, who fall into the category of the 'Great and the Good' of British society.[811] Ellen Wilkinson, coming from a different educational and social background, put the emphasis on social inclusion and adult education, necessitating closer state control of the Arts Council, which she regarded as a social service in the emerging structure of the post-war welfare state. Although Attlee and Dalton were in favour of the detached *l'art pour l'art* approach and the focus on metropolitan highbrow culture, the Labour Party's Research Department went on to produce memoranda which came closer to Ellen Wilkinson's ideas of adult education, self-improvement and rational leisure in the years directly following the war.[812]

5. The constitution of the Arts Council

Two methods of incorporation of the future Arts Council of Great Britain offered themselves, incorporation by legislation and through Royal Charter. The latter option had been suggested by Benjamin Ifor Evans as early as 1941[813] and was also seen as the most likely method in the debate about CEMA's future setting in in October 1944. Some voices within the Treasury, though, favoured legislation for '[i]f we set up a body the purpose of which is to be a vehicle for a State subsidy to the arts, we are in fact letting Parliament in for a long term financial commitment.'[814] This was contradicted by the Ministry of Education whose officials thought legislation was 'rather a "sledgehammer to crack a nut".'[815] Moreover, Sir Robert Wood thought that 'the legislation programme was extremely full and it would not be easy to go ahead at all quickly,'[816] rendering the procedure by charter the preferable idea. After Anderson's consultations with Clement Attlee in January 1945, it emerged that incorporation by Royal Charter was the method of choice.[817]

Whereas these problems were solved without much discussion, the detail work of drafting the charter, which implied laying down the policy of the future Arts Council, demanded further attention. Keynes's original draft charter underwent a number of changes in the course of 1945 which gave rise to controversial interpretations of the aims and intentions of the fathers of the Arts Council, especially Keynes himself.

In a talk for the BBC on 8 July 1945, which was printed in *The Listener* on 12 July 1945, Keynes set out his general programme which he wished to pursue with the Arts Council of Great Britain:

> 'I do not believe it is yet realised what an important thing has happened: State 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 purposes and a reasonable prospect of success to present for public enjoyment the arts of drama, music and painting.
> At last the public exchequer has recognised the support and encouragement of the civilising arts of life as a part of their duty. But we do not intend to socialise this side of social endeavour. (...) Our war-time experience has led us already to one clear discovery: the unsatisfied demand and the enormous public hunger for serious and fine entertainment. This certainly did not exist a few years ago. I do not believe that it is merely a war-time phenomenon. I fancy that the B.B.C. has played a big part, the predominant part, in creating this public demand. (...) How satisfactory it would be if different parts of this country would again walk their several ways as they once did and learn to develop something different from their neighbours and characteristic of themselves. Nothing can be more damaging than the excessive prestige of metropolitan standards and fashions. Let every part of Merry England be merry in its own way. Death to Hollywood.'[818]

In this talk, Keynes defined his cultural programme and concept in broad terms. As could have been seen from the hitherto executed policy, the Arts Council concentrated on fine arts, which was exclusively defined in the classical trivium of music, drama and painting, or more nebulously, as serious and fine entertainment. Admittedly, this laid him open to criticism when it came to the exact wording of the Charter of the Arts Council, but it is possible to hold against this critique that neither Keynes nor the final Charter of the Arts Council were so narrow in their cultural conception as they *prima vista* appear.

In the first drafts, Keynes had defined the scope of activities of the Arts Council as being 'to increase the accessibility of the arts to the public throughout the country; to improve the standard of execution of the arts; to encourage and aid proficiency in the arts; to improve and maintain the status of the artist.'[819] Hence, the scope of the Council's range depended on the definition of the 'arts'. In autumn 1945, the term 'arts' was specified by Keynes as 'fine arts', which limited the scope and *prima facie* excluded popular art forms like film. In his memoirs, Lord Macmillan, the former chairman of CEMA, thought it correct that Keynes limited the scope of the Council's activities.[820] Later critics, like Andrew Sinclair in his various books on the arts and the state in Britain and Richard Weight in his essay on the 'Arts Council movement 1943-1953', denounced this

decision to specify the arts as 'fine' as a typical élitist attempt to banish folk culture and community arts from the Council's range[821] and to prefer the safeguard of artistic standards over the democratisation of culture.[822] Both authors represent the change of wording as a move solely motivated by an élitist Bloomsbury concept of art. Although Keynes himself certainly gave the impression in his above quoted BBC talk and by his policy as the Council's chairman, there was a more practical reason why the draft was changed, which was not motivated at all by Keynes or the Arts Council, though neither were unhappy with the solution which emerged.

Until summer 1945, CEMA/Arts Council had their quarters in government buildings, first with the Board of Education in Alexandra House, Kingsway, then in Belgrave Square. At the end of 1945, the Arts Council had to find a new home and moved to St. James's Square. In order to reduce the cost for the building, Keynes had enquired with the Treasury's solicitor R.W.A. Speed about the possibilities to derate the Arts Council's property under the Scientific Societies Act of 1843.[823] In the course of the enquiry, it emerged that the charter of the Arts Council as suggested was too vague to qualify the Arts Council for a deration. Hence, Speed suggested to specify the definition of the arts as 'fine arts'.[824] Naturally, this suggestion raised scepticism in the Treasury and within the Arts Council about the implications of the restrictions, although the main fear was that opera and ballet would be excluded rather than aspects of popular culture such as film and jazz.[825] After considerations within the legal department of the Treasury, Speed was able to report at the end of October that it seemed 'from all this that the Council will be able to get its certificate in the form of the amended draft; and that "fine arts" will include dramatic art, opera, ballet and architecture. There seems no decision on films: I should like a little further time to consider that.'[826]

The inclusion of film was a particular wish of the Ministry of Education. According to B.L. Pearson, Ellen Wilkinson 'would not wish the Council to be precluded from interesting themselves in these subjects, particularly films (...) which are subjects in which (...) there is a growing disposition on the part of the Council to interest themselves.'[827] Although one may doubt that films were a particular interest of the Arts Council and Keynes – taking his battle cry 'Death to Hollywood' into consideration – the Arts Council was not loath to see the option of taking films into their orbit either. After Hale had tentatively announced that the Arts Council would be given its certificate under the Scientific Societies Act of 1843 and hence would be derated,[828] the solicitors of the Treasury confirmed the inclusion of films in the term 'fine arts'.[829] This was implemented and the final version of the Charter of the Arts Council,

which was incorporated in August 1946, included the changes suggested by the Treasury's solicitors. The qualification of the arts within the Arts Council's terms of reference certainly did not go against the wishes of Keynes and the majority of the Arts Council. Still, it was not merely Bloomsbury élitism that led to the specification, but financial expediency. Furthermore, against later interpretations, the qualification was not as narrow as it seemed in the first place. At the end of the day, though, the derating did not occur whilst the limiting definition remained. In order to broaden the general outlook of the Arts Council later on it was necessary to undo the limitation of the definition of arts in a second charter in 1967.[830]

Whereas the limitation of the council's concept of cultural activities worthwhile funding was based on a political consensus of the great and the good in the cultural tradition from Arnold to Eliot – though with varying concepts of the educational approach behind it – another limitation of the council's work took place in the time directly after the Second World War which resulted to no small extent from decisions made or instigated by Keynes. Although he had postulated in his talk for the BBC that a concentration on metropolitan standards would ultimately be detrimental to the cultural landscape of the country, a strong emphasis on the London art scene emerged as policy in the years following the war. Since CEMA had let itself in to a long-term commitment to both opera houses in London, a large share of its grant went into the capital thus considerably reducing the money to be spent on the provinces. In the peak year of 1958/59, Covent Garden received 49,5%, Sadler's Wells 20% of the Arts Council's budget for England, which made national programmes of making the arts available to the provinces virtually impossible.[831] Unsurprisingly, the successor to Mary Glasgow as Secretary General, W.E. Williams, changed the old motto 'The best for the most' into 'Few, but roses'[832] in the early 1950s, which usually bloomed in London.[833] The final retreat from the provinces took place in the course of the 1950s, when the Arts Council wound up its regional offices and re-centralised the business in the capital.

6. Conclusion

After long negotiations within the Treasury and the Ministry of Education in 1944/1945, CEMA was put on a permanent basis as the Arts Council of Great Britain through incorporation by Royal Charter on 9 August 1946. The father of the Arts Council, John Maynard Keynes did not see his work completed. He died on Easter Sunday 1946. The departmental responsibility changed from the Ministry of Education to the Treasury, which mirrored the concept of the Arts Council as an organisation operating at arm's length from the government despite depending solely

on government grants. The decision to perpetuate CEMA after the war was taken on the political level by the Chancellor, Sir John Anderson, and the Lord President of the Council, Clement Attlee, on recommendation of civil servants in the Treasury and the Ministry of Education without reference to the cabinet, thus showing a cross-party consensus. Despite attempts to broaden outlook and approach of the future Arts Council to aspects of community culture, most prominently by the incoming Minister of Education, Ellen Wilkinson, the political consensus to perpetuate this feature of state commitment also embodied an élitist cultural consensus mirrored in the programme of the Arts Council as defined by Lord Keynes. The turning away from its origins as a welfare service was codified in the Charter of the Arts Council of 1946 which committed the Arts Council to fine arts exclusively, while the decisions by the CEMA Council under the chairmanship of Keynes on the operational level committed the future Arts Council to the funding of metropolitan ventures such as the two opera houses in London. This decision anticipated and prejudiced the policy of the Arts Council in the 1950s and 1960s. While CEMA had expanded the provision of 'culture' to the provinces during wartime, it began the battle of retreat to the capital already in 1946.

VIII. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

The Second World War brought about changes in many spheres of the British society. Many of them lasted only for the 'duration', others left a more sustainable mark on the political and social landscape. One remarkable change of the scope of Government activity which set in in December 1939 was the assumption of a more active role of the state in the realm of the arts. Until 1939, the general attitude of British governments irrespective of party allegiance had been marked by the concept of laissez-faire, epitomised in the words of Lord Melbourne dating from 1834: 'God help the minister, that meddles with Art.'[834] Although examples of state intervention into the sphere of arts can be found in the first half of the twentieth century, such as the setting up of the British Broadcasting Corporation, the establishment of the British Council on a national, and the founding of the City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra on a municipal level, these examples merely proved exceptions to the rule of state neutrality which held good until the outbreak of the Second World War. The most striking example of this iron principle of at best benevolent neutrality is the attempt to establish a National Theatre which began in the late nineteenth century and which was not crowned with success before 1963. When publishing an elaborate plan for the setting up of such an establishment in 1907, William Archer and Harley Granville Barker thought it necessary to declare that the reason why they did not appeal to the government for financial aid to this national enterprise, was their conviction that such an appeal was a 'waste of time'.[835]

This noble reticence towards involving the state in matters artistic or cultural, was not confined to politics, which were ruled by a strong sense of financial expediency. With few exceptions, most notably Matthew Arnold and J.B. Priestley, this attitude was widely shared by the British intelligentsia and arts scene. In a consensus spanning from the socialist George Orwell to the conservative T.S. Eliot, state intervention in the arts was thought to imply a high degree of control, to produce mediocre rather than avant-garde art and to be detrimental to creativity and spontaneity in general. This attitude was sustained in the 1930s after the Nazi government in Germany had nationalised all kinds of artistic production.

The social and political consensus ensured that the growth of government activity and involvement which began in Britain from the 1880s and gained momentum in the aftermath of the First World War, did not automatically translate into state interference in the field of the arts. This changed in December 1939, when a charitable organisation, the Pilgrim Trust, approached the Conservative Government of the day for a

grant to encourage the diffusion of classical music, drama and fine art throughout the country as a measure to fight the depressing effects of the blackout. The preliminary talks resulted in the forming of a *Committee for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts*, abbreviated to CEMA. The justification of a grant for the encouragement of the arts as a contribution to the country's war effort finally softened the government, which hitherto had judged such a measure as running counter to financial expediency. In the first announcements of the President of the Board of Education, under whose aegis CEMA was placed, and senior Treasury officials, stress was put on the fact that the grant was not given to encourage the arts, but to fight the boredom of the blackout and to prevent public morale from faltering in the face of the war. Furthermore, the original grant, which amounted to no more than £25,000 matching the same amount procured from private sources, was seen to be a one-time measure to help the British population over the first war winter. CEMA was elevated to the *Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts* in April 1940, but remained an informal, un-incorporated body throughout the war, which received its funds in equal shares from private and public sources until 1942, when the Pilgrim Trust withdrew and CEMA became a governmental concern exclusively under the wing of the Board, later the Ministry of Education.

Thus, as set out in the first two theses formulated in the introduction to this study, state sponsorship of the arts began in Britain as a direct result of the repercussions of the Second World War. Having said this, it is necessary to add that this does not mean that without the war, there would be no cultural policy in Britain today. However, the war determined the time of the beginning of cultural policy in Britain and the way in which it was executed. Since all government announcements lay emphasis on the fact that only the exceptional circumstances of the war, i.e. disruption of civilian life by such different factors as blackout prescriptions, air raids, loss of homes and of personal belongings and evacuation, that facilitated government action in this way, it is impossible to deny the war a major impact in the humble beginnings of cultural policy in Britain. Furthermore, the war revealed the fact that provision of cultural facilities like theatres and art galleries and the endowment of theatre and ballet companies was disastrous. Although various prominent voices including Clive Bell, Sir Kenneth Clark, and John Maynard Keynes had described such a state of affairs already in the decade before the Second World War, it took the challenge of the war to make the government realise that the arts were in a precarious state in Britain and needed financial aid beyond private patronage. As theatre director Tyrone Guthrie put it, the British government began with arts sponsorship 'at a

time when Old Britannia suddenly realised that she would need more than a trident and a shield to keep her reputation.'[836]

Critics of the thesis of the war as progenitor of change either entirely deny the impact of the war on developments or, if they admit an impact, they describe it as not very lasting. In this case, however, further material can be found to sustain the thesis on which this study is based in addition to the government documents extensively quoted within the work. Whereas no party thought it necessary to refer to cultural and leisure facilities in their election manifestos before the war, both major parties gave some prominence to these aspects of social policy in their manifestos in 1945. The Conservatives stated that '[n]o system of education can be complete unless it heightens what is splendid and glorious in life and art. Art, science and learning are the means by which the life of the whole people can be beautified and enriched.'[837] Labour promised in their manifesto 'Let us face the future' that '[b]y the provision of concert halls, modern libraries, theatres and suitable civic centres, we desire to assure to our people full access to the great heritage of culture in this nation.'[838] Even though by 1950 the Conservatives did not refer to recreation and its provision by the state in their manifesto anymore, the Arts Council of Great Britain, which had succeeded CEMA in 1946, and its funding by the state was an established fact which was not given up after the Conservative victory in 1951. On the contrary, it grew in terms of staff and financial support until its break up into the Arts Councils for England, Scotland and Wales in 1994. Furthermore, apart from the purely political sphere, the wartime experience of wide-spread appreciation of serious culture, which the war brought to the fore, inspired the BBC to introduce the Third Programme in 1946, which featured classical music, recorded drama and scientific talks exclusively.

Although it has been said that cultural diffusion was the general aim of CEMA during the war, the aims have to be seen in a more differentiated way. First of all, due to the choice of personnel, CEMA concentrated on what can be termed bourgeois high culture. Although the concept of culture was therefore narrow, the approach to diffusion was very broad. CEMA formulated two aims, which had to be matched, firstly to bring mental relief to the hard pressed British populace and to build up new audiences by presenting Shakespeare plays or Beethoven symphonies to factory workers in their lunch hours, the so-called welfare or social aim, and the standard aim, i.e. to raise the standard of artistic performance. The short-term publicity manager, Ivor Brown, summarised both aims in the slogan 'The best for the most.' The emphasis in the first phase of CEMA clearly lay on the social side. Originally, CEMA encouraged the people to make their own drama and music through the work of drama advisers and so called Music Travellers, a sort of Shakespeare and

Beethoven DIY. Additionally, Symphony Orchestras toured drab industrial regions thus leaving out London and other places, where the cultural scene remained relatively intact, while art exhibitions were presented to places where fine art hitherto had seldom been displayed. The aim of CEMA in the first phase, therefore, was broadly speaking 'vertical diffusion' of the arts, i.e. bringing the arts, hitherto unattainable for the lower strata of British society, to the people.

In 1942, the Pilgrim Trust withdrew and CEMA came entirely under the wing of the Board of Education which had held a share of 50 per cent in the venture hitherto. In came John Maynard Keynes as new chairman of the Council who changed policy and outlook of CEMA with the approval of the President of the Board of Education, R.A. Butler, so as to make it fit for conversion into a peace time body. Although all aspects of CEMA's work continued, the balance was shifted from the social or welfare approach to the standard approach. Education still figured as a major aim, but it was pursued in a different style than had been under the Pilgrim Trust. Whereas in the first years drama advisers and Music Travellers literally taught amateurs, education now simply meant offering high culture. Ballet and opera came into CEMA's orbit and the co-operation with the professional theatre, which had started in 1940, was extended. After the welfarist beginnings, the central aim became more and more to add to national prestige by funding drama and music of high standard, which became clearer in the course of the year 1944 when CEMA started to wind up features such as factory concerts. The aim of vertical diffusion was superseded by horizontal diffusion, i.e. bringing the arts to places rather than to the people including the lower strata of the population. The conflict of aims was not confined to CEMA's own policy. The three government departments involved in CEMA's work, the Board of Education, the Ministry of Labour and National Service, and the Treasury harboured a set of different and sometimes differing concepts of CEMA's task. The Ministry of Labour wished to provide light entertainment and variety shows for war workers and the troops as a means to cheer up the workers in order to increase industrial output through CEMA and ENSA. CEMA's aim to educate the audience while entertaining them, however, did not fit into the plans and the co-operation between CEMA and the Ministry of Labour ended in January 1941. The Treasury regarded CEMA essentially as a morale-boosting affair in the beginning, the educational value of the scheme was of secondary importance at a time when survival was the order of the day. The Board/Ministry of Education, finally, concurred with CEMA's aims to increase knowledge and understanding of the arts and to widen access to it as well as to enable artists in Britain to stage musical and dramatic productions of high standard and quality irrespective of commercial

calculations. In practice, these conflicting aims regularly led to friction between CEMA and the respective departments, which revealed that arts sponsorship was started on an experimental *ad hoc* basis without a thought-out policy on the part of the government behind it.

Since the Ministry of Labour and a number of Treasury officials regarded CEMA as a wartime experiment, the transformation of the wartime CEMA into the peacetime Arts Council of Great Britain was far from automatic. The intradepartmental and interdepartmental discussion about CEMA began in the course of the year 1944 within the context of general planning for reconstruction. Whereas even the responsible President of the Board of Education had claimed that CEMA was a body designed to fight the demoralising effects of the war in 1939, CEMA had proved a valuable social service and a popular success for the government which was not to be wound up easily. Hence, the formerly overriding argument of purely financial expediency implying that the arts were merely the icing on the cake was now countered by the argument of national prestige, which arts sponsorship was thought likely to enhance. The most complicating factor was the linkage of CEMA's perpetuation with the reform of Entertainment Tax. In view of general cuts in spending and increase in taxation, the Treasury felt justified in perpetuating CEMA only under the condition that exemption from Entertainment Tax, which was granted to productions of 'educational or partly educational' value, was repealed at the same time. The decision to perpetuate CEMA was taken in January 1945 when the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the independent Sir John Anderson, and the Lord President of the Council, Labour leader Clement Attlee, agreed that since the increase of taxation due to wartime reconstruction would abolish the private benefactor, the state had to step in instead to ensure the thriving of a varied cultural scene in Britain. The informal way in which the decision was taken, displayed a cross-party consensus which rendered discussion in either cabinet or Parliament unnecessary. On 12 June 1945, the Chancellor Sir John Anderson announced in the House of Commons that CEMA was to be incorporated by Royal Charter under the name of *Arts Council of Great Britain*, now under the aegis of the Treasury. The handing over of responsibility from the Ministry of Education to the Treasury was motivated by the wish to give the Arts Council more independence of political interference.

This decision, however, only determined the *quod* of CEMA's or the Arts Council of Great Britain's future, not its *quomodo*. With its origins in factory canteens and its welfarist ideas, CEMA seemed a facet of New Jerusalem, of a participatory society in which everything, including the enjoyment of highbrow culture, was open to every member of the society – if necessary supported by adult education to teach the postwar citizens

to appreciate the wonders of classical music and the technical and artistic intricacies of ballet and opera. However, despite its welfarist beginnings, CEMA regarded aspects of the work such as factory concerts as transitory and exchanged a possible aim of social inclusion for that of national or even metropolitan prestige. Consequently, the Arts Council defined its aims in the Charter as increasing accessibility to and understanding of the fine arts exclusively, thus excluding more popular and community forms of culture. The Arts Council, although not as narrow in its range as usually alleged, was the child of a conservative-liberal consensus of the 'great and the good'.

In the introduction to this study it was stated that the way in which cultural policy is executed in a country allows for conclusions about the political culture in that country inasmuch as both concepts usually correlate. Two features of political culture, one operational code and one strategic pattern, stood to the fore in this study. The operational code, which is usually seen as particularly British, is the result of a distaste for abstract concepts and over-organisation, i.e. the principle of 'muddling through'. As all sources show, CEMA was never meant to exist longer than it would take to exhaust the first grant – or the 'duration' at most. Even CEMA's founding father Thomas Jones was reported as not being interested in arts sponsorship,[839] but in a short-lived social service to entertain and educate people in the black-out and to give work to unemployed artists. Step by step, CEMA grew out of the original (non-)concept, and the government stumbled into institutionalised arts sponsorship. Having once launched the programme, the British government found themselves in the position of Goethe's 'sorcerer's apprentice' who could not master the spirits he had evoked. Hence, although state sponsorship of the arts began in Britain in 1939, it has to be added that this was the largely unintended effect of the decision to take part in the Pilgrim Trust's scheme to help the population over the boredom of the 'bore war' and the first war winter by funding the arts. As Robert Speaight observed in his history of British Drama since 1939: 'Nevertheless, the change has taken place, and we know from experience that British institutions more often have their roots in circumstance than in logic. They are not for that reason less enduring.'[840]

The second aspect of political culture in question, which has been the subject of chapters two and three of the study, is the concept of the state and its functions and tasks. Whereas culture has been a matter for state attention in many continental countries for a long time, which in due course either set up Ministries of Culture or Fine Art or funded the arts through other state departments, Britain chose a different administrative set-up and installed a body outside government and largely outside governmental control. Although the state became involved in the

management or at least the funding of the arts, the means of control remained limited. Then and now, the influence, at least *prima facie*, is confined to the choice of personnel of the Council and to the voting upon the size of the grant. This organisational set-up is described as a quasi-autonomous non-governmental organisation, a *quango*. In a long British tradition to restrict the state's scope of action to its core competence, the state involvement beyond the annual voting of a grant was in theory restricted to a minimum. Still, whereas the arm's-length-principle held good in the first years of the Arts Council's existence, the Arts Council did not escape a growing politicisation and the extension of political influence in the 1960s and especially the late 1970s. As the cultural critic Raymond Williams explained in his article on the Arts Council of 1979, being at arm's length, the Arts Council was still within the reach of a government, which could, as the case of Keynes proved, take considerable influence through the choice of personnel.[841]

Although the story so far seemed to justify Lord Macmillan's hopeful words of April 1940 that CEMA 'was an example of how on rare occasions good may come out of evil, and help be given through the pressure of tragic events to activities which, in addition to their war-time urgency, have permanent peace-time value'[842], the Arts Council was no unqualified success. Already in 1947, K.W. Bartlett diagnosed that despite the fact that the wartime beginnings of arts sponsorship were continued in peace time there were first signs of a decreasing public interest in the goods the Arts Council was set up to deliver.[843] In his article 'Betrayed spring: The Labour Government and British Literary Culture', Andy Croft stated that

> 'Within a few years the cultural forces unlocked by CEMA had been frustrated and the high hopes present at the formation of the Arts Council severely disappointed. This was partly because the social basis of the wartime culture had ended with the war, but it was a process exacerbated by the policies of the Arts Council which seemed as remote from the needs and concerns of the professionals as it was from those of the amateurs.'[844]

The often quoted wartime consensus which apparently had bridged the culture gap in the years from 1940 to 1946 – if it ever existed – broke up soon after the war. The exclusive concept of the arts enshrined in the charter of 1946 and the withdrawal from the regions in the 1950s helped to defeat the aims of social and national inclusion, or the vertical and horizontal dissemination of the arts, which had been the policy of the Council's predecessor CEMA and also the Arts Council's original aim. Moreover, CEMA/the Arts Council did not divine that it made a

difference whether the arts were served on a silver tray in factory canteens where the audiences could not 'escape' or whether they were simply on offer for market prices. Finally, being somewhat awkwardly placed between artists, the audience and the government, it is not surprising that the Arts Council came under criticism from various quarters, even from former CEMA panel members like J.B. Priestley.[845]

In 1964, the new Labour Government under Harold Wilson changed the outlook of the Arts Council through an amendment of the Charter. The departmental responsibility returned from the Treasury to the Department for Education and Science (DES) after it had been briefly under the umbrella of the Office of Works with Jennie Lee, the widow of Aneurin Bevan, as Minister for the Arts. Although Great Britain now had a Minister with responsibility for the Arts, the measure of influence of the Government remained as limited as before. Consequently, Nigel Abercrombie, a former Secretary General of the Arts Council, could write in a brochure for the UNESCO as late as 1983 that despite the existence of a Minister for the Arts '[i]l n'y a pas et il n'y a jamais eu au Royaume-Uni d'entité politique correspondant à un Ministère de la culture.'[846]

In 1967, after it had become clear that the original charter of 1946 had outlived its time, the Arts Council was reconstituted. The aims were put in more simple terms as 'To develop and improve the knowledge, understanding and practice of the arts' and 'to increase the accessibility of the arts to the public throughout Great Britain'.[847] In terms of policy, the major practical change was a widening of the Council's scope of action. This change was borne out in the replacement of the term 'fine arts exclusively' by simply 'the arts' in the Charter. Thus, popular culture like jazz and modern dance came within the ambit of the Council in due course, which Keynes and his colleagues had frowned upon. Raymond Williams, though generally welcoming the revision of the Charter and the underlying understanding of the arts, criticised the new formula as less consistent than the old one, since '[s]ocially, the arts were the cultural interests of an older upper-middle and middle class: a limited governmental initiative – a financial rather than a cultural or educational intervention – would help to sustain them and to make them more and more widely accessible.'[848] On the administrative level, the membership of the Council was enlarged, and separate councils for Scotland and Wales were established, though they technically remained sub-committees of the Council for the time being. After a rather prosperous time in the mid-1960s and early 1970s linked with the name of Lord Goodman, who served as chairman of the Council from 1965 to 1972, the tide changed once more against state sponsorship of the arts from 1979 on. Margaret Thatcher's reign added a new facet to the role of the state in arts sponsorship. Whilst the appointments of Council members became more

politically motivated than before,[849] the Arts Ministers Paul Channon, Lord Gowrie,[850] and Richard Luce concentrated on raising funds from private sources. According to Robert Hewison, the new policy of the government and the Council was to encourage art purveyors to increase their earnings through improved marketing and management apparently putting the encouragement of high artistic standards in the second place.[851]

In the years from 1946 until today, the administrative responsibility for the Arts Council has changed from the Treasury to different government departments. Also the degree of political influence varied from a very distant laisser-faire in the early years of the Arts Council to more and more politically motivated appointments of Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen and Council members. Still, government influence – although it was greatly extended in the 1980s – always had to take the indirect way of choosing personnel rather than determining policy as in other countries with fully-fledged Arts Ministries.

References

1 Shakespeare, William, The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark, The Arden Edition of the Works of William Shakespeare, ed. Harold Jenkins, London/New York 1982, p256.

2 Archer, William/Granville Barker, Harley, A National Theatre: Scheme and Estimates, London 1907, pXIX.

3 Bell, Clive, A Ministry of Arts, *New Statesman and Nation* XVIII, No. 451, October 14, 1939, p518.

4 Blokland, Hans, Freedom and Culture in Western Society, London 1997; Harris, John S., Government Patronage of the Arts in Great Britain, Chicago 1970, p10; McGuigan, Jim, Culture and the Public Sphere, London 1996, p54; Ridley, F.F., Tradition, Change and Crisis in Great Britain, in Cummings, Milton C./Katz, Richard S. (Eds.), The Patron State - Government and the Arts in Europe, North America, and Japan, New York/Oxford 1987, 225-253, p225.

5 Mortimer, Raymond, First aid to the artist, *New Statesman and Nation* XVIII, No. 440, 29 July 1939, p175.

6 Ibidem, p175.

7 Bell, Ministry of Arts, p518.

8 Keynes, John Maynard, Art and the State, *The Listener*, 26 August 1936, 371-374, p372.

9 Bell, Clive, The Failure of State Art, *The Listener*, 21 October 1936, 744-746, p747. See also Bell, Clive, Art, London 1914, p258: 'So don't be silly: even private patronage is less fatal to art than public.'

10 'Kulturpolitik', Der Große Brockhaus, 17th edition 1970, Volume 10: Kat-KZ, pp742-743.

11 The New Encyclopaedia Britannica, 15th edition, Volume 16, Macropaedia: Knowledge in depth: Chicago - Death, Chicago 1988.

12 Encyclopedia Britannica, 14th edition, Volume 6: Colebrooke to Damascus, Chicago/London/ Toronto 1969, pp688-700.

13 'Culture', in Williams, Raymond, Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society, Glasgow 1976, 76-82, p81. The reason for this growing hostility towards the term 'culture' was the discreditation which the German equivalent 'Kultur' underwent since the 1870s, when it was 'applied derisively to German civilization, esp. as exemplified by their method of warfare', see also Blaicher, Günther, Das Deutschlandbild in der englischen Literatur, Darmstadt 1992, pp162/163; and the frequent use of 'Kultur' in German propaganda during and after the First World War, see Williams, Keywords, p81.

14 The *Times*, March 23, 1935, quoted in Ellwood, D.W., 'Showing the world what it owed to Britain: foreign policy and 'cultural propaganda', 1935-45, in Pronay, Nicholas/Spring, D.W. (Eds.), Propaganda, Politics and Film, 1918 - 1945, London/Basingstoke 1982, 50-73, p55.

15 Quoted in Shaw, Roy, The Arts and the People, London 1987, p119.

16 Kroeber, A.L./Kluckhohn, Clyde, Culture: a critical review of concepts and definitions, Cambridge/MA 1952.

17 Williams, Keywords, p80.

[18] White, Leslie A., The Concept of Cultural Systems: A Key to Understanding Tribes and Nations, New York/London 1975, p4.

[19] For the differentiation of tastes and culture see Gans, Herbert J., Popular Culture and High Culture: An Analysis and Evaluation of Taste, New York 1974.

[20] Willatt, Hugh, The Arts Council of Great Britain, The First 25 Years, London 1971; Hutchison, Robert, The Politics of the Arts Council, London 1982; White, Eric Walter, The Arts Council of Great Britain, London 1975; Sinclair, Andrew, Arts and Cultures, London 1995; Hewison, Robert, Culture and Consensus – England, art and politics since 1940, London 1996; Witts, Richard, Artist unknown: An Alternative History of the Arts Council, London 1998.

[21] Leventhal, F.M., 'The Best for the Most' - CEMA and State Sponsoring of the Arts in Wartime, 1939-1945, Twentieth Century British History 1 (1990), 289-317.

[22] Mortier, Janie, Les origines de l'Arts Council: l'État britannique se découvre une mission culturelle à la faveur de la guerre, in Frison, Danièle (Ed.), La société anglaise en guerre, Paris 1996, 181-190.

[23] The most obvious misrepresentations of CEMA's work can be found in Ziegler, Philip, London at War 1939-1945, London 1995, p156, and in the introductory chapters of Witts, Richard, Artist unknown: An Alternative History of the Arts Council, London 1998.

[24] For Frances Donaldson, CEMA stood for 'Council for Education, Music and the Arts', Donaldson, Frances, The British Council – The First Fifty Years, London 1985, p121, whereas Asa Briggs gives 'Council for the Enjoyment of Music and the Arts' as full title, Briggs, Asa, Social History of Britain, London 1983, p272.

[25] Witts, Richard, Artist unknown: An Alternative History of the Arts Council, London 1998.

[26] For state intervention in general during the interwar years see Jones, Stephen G., State intervention in sport and leisure between the wars, Journal of Contemporary History 22 (1987), 163-182, p176.

[27] Blokland, Freedom and Culture in Western Society, London 1997, pp203/4.

[28] Clemens, Gabriele, Britische Kulturpolitik in Deutschland 1945-1949 (= Historische Mitteilungen im Auftrage der Ranke-Gesellschaft, Beiheft 24), Stuttgart 1997, p9, my translation.

[29] One obvious reason is the wish to boost national prestige at home and abroad, see e.g. McGuigan, Jim, Culture and the Public Sphere, London 1996, p57; Harris, John S., Government Patronage of the Arts in Great Britain, Chicago 1970, p 13; O'Hagan, John W., The State and the Arts. An Analysis of Key Economic Policy Issues in Europe and the United States, Cheltenham 1998, p25.

[30] For an excellent account of the prehistory of state intervention in Great Britain see Minihan, Janet, The Nationalization of Culture, London 1977.

[31] Pearson, Nicholas, The State and the Visual Arts, Milton Keynes 1982, pp1-55.

[32] Ibidem, p8.

33 Pearson actually differentiates between the different roles and functions of the monarch in Britain, but regards the institution monarchy intrinsically as an institution of state, so almost all actions of the monarch are state actions for Pearson, State, p9.

34 Ibidem, p3: 'The State in other words, is a complex set of relations which shape and are part of a wide range of economic, social and cultural activities. The State is not a discrete organization or machine. It is a set of practices, relations and forms of authority bound up with many aspects of daily life.'

35 Hewison, Culture, pXV.

36 See also Davis, Tracy C., The Economics of the British Stage, 1800-1914, London 2000, p6.

37 Peter Fuller calls it a 'sobering thought that the truth of this improbable and uncongenial argument has been demonstrated in Britain twice this century.', Fuller, The Visual Arts, in Ford, Boris (Ed.), Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain, Volume 9: Since the Second World War, Cambridge 1988, 99-145, p100.

38 Pick, John, The State and the Arts, Eastbourne 1980, p9.

39 Weight, Richard, 'Building a new British culture': The Arts Council Movement 1943-53, in Weight, Richard/Beach, Abigail, The Right to Belong: Citizenship and National Identity in Britain 1930-1960, London 1998, 157-180, p157; Shaw, Roy and Gwen, The Cultural and Social Setting, in Ford, Boris (Ed.), Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain, Volume 9: Since the Second World War, Cambridge 1988, 2-44, p5; Sinfield, Alan, Literature, Politics and Culture in Postwar Britain, Oxford 1989, pp47/48.

40 See Titmuss, Richard M., Problems of Social Policy, History of the Second World War - United Kingdom Civil Series, ed. W.K. Hancock, London 1950; Marwick, Arthur, The Deluge: British Society and the First World War, London/Basingstoke 1965; Marwick, Britain in the Century of Total War – War, Peace and Social Change 1900-1967, Boston/Toronto 1968; Marwick, The Home Front: The British and the Second World War, London 1976; Marwick, Class: Image and Reality in Britain, France and the USA since 1930, Glasgow 1980; Marwick (Ed.), Total War and Social Change, Basingstoke/London 1988; with a similar line of argument: Addison, Paul, The Road to 1945, London 1975.

41 Marwick, Arthur, The Home Front: The British and the Second World War, London 1976, p142.

42 Calder, Angus, The People's War, New York 1969; Pelling, Henry, Modern Britain 1885-1955, A History of England, Volume 4, London 1960; Summerfield, Penny, The 'levelling of class', in Smith, Harold, L. (Ed.), War and Social Change – British Society in the Second World War, Manchester 1986, 179-207.

43 Harris, José, Some Aspects of Social Policy in Britain during the Second World War, in Mommsen, Wolfgang J. (Ed.), The Emergence of the Welfare State in Britain and Germany 1850-1950, London 1981, 247-262; Harris, José, Political ideas and the debate on State welfare, 1940-45, in Smith, Harold, L. (Ed.), War and Social Change - British Society in the Second World War, Manchester 1986; Harris, José, Society and the state in twentieth-century

Britain, in Thompson, F.M.L. (Ed.), The Cambridge Social History of Britain 1750-1950, Volume 3: Social agencies and institutions, Cambridge 1990, 63-117; Jefferys, Kevin, British Politics and Social Policy During the Second World War, Historical Journal 30 (1987), 123-144.

44 Harris, José, Society and the state in twentieth-century Britain, in Thompson, F.M.L. (Ed.), The Cambridge Social History of Britain 1750-1950, Volume 3: Social agencies and institutions; Cambridge 1990, 63-117, p80: 'Into the old bottles of the late Victorian constitution much new wine was poured in the form of government intervention in industry, extension of social welfare schemes and general administrative rationalisation.'

45 Calder,People's War , p17.

46 Harris, José, Society and the state in twentieth-century Britain, in Thompson, F.M.L. (Ed.), The Cambridge Social History of Britain 1750-1950, Volume 3: Social agencies and institutions; Cambridge 1990, p92. See also Jefferys, British Politics, p142.

47 Harris, Society, p92.

48 Pelling, Henry, Britain and the Second World War, London 1970, p297.

49 Minihan, Nationalization, p173.

50 Aldgate, Anthony/Richards, Jeffrey, Britain can take it – The British Cinema in the Second World War, Oxford 1986, p12.

51 Thorpe, Andrew, Britain, in Noakes, Jeremy, The Civilian in War: The Home Front in Europe, Japan and the USA in World War II, Exeter 1992, p15.

52 Toynbee, Arnold J., A Study of History, Abridgement of Volumes I-VI by D.C. Somervell, London 1949, Chapter II.V., pp 60-79.

53 Marwick, Arthur, Class, p214. For a more sociological explanation of the relationship between war and social and political change see Fennell, Graham, The Second World War and the Welfare State in Britain: Sociological Interpretations of Historical Development, in Jamieson, Lynn/Corr, Helen (Eds.), State, Private Life and Political Change, Basingstoke 1990, 75-95, pp82-84.

54 See Marwick, Arthur, War and the Arts – Is There a Connection? The Case of the Two Total Wars, War in History 2 (1995), 65-86, p66.

55 Ibidem; Marwick, Arthur/Emsley, Clive, Introduction to Emsley, Clive/Marwick, Arthur/ Simpson, Wendy, War, Peace and Social Change in Twentieth-Century Europe, Milton Keynes 1989, 1-25, p2.

56 Blokland, Freedom, p207.

57 Pearson, State, pp30-36.

58 Clemens, Kulturpolitik, p16.

59 McGuigan, Culture, p57.

60 Marwick, Arthur, Britain in the Century of Total War, Boston/Toronto 1968, p298.

61 Weight, Richard, State, Intelligentsia and the Promotion of National Culture in Britain, 1939-1945, Historical Research 69 (1996), 83-101, pp85/86 and 97; Hayes, Nick, More than 'Music-while-you-eat'? Factory and Hostel Concerts, 'Good Culture' and the Workers, in Hayes, Nick/Hill, Jeff (Eds.), 'Millions Like Us?': British Culture in the Second World War, Liverpool 1999, 209-235, pp229/230 and 235.

62 Brown, Ivor, The Way of my World, London 1954, p264; Hewison, Robert, Under siege, Literary Life in London 1939-1945, London 1977, p180.
63 Ridley, F.F., Tradition, Change and Crisis in Great Britain, in Cummings, Milton C./Katz, Richard S. (Eds.), The Patron State - Government and the Arts in Europe, North America, and Japan, New York/Oxford 1987, 225-253, p225.
64 Almond, Gabriel/Verba, Sidney, The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations, Princeton 1963, p14; a similar approach is taken by Walter A. Rosenbaum in his book 'Political Culture', London 1975, pp 4 and 6/7.
65 Almond/Verba, op. cit., p14.
66 Ibidem.
67 Rosenbaum, Walter A., Political Culture, London 1975, p26.
68 Ibidem, p65; Döring, Herbert, Großbritannien: Regierung, Gesellschaft und politische Kultur, Opladen 1993, p63.
69 Halsey, A.H., Change in British Society: From 1900 to the present day, Oxford 1995, p3.
70 Rosenbaum, Political Culture, p65.
71 Mill, John Stuart, Principles of Political Economy with Some of Their Applications to Social Philosophy, Collected Works of John Stuart Mill, Volume III, Toronto 1965, pp944/945.
72 Haydon, Benjamin Robert, The Autobiography and Memoirs of Benjamin Robert Haydon, Volume II, London 1926, p572, my italics.
73 Ibidem.
74 McGuigan, Culture, p7.
75 Cummings/Katz, Patron State, p6; Blokland, Freedom, p205, see also Blanning, T.C.W., The Culture of Power and the Power of Culture – Old Regime Europe 1660 – 1789, Oxford 2002.
76 Cummings/Katz, Patron State, pp5seq.
77 Williams, Raymond, Culture and Society: Coleridge to Orwell, London 1958.
78 Dicey, A.V., Law and Public Opinion in England, London 1926, p180. Dicey was criticised for his biased representation of the nineteenth century as the golden age of British business, cf. Brebner, J. Bartlet, Laissez Faire in Nineteenth-Century Britain, Journal of Economic History 8 (1948), 59-73. However, his description – without his political intentions and motivation, which are of minor interest to this thesis – remains a valuable source to get the flavour of the time.
79 Haydon, Autobiography, p574.
80 Ridley, Tradition, pp225seq.
81 Cummings/Katz, Patron State, p7; Harris, John S., Government Patronage of the Arts in Great Britain, Chicago 1970, p13.
82 Cf. Ridley, Tradition, p225
83 Mill, John Stuart, On Liberty, in On Liberty and Utilitarianism, Oxford 1992, p6.
84 Mill, John Stuart, Principles of Political Economy with Some of Their Applications to Social Philosophy, Collected Works of John Stuart Mill, Volume III, Toronto 1965, p880.

85 Mill, On Liberty, p100.
86 Ridley, Tradition, p226; see also Priestley, J.B., Theatre Outlook, London 1947, p17.
87 Mill, On Liberty, p91.
88 Mill, Principles of Political Economy with Some of Their Applications to Social Philosophy, Collected Works of John Stuart Mill, Volume III, Toronto 1965, p939.
89 Cf. Netzer, Dick, The Subsidized Muse: Public Support for the Arts in the United States, Cambridge 1978, p36; Lingle, Christopher, Public Choice and Public Funding of the Arts, in Towse, R./Khakee, A. (Eds.), Cultural Economics, Berlin 1992, 21-30, p21; Cummings/Katz, Patron State, p13.
90 Mill, Political Economy, p938; see also Mill, On Liberty, p72: 'To individuality should belong the part of life in which it is chiefly the individual that is interested; to society, the part which chiefly interests society.'
91 Netzer, Subsidized Muse, p36.
92 Ibidem.
93 Ibidem, p138.
94 For the change in liberal political thought see Freeden, Michael, The New Liberalism: An ideology of social reform, Oxford 1978; Freeden, Michael, Liberalism Divided - A Study in British Political Thought 1914-1939, Oxford 1986; Tant, A.P., British Government: The Triumph of Elitism, Aldershot 1993; Collini, Stefan, Public Moralists - Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain 1850-1930, London/Oxford 1991; Weiler, Peter, The New Liberalism - Liberal Social Theory in Great Britain 1889-1914, New York/London 1982; Colls, Robert/Dodd, Philip, Englishness: Politics and Culture, 1880-1920, London 1986; Fry, Geoffrey K., The Growth of Government - The Development of Ideas about the Role of the State and the Machinery and Functions of Government in Britain since 1780, London 1979; Dicey, A.V., Law and Public Opinion in England, London 1926; Emy, H.N., Liberals, Radicals and Social Politics, 1892-1914, Cambridge 1973; Langan, Mary/Schwarz, Bill (Eds.), Crises in the British State 1880-1930, London/Melbourne 1985.
95 Hall, Stuart/Schwarz, Bill, State and Society, 1880-1930, in Langan/Schwarz (Eds.), Crises, 7-32, p10.
96 Colls, Robert, Englishness and the Political Culture, in Colls, Robert/Dodd, Philip (Eds.), Englishness: Politics and Culture, 1880-1920, London 1986, 29-61, p51.
97 Tant, A.P., British Government: The Triumph of Elitism, Aldershot 1993, p104.
98 Colls, Englishness, pp29/30.
99 Hobhouse, Leonard Trelawney, Liberalism and other Writings, Cambridge 1994, p27.
100 See also Sir Charles Windham who condemned the idea of a state funded theatre in an almost perfectly Millian letter to the *Daily Telegraph* in 1908 as 'alien to the spirit of our nation and of our age, which has always believed in, and relied on, individual effort and personal competition as a healthier

stimulus than the motherly or grand-motherly fostering of a State muse'. *Daily Telegraph*, 26 March 1908.

101 Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, 5th series, Volume 52, 23 April 1913, col. 454.

102 Ibidem, col 465.

103 Ibidem, col. 483.

104 Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, 5th series, Volume 52, 23 April 1913, cols. 483seq.

105 H.J. Mackinder reported in his speech that Lloyd George in his capacity as Chancellor of the Exchequer and Churchill in his capacity as First Lord of the Admiralty had signed an appeal of the National Theatre movement to the London County Council for an allotment of a site for the Theatre, ibidem, col. 456/457.

106 Ibidem, cols. 487/488.

107 Ibidem, col. 488.

108 Churchill in particular appeared in public as a champion of state support. According to Geoffrey Whitworth, the Secretary of the National Theatre Committee, Churchill 'considered it was a pity, and even a folly that we did not make some national effort to aid and assist dramatic representation. (...) He was one of those who held that it was the duty of the State to be the generous but discriminating parent of the arts and sciences; and if we could only divert national attention from the often senseless process of territorial expansion, and the ugly apparatus of war, to those more graceful and gentler flights of fancy and of ambition which were associated with the theatre and drama, we should more securely vindicate our claim to be a civilized people.', Whitworth, Geoffrey, The making of a National Theatre, London undated, p58.

109 Britain, Ian, Fabianism and Culture: A Study in British Socialism and the Arts, c. 1884-1918, Cambridge 1982, p121.

110 Webb, Beatrice, My apprenticeship, London 1926, Appendix: Art and Invention, p452.

111 MacDonald, James Ramsay, Socialism: Critical and Constructive, London 1924, p146.

112 Ibidem, p162.

113 Baldwin, Stanley, Our Inheritance: Speeches and Addresses, London 1928, 243seq.

114 Ibidem, p246.

115 Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, Vol. 287, 19 March 1934, col. 958.

116 Ibidem, col. 965.

117 Minihan, Nationalization, p174.

118 Forster, E.M., Culture and Freedom, in Two Cheers for Democracy, London 1972, 31-35, p34.

119 Cf. Minihan, Nationalization, pXII; Williams, Raymond, Culture and Society, 1780-1950, London 1960, pp3-20.

120 Burke, Edmund, Reflections on the Revolution in France, London 1986, p194.

121 Arnold, Matthew, Culture and Anarchy, Cambridge 1935.
122 Ibidem, p6.
123 Ibidem, p72.
124 Ibidem, p11.
125 Arnold, Matthew, The French Play in London, in Super, R.H. (Ed.), The Complete Prose Works of Matthew Arnold, Volume IX: English Literature and Irish Politics, Michigan 1973, 64-85.
126 Ibidem, pp79/80.
127 Ibidem, p80.
128 Arnold's depiction of a national British culture is shared by the German sociologist Max Weber in his study *Die protestantische Ethik und der 'Geist' des Kapitalismus*, (The Protestant Ethics and the Spirit of Capitalism), Teil II: Die Berufsidee des asketischen Protestantismus, Hain Hanstein 1993, pp53-155; see also Cummings/Katz, Patron State, p6; Ridley, Tradition, p225; Bridges-Adams, W., The British Theatre, London/New York/Toronto 1944, p18; Priestley, John Boynton, Theatre Outlook, London 1947, p17.
129 For a more differentiate picture of the situation of the theatre in late nineteenth century Britain see Rowell, George, The Drama of Wilde and Pinero, in Ford, Boris (Ed.), The Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain, Volume 7: The Later Victorian Age, Cambridge 1989, 145-151, p145.
130 Arnold, French Play, p84.
131 Ibidem, p81.
132 Ibidem, p84, italics in the original.
133 Printed in Forster, E.M., Two Cheers for Democracy, London 1972, 99-104.
134 Ibidem, p99.
135 Ibidem, pp100/101.
136 Sir Richard Terry was chief organist of Westminster Cathedral from 1901-1924.
137 Ibidem, p100, my italics.
138 Despite his once in a while gusto for a croon, Forster referred to Jazz musicians as 'amusement-mongers', ibidem, p100.
139 Ibidem, p99.
140 Ibidem, p103.
141 Ibidem, p100.
142 Arnold, Matthew, Culture and Anarchy, Cambridge 1935, p6.
143 Forster, Two Cheers, p102.
144 Forster, The Duty of the Society to the Artist (1942), in Two Cheers for Democracy, London 1972, 94-98, p95.
145 Ibidem.
146 Forster, Two Cheers for Democracy, London 1972, p102/103.
147 Ibidem, p103.
148 Ibidem.
149 Forster, The Duty of the Society to the Artist, in Two Cheers for Democracy, London 1972, p95.
150 Ibidem, p95.
151 Ibidem, p96.
152 Ibidem, p97.

153 Forster, E.M., Culture and Freedom, in Two Cheers for Democracy, London 1972, 31-35, p31.
154 Ibidem.
155 Ibidem, p33. In his essay 'To hell with culture', printed in 'To hell with culture and other essays', London 1963, 10-37, Herbert Read agrees with this view, sustaining his argument by the fact most of Germany's writers and painters like Oskar Kokoschka and Thomas Mann who would not conform were driven into exile, p21.
156 Orwell, George, The Complete Works of George Orwell, ed. Peter Davidson, Volume 13: All Propaganda is lies, London 1998, p74.
157 Ibidem.
158 Orwell, George, Collected Essays, Journalism & Letters, Volume III: As I please, 1943-1945, London 1968, No. 72: A Controversy: Orwell: Agate, p259.
159 Orwell, George, Nineteen-Eighty-Four, New York 1949, p6.
160 Orwell, George, Collected Essays, Journalism & Letters, Volume III: As I please, 1943-1945, London 1968, No. 66: As I please, p230.
161 Ibidem.
162 Ibidem.
163 Ibidem.
164 Orwell goes so far to describe the installation of the Ministry of Information and the BBC as governmental or state controlled bodies as the 'same thing (...) in a more veiled way' as the complete take over of the arts sphere in Germany and the Soviet Union, ibidem.
165 Orwell, Collected Essays Volume III, No. 71, As I please, pp254seq.
166 Ibidem.
167 Eliot, T.S., Notes toward a definition of culture, London 1948, p9.
168 Ibidem, p21, italics in the original.
169 Ibidem, p31. That cultural values fall victim to fashion and change, is noted by Storry, Mike/Childs, Peter (Eds.), British Cultural Identities, London/New York 1997, who hold that 'Forty-five years on, conceptions of English and British identity have changed enormously; for example, few people would attribute any significance to the 'twelfth of August', the opening day of the grouse-shooting season', p4.
170 Eliot, Notes, 41.
171 Williams, Raymond, Culture & Society: Coleridge to Orwell, London 1958, p234.
172 Eliot, Notes, p19.
173 Williams, Culture & Society, p234.
174 Eliot, Notes, p83.
175 Ibidem, p93.
176 Ibidem, p94.
177 Ibidem.
178 Ibidem, p106.
179 Ibidem, p108; see also p106: 'to aim to make everyone share in the appreciation of the fruits of the more conscious part of culture is to adulterate and cheapen what you give'.
180 Ibidem, p107.

181 Printed in Connolly, Cyril, The Condemned Playground Essays: 1927-1944, London 1945, 260-287.

182 'The artist in Russia has the largest income, in America the strongest head, in Ireland the bitterest tongue, in France the cheapest food, in Switzerland the sublimest scenery, in Central Europe the best political education, in England he has only the wind and the rain and reconstruction.', Connolly, Comment, *Horizon V*, No. 29, May 1942, 297-300, p297.

183 Connolly, The Condemned Playground Essays, London 1945, p265.

184 Ibidem, pp284/5.

185 Connolly, Comment, Horizon IV, No. 19, July 1941, 5-8, pp6/7. This diagnosed disrespect of arts and artist in Britain as a national character trait was shared by Orwell, who alleged that in his country 'Professional footballers, boxers, jockeys, and even cricketers enjoy a popularity that no scientist or artist could hope to rival.', Orwell, The English People, London 1947, pp8 and 11.

186 Connolly, Cyril, The Condemned Playground Essays, London 1945, p265. This kind of patronage or encouragement of the arts is the practised form in the United States, where still less money is directly spent on arts and science than in Britain until today, see Cummings/Katz, The Patron State - Government and the Arts in Europe, North America, and Japan, New York/Oxford 1987.

187 Connolly, Condemned Playground, p265.

188 See Cummings/Katz, Patron State; Heilbrun, James/Gray, Charles M., The economics of art and culture – An American Perspective, Cambridge 1993.

189 Priestley, J.B., Theatre Outlook, London 1947; Priestley, J.B., The Arts under Socialism, London 1947.

190 Minihan, Nationalization, p215.

191 Priestley became more and more critical of the policy of CEMA and later the Arts Council and even suggested that the Arts Council should not deal with theatre at all, Priestley, J.B., Theatre Outlook, London 1947, p55, Note 1.

192 Priestley, John Boynton, The Arts under Socialism, London 1947, p6.

193 Ibidem, p5.

194 Ibidem, p13.

195 Ibidem, p19.

196 Ibidem, p24.

197 Priestley, Theatre Outlook, London 1947, p22.

198 Ibidem, p17.

199 Ibidem.

200 Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, Volume 199, 25 October 1926, cols. 1602seq.

201 See e.g. Minihan, Nationalization, London 1977; for state funding of the visual arts see Pearson, State, Milton Keynes 1982.

202 For municipal funding of classical concerts see Russell, Dave, Popular Music in England, Manchester 1997, pp45-47; see also below IV.3.

203 Minihan, Nationalization, p10.

[204] Briggs, Asa, The Cultural and Social Setting, in Ford, Boris (Ed.), The Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain, Volume 7: The Later Victorian Age, Cambridge 1989, 1-38, p4.

[205] Cunningham, Hugh, Leisure and culture, in Thompson, F.M.L. (Ed.), The Cambridge Social History of Britain 1750-1950, Volume 3: Social agencies and institutions; Cambridge 1990, 279-339, p321.

[206] Minihan, Nationalization, p14.

[207] Kelly, Thomas, Books for the People - An Illustrated History of the British Public Libraries, London 1977, p73.

[208] Quoted in Pearson, State, p35. For further reading on social reformers and art see Borzello, Frances, Civilising Caliban: The Misuse of Art 1875-1980, London/New York 1987, especially The Theory of Cultural Philanthropy, pp32-39; Minihan, Nationalization, pp 96-138; Bailey, Peter, Leisure and class in Victorian England, 1978, pp35-55.

[209] See for example Forster, E.M., Does Culture Matter? (1935; 1940), in Two Cheers for Democracy, London 1972, 99-104, p99.

[210] From the host of studies dealing with the development of the welfare state in Britain see: Finlayson, Geoffrey, Citizen, State and Social Welfare in Britain 1830-1990, Oxford 1994; Laybourn, Keith, The Evolution of British Social Policy and the Welfare State, Keele 1995; Lloyd, T.O., Empire to Welfare State, English History 1906-1985, Oxford 1986; Mommsen, Wolfgang J. (Ed.), The Emergence of the Welfare State in Britain and Germany 1850-1950, London 1981, in particular the article by José Harris, Some Aspects of Social Policy in Britain during the Second World War, 247-262; Sullivan, Michael, The Development of the British welfare state, Hemel Hempstead 1996; Harris, José, Political ideas and the debate on State welfare, 1940-45, in Smith, Harold, L. (Ed.), War and Social Change - British Society in the Second World War, Manchester 1986; Harris, José, Political Thought and the Welfare State 1870-1940: An Intellectual Framework for British Social Policy, Past and Present 135 (1992), 116-141; for a more sociological approach see Flora, Peter/Heidenheimer, Arnold J., The Development of Welfare States in Europe and America, New Brunswick/London 1981.

[211] The ideal of the nightwatchman state, although it was never really attained, existed as a political concept serving as a guiding star. Thus, every intervention of the state had to be justified in terms of expediency and functionality, see Harris, José, Society and the state in twentieth-century Britain, in Thompson, F.M.L. (Ed.), The Cambridge Social History of Britain 1750-1950, Volume 3: Social agencies and institutions; Cambridge 1990, 63-117, p68; Weiler, Peter, The New Liberalism – Liberal Social theory in Great Britain 1889-1914, New York/London 1982, p14. For the demise of Liberalism and the Liberal Party see Dangerfield, George, The Strange Death of Liberal England, London 1935.

[212] Miles, Peter/Smith, Malcolm, Cinema, Literature & Society, Beckenham 1987, p13.

[213] E.g. the criticism by J.B. Priestley – even after the end of the Second World War, Priestley, J.B., The Arts under Socialism, London 1947, p6; also Hugh

Walpole in his short story *Lilac*, in Walpole, Hugh, All Souls' Night, Leipzig 1933, p134.

214 As Briggs shows in his invaluable History of Broadcasting, the BBC was at pains to argue that it was not a monopoly, because membership of the Company was open to any manufacturer of wireless sets who wished to join it, Briggs, Asa, The History of Broadcasting in the United Kingdom, Volume 1, The Birth of Broadcasting, London/New York/Toronto 1961, p9.

215 Briggs, Asa, The BBC, The First Fifty Years, Oxford/New York 1985, p19.

216 Ibidem.

217 Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, Volume 199, 25 October 1926, col. 1590.

218 Ibidem, col. 1604.

219 Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, Volume 198, 14 July 1926, col. 473.

220 This idea was rejected by the Post Office itself much earlier because 'a Minister might well shrink from the prospect of having to defend in Parliament the various items in Government concerts', quoted in Briggs, Asa, The BBC: The First Fifty Years, Oxford/New York 1985, p53.

221 Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, Volume 199, 15 November 1926, col. 1580.

222 Briggs, The History of Broadcasting in the United Kingdom, Volume 2, The Golden Age of Wireless, London/New York/Toronto 1965, p422.

223 Ibidem, pp422/423. For the role of the BBC during the General Strike see Briggs, The History of Broadcasting in the United Kingdom, Volume 1, The Birth of Broadcasting, London/New York/Toronto 1961, pp360-384.

224 Pegg, Mark, Broadcasting and Society 1918-1939, Beckenham 1983, pp206 and 221.

225 Quoted in Coase, R.H., British Broadcasting - A Study in Monopoly, London 1950, p49.

226 Ibidem, p133; in his history of broadcasting, Briggs stated that discussions about the monopoly during the first years of radio service in Britain usually began with the technical details and ended with a discussion of the 'social and administrative factors', in which the GPO was more interested in the former, while Reith put the stress on the latter, Briggs, Asa, History of Broadcasting in the United Kingdom, Volume 1, The Birth of Broadcasting, London/New York/Toronto 1961, p9; similarly Seaman, L.C.B., Life in Britain between the Wars, London 1970, pp79/80, who states that '[t]here were technical reasons for establishing a monopoly in broadcasting and vesting it in a body which, though independent of Government, was ultimately responsible to a Minister of the Crown (the Postmaster-General), but an additional factor was the vigorously expressed idealism of J.C. W. Reith'.

227 Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, Volume 274, 22 February 1933, col. 1815.

228 Reith, J.C.W., Into the wind, London 1949, p116.

229 Mackerness, Edward, A Social History of English Music, London/Toronto 1964, p255.

230 Quoted in Briggs, History of Broadcasting, Volume 1, p244.

231 Jennings, H./Gill, W., Broadcasting in Everyday life, London 1940, p35.
232 For Henry Wood see Jacobs, Arthur, Henry J. Wood - Maker of the Proms, London 1994.
233 Quoted in Kenyon, Nicholas, The BBC Symphony Orchestra – The first fifty years 1930-1980, London 1981, p47; see also Pegg, Broadcasting, p200.
234 Quoted in Kenyon, BBC Symphony Orchestra, p69.
235 The famous singer Dame Clara Butt is cited in Briggs, Asa, The BBC, The First Fifty Years, Oxford/New York 1985 with the words: 'Wireless is helping to build up a vast new body of intelligent listeners. It is educating them by giving them the finest music.', p123. Also John Maynard Keynes, as Chairman of the CEMA, wrote in July 1945 that his work was paved the way for by the BBC, Keynes, John Maynard, The Arts Council: Its Policy and Hopes, 12 July 1945, Victoria and Albert Museum (hereafter V&A) EL 2/34.
236 Thorpe, Andrew, Britain in the 1930s – The Deceptive Decade, Oxford 1992, p108.
237 Quoted in Briggs, History of Broadcasting, Volume I, p327.
238 Donaldson, British Council, p11.
239 Nicolson, Harold, The British Council 1934 – 1955, Twenty-First Anniversary Report, London 1955, p4.
240 Donaldson, British Council, pp11-28.
241 Russell Galt, The Conflict of French and English Educational Philosophies in Egypt, March 1933, PRO FO 371/17034, quoted in Donaldson, British Council, p3.
242 Taylor, Philip Michael, The Projection of Britain, Cambridge/New York/Melbourne 1981, p126.
243 PRO BW 2/61, quoted in Taylor, Projection, p153.
244 Taylor, Projection, p152.
245 Ibidem, p132.
246 Quoted in Taylor, Projection, p131.
247 Duff Cooper to Winston Churchill, 7 February 1941, The National Archives, Public Record Office, Kew, TNA(PRO) PREM 4/20/3.
248 Donaldson, British Council, p32.
249 Sinclair, Andrew, The Need to Give: Patrons and the Arts, London 1990, p113.
250 Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, Volume 355, 14 December 1939, col. 1310.
251 Neville Chamberlain Papers, Letter to Beatrice Chamberlain, Birmingham University Library Archives, NC 1/13/3/38, henceforward Neville Chamberlain Papers, NC number code.
252 Ibidem.
253 Ibidem.
254 Beecham, Sir Thomas, A Mingled Chime: Leaves from an Autobiography, London 1949, p154.
255 Ibidem.
256 Neville Chamberlain Papers, Letter to Ida Chamberlain, 2 June 1918, NC 18/1/170.
257 CRL = Civic Recreation League.

[258] Neville Chamberlain Papers, Letter to Ida Chamberlain, 2 June 1918, NC 18/1/170.

[259] Archer, William/Granville Barker, Harley, A National Theatre: Scheme and Estimates, London 1907, pXIX.

[260] As late as April 1944, with political discussion about the future of CEMA in full swing, a parliamentary question proposing the establishment of a committee by the government exploring the possibilities of a National Theatre and its funding with public money, was clearly rejected by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir John Anderson, House of Commons, Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 399, 20 April 1944, col. 366.

[261] Whitworth, National Theatre, p64.

[262] Ibidem, p68.

[263] Ibidem, p64.

[264] Ibidem, pp170seq.

[265] Ibidem, pp171 and 173.

[266] Quoted in Whitworth, National Theatre, p172.

[267] Ibidem, p172.

[268] Lister, Elizabeth, Beethoven and Goering, in Stanley, Arthur (Ed.), Britain at War – An Anthology, London 1943, pp313/4, also in *The Listener*, 18 September 1941, p403.

[269] In Mass Observation's first publication in the war 'War begins at Home', published in 1940, the blackout was the No. 1 grievance of all interviewed and overheard persons, Harrisson, Tom/Madge, Charles (Eds.), War begins at home: Mass Observation, London 1940., p185. See also O'Brien, T.H., Civil Defence, History of the Second World War, United Kingdom Civil Series, ed. Sir Keith Hancock, London 1955, p293.

[270] Quoted in Hewison, Under siege, p11.

[271] Clark, Kenneth, The other half, London 1977, p1.

[272] See for example Lord De La Warr in a letter to Lord Derwent dating of 1 January 1940: 'I am entirely on the side of those who are making an effort to avoid a cultural black-out (...).', TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.

[273] Hewison, Under siege, p11.

[274] Brown, Ivor , *New Statesman and Nation*, Vol. XX, No. 511, 7 December 1940, p564.

[275] War Time Programmes: First Report of Defence Sub-Committee, 11 January 1939, BBC Written Archives Centre (henceforth WAC), R 34/266 Policy: Broadcasting in War Time 1938-1939.

[276] Ibidem.

[277] Panter-Downes, London War Notes 1939-1945, London 1972, p7.

[278] Ibidem, p14.

[279] White, Antonia, BBC at War, London undated, p4.

[280] Ibidem.

[281] Panter-Downes, London War Notes, pp7 and 14.

[282] Quoted in Kenyon, BBC, p157.

[283] Ibidem.

[284] Harrisson/Madge, Mass Observation, p292.

285 Radio Luxembourg was one of a number of private radio stations whose range of transmission reached to the British Isles rendering a more popular competition to the still rather stern and educative BBC.

286 A.P. Ryan to Sir Stephen Tallents, 10 February 1940, BBC WAC R 34/269/3 Policy: Broadcast for the Fighting Forces, File 2.

287 Boult, Sir Adrian, BBC Handbook 1941, London 1941, p66.

288 White, Antonia, BBC at War, London undated, p8.

289 Pirouet, Edmund, Heard Melodies Are Sweet: A History of the London Philharmonic Orchestra, Lewes 1998, p23; Myers, Rollo, Music since 1939, London 1947, pp12seq. Speaking for London, Mollie Panter-Downes noted that interest probably did not grow but became more visible because of a decreased supply through closing down of concert halls, Panter-Downes, War Notes, pp363seq.

290 See 'The History of CEMA from December 1939', TNA(PRO) ED 138/14; CEMA Paper LXXX: Ministry of Labour and National Service, 8 January 1941: 'The success of the C.E.M.A. parties which have visited factories indicate the desirability of developing this service.', V&A EL 1/13; Minutes of the 7th Meeting of the Council, 16 January 1941, V&A EL 1/6; H.F. Rossetti to Mary Glasgow, 8 January 1941, V&A EL 2/29; Helen Anderson (Music Traveller North East) to Gladys Crook, 5 March 1941, V&A EL 2/43; T.N. Hill (Regional Officer 'Parklands') to H.F. Rossetti, 3 September 1941, TNA(PRO) LAB 26/35.

291 Boult, Sir Adrian, My own trumpet, London 1973, p115.

292 For the evacuation of the collection of the National Gallery and other galleries in Britain see Richardson, Robert, Closings and Openings: Leading Public Art Galleries During the Second World War, in Kirkham, Pat/Thoms, David (Eds.), War Culture: Social Change and Changing Experience in World War Two Britain, London 1995, pp29-37.

293 Clark, The other half, p27, see also Clark, Concerts in the National Gallery, *The Listener*, 2 November 1939, p884.

294 Panter-Downes, War Notes, p16.

295 Clark, The other half, p28.

296 Quoted in Panter-Downes, War Notes, p16.

297 See e.g. the letter by John Maud, Master of Birkbeck College, to Sir Kenneth Clark of 21 November 1939, asking for assistance in the set-up of a concert series built on the National Gallery model, Sir Kenneth Clark Papers, Tate Gallery Archive (TGA), 8812.1.3.1971; letter by Myra Hess to Sir Kenneth Clark enclosing letter of 6 January 1940 by Miss H.M. Casley asking for assistance in organising toy concerts as staged in the National Gallery for children in reception areas, Sir Kenneth Clark Papers, TGA 8812.1.3.1329.

298 The chief conductor of the London Philharmonic Orchestra, Sir Thomas Beecham declared that the orchestra was in danger and might not survive the war, quoted in Kenyon, BBC, p165.

299 Titmuss, Richard, The Problems of social policy, The History of the Second World War, United Kingdom Civil Series, ed. W.K. Hancock, London 1950, p18.

[300] In his book London at War 1939-1945, London 1995, Philip Ziegler extensively quotes voices warning of a faltering morale due to boredom, Ziegler, London at War, p42; see also Harrison/Madge, Mass Observation, pp181 and 185.

[301] Lighting Restrictions: Effect on Public Morale & relaxation of street lighting, Letter to Regional Commissioners and Summary of replies October 1939, TNA(PRO) HO 186/40.

[302] Ibidem.

[303] Home Publicity Division: Branch 1: Minutes of Meetings, September 1, 1939, TNA(PRO) INF 1/316.

[304] See e.g. the failure of the famous poster 'Your courage, your cheerfulness, your resolution will bring us victory', which could be read as implying that it was the common people who had to carry the day for the ruling élite.

[305] CEMA Bulletin No.25, May 1942; see also Draft History of CEMA by Mary Glasgow, TNA(PRO) ED 138/14.

[306] Ibidem.

[307] See also Leventhal, F.M., loc.cit., p292. Although his work otherwise is fraught with factual mistakes and misinterpretations, Richard Witts is probably right in stating that Jones was justified in blushing, although rather 'for penning this pack of lies.', Witts, Artist unknown, p43.

[308] De La Warr to Tom Jones, 13 December 1939, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B

[309] Brown, Ivor, The Way of my World, London 1954, pp261seq.

[310] Cultural Activities in War-time, Notes of an informal Conference held at the Board's Offices on Monday, 18 December 1939, V&A EL 1/1.

[311] Ibidem.

[312] Secretary for Information to President about a proposed Committee on Cultural Facilities in Wartime, 11 December 1939, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.

[313] Ibidem.

[314] Ibidem.

[315] De La Warr to Thomas Jones, 13 December 1939, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.

[316] Ibidem.

[317] Ibidem.

[318] De La Warr to Thomas Jones, 13 December 1939, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.

[319] See Colles, H.C., Walford Davies: A Biography, London/New York/Toronto 1942, especially Chapter XII: Wondrous machines, pp130-143.

[320] Jones had established a college of adult education, Coleg Harlech, in his native Wales, see Ellis, E.L., T.J., A Life of Dr Thomas Jones, C.H., Cardiff 1992, pp299seq.

[321] Cultural Activities in War-time, Notes of an informal Conference held at the Board's Offices on Monday, 18 December 1939, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B, pp1-2.

[322] See also Glasgow, Mary, The concept of the Arts Council, in Keynes, Milo (ed.), Essays on John Maynard Keynes, Cambridge 1975, 260-271, p261.

[323] Ibidem.

[324] Cultural Activities in War-time, Notes of an informal Conference, 18 December 1939, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.
[325] Committee for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts, 19 December 1939, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.
[326] Ibidem.
[327] Ibidem.
[328] Ibidem.
[329] Ibidem.
[330] Ibidem.
[331] Ibidem.
[332] Lord Peter Derwent to Lord De La Warr, 21 December 1939, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.
[333] De La Warr to Lord Peter Derwent, 1 January 1940, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.
[334] De La Warr to Lord Peter Derwent, 24 January 1940, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.
[335] Foss, Hubert/Goodwin, Noël, London Symphony: Portrait of an Orchestra, London 1954, p106.
[336] Minutes of the Second Meeting of the Committee, 18 January 1940, V&A EL 1/3.
[337] CEMA Paper XXIII: Progress Report, V&A EL 1/10, emphasis in original.
[338] Ibidem.
[339] CEMA Paper XXIII: Progress Report, V&A EL 1/10.
[340] Ibidem.
[341] Ibidem.
[342] Ibidem.
[343] See Marwick, Class, p214.
[344] Brown, Way, p264.
[345] CEMA Paper XXIII: Progress Report, V&A EL 1/10.
[346] CEMA Paper XIV: C.E.M.A. Memorandum by Dr. George Dyson, Royal College of Music, January 1940, V&A EL 1/10.
[347] Ibidem.
[348] Ibidem.
[349] Minutes of the Second Meeting, 18 January 1940, V&A EL 1/3; see also letters by De La Warr to Jones, 13 December 1939, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B and by Mary Glasgow to G.R. Hughes, 25 July 1940, V&A EL 2/9.
[350] Report on Progress and Outline of Case to be made to the Treasury, V&A EL 1/4.
[351] Paper XIV: C.E.M.A. Memorandum by Dr. George Dyson, Royal College of Music, January 1940, V&A EL 1/10.
[352] Stanley Marchant to Sir Adrian Boult, 16 October 1940, BBC WAC R 27/11/1 Music-General Arts Council of Great Britain, File 1: 1940-1942.
[353] After Ivor Brown had publicly claimed that CEMA was predominantly responsible for the rescue of the London Philharmonic Orchestra, Brown, This Entertainment Problem II, *New Statesman and Nation*, Vol. XX, No. 512, 14 December 1940, p619, Thomas Russell, Secretary of the London Philharmonic Orchestra, criticised in a letter to this London weekly the

support by CEMA as rather meagre, Russell, *New Statesman and Nation*, Vol. XX, No 513, 21 December 1940, pp652seq. See also BBC Internal Circulating Memo, 18 October 1940 by Julian Herbage, BBC WAC R 27/11/1 Music-General Arts Council of Great Britain, File 1: 1940-1942.

354 CEMA Paper XV: Memorandum of Enquiries made in Dagenham on January 12th, 1940, concerning the possibility of organising concerts of the National Gallery kind in the district by M.C. Glasgow, V&A EL 1/10.

355 See e.g. Pirouet, Melodies, pp23, 36-38; Myers, Music since 1939, pp12/13.

356 Blatchford, Montagu, Clarion, 7 July 1905, p3, quoted in Waters, Chris, British Socialists and the Politics of popular culture, 1884-1914, Manchester 1990, pp97/98.

357 CEMA Paper XXVI, Memorandum to the Committee on music policy, 25 January 1940, by Sir Walford Davies, V&A EL 1/11.

358 Ibidem.

359 Ibidem.

360 Mary Glasgow to the National Council of Social Service's music organiser John Hollins, 1 October 1940: 'We must'nt [sic] be afraid of being popular and simple in our efforts to avoid being vulgar and sentimental. Above all we must'nt [sic] let people call us highbrow.'; see also letter by the artist George Baker to Ivor Brown, 16 September 1940: 'The managers at the Bakelite and Courtauld's factories both told us that they were shy about taking a concert from C.E.M.A. because Mr. Hollins had warned them that the programme would be a bit highbrow. I think this is a somewhat unfortunate way in which to offer concerts to factory managers who are obviously frightened of the word highbrow.', both V&A EL 2/29.

361 Secretary of the Music Panel of the Board of Education to Mary Glasgow, 15 October 1943, V&A EL 2/24: 'It was felt that undue prominence was given to the name of artists, whereas the music they were to perform was generally not mentioned.'

362 Mary Glasgow to Secretary of the Music Panel of the Board of Education, 26 October 1943, V&A EL 2/24.

363 CEMA Paper XIV, V&A EL 1/10.

364 This decision was reconfirmed in January 1941, and remained in force until the provision of factory concerts lapsed. Minutes of the 12th Meeting of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts, 3 December 1941, V&A EL 1/6.

365 CEMA Paper XIX: Suggested National Scheme for the Stimulation and Encouragement of Amateur Drama (Lawrence du Garde Peach), V&A EL 1/10.

366 Ibidem.

367 Minutes of the Second Meeting, 18 January 1940, V&A EL 1/3.

368 Ibidem.

369 CEMA Paper XXV, Drama report on interview with Mr. L. Hale (Journalist), Mr I. Brown, Mr. T. Parker (Manager of the Westminster Theatre), 26 January 1940, V&A EL 1/10.

370 CEMA Papers XXII: Plan for Exhibitions: A note of modifications proposed at the last meeting of the C.E.M.A by Sir Kenneth Clark and W.E. Williams, V&A EL 1/10.

371 Literature had been outside the Council's work from the beginning and remained so for the duration of the war and in its direct aftermath. In March 1943, the President of the Board of Education, R.A. Butler, briefly contemplated the encouragement of literature and poetry, R.A. Butler to Sir Robert Wood, 28 March 1943, TNA(PRO) ED 136/195B. He was immediately discouraged from the plan by his advisers, who thought that the 'plan contemplates "production" and not merely "purveying"', and that introduces an idea that goes beyond anything in the present C.E.M.A. layout. C.E.M.A. are not subsidising the composer to compose, or dramatist to write plays: they are carrying what exists of a high standard in Music, pictorial art or drama to the people', Sir Robert Wood to R.A. Butler, 31 May 1943, TNA(PRO) ED 136/195B.

372 Report of Progress and Outline of Case to be made to the Treasury, 18 January 1940, V&A EL 1/4, my italics.

373 Ibidem.

374 CEMA Paper XXXII: Interim Report from Dr. Dyson on the Concert Scheme, 20 February 1940, V&A EL 1/11.

375 CEMA Paper XLI: Orchestral Concerts in Industrial Areas Statement of Progress, V&A EL 1/11.

376 Churchill, Winston in the *Times*, 5 September 1939: 'In this war we are not fighting against you, the German people, for whom we have no bitter feelings, but against a tyrannous and forsworn regime.'

377 CEMA Paper XLII: Factory Concerts Statements of Progress, Appendix, V&A EL1/11.

378 CEMA Paper LIII Music: Dr. Dyson's Suggestions: May 1940, V&A EL 1/12.

379 Ibidem.

380 CEMA Paper 179: C.E.M.A. Concerts, TNA(PRO) ED 136/191.

381 CEMA Paper CXI: CEMA Survey January 1940 - March 1942, V&A EL 1/14.

382 CEMA Paper XXVI: Memorandum to the Committee on music policy, January 25th, 1940 by Sir Walford Davies, V&A EL 1/11.

383 CEMA Paper XLV: Rural Music School Council: Interim Report on the Work of the Pilgrim Trust Travellers, V&A EL 1/11.

384 Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, Volume 359, 10 April 1940, col. 603/604.

385 Eric Hale (Treasury) to D. du B. Davidson (Board of Education), 15 March 1940, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B, my italics.

386 Ibidem. This account renders Witts's explanation that the Committee was restructured as a council in order to compensate Macmillan for his loss of office in the government – he had been replaced as Minister of Information by Lord Reith – very unlikely, Witts, Artist unknown, p46.

387 Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, Vol. 359, 10 April 1940, col. 606.

388 Minutes of the First Meeting of the Council and its Honorary Directors at the Offices of the Board of Education on 23 April 1940, V&A EL 1/6.
389 Ibidem.
390 Ibidem.
391 Ibidem.
392 The aid given extended from help to the artistic side of production as well as to equipment, for example lighting dumps, which were reported to be 'widely used and very much appreciated', CEMA Paper LII: Committee for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts, Amateur Drama Section, Estimates on Expenditure 1940/41, V&A EL 1/12.
393 CEMA Paper LXIX: Amateur Drama Section Report by Honorary Organiser on Six Months' Work, V&A EL 1/12.
394 CEMA Paper LV: Assistance for the Professional Theatre, V&A EL 1/12.
395 CEMA Paper LXXI: C.E.M.A.'s aid to the Professional Theatre by Ivor Brown, V&A EL 1/12.
396 Ibidem.
397 Ibidem.
398 G.H. Ince (Ministry of Labour and National Service) to Mary Glasgow, 20 June 1940, V&A EL 2/28.
399 Ernest Bevin was Minister for Labour and National Service in the coalition government from 1940 to 1945.
400 Dean, Basil, The Theatre at War, London 1956, p134.
401 CEMA Paper LIII: Music: Dr. Dyson's Suggestions: May 1940, V&A EL 1/12.
402 Minutes of the second meeting of the Council, 28 May 1940, V&A EL 1/6.
403 R.S. Wood (Board of Education) to G.H. Ince (Ministry of Labour), 6 June 1940 including the offer by CEMA to co-operate. See also letter by G.H. Ince to Mary Glasgow, 20 June 1940, V&A EL 2/28. Later on, an even closer co-operation was suggested at times by Thelma Cazalet, MP and member of the CEMA Council, Minutes of the Minutes of the 5th meeting of the Council, 6 August 1940, V&A EL 1/6.
404 Mary Glasgow to G.H. Ince, 22 June 1940, V&A EL 2/28. See also Mary Glasgow to Basil Dean, 29 June 1940, V&A EL 2/28.
405 Basil Dean to Mary Glasgow, 3 July 1940, V&A EL 2/28.
406 G.H. Ince to Mary Glasgow, 20 June 1940, V&A EL 2/28. See also H.F. Rossetti to Mary Glasgow, July 1940, V&A EL 2/29.
407 Mary Glasgow to John Hollins, 4 July 1940, V&A EL 2/28, letter by Mary Glasgow to Robert R. Hyde (Industrial Welfare Society), V&A EL 2/29.
408 See Mary Glasgow to H.F. Rossetti, 29 July 1940, V&A EL 2/29; Mary Glasgow to John Hollins, 29 July 1940, Mary Glasgow to Vernon Evans (National Council of Social Service), 17 July 1940; Ivor Brown to Basil Dean, 2 August 1940, all V&A EL 2/28.
409 Jos. J. Taylor (Ministry of Labour and National Service) to Mary Glasgow, 2 August 1940, V&A EL 2/29; see also H.F. Rossetti to Mary Glasgow, July 1940, V&A EL 2/29.
410 Priestley, John Boynton, Postscripts, London/Toronto 1940, 11 August 1940, pp51-53.

411 NAAFI Director of Entertainments to H.F. Rossetti, 7 October 1940, TNA(PRO) LAB 26/35.

412 Treasury to G.H. Ince, Ministry of Labour and National Service, 7 September 1940, TNA(PRO) LAB 26/36.

413 John Richardson to the CEMA concert organiser, Gladys Crook, 25 November 1940; Minutes of the 24th Meeting of the Council, 19 October 1943, V&A EL 1/7.

414 Dean, Theatre, p134.

415 Ibidem, p136.

416 See Ministry of Labour Circular 128/14 of 8 October 1940 announcing 'light classical music' performed by CEMA, V&A EL 2/28. A usual programme for a factory included rather familiar pieces such as the Prologue from I Pagliacci, a Sussex Folk song, The Londonderry Air, Kreisler's Liebesleid, Bizet's Toreador, and the Volga Boat Song 2, CEMA Paper LXVIII: Factory concerts for ENSA, V&A EL 1/12.

417 Letters to the Ministry of Labour by Divisional Controller Birmingham, 1 January 1941; Divisional Controller North Midlands, 3 January 1941; J.W. Corbett (Divisional Controller Newcastle), 4 January 1941; Controller Parklands/Bristol, 4 January 1941, all in TNA(PRO) LAB 26/35; also Minutes of the 7th Meeting of the Council, 16 January 1941, V&A EL 1/6.

418 Minutes of the 7th Meeting of the Council, 16 January 1941, V&A EL 1/6.

419 Minute by H. Kidd, 15 January 1941, TNA(PRO) LAB 26/35.

420 Rossetti to Alderson, 8 February 1941, TNA(PRO) LAB 26/35.

421 CEMA Paper LXXX: Ministry of Labour and National Service, 8 January 1941, V&A EL 1/13.

422 Minutes of the 7th Meeting of the Council, 16 January 1941, V&A EL 1/6.

423 Rossetti to F.W.H. Smith, TNA(PRO) LAB 26/35.

424 Rossetti to Smith, 3 March 1941, TNA(PRO) LAB 26/35.

425 H.F. Rossetti's notes for the Conference on Factory Concerts at the Ministry of Labour, 3 March 1941, V&A EL 2/29, emphasis in original. In the same vein, see Martin, Kingsley, Music at Dinner, *New Statesman and Nation*, Vol. XXII, No. 564, 13 December 1941, p490.

426 Annex to letter by Rossetti to Mary Glasgow concerning the meeting of representatives of CEMA (Sir Stanley Marchant, Sir Kenneth Barnes, Thelma Cazalet, Mary Glasgow) and of the Ministry of Labour and National Service (F.W.H. Smith, H.F. Rossetti), 6 March 1941, V&A EL 2/29.

427 Rossetti to Mary Glasgow, 22 February 1941, V&A EL 2/29.

428 Mary Glasgow to Rossetti, 25 February 1941, V&A EL 2/29.

429 H.F. Rossetti's notes for the Conference on Factory Concerts at the Ministry of Labour, 3 March 1941, V&A EL 2/29.

430 CEMA Paper 179: C.E.M.A. Concerts, TNA(PRO) ED 136/191; see also letter by Mary Glasgow to Ralph Vaughan Williams, 4 February 1944, V&A EL 2/20.

431 In CEMA Paper LXIII: 'Art for the People' Exhibitions organised by The British Institute of Adult Education between March and July, 1940, V&A EL 1/12, it was reported that the British Institute of Adult Education had

organised 40 exhibitions in the given period, 32 of which had been made possible by the support of CEMA.

[432] During the Lancashire tour, the Old Vic visited 29 places in 22 weeks, performing before an estimated number of 100,000 people. The Welsh tour comprised 60 places in 20 ½ weeks again with an estimated audience of 100,000 persons, CEMA Paper XCIX: Old Vic and Sadler's Wells Tours Statistical Details, V&A EL 1/13.

[433] CEMA Paper LXXI: C.E.M.A.'s aid to the Professional Theatre by Ivor Brown, V&A EL 1/12.

[434] Music in Air Raid Shelters, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.

[435] Panter-Downes, War Notes, 25 August 1940, p91; see also 29 September 1940, p105. See also e.g. Read, Herbert, Art in an Electric Atmosphere, *Horizon* III/17 (1941), 308-313. p308. A slightly different report is given by the author George Beardmore, who confirms that the people acted rather normal under un-normal circumstances, but that '[o]nce the high excitement of racing from doorway to doorway is over, dodging shrapnel and expecting one's steel helmet to protect one – actually no more adequate to protect the head from those sizzling, razor-sharp fragments than a hare's foot – and the fear from hearing the scream of the descending bomb, a period of depression sets in. Have noticed it myself, a sinking of the spirits and listlessness. I daresay prolonged exposure to such dangers may have some lasting effect.', Beardmore, George, Civilians at War: Journals 1938-1946, Oxford 1986, pp88/89.

[436] Music in Air Raid Shelters, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.

[437] It is in this part of CEMA's work where the most wrong and ill-informed accounts are given. Philip Ziegler stated that: 'The Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts (CEMA) sent people into the shelters with gramophones and classical records; this was not an invariable success, at a shelter in Enfield there were complaints that the music made it impossible to hear the bombs properly', Ziegler, London at War, p156. This account is, of course, simply wrong. CEMA sent around concert parties performing live. At the same time, no indication for the second claim could be found and unfortunately Ziegler denies the reader the source of his information. This kind of morale as described in this passage seems to belong to the legend of cockney morale, which Angus Calder termed the 'myth of the Blitz', Calder, Angus, The Myth of the Blitz, London 1991.

[438] Music in Air Raid Shelters, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.

[439] Ibidem.

[440] CEMA Paper LXXIV: Rest Centre & Shelter concerts, V&A EL 1/12.

[441] Ibidem: 'Community singing - after which a girl in the audience sang "Drink to me only" very nicely.'

[442] CEMA Paper LXXXV: Emergency Music, V&A EL 1/13.

[443] CEMA Paper LXXIV: Rest Centre & Shelter concerts, V&A EL 1/12.

[444] Exchange of letters Wood-Crystal in October/November 1940, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.

[445] Letter by Wood to D. du B. Davidson, 11 February 1941, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.

446 C.E.M.A. Memorandum Music in Rest Centres, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.
447 Calder, People's War, p189.
448 CEMA Paper 161: Plays in R.O.F., Industrial and Rural Hostels for War Workers, Report on the First Year July 1942-June, 1943 by Leonard Crainford, 21 June 1943, TNA(PRO) ED 136/189.
449 CEMA Paper LXXI: C.E.M.A.'s aid to the Professional Theatre by Ivor Brown, V&A EL 1/12.
450 Ibidem.
451 CEMA Paper 135: Drama Report on Proposals and appeals, V&A EL 1/14.
452 CEMA Paper CX: Report on a speaking tour by Ivor Brown, October 1941, V&A EL 1/14.
453 See his address to the newly founded Council, Minutes of the First Meeting of the Council and its Honorary Directors at the Offices of the Board of Education, 23 April 1940, V&A EL 1/6.
454 R.S. Wood to D. du B. Davidson, 11 February 1941, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.
455 Minutes of the 7th Meeting of the Council, 16 January 1941, V&A EL 1/6.
456 CEMA Application to the Treasury for an annual grant for the duration of the War, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.
457 Ibidem.
458 Jones, Thomas, A Diary with letters, 1931-1945, London 1954, p493.
459 B. Ifor Evans (British Council) to Sir Robert Wood, 19 September 1941, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.
460 Ibidem.
461 Sir Robert Wood to Evans, 22 September 1941, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.
462 Sir Robert Wood to Thomas Jones, 27 September 1941, V&A EL 2/9.
463 Ibidem.
464 Ibidem.
465 Ibidem.
466 Thomas Jones to Wood, 29 September 1941, V&A EL 2/9.
467 Confidential Minute by Mary Glasgow, 06 August 1941, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.
468 Ibidem.
469 Ibidem.
470 Minutes of the 11th Meeting of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts, 16 September 1941, V&A EL 1/6.
471 Report on Region 4 (Cambs, Essex, Norfolk, Suffolk, Beds, Hunts, Herts) by Anne Carlisle, June 1944, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188.
472 Prologue at the opening of the Theatre Royal, Bristol, 11 May 1942, quoted by Keynes, John Maynard, *The Times*, 11 May 1943.
473 See for example Hewison, Under siege, p180.
474 R.A. Butler to Keynes, 17 December 1941, John Maynard Keynes Papers, King's College, Cambridge (hereafter KCC) PP 84/1.
475 Keynes to R.A. Butler, 24 December 1941, V&A EL 2/11.
476 Ibidem.
477 Memorandum of a conversation between Butler and Keynes, 7 January 1942, V&A EL 2/11.

478 Sir Robert Wood to Benjamin Ifor Evans, 28 January 1942, John Maynard Keynes Papers KCC PP 84/1.
479 Keynes to Butler, 14 January 1942, V&A EL 2/11.
480 Butler to Keynes, 16 January 1942, V&A EL 2/11.
481 Butler to Macmillan, 19 January 1942, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.
482 Thomas Jones to Keynes, 19 January 1942, John Maynard Keynes Papers KCC PP 84/1.
483 Keynes to Thomas Jones, 22 January 1942, John Maynard Keynes Papers KCC PP 84/1, my italics.
484 Minutes of the 13th Meeting of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts, 17 February 1942, V&A EL 1/6.
485 Brown, Way, p265.
486 Glasgow, Mary, The Concept of the Arts Council, in Keynes, Milo (Ed.), Essays on John Maynard Keynes, Cambridge 1975, 260-272, p262.
487 Keynes to Sir Henry Buckland, 18 December 1942, V&A EL 2/21.
488 Ibidem.
489 Minutes of the First Meeting of the Drama Panel, 6 January 1943, TNA(PRO) ED 136/189.
490 Keynes to Ernest Barker, 13 May 1943, John Maynard Keynes Papers KCC PP 84/1.
491 Eliot, Notes, p31.
492 Keynes to Mary Glasgow, 12 February 1942, V&A EL 2/37.
493 Keynes to Mary Glasgow, 17 February 1942, V&A EL/37.
494 Keynes to Mary Glasgow, 4 March 1942, V&A EL2/37.
495 Ibidem.
496 Theatre Companies: Conditions of Association with C.E.M.A., TNA(PRO) ED 136/192.
497 Ibidem.
498 According to CEMA Paper 168, V&A EL 1/14, by June/July 1943, the Council's assessors sat on the Boards of the following companies: Old Vic and Sadler's Wells, Tennent Plays, Market Theatre, Robert Atkins, Travelling Repertory Theatre, Ballets Jooss, Pilgrim Players, Adelphi Players.
499 Theatre Companies: Conditions of Association with C.E.M.A., TNA(PRO) ED 136/192.
500 Ibidem.
501 Orchestras: Conditions of Association with C.E.M.A., TNA(PRO) ED 136/192.
502 Clark, Kenneth, Art and Democracy, TGA 8812.2.2.42., my italics.
503 Brown admitted as early as winter 1940 that the endowment of the amateur very often meant the 'endowment of incompetence' which was necessary for the time being as a welfare project, but which was to end after the war. Brown, Ivor, The Entertainment Problem II, *New Statesman and Nation*, 14 December 1940, Vol. XX, No. 512, p.619.
504 C.E.M.A. Note of a conversation held at the Treasury Chambers, 11 December 1941, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.

505 Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts, the Fifth Year of C.E.M.A., The End of the Beginning, Report on the work of C.E.M.A. for 1944, London undated, p4.

506 Ivor Brown was replaced soon afterwards by Lewis Casson, who had served for a brief spell in 1940 in this function and had been Brown's predecessor in office. See Letter Mary Glasgow to Sylvia Goodfellow (Secretary at the Board of Education), 2 October 1942, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.

507 Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts, the Arts in Wartime, A report of the Work of C.E.M.A. 1942/43, London undated, TNA(PRO) ED 136/192.

508 The Council did not install an executive board before February 1945.

509 Minutes of the 20th Meeting of the Council, 8 December 1942, V&A EL 1/6. The idea of advisory panels had already been tendered in the announcement of the Government's original commitment on 10 April 1940, Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons Volume 359, 10 April 1940, col. 606.

510 Keynes to Butler, 2 March 1943, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196B.

511 Keynes to Butler, 16 April 1943, V&A EL 1/18: "As I have never heard of Monnington, I cannot reasonably object to him. It will, I think, be of some assistance to me to be able to tell members of the Panel that I was not consulted.'

512 Butler to Keynes, 20 April 1943, John Maynard Keynes Papers KCC PP 84/3. The importance of the case resulted from the fact that criticism had arisen from the Royal Academy concerning the choice of members of the Art Panel. The original members of the panel were Samuel Courtauld, W.E. Williams, the painter Duncan Grant, the painter and sculptor Henry Moore, and John Rothenstein, Director of the Tate Gallery, hence representing the spheres of private collecting, art education, painting, sculpture and museums. The Academicians suspected Grant and Moore to be 'protégés of Sir Kenneth Clark with a touch of Gordon Square' who would not represent the art scene in Britain. The appointment of Monnington, hence, would have been a conciliatory move towards the Academy.

513 Herbert Farjeon to Mary Glasgow, 25 November 1944, V&A EL 2/1.

514 Mary Glasgow to R.A. Butler, 8 April 1943, V&A EL 1/18.

515 Keynes to Samuel Courtauld, 20 April 1944, V&A EL 2/39.

516 Memorandum by R.A. Butler of a conversation with Lord Keynes, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.

517 Minutes of the Fifth Meeting of the Drama Panel, 4 August 1943, TNA(PRO) ED 136/189.

518 Ibidem.

519 Keynes to Mary Glasgow, 11 August 1943, V&A EL 2/38.

520 Mary Glasgow to Deputy Secretary of the Board of Education, 11 June 1943, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.

521 Keynes to Samuel Courtauld, 20 April 1944, V&A EL 2/39.

522 See letter by John Colville, Secretary of State for Scotland to Herwald Ramsbotham, 11 April 1940, V&A EL 2/80.

523 O.H. Mavor to Keynes, 23 December 1942, John Maynard Keynes Papers, KCC PP 84/1.

524 Keynes to Mary Glasgow, 30 December 1942, V&A EL 2/37.
525 Keynes to Mary Glasgow 13 January 1943, V&A EL 2/38.
526 Minutes of the 21st Meeting of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts, 3 March 1943, V&A EL 1/7. The original members of the Scottish Committee were O.H. Mavor, Ernest Bullock, Thomas John Honeyman, William Wallace McKechnie, John Ronald Peddie and Sir George Pirie.
527 Minutes of the First Meeting of the Scottish Committee of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts 19 March 1943, V&A EL 2/80. The committee of organisers consisted of the regional officers and the drama organiser David Yacamini.
528 Wales followed the Scottish example on 16 March 1945 with the establishment of a Welsh Advisory Committee under the chairmanship of Lord Harlech, V&A EL 2/17. The first proposal had been tendered by Mary Glasgow in a letter to Keynes on 17 January 1945, V&A EL 2/40.
529 Minutes of the 14th Meeting of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts, 21 April, 1942, V&A EL 1/6.
530 Minutes of the 14th Meeting of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts, 21 April 1942, V&A EL 1/6.
531 R.A. Butler to Keynes 22 July 1942, John Maynard Keynes Papers KCC PP 84/1.
532 Ibidem.
533 Minutes of the 21st Meeting of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts, 3 March 1943, V&A EL 1/7.
534 L.T.B. = London Transport (Passenger) Board.
535 Lord Esher to Keynes, 4 March 1942, V&A EL 2/14.
536 Marwick, Arthur, The Home Front: The British and the Second World War, London 1976, p142.
537 See a discussion including John Rothenstein, Director of the Tate Gallery, James Laver of the Victoria and Albert Museum and the author Sidney R. Jones, who all agreed that a Ministry of Fine Arts would not be desirable, printed in the arts journal *The Studio*, February 1943, within TNA(PRO) CAB 124/426.
538 Keynes to Munro Wheeler, 12 October 1943, John Maynard Keynes Papers KCC PP 84/2.
539 Keynes to MS Stepanov, V&A EL 2/39.
540 *The Times*, 3 August 1942.
541 Ibidem.
542 Minutes of the 17th Meeting of the Council, 2 September 1942, V&A EL 1/6.
543 Ibidem.
544 CEMA Paper 152: Draft Budget for 1943/44, V&A EL 1/14.
545 W.E. Williams to Sir Kenneth Clark, 7 September 1942, TGA 8812.1.1.14.
546 See letters by Mary Glasgow to W.E. Williams, 28 August 1942, John Maynard Keynes Papers KCC PP 84/1; W.E. Williams to Keynes, 3 September 1942, John Maynard Keynes Papers KCC PP 84/1; W.E. Williams to Mary Glasgow, 3 September 1942, John Maynard Keynes Papers KCC PP 84/1.
547 Mary Glasgow to Sir Kenneth Clark, 15 September 1942, V&A EL 2/13.

548 Ibidem.

549 See Sir Kenneth Clark's intervention on behalf of the British Institute of Adult Education at the First Meeting of the Art Panel, 13 January 1943, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188A.

550 Minutes of the First Meeting of the Art Panel, 13 January 1943, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188A.

551 Ibidem.

552 See Proposal by the Council's Art Director, Philip James, 25 August 1941, V&A EL 2/13.

553 CEMA Paper LXXXII: Notes on Art Exhibition, V&A EL 1/13, the exhibitions touring were: (a) Contemporary Paintings, (b) 20th Century British Draughtsmen, (c) The Edward Hulton Coloured Engravings; (d) Official War Artists; (e) British Landscapes, 1740-1840; (f) Water Colour Painting (lent by the V&A); (g) French and English Painting; (h) Living in Cities.

554 CEMA Paper CXVIII: Committee for the Purchase of Pictures, V&A EL 1/14.

555 Production of Lithographs by P. James, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188A.

556 Hewison, Robert, Under siege: Literary Life in London 1939-1945, London 1977, p60.

557 CEMA Bulletin No. 27, July 1942, p1.

558 See Catalogue 'Pictures to live with', 31 July - 14 August 1943, Wigan, 'Painting is one of the arts which are a part of the cultural heritage we are fighting to preserve.', John Maynard Keynes Papers KCC PP 84/2.

559 Minutes of the First Meeting of the Arts Panel, 13 January 1943, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188A.

560 Ibidem. The fees for accepted designs ranged from £80 to £120, the designs, by that procedure, became the property of CEMA, which did not necessarily meet with approval by the artists. Paul Nash, for example, requested the retention of the property rights, which the Council felt unable to accept, unless the artist was prepared to accept a reduction in the fee paid, ibidem.

561 Minutes of the 4th Meeting of the Art Panel, 23 September 1943, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188A.

562 Keynes to Mary Glasgow, 16 June 1942, John Maynard Keynes Papers KCC PP 84/1: 'The only point I had on your draft, which I enclose, is that it overstates, in my opinion, the extent to which we accepted Mr. Williams' reservations about the continuance of the guide lecturer system. It was left, I thought, that we should not press for any drastic or immediate change, but that he should aim at reducing their number and should consider in the ensuing months the advisability of this system.'

563 CEMA Paper 174: Art Exhibitions for 1944-45, by Philip James, TNA(PRO) ED 136/191.

564 Ibidem.

565 Minutes of the Ninth Meeting of the Art Panel, 22 September 1944, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188A. See also Williams's own account Williams, William Emrys, The Pre-History of the Arts Council, reprinted in Adults Learning 8 (1996), No.4, 94-96, p96.

566 Minutes of the Fourth Meeting of the Art Panel, 23 September 1943, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188A.

567 See, e.g., the list of exhibition touring in 1944 including exhibitions of works by Walter Sickert, Matthew Smith, 'Seven British Painters', 'Living Scottish Painters', 'Modern French Paintings', 'Contemporary Art', Minutes of the Ninth Meeting of the Art Panel, 22 September 1944, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188A.

568 *The Times*, 11 March 1944.

569 *The Times*, 14 March 1944.

570 See e.g. *New Statesman and Nation*: London Diary, Vol. XX, No. 501, 28 September 1940; Plays and Pictures, Vol. XXIII, No. 583, 25 April 1942, p272; CEMA by Raymond Mortimer, Vol. XXIV, No. 606, 3 October 1942, p219; London Diary, Vol. XXV, No. 637, 8 May 1943, p300.

571 *New Statesman and Nation*, London Diary, Vol. XXVII, No.682, 18 March 1944, p185.

572 Report on Region I (1942-1944) (Northumberland, Durham, Yorkshire, North Riding) by Helen Munro, May 1944, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188C.

573 Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts, the Arts in Wartime, A report of the Work of C.E.M.A. 1942/43, London undated, TNA(PRO) ED 136/192, p13.

574 Minutes of the First Meeting of the Music Panel, 20 January 1943, TNA(PRO) ED 136/189.

575 Minutes of the Third Meeting of the Music Panel, 30 June 1943, TNA(PRO) ED 136/189, see also Minutes of the 22nd Meeting of the Council, 16 June 1943, V&A EL 1/7.

576 Ibidem.

577 Minutes of the Fourth Meeting of the Music Panel, 2 September 1943, TNA(PRO) ED 136/189.

578 Mary Glasgow to Vaughan Williams, 4 February 1944, V&A EL 2/20; Molly Lake admitted in a letter to Mary Glasgow that the work of a Music Traveller was not 'one which any person could keep on doing indefinitely if they want to be a performing artist.', Molly Lake to Mary Glasgow, 13 July 1943, V&A EL 2/57

579 Ralph Vaughan Williams to Mary Glasgow, 31 July 1943, V&A EL 2/20.

580 Minutes of the 17th Meeting of the Council, 2 September 1942, V&A EL 1/6; see also letters to Mary Glasgow, 8 January 1944 and 13 February 1944, V&A EL 2/20. Furthermore his opposition to purchase the theatres in Bedford and Luton, Minutes of the 23rd Meeting of the Council, 20 July 1943, V&A EL 1/7, and Minutes of the 32nd Meeting of the Council, V&A EL 1/7.

581 Keynes to Mary Glasgow, 28 June 1943, V&A EL 2/38.

582 Minutes of the 6th Meeting of the Music Panel, 11 April 1944, TNA(PRO) ED 136/189.

583 See Helen Munro to Mary Glasgow, 7 April 1944, V&A EL 3/11 and the Report on Region 7 by Cyril Wood, November 1944, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188C.

584 Memorandum by Sybil Eaton, April 1943, V&A EL 2/47.

585 Report by Eve Kisch appointed Music Traveller of Region 10 (Lancashire, Cheshire, Cumberland and Westmoreland), Regional Officer to Region 10, then 3, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188C.

586 Report on Region 10 by Peter Crossley-Holland, November 1944, V&A EL 3/83.

587 Ibidem.

588 Report on Region 4 by Anne Carlisle, June 1944, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188C.

589 Minutes of the 7th Meeting of the Music Panel, 23 June 1944, TNA(PRO) ED 136/189.

590 Ibidem.

591 Ibidem.

592 Report on Region 1 by Helen Munro, May 1944, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.

593 CEMA Paper 179: C.E.M.A. concerts, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188C. Originally, ten clubs had been funded at a rate of £50 in 1941; in 1943 the number was increased to 27 and in 1944 to 40.

594 CEMA Circulars 33 and 39, V&A EL 3/3.

595 CEMA Paper 184: Factory Music Clubs, 3 November 1944, TNA(PRO) ED 136/191.

596 See Val Drewry to A.D.M., 11 July 1942, BBC WAC R 27/11/1: Music-General Arts Council of Great Britain, File 1: 1940-1942; W.K. Stanton (Music Director Midland Region) to Midland Regional Director and Director of Music (Marylebone High Street) 21 January 1944, BBC WAC R 27/11/2: Music-General Arts Council of Great Britain, File 2: 1943-1944. See also Note of a meeting, 1 September 1944, between Mr. Ronald Biggs and Mr. Kenneth Wright of the B.B.C. and Miss M.C. Glasgow and Mr. E.W. White of C.E.M.A, V&A EL 2/5.

597 Note of a meeting, 1 September 1944, between Mr. Ronald Biggs and Mr. Kenneth Wright of the B.B.C. and Miss M.C. Glasgow and Mr. E.W. White of C.E.M.A, V&A EL 2/5.

598 BBC WAC R 27/11/2: Music-General: Arts Council of Great Britain, File 2: 1943-1944.

599 Friction arose again between the BBC and CEMA, when the former decided to cut the length of the concerts from sixty to forty-five minutes, Letter by Director of Programme Planning, 21 January 1945, BBC WAC R 27/11/3: Music-General Arts Council of Great Britain, File 3: 1945. Despite pleas by CEMA and the BBC's new Music Director, Dr. Victor Hely-Hutchinson, to the Director of Programme Planning, the decision to cut down the broadcast of the concerts was announced as final on 21 February 1945, Assistant Director of Programme Planning, James Langham, to Director of Music, 21 February 1945, BBC WAC R 27/11/3: Music-General Arts Council of Great Britain, File 3: 1945.

600 See Talk by Clemence Dane for the BBC: Touring in Wartime with C.E.M.A., 14 February 1943, BBC WAC, Talk Script T 106; Talk by Benjamin Ifor Evans for the BBC on 29 July 1945, T 131; Talk by R.F. Dunnett with David Yacamini, Mrs. Charles Kemp, Mr. G Paterson Whyte, Miss Molly Francis on C.E.M.A., 3 October 1942, BBC WAC T 121. After the war, the BBC recalled the war work done by CEMA in a five week series within the Women's

Magazine programme; Women's Magazine series from 13 May – 10 June 1947, BBC WAC T 661.

601 For 'Holidays at Home' see Sladen, Chris, Holidays at Home in the Second World War, Journal of Contemporary History 37 (2002), 67-89.

602 Ministry of Labour and National Service Holidays: Official Statement No. 29, 30 April 1941, TNA(PRO) LAB 26/45; see also the undated Memorandum Holidays in 1941 of the Committee on Worker's Holidays: 'The public should be plainly told that in view of the need to use holiday accommodation and transport to the full for purposes connected with the war effort, the natural desire to spend a holiday away from home must be postponed until after the war.', TNA(PRO) LAB 26/45 and E.D.L. 80 Ministry of Labour and National Service: Making the Best of Holidays in 1942: 'As all essential travel, whether by rail or by road must be avoided this year, the great majority of holiday-makers will have to spend their holidays at home.', TNA(PRO) LAB 26/46.

603 Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts, The Arts in Wartime, A report of the Work of C.E.M.A. 1942/43, London undated, pp8/9; Minutes of the First Meeting of the Drama Panel, 6 January 1943, TNA(PRO) ED 136/189.

604 Ministry of Labour and National Service Leaflet E.D.L. 81: Holidays in 1942, TNA(PRO) LAB 26/46.

605 The History of CEMA from December 1939, TNA(PRO) ED 138/14.

606 CEMA Paper LXXI: C.E.M.A.'s aid to the Professional Theatre by Ivor Brown, V&A EL 1/12.

607 Minutes of the 14th Meeting of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts, 21 April 1942, V&A EL 1/6, see also letter by John Maynard Keynes to Mary Glasgow, 5 August 1942, V&A EL 2/30.

608 See letters by Mary Glasgow to G.R. Hughes, 25 July 1940 and 1 October 1940, V&A EL 2/9. The only exception from this rule had been the concerts of small ensembles in rest shelters and rest centres during the days of the Blitz, see previous chapter.

609 CEMA Paper 138: Director of Drama's Report, Midsummer 1942, V&A EL 1/14.

610 CEMA Paper 173: Relations with the Old Vic and Sadler's Wells, TNA(PRO) ED 136/191.

611 Minutes of the First Meeting of the Drama Panel, 6 January 1943, TNA(PRO) ED 136/189.

612 For a general history of the Theatre Royal, Bristol see Barker, Kathleen, The Theatre Royal, Bristol, 1766-1966: Two Centuries of Stage History, London 1974.

613 Minutes of the 18th Meeting of the Council's Executive Committee, 14 November 1945, V&A EL 1/18.

614 Quoted in *The Theatre Managers' Journal*, Vol. XXI, No 258, January 1943, p1.

615 Ibidem.

616 Minutes of the First Meeting of the Drama Panel, 6 January 1943, TNA(PRO) ED 136/189.

617 Keynes to Mary Glasgow, 18 March 1943; Keynes to Ivor Brown, 16 March 1943; Ivor Brown to Keynes, 23 March 1943, all in John Maynard Keynes Papers KCC PP 84/1.
618 Keynes to Mary Glasgow, 28 July 1943, V&A EL 2/38.
619 Memorandum signed by Sir Robert Wood, 11 October 1944, of a meeting between Sir Robert Wood, John Maynard Keynes, E. Hale, Sir Alan Barlow, 10 October 1944, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196A.
620 Minutes of the 23rd Meeting of the Council, 20 July 1943, V&A EL 1/7.
621 Ibidem.
622 Keynes to Mary Glasgow, 9 October 1942, V&A EL 2/37.
623 See e.g. the letter by Keynes to Mary Glasgow of 16 May 1944 concerning the new productions of the Old Vic: 'To spend £2,500 on each production for costumes and decor alone, excluding all the preliminary and rehearsal expenses is surely insane, and not only insane but out of proportion and uncalled for. Very lavish productions cut no ice with anyone and are already the plague of the West End.', V&A EL 2/88. See also Ivor Brown to Mary Glasgow, 12 August 1943, V&A EL 2/12.
624 Most of the Old Vic's productions were of plays by Shakespeare (see Trewin, J.C., Shakespeare on the English Stage 1900-1964, London 1964, p189), who enjoyed the exceptional status that all his plays were regarded as educational or partly educational, Memorandum Entertainments Duty on 'Living' Entertainments, undated, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.
625 Landstone, Off-Stage - A Personal Record of the first twelve years of State Sponsored Drama in Great Britain, London/New York 1953, p69.
626 CEMA Paper 168: The Relation of the Council to its Associated Theatre Companies, V&A EL 1/14.
627 Ibidem.
628 Ibidem.
629 Ibidem.
630 Landstone, Off-Stage, p74.
631 CEMA Paper 138: Director of Drama's Report Midsummer 1942, V&A EL 1/14.
632 CEMA Paper 143: The Governors of the Old Vic and Sadler's Wells in association with C.E.M.A. Minutes of the first Meeting of the Consultative Committee, 6 August, 1942, V&A EL 1/14.
633 Mary Glasgow to Keynes, 17 April 1943, V&A EL 2/38.
634 Ibidem.
635 Mary Glasgow to Keynes, 20 April 1943, V&A EL 2/38.
636 *Daily Express*, 19 June 1943.
637 *Daily Express*, 28 June 1943.
638 Ibidem.
639 *Daily Express*, 3 July 1943.
640 See the statement by the theatre producer George Black in the *Daily Express*, 5 July 1943.
641 *Daily Express*, 3 July 1943.
642 *Evening Standard*, 4 August 1943.
643 *Evening Standard*, 7 August 1943.

644 Ibidem.
645 *Evening Standard*, 10 August 1943. See also Questions by Ernest Betts to Keynes, 5 July 1943, John Maynard Keynes Papers KCC PP 84/6.
646 Press Statement, V&A EL 2/26.
647 Mary Glasgow to Keynes, 11 August 1943, V&A EL 2/38.
648 Ashley Dukes to Keynes, 6 May 1943, John Maynard Keynes Papers KCC PP 84/1. Dukes was backed by fellow panel member Athene Seyler, Seyler to Ashley Dukes, 12 May 1943, John Maynard Keynes Papers KCC PP 84/1.
649 Ashley Dukes to John Maynard Keynes, 8 May 1943, John Maynard Keynes Papers KCC PP 84/1.
650 See also his strong intervention on behalf of the hostel tours, which thought so important that he threatened to withdraw altogether from the Panel, if their financial allocation was reduced, Minutes of the Fifth Meeting of the Drama Panel, 4 August 1943, TNA(PRO) ED 136/189.
651 J.B. Priestley to Mary Glasgow, 8 May 1944, V&A EL 2/1.
652 Ibidem.
653 Ibidem.
654 Priestley, J.B., Some notes on the Theatre Situation, 23 March 1944, V&A EL 2/2.
655 J.B. Priestley to Mary Glasgow, 20 October 1944, V&A EL 2/2.
656 Walter Payne (Chairman of The Theatre Managers' National Committee) to Chancellor of the Exchequer, 14 October 1943, TNA(PRO) T 161/1433.
657 Ibidem.
658 E. Hale to Sir Alan Barlow: 'I think that these people had better be allowed to come & blow off steam, preferably to the Financial Secretary.', TNA(PRO) T 161/1433.
659 Memorandum of the Meeting with the National Theatre Committee, 12 November 1943, V&A EL 2/26.
660 Ibidem.
661 Sir Archibald Carter to Sir Alan Barlow, 29 November 1944, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.
662 Ibidem.
663 Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons Volume 392, 19 October 1943, cols. 1212seq. The committee included apart from Pooley Sir Gerald Canny and Dr. T.H.W. Armstrong.
664 CEMA Paper XIV by Dr. George Dyson, January 1940, V&A EL 1/10.
665 Minute by Mary Glasgow, 22 February 1943, V&A EL2/26, my italics.
666 See correspondence CEMA – H. M. Customs and Excise, 27 August – 23 September 1943, V&A EL 2/26.
667 Mary Glasgow to Sir Archibald Carter, 27 August 1943, V&A EL 2/26.
668 Eric Hale (Treasury) to Davidson (Board of Education), 25 March 1943, V&A EL 2/26.
669 List A and List B are enclosed as Appendix C to an unsigned 'Memorandum Entertainments Duty on 'Living' Entertainments', TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.
670 Ashley Dukes on the working of the 'A' and 'B' lists of Plays furnished by H.M. Customs and Excise – respectively plays regarded as 'partly educational' and 'not partly educational', V&A EL 2/26.

671 Ibidem.
672 Ibidem.
673 Ibidem.
674 Sir Archibald Carter to Keynes, 12 January 1944, John Maynard Keynes Papers KCC PP 84/6.
675 Minutes of the 26th meeting of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts, 14 March 1944, V&A EL 1/7.
676 Keynes to Sir Archibald Carter, 12 May 1944, V&A EL 2/9; see also O.H. Mavor to Mary Glasgow, 15 March 1944, John Maynard Keynes Papers KCC PP 84/6.
677 Keynes to Sir Archibald Carter, 16 June 1944, John Maynard Keynes Papers KCC PP 84/6.
678 Keynes to Sir Archibald Carter, 6 January 1944, V&A EL 2/9.
679 Sir Archibald Carter to Keynes, 12 January 1944, V&A EL 2/9.
680 Sir Archibald Carter to Keynes, 13 June 1944, John Maynard Keynes Papers KCC PP 84/6.
681 Ibidem.
682 Ibidem.
683 Ibidem.
684 Ernest Bevin to R.A. Butler, 10 May 1943, TNA(PRO) ED 136/193.
685 Dean, Theatre at War, p134.
686 Dean, Theatre at War, p135.
687 CEMA Paper 169: Employment of Musicians for Factory Concerts, 5 October 1943, TNA(PRO) ED 136/191.
688 Ibidem.
689 Mary Glasgow to Sir Kenneth Clark, 19 May 1943, Kenneth Clark Papers, TGA 8812.1.1.18., my italics.
690 See explanation by Mary Glasgow on occasion of the First Meeting of the Music Panel, 20 January 1943, TNA(PRO) ED 136/189.
691 Report by Sir John Forster to Ernest Bevin, Minister of Labour and National Service, 17 December 1943, TNA(PRO) ED 136/193, p1.
692 Ibidem, p22.
693 Summary of the Recommendations contained in Sir John Forster's Report on the Man and Woman Power in the Entertainment Industry with Observations thereon by the Minister of Labour and National Service, TNA(PRO) ED 136/193.
694 Mary Glasgow to Sylvia Goodfellow, 20 January 1944, TNA(PRO) ED 136/193.
695 Bevin to R.A. Butler, 18 February 1944, TNA(PRO) ED 136/193.
696 Bevin to R.A. Butler, 5 April 1944, TNA(PRO) ED 136/193.
697 See Kurt Jooss to Keynes, 12 January 1943, John Maynard Keynes Papers KCC PP 84/1.
698 See e.g. letters by Harvey D. Wade to CEMA, 31 May 1943; by E. Wilson Hooker, 25 August 1943; by Kenneth Stocks on behalf of the Chace Hostel Discussion Group, 21 September 1943, all in V&A EL 3/72.
699 'Letter from a member of the public paying his first visit to a CEMA-Concert', V&A EL 1/14.

[700] Martin, Kingsley, Music at Dinner, *New Statesman and Nation*, Vol. XXII, No. 564, 13 December 1941, p490; H.F. Rossetti's notes for the Conference on Factory Concerts at the Ministry of Labour, 3 March 1941, V&A EL 2/29.

[701] North Midlands Divisional Office to A. Gry-Jones (Ministry of Labour and National Service) on Symphony Orchestras concerts: 'My opinion is that if C.E.M.A. had handled the this job they would have done it better.' TNA(PRO) LAB 26/44.

[702] See e.g. the letters from George Kent Limited, 11 April 1942; A.A. Jones & Shipman, 3 November 1942; High Duty Alloys/Slough, 30 April 1941, all V&A EL 2/30.

[703] B.J. Garwood to Tom Harrison, Regional Officer for Region 9, Birmingham, 8 December 1943, V&A EL 3/72. See also letter by E.L. Codmer to CEMA, 9 January 1944, V&A EL 3/46.

[704] Report on Region 4 by Anne Carlisle, June 1944, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B; Mary Glasgow to Ralph Vaughan Williams, 10 August 1943, V&A EL 2/20; Peter Crossley-Holland to Drama Director Lewis Casson, 22 August 1944, V&A EL 3/87.

[705] Pick, John, Managing the Arts? The British Experience, London 1986, pp39-41.

[706] Ibidem, p41.

[707] C.L. Fawcett to R.A. Butler, 30 November 1943, V&A EL 3/46.

[708] Guthrie, Tyrone, *Liverpool Post*, 16 April 1945.

[709] Eric Hale to Sir Alan Barlow, 8 November 1943, TNA(PRO) T 161/1433.

[710] J.A.C. Robertson to Eric Hale, Cease Fire (Europe) Book, 14 August 1944, TNA(PRO) T 161/1433.

[711] Keynes to R.A. Butler, 14 January 1942, V&A EL 2/11.

[712] See hand-written notice on letter by W.K. Pyke-Lees to Sir Alan Barlow, 18 August 1944, TNA(PRO) T 161/1433.

[713] Minutes of a conversation between Sir Robert Wood, Sir Alan Barlow and Eric Hale, 10 October 1944, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.

[714] H.M. Customs and Excise, Memorandum Entertainments Duty on 'Living' Entertainments, 29 November 1944, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.

[715] Ibidem.

[716] Ibidem.

[717] Ibidem.

[718] Ibidem.

[719] See Hale to Sir Alan Barlow 2 October 1944: The Future of CEMA, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196A.

[720] Ashley Dukes on the working of the 'A' and 'B' lists of Plays furnished by H.M. Customs and Excise – respectively plays regarded as 'partly educational' and 'not partly educational', V&A EL 2/26.

[721] Unsigned Memorandum: The Future of C.E.M.A., 12 December 1944, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189, my italics.

[722] R.S. Wood to D. du B. Davidson, 11 February 1941, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.

[723] Sir Alan Barlow to Financial Secretary/Chancellor of the Exchequer, 30 November 1944, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.

724 Hand-written notice by Osbert Peake on letter by Sir Alan Barlow to Financial Secretary/Chancellor of the Exchequer, 30 November 1944, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.
725 Lord Esher to Keynes, 4 March 1942, V&A EL 2/13.
726 Sabine, Basil, British Budgets in Peace and War, 1932-1945, London 1970, p186.
727 Hand-written notice by Sir John Anderson on letter by Sir Alan Barlow to Financial Secretary/Chancellor of the Exchequer, 30 January 1945, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.
728 CEMA Circular 29, March 1945, V&A EL 3/3.
729 Mary Glasgow to Keynes, 7 September 1945, V&A EL 2/40.
730 Ibidem.
731 Keynes to Mary Glasgow, 23 November 1945, V&A EL 2/40.
732 Minutes of the 30th Meeting of the Council, 26 September 1944, V&A EL 1/7.
733 Ibidem.
734 Ibidem.
735 Appendix to the Minutes of the 32nd Meeting of the Council: Letter from the Chairman, Lord Keynes, to the Minister of Education, Mr. R.A. Butler, 1 February 1945, V&A EL 1/7.
736 Evelyn M. Williams (Clerk to the Governors of the Vic Wells) to Charles Webster, 31 March 1945, V&A EL 2/89.
737 Minutes of the 29th Meeting of the Council, 25 July 1944, V&A EL 1/7.
738 Memorandum Sadler's Wells-Covent Garden by Edward J. Dent and Tyrone Guthrie, V&A EL 2/89.
739 Ibidem, my italics.
740 Ibidem.
741 Ibidem.
742 Ibidem.
743 Memorandum Sadler's Wells-Covent Garden, undated and unsigned, V&A EL 2/89.
744 See Witts, Artist unknown, pp162-198.
745 Mary Glasgow to Keynes, 3 August 1944, TNA(PRO) 2/39. The other members of the Board were Leslie Boosey, Ralph Hawkes, the composer William Walton, Prof. Edward Dent and Samuel Courtauld.
746 R.A. Butler to Mary Glasgow, 30 January 1945, V&A EL 2/9.
747 Keynes to Sir Alan Barlow, January 1945, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196 A.
748 B.L. Pearson to Sir Robert Wood, 8 February 1945, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196 A.
749 Mary Glasgow to Keynes, 2 November 1944, V&A EL 2/39.
750 Covent Garden Scheme, John Maynard Keynes Papers KCC PP 84/8.
751 Ibidem.
752 Minutes of the 7th and 9th Meetings of the Executive Committee, May/June 1945, V&A EL 1/18.
753 Minutes of the 11th Meeting of the Council's Executive Committee, 11 July 1945, V&A EL 1/18.

754 Minutes of the 12th Meeting of the Council's Executive Committee, 25 July 1945, V&A EL 1/18.

755 Minutes of the 14th Meeting of the Council's Executive Committee, 14 September 1945, V&A EL 1/18.

756 Minutes of the 15th Meeting of the Council's Executive Committee, 21 September 1945, V&A EL 1/18.

757 For John Christie see Blunt, Wilfrid, John Christie of Glyndebourne, London 1968.

758 CEMA Paper 189: Draft Budget for the year 1945/46, Note 8, TNA(PRO) ED 136/191, my italics; see also B. Ifor Evans to Keynes, 25 August 1945, V&A EL 2/2.

759 Keynes to Sir Alan Barlow, 20 September 1944, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.

760 Sir Robert Wood to R.A. Butler, 18 September 1944, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196 A. In a hand-written note, B.L. Pearson, the Ministry's Accountant General, concurred with Wood's view, ibidem.

761 E. Hale to Sir Alan Barlow, 17 April 1945, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189; Minute by B.L. Pearson, 12 May 1945, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196 A; Minutes of the 15th Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Arts Council, 21 September 1945, V&A EL 1/18; Keynes to Mary Glasgow, 23 November 1945, V&A EL 2/40; Keynes to E. Hale, 31 December 1945, V&A EL 2/87.

762 Eric Hale to Sir Alan Barlow, 2 October 1944, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196A.

763 Ibidem.

764 Sir Alan Barlow to Financial Secretary/Chancellor of the Exchequer, 30 November 1944, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189. See also Sir Archibald Carter to Keynes, 12 January 1944, V&A EL 2/9.

765 Sir Archibald Carter to Sir Alan Barlow, 23 January 1945, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.

766 See Sir Archibald Carter to Chancellor of the Exchequer on Conversation between Sir Archibald Carter, Sir Alan Barlow and Lord Keynes, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189: 'In principle, the Treasury and this Department would have preferred a change which the whole business of giving financial assistance to music and drama would have been transferred to the shoulders of C.E.M.A., so removing entirely the sphere of taxation all questions involving a judgment on what is worthy of support on cultural grounds.'

767 Ibidem. Despite his official opinion to put the responsibility for the exemption into CEMA's hands, Sir Archibald Carter privately assured Keynes of his sympathy with the latter's 'hesitation to place too much on the shoulders of C.E.M.A. before it has become a revered institution in the eyes of the general public', Sir Archibald Carter to Keynes, 20 February 1945, John Maynard Keynes Papers KCC PP 84/6.

768 Minutes of a conversation between H.M. Customs and Excise and the British Drama League, 19 February 1945, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.

769 Ibidem.

770 Sir Archibald Carter to Chancellor of the Exchequer on Conversation between Sir Archibald Carter, Sir Alan Barlow and Lord Keynes, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.

771 Ibidem.

772 Keynes to Sir Archibald Carter, 13 February 1945, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.
773 E. Hale to Sir Alan Barlow, 26 February 1945, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189; see also Memorandum by Sir Robert Wood, 11 October 1944, of a meeting Sir Robert Wood, John Maynard Keynes, E. Hale, Sir Alan Barlow, 10 October 1944, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196 A.
774 Sir Robert Wood to R.A. Butler, 18 September 1944, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196 A.
775 Hand-written note by Sir John Anderson on letter by Sir Alan Barlow to Chancellor of the Exchequer, 21 March 1945, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.
776 See ibidem, Eric Hale to Sir Alan Barlow, 24 January 1945, and Memorandum: Entertainments Duty, Customs and Excise, 6 April 1945, all in TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.
777 Keynes to Barlow, 7 January 1945, John Maynard Keynes Papers KCC PP 84/1.
778 Barlow to Sir Robert Wood, 15 February 1945, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196A. See also letter by R.A. Butler to Keynes, 10 January 1945, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196A.
779 Minutes of the 2nd Meeting of the Council's Executive Committee, 28 February 1945, V&A EL 1/18.
780 The name of Arts Council of Great Britain had been accepted by CEMA Council, Minutes of the 34th Meeting of the Council, 15 May 1945, V&A EL 1/7, after it had become clear that the Home Office would not grant CEMA's successor the permission to use the originally suggested title 'Royal Arts Council', Mary Glasgow to Keynes, 22 March 1945, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196 A. Keynes had been unhappy with the name CEMA from the beginning which he thought a 'dreadful name', Minute of a Discussion with R.A. Butler, 15 February 1943, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196 B. In the second part of his memoirs, however, Sir Kenneth Clark, member of CEMA from its very beginnings, claims to have coined the name, Clark, The other half, London 1977, p26.
781 Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, Volume 411, 12 June 1945, cols. 1482/83.
782 Ibidem, col.1482.
783 Memorandum by Sir Robert Wood, 11 October 1944, of a meeting of Sir Robert Wood, John Maynard Keynes, E. Hale, Sir Alan Barlow, 10 October 1944, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196 A.
784 Keynes to Sir Archibald Carter, 13 February 1945, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.
785 Mary Glasgow to Keynes, 3 December 1945, V&A EL 2/40.
786 Keynes to Eric Hale, 31 December 1945, V&A EL 2/87.
787 In the financial year 1948/49 the government grant reached £575,000, ten years later, in 1958/59 the grant went for the first time beyond the mark of £1m, figures taken from Willatt, Hugh, The Arts Council of Great Britain, The First 25 Years, London 1971, p7.
788 Leventhal, The Best, p316.
789 Eric Hale to Sir Alan Barlow, 12 April 1945, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.
790 Ibidem.

791 Minute by Sir Robert Wood for R.A. Butler, 12 March 1945, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196 A.

792 See correspondence between E. Hale, Sir Robert Wood, J.W. Parker (Scottish Office of Education), 9 March - 3 April 1945, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196 A.

793 Apart from Wood see Minute by B.L. Pearson, 12 May 1945, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196 A.

794 Hand-written note by Butler on Minute by Sir Robert Wood for R.A. Butler: 'I don't like this at all. Please discuss, I want the money on our Vote.', 12 March 1945, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196 A. See also Letter by R.A. Butler to Keynes, 4 April 1945, ibidem: 'My advisers in fact take the view that there are advantages administratively in letting CEMA on to the Treasury vote. I, for my part, am dead against breaking into the intimate connection which I feel exists between the Ministry and CEMA. I believe that the promotion of the Arts & of their enjoyment is vitally bound up with Education in the broad sense.' See also Butler to Mary Glasgow, Sir Robert Wood, B.L. Pearson, 14 May 1945, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196 A.

795 Draft of the President's New Year's message, V&A EL 2/26.

796 See minute of meeting between R.A. Butler, E. Hale and Sir Alan Barlow, 13 April 1945: 'Sir Alan emphasised the desirability of avoiding if possible, direct Ministerial responsibility for action that had to be taken in a rather difficult world.' TNA(PRO) ED 136/196 A.

797 Barlow to Chancellor of the Exchequer, 20 April 1945, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.

798 Keynes himself did not see the proximity of the future Arts Council and the Ministry of Education as a danger, at least no immediate one, and saw 'great advantages in having a Minister who takes a lively interest in us. This has been sufficiently obvious in recent times.' Keynes to Butler, 6 April 1945, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196 A.

799 Hale to Barlow, 17 April 1945, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.

800 Leventhal, The Best, p316.

801 Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons Volume 411, 12 June 1945, cols. 1482seq.

802 Mary Glasgow to Keynes, 14 May 1945, V&A EL 2/40.

803 Ellen Wilkinson to Keynes, 27 August 1945, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196 A.

804 Mary Glasgow to Keynes, 7 September 1945, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196 A.

805 Ellen Wilkinson to Hugh Dalton, 7 September 1945, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196 A.

806 Ibidem.

807 Fielding, Steven/Thompson, Peter/Tiratsoo, Nick, 'England Arise': Labour Party and popular politics in 1940s Britain, Manchester/New York 1995, p139.

808 Hugh Dalton to Ellen Wilkinson, 19 September 1945, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.

809 Ibidem.

810 A.A. Part (Ministry of Education) to B.F. St. John Trend (Treasury), 28 December 1945, V&A EL 2/11.

811 For the concept of the 'Great and the Good', see Hennessy, Peter, The Great and the Good: An Inquiry into the British Establishment, Policy Studies Institute, Research Report No.654 (March 1986), London 1986.

812 See for example, Labour History and Study Centre (LHASC) R.D.35/November 1946: A Policy for Leisure, and LHASC R.D.43/February 1947: The Enjoyment of leisure, especially pp4seq.

813 B. Ifor Evans (British Council) to Sir Robert Wood, 19 September 1941, TNA(PRO) ED 136/188B.

814 E. Hale to Sir Alan Barlow, The Future of CEMA, 2 October 1944, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196 A.

815 Minutes of a Meeting on 10 October 1944 between Sir Alan Barlow, Sir Robert Wood and E. Hale, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.

816 Memorandum by Sir Robert Wood, 11 October 1944 of meeting Sir Robert Wood, John Maynard Keynes, E. Hale, Sir Alan Barlow, 10 October 1944, TNA(PRO) ED 136/196 A.

817 Minutes of the 2nd Meeting of the Council's Executive Committee, 28 February 1945, Appendix II: Draft Wording to be used in the application for a Charter, V&A EL 1/18.

818 Keynes, John Maynard, The Arts Council: Its policy and hopes, *The Listener*, 12 July 1945.

819 Keynes to Butler, 1 February 1945, V&A EL 1/7.

820 Lord Macmillan, A Man of Law's Tale, London 1952, p51.

821 Sinclair, Andrew, Arts and Cultures, London 1995, p51.

822 Weight, Richard, 'Building a new British culture': The Arts Council Movement 1943-53, in Weight, Richard/Beach, Abigail (Eds.), The Right to Belong: Citizenship and National Identity in Britain 1930-1960, London 1998, 157-180, p160.

823 See Correspondence between Eric Hale and R.W.A. Speed, solicitor of the Treasury, 31 August 1945; Speed to Hale, 11 October 1945; Hale to Speed 12 October 1945; Hale to Pearson, 12 October 1945; Mary Glasgow to Hale 16 October 1945; Hale to Speed 17 October 1945, Hale to Mary Glasgow 23 October 1945, all in TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.

824 Speed to Hale, 11 October 1945, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.

825 Hale to Speed, 12 October 1945, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189. See also letter by Hale to B.L. Pearson (Ministry of Education), 12 October 1945, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.

826 Speed to Hale, 31 October 1945, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189. See also Stephens (Treasury) to Mary Glasgow, 2 November 1945; Eric W. White (Arts Council) to Stephens, 5 November 1945, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.

827 Pearson to Hale, 12 November 1945, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.

828 Hale to Mary Glasgow, 16 November 1945, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.

829 Speed to Stephens, 16 November 1945, TNA(PRO) T 161/1189.

830 The cultural critic, Raymond Williams, himself a member of the Arts Council, thought the new version, i.e. simply 'arts' instead of 'fine arts exclusively', 'more in line with real needs, but the former, for all its evidently residual character, in a way just because of it, had more consistency. Socially, the arts were the cultural interests of an older upper-middle and middle class: a limited

governmental initiative - a financial rather than a cultural or educational intervention - would help to sustain them and to make them more and more widely accessible.', Williams, Raymond, The Arts Council, Political Quarterly 50 (1979), 157-171, p163.

831 Figures taken from Witts, Artist unknown, pp412/13.

832 Arts Council of Great Britain, Sixth Annual Report, 1950/51, p31.

833 The First Ten Years, The Eleventh Annual Report of the Arts Council of Great Britain 1955-1956, London 1956: 'Covent Garden, Sadler's Wells, and the Old Vic, then, as these national institutions endeavouring to provide exemplary performances in the metropolis are a primary responsibility of the Arts Council.', p23.

834 Haydon, Autobiography, p572.

835 Archer/Granville Barker, National Theatre Scheme, pXIX.

836 Guthrie, Tyrone, Liverpool Post, 16 April 1945.

837 Craig, F.W.S. (Ed.), British General Election Manifestos 1900-1974, London/Basingstoke 1975, p119.

838 Ibidem, p129.

839 Clark, Kenneth, The other half, London 1977, p26.

840 Speaight, Robert, Drama since 1939, London/New York/Toronto 1947, p10.

841 Williams, Raymond, The Arts Council, Political Quarterly 50 (1979), 157-171, p159. In his book Culture and Consensus, Robert Hewison showed that the government at times directly intervened, notably in the case of Richard Hoggart, vice-chairman of the Council in 1981, whose appointment as councillor was – against custom and for purely political reasons – not renewed, Hewison, Culture, p248.

842 Minutes of the First Meeting of the Council and its Honorary Directors at the Offices of the Board of Education on 23 April 1940, V&A EL 1/6.

843 Bartlett, K.W., Englands Musikleben seit 1933, Melos - Zeitschrift für Neue Musik (November 1946), 77-79, p78.

844 Croft, Andy, Betrayed Spring: The Labour Government and British Literary Culture, in Fyrth, Jim, Labour's Promised Land: Culture and Society in Labour Britain 1945-1951, London 1995, 197-223, p210.

845 See Priestley, J.B., Theatre Outlook, London 1947, especially pp22 and 55.

846 Abercrombie, Nigel, La politique culturelle au Royaume-Uni, Unesco, Paris 1983, p23.

847 The new charter is reprinted in White, Arts Council, pp303-7.

848 Williams, Raymond, The Arts Council, Political Quarterly 50 (1979), p163.

849 See Shaw, Roy, The Arts and the People, London 1987, pp40-58.

850 Lord Gowrie became Arts Council Chairman in 1994 thus betraying the growing nearness of the Arts Council and the government.

851 Hewison, Culture and Consensus, England, art and politics since 1940, London 1996, pp251-294, especially pp251-260.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Sources

I. 1. Unpublished Sources

Victoria and Albert Museum, London
Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts Papers

EL 1: Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts: Minutes and Papers
EL 2: Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts: Correspondence: Central
EL 3: Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts: Correspondence: Regional
EL 4: Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts and the Arts Council

Public Record Office, Kew
Board of Education/Ministry of Education

ED 136/188A : Minutes and Meetings of the Art Panel Exhibition Pamphlets
ED 136/188B : Miscellaneous Correspondence
ED 136/188C : Reports from the Regional Offices
ED 136/189 : Minutes and Meetings of Music and Drama Panels
ED 136/190 : Council Papers Nos. 62-140
ED 136/191 : Council Papers Nos. 141-199
ED 136/192 : Meetings of the Council (1-32, 34), Minutes of meetings 1-16 of the Council and its Honorary Directors
ED 136/193 : Enquiry by Committee appointed by Minister of Labour on man and woman power in the entertainment industry. Omission from Report of reference to the work of the Council in Report's Conclusion
ED 136/194 : Membership of Council
ED 136/195A : Council Executive Committee minutes and meetings
ED 136/195B : Suggested formation of body to foster good literature
ED 136/196A : Proposals for the re-organisation of the Council as a permanent peacetime body. Discussions and correspondence with the

Treasury etc. Comments on the draft of the Incorporation for the Arts Council
ED 136/196B : Suggestions for appointment of members on Art Panel
ED 136/196C : Long term planning for the Arts
ED 138/14 : Board of Education and Ministry of Education: Drafts and Papers; Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts:
Mr. Davidson's file including Miss Glasgow's original draft

Treasury
T 161/1433
T 161/1189

Ministry of Labour and National Service
LAB 26/35-37
LAB 26/41-42
LAB 26/44-46

Home Office
HO 186/40
HO 199/434: Policy regarding the preservation of public morale; Correspondence with the Ministry of Information

Cabinet Papers
CAB 124/426

Ministry of Information
INF 1/232: Central Institute of Arts and Design
INF 1/233: Central Institute of Arts and Design
INF 1/316: Home Publicity Division: Branch 1: Minutes of Meetings

Prime Minister's Office
PREM 4/20/3

James Ramsay MacDonald Papers
PRO 30/69/210

King's College Library Archive, Cambridge
John Maynard Keynes Private Papers

PP 84/1 General Policy and CEMA's successor, Arts Council
PP 84/2 Art
PP 84/3 Butler, R.A., Minister of Education, 1943-4
PP 84/4 Crystal Palace
PP 84/5 Drama, 1943-6
PP 84/6 Entertainments Tax, 1943-5
PP 84/7 Music, 1943-6
PP 84/8 Royal Opera House Covent Garden, 1945-6

The University Of Birmingham Archive, Birmingham:
Neville Chamberlain Papers
NC 1/13/3/38 ATT2
NC 5/9/6
NC 9/2/42
NC 11/15/25
NC 18/1/136
NC 18/1/170
NC 18/1/196
NC 18/1/205
NC 18/1/319

Tate Gallery Archive, London
Sir Kenneth Clark Papers
TGA 8812.1 Correspondence
TGA 8812.1.1. 1940-1942
TGA 8812.1.2. 1940s-1950s
TGA 8812.1.3. General
TGA 8812.2. Writings
TGA 8812.2.1. Notes
TGA 8812.2.2. Manuscripts/Published Writings
TGA 8812.4. Personal Papers
TGA 8812.4.1. Diaries

National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth
NLW MSS Dr. Thomas Jones, C.H., Collection
NLW MSS M Social and Cultural
NLW MSS H Wales
NLW MSS W General Correspondence
NLW MSS WW Additional Papers General Correspondence

BBC Written Archives Centre, Reading
R 27/11/1 Music-General: Arts Council of Great Britain, File 1: 1940-1942

R 27/11/2 Music-General: Arts Council of Great Britain: File 2: 1943-1944
R 27/11/3 Music-General: Arts Council of Great Britain, File 3: 1945
R 34/941 Policy: Secret Correspondence with Government Departments 1938-1941
R 34/953 Policy: Programme Directives Nos. 1-113, 1940-1945 (formerly 830/279a)
R 34/266 Policy: Broadcasting in War Time 1938-1939
R 34/269/1 Policy: Broadcast for the Fighting Forces File 1A
R 34/269/2 Policy: Broadcast for the Fighting Forces File 1B
R 34/269/3 Policy: Broadcast for the Fighting Forces File 2

Microfilm Talk Scripts

T 106 DAN – DAR:	*Talk by Clemence Dane for the BBC: Touring in Wartime with C.E.M.A., 14 February 1943*
T 121 DUN – DYO:	Talk by R.F. Dunnett with David Yacamini, Mrs. Charles Kemp, Mr. G. Paterson Whyte, Miss Molly Francis on C.E.M.A., 3 October 1942
T 131 ENT – EVA:	Talk by Benjamin Ifor Evans for the BBC on 29 July 1945
T 661:	Women's Magazine No.6 – Wood, G.L.: Women's Magazine Series on CEMA's work, 13 May – 10 June 1947

Labour History and Study Centre, Manchester

R.D.R. 284/March, 1945:	Labour Party, Policy Committee: Facilities for Popular Entertainment and Culture
R.D. 35/November, 1946:	Labour Party: A Policy for Leisure
R.D. 43/February, 1947:	The Enjoyment of Leisure

I. 2. Published Sources

Agate, James, The Contemporary Theatre (1944 and 1945), London 1946
Archer, William/Granville Barker, Harley, A National Theatre: Scheme and Estimates, London 1907
Arnold, Matthew, Culture and Anarchy, Cambridge 1935
Arnold, Matthew, The Complete Prose Works of Matthew Arnold, Volume IX: English Literature and Irish Politics, ed. R.H. Super, Michigan 1973
Arts Council of Great Britain, Plans for an Arts Centre, London 1945

Arts Council of Great Britain, The Arts Council of Great Britain: What it is and what it does, London 1950
Attlee, Clement Richard, As it happened, London/Melbourne/ Toronto 1954
Baldwin, Stanley, Our Inheritance: Speeches and Addresses, London 1928
BBC Yearbook/Handbook, London 1933seq
Beardmore, George, Civilians at War: Journals 1938-1946, Oxford 1986
Beecham, Sir Thomas, A Mingled Chime: Leaves from an Autobiography, London 1949
Bell, Clive, Art, London 1914
Bell, Clive, Civilization, West Drayton 1947
Bell, Clive, The Failure of State Art, The Listener, 21 October 1936, 744-746
Bell, Clive, A Ministry of Arts, New Statesman and Nation XVIII, No. 451, October 19, 1939, 518-19
Boult, Sir Adrian, My own trumpet, London 1973
Bridges, Lord, The State and the Arts - The Romanes Lecture (3 June, 1958), Oxford 1958
Brown, Ivor, The Way of My World, London 1954
Burke, Edmund, Reflection on the Revolution in France, London 1986
Butler, R.A., The art of the possible, London 1971
Carless, Richard/Brewster, Patricia, Patronage and the arts, London 1959
Casson, John, Sybil and Lewis: A Memoir, London 1972
CEMA Bulletin
Clark, Kenneth, The other half, London 1977
Connolly, Cyril, The Condemned Playground Essays: 1927-1944, London 1945
Craig, F.W.S. (Ed.), British General Election Manifestos 1900-1974, London/Basingstoke 1975
Dalton, Hugh, Call back yesterday, Memoirs 1887-1931, London 1953
Dean, Basil, The Theatre at War, London 1956
Dewey, John, The Later Works, 1925-1953, Volume 13: 1938-1939, ed. Steven M. Cahn, Carbondale/Edwardsville 1988
Eliot, T.S., Notes toward a definition of culture, London 1948
Forster, E.M., Two Cheers for Democracy, ed. Oliver Stallybrass, London 1972
Goldsmith, Anthony, Playwrights of the Future, Horizon VII (March 1943), 195-203
Gyseghem, Andre van, Moscow Theatre, Left Review Volume 2, No. 3, December 1935, 108-112
Harrisson, Tom, Living Through the Blitz, London 1976

Harrisson, Tom/Madge, Charles (Eds.), War begins at home: Mass Observation, London 1940
Haydon, Benjamin Robert, The Autobiography and Memoirs of Benjamin Robert Haydon, Volume II, London 1926
Hobhouse, Leonard Trelawney, Liberalism and other Writings, Cambridge 1994
Hodgson, Vere, Few eggs and no oranges: The Diaries of Vere Hodgson 1940-1945, London 1976
Huxley, Aldous, Brave New World, London 1932
Jones, Thomas, A diary with letters, 1931-1945, London 1954
Keynes, John Maynard, The end of laissez-faire, London 1926
Keynes, John Maynard, Art and the State, The Listener, 26 August 1936, 371-374
Lambert, Constant, Music-Ho: A Study of Music in Decline, London 1985
Landstone, Charles, Off-Stage - A Personal Record of the first twelve years of State Sponsored Drama in Great Britain, London/New York 1953
Leavis, F.R., Mass Civilization and Minority Culture, Cambridge 1930
MacDonald, James Ramsay, Socialism: Critical and Constructive, revised edition, London 1924
Macmillan, Harold, The Middle Way - A Study of the Problem of Economic and Social Progress in a Free and Democratic Society, London 1938
Macmillan, Hugh Pattison, Lord, A Man of Law's Tale, London 1952
Mill, John Stuart, Autobiography, London 1873
Mill, John Stuart, On Liberty and Utilitarianism, Oxford 1992
Mill, John Stuart, Principles of Political Economy with Some of Their Applications to Social Philosophy, Collected Works of John Stuart Mill, Volume III, Toronto 1965
Mill, John Stuart, On Bentham and Coleridge, ed. F.R. Leavis, Cambridge 1950
Morris, William, The Collected Works of William Morris, Volume XXIII: Signs of Change; Lectures on Socialism, London/New York 1915
Morris, William, On Art and Socialism, ed. Holbrook Jackson, William Morris: Essays and Lectures, Paulton/London 1947
Mortimer, Raymond, First aid to the artist, New Statesman and Nation XVIII, No. 440, July 29, 1939, 175-176
The New Survey of London Life and Labour, Volume IX: Life and Leisure, London 1935
Nicolson, Harold, Diaries and Letters, 1939-1945, London 1967
Orwell, George, The English People, London 1947

Orwell, George, Nineteen-Eighty-Four, New York 1949
Orwell, George, Collected Essays, Journalism & Letters, Volume II: My Country Right or Left, 1940-1943, London 1968
Orwell, George, Collected Essays, Journalism & Letters, Volume III: As I please, 1943-1945, London 1968
Orwell, George, The Complete Works of George Orwell, ed. Peter Davidson, Volume 12: A Patriot After All, London 1998
Orwell, George, The Complete Works of George Orwell, ed. Peter Davidson, Volume 13: All Propaganda is lies, London 1998
Oxford and Asquith, Herbert Henry, Earl of, Memoirs and Reflections 1852-1927, London/Toronto/ Melbourne/Sydney 1928
Panter-Downes, Mollie, London War Notes 1939-1945, London 1972
Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, 5th Series, London 1930seq
Priestley, John Boynton, Postscripts, London/Toronto 1940
Priestley, John Boynton, Angel Pavement, London 1942
Priestley, John Boynton, Theatre Outlook, London 1947
Priestley, John Boynton, The Arts under Socialism, London 1947
Priestley, John Boynton, The English, London 1973
Priestley, John Boynton, English Journey, London 1994
Read, Herbert, To hell with culture and other essays on art and society, London 1963
Read, Herbert, Art in an Electric Atmosphere, Horizon III (1941), 308-313
Reith, John C.W., Into the wind, London 1949
Reith, John C.W., Broadcast over Britain, London 1923
Rothenstein, Michael, 'Can we be educated up to Art?' Notes on lecturing to the army, Horizon VII (April 1943), 270-277
Ruskin, John, The Crown of Wild Olive, The Complete Works of John Ruskin, ed. E.T. Cook/Alexander Wedderburn, Volume XVIII: Sesame and Lilies, The Ethics of the Dust, The Crown of Wild Olive with Letters on Public Affairs, 1859-1866, London 1905
Shakespeare, William, The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark, The Arden Edition of the Works of William Shakespeare, ed. Harold Jenkins, London/New York 1982
Thatcher, Margaret, The Downing Street Years, London 1993
Vaughan-Williams, Ralph, National Music and other essays, Oxford 1996
Warren, Henry C., The Maecenate of the Microphone, BBC Yearbook 1934, London 1934
Waugh, Evelyn, Put out more flags, Harmondsworth/New York 1943
Webb, Beatrice, My apprenticeship, London 1926
West, W.J. (Ed.), Orwell - The War Broadcasts, London 1985
White, Antonia, BBC at War, London undated

Willatt, Hugh, The Arts Council of Great Britain, The First 25 Years, London 1971
Woolf, Leonard, An Autobiography, Volume 2, 1911-1969, Oxford/New York/Toronto/ Melbourne 1980

I. 3. Press

The Daily Express
The Economist
The Evening Standard
Horizon
The Listener
The New Statesman and Nation
The Observer
The Studio
The Times

II. Secondary Works

II.1. Books, Monographs

Abercrombie, Nigel, La politique culturelle au Royaume-Uni, Unesco, Paris 1983
Addison, Paul, Now the war is over: A Social History of Britain 1945-1951, London 1995
Addison, Paul, The Road to 1945, London 1975
Aldcroft, Derek H., The Interwar Economy: Britain, 1919-1939, London 1970
Aldgate, Anthony/Richards, Jeffrey, Britain can take it – The British Cinema in the Second World War, Oxford 1986
Allsobrook, David Ian, Music for Wales: Walford Davies and the National Council of Music, 1918-1941, Cardiff 1992
Almond, Gabriel/Verba, Sidney, The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations, Princeton 1963
Arundell, Dennis, The Story of Sadler's Wells, 1683-1964, London 1965
Bagby, Philip, Culture and History: Prolegomena to the Comparative Study of Civilizations, London/New York/Toronto 1958
Bailey, Peter, Leisure and Class in Victorian England: Rational recreation and the contest for control, London/Toronto/Buffalo 1978
Baldry, Harold, The Case for the Arts, London 1981
Balfour, Michael, Propaganda in War 1939-1945, Organisations, Policies and Publics in Britain and Germany, London/Boston/Henley 1979
Bannister, Winifred, James Bridie and his theatre, London 1955

Barker, Kathleen, The Theatre Royal, Bristol, 1766-1966: Two Centuries of Stage History, London 1974
Barnett, Correlli, The Audit of War – The Illusion & Reality of Britain as a Great Nation, London 1986
Barnett, Correlli, The Lost Victory – British Dreams, British Realities 1945-1950, London/ Basingstoke 1995
Baumol, Hilda and William J., Inflation and the Performing Arts, New York/London 1984
Baumol, William J./Bowen, William G., Performing Arts – The Economic Dilemma, New York 1966
Bean, J.M.W., The Political Culture of Modern Britain: Studies in memory of Stephen Koss, London 1987
Bédarida, François, A Social History of England, 1851-1975, London/New York 1979
Benson, John, The working class in Britain, 1850-1939, London/New York 1989
Bentley, Michael, The Climax of Liberal Politics, British Liberalism in Theory and Practice -1868 - 1918, London 1987
Beyme, Klaus von, Kulturpolitik und nationale Identität, Opladen/Wiesbaden 1998
Birkbeck Hill, George (Ed.), Boswell's Life of Johnson Volume I: The Life (1709-1765), Oxford 1934
Blaicher, Günther, Das Deutschlandbild in der englischen Literatur, Darmstadt 1992
Blake, Andrew, The land without music, Manchester/New York 1997
Blanning, T.C.W., The Culture of Power and the Power of Culture – Old Regime Europe 1660-1789, Oxford 2002
Blaug, M., The Economics of Arts, London 1976
Blokland, Hans, Freedom and Culture in Western Society, London 1997
Bloom, Clive/Day, Gary (Eds.), Literature and Culture in Modern Britain, Vol. 1: 1900-1929, London/New York 1993
Bloom, Clive/Day, Gary (Eds.), Literature and Culture in Modern Britain, Vol. 2: 1930-1955, London/New York 1997
Bloom, Harold (Ed.), Modern Critical View: T.S. Eliot, New York 1985
Blunt, Wilfrid, John Christie of Glyndebourne, London 1968
Bond, Brian/Roy, Ian (Eds.), War and Society - A Yearbook of Military History, London 1975
Bond, Brian, War and Society in Europe, 1870-1970, Leicester/New York 1983
Borer, Mary Cathcart, The Story of Covent Garden, 1984
Borzello, Frances, Civilising Caliban: The Misuse of Art 1875-1980, London/New York 1987
Bottomore, Thomas B., Elites and Society, London 1964

Bourdieu, Pierre, La Distinction – Critique de jugement sociale, Paris 1979
Bourne, J.M., Patronage and Society in Nineteenth-Century England, London 1986
Bridges-Adams, W., The British Theatre, Third revised edition, London/New York/Toronto 1944
Briggs, Asa, The BBC – The First Fifty Years, Oxford 1985
Briggs, Asa, A Social History of Britain, London 1983
Briggs, Asa, The History of Broadcasting in the United Kingdom, Volume I: The Birth of Broadcasting, London/New York/Toronto 1961
Briggs, Asa, The History of Broadcasting in the United Kingdom, Volume II: The Golden Age of Wireless, London/New York/Toronto 1965
Briggs, Asa, The History of Broadcasting in the United Kingdom, Volume III: The War of the Words, London 1970
Briggs, Susan, Keep Smiling Through, London 1975
Britain, Ian, Fabianism and Culture: A Study in British Socialism and the Arts, c. 1884-1918, Cambridge 1982
Brivati, Brian/Jones, Harriet (Eds.), What difference did the war make?, London 1993
Bruce, Maurice (Ed.), The Rise of the Welfare State, English Social Policy, 1601-1971, London 1973
Bruce, Maurice, The Coming of the Welfare State, London 1971
Burns, C. Delisle, Leisure in the Modern World, London 1932
Burns, Tom, The BBC – Public Institution and Private World, London/Basingstoke 1977
Calder, Angus, The People's War, New York 1969
Calder, Angus, The Myth of the Blitz, London 1991
Calvocoressi, Peter, The British Experience 1945-1975, Harmondsworth 1978
Checkland, Sidney, British public policy 1776-1939: An economic, social and political perspective, Cambridge 1983
Christopher, David, British Culture – An Introduction, London 1999
Clark, Jon/Heineman, Margot/Margolies, David/Smee, Carol (Eds.), Culture and Crisis in Britain in the Thirties, London 1979
Clarke, Mary, The Sadler's Wells's Ballet: A History and an Appreciation, London 1955
Clarke, Mary, Dancers of Mercury: The Story of Ballet Rambert, London 1962
Clarke, Peter, Hope and Glory, Britain 1900-1990, London 1996
Clemens, Gabriele (Ed.), Kulturpolitik im besetzten Deutschland, Stuttgart 1994

Clemens, Gabriele, Britische Kulturpolitik in Deutschland 1945-1949 (= Historische Mitteilungen im Auftrage der Ranke-Gesellschaft, Beiheft 24), Stuttgart 1997
Coase, R.H., British Broadcasting – A Study in Monopoly, London 1950
Collini, Stefan, Public Moralists – Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain 1850-1930, London/Oxford 1991
Colles, H.C., Walford Davies: A Biography, London/New York/Toronto 1942
Colls, Robert/Dodd, Philip, Englishness: Politics and Culture, 1880-1920, London 1986
Crabtree, Derek/Thirlwall, A.P. (Eds.), Keynes and the Bloomsbury Group, The Fourth Keynes Seminar held at the University of Kent at Canterbury 1978, London/Basingstoke 1980
Crabtree, Derek/Thirlwall, A.P. (Eds.), Keynes and the Role of the State, The Tenth Keynes Seminar held at the University of Kent at Canterbury, 1991, Basingstoke/London 1993
Cronin, James E., War, State and Society in Twentieth-Century Britain, London/New York 1991
Cummings, Milton C./Katz, Richard S., The Patron State – Government and the Arts in Europe, North America, and Japan, New York/Oxford 1987
Cunningham, Hugh, Leisure in the Industrial Revolution c. 1750-1880, London 1980
Cuomo, Glenn R. (Ed.), National Socialist Cultural Policy, New York 1995
Dangerfield, George, The Strange Death of Liberal England, London 1935 (repr. 1980)
David, Hugh, The Fitzrovians: A Portrait of Bohemian Society 1900-55, London 1988
Davis, Tracy C., The Economics of the British Stage, 1800-1914, London 2000
Davies, Andrew/Fielding, Steven (Eds.), Workers' Worlds: Cultures and communitites in Manchester and Salford, 1880-1939, Manchester/New York 1992
Deane, Patrick, History in our hands; a critical anthology of writings on literature, culture, and politics from the 1930s, London 1998
Dent, Edward J., A Theatre for everybody: The Story of the Old Vic and Sadler's Wells, London 1945
Dewey, Peter, War and Progress: Britain 1914-1945, London 1997
Dicey, A.V., Law and Public Opinion in England, London 1926
Doctor, Jennifer, The BBC and Ultra-Modern Music, 1922-1936: Shaping a Nation's Taste, Cambridge 1999

Döring, Herbert, Großbritannien: Regierung, Gesellschaft und politische Kultur, Opladen 1993
Donaldson, Frances, The British Council – The First Fifty Years, London 1985
Dorian, Frederick, Commitment to Culture, Pittsburgh 1964
Doyle, Brian, English & Englishness, London/New York 1989
Duncan, Sylvia (Ed.), The People's War, Calderdale 1995
Dworkin, Dennis L./Roman, Leslie G., Views Beyond the Border Country – Raymond Williams and Cultural Politics, New York und London 1993
Ellis, E.L., T.J.: a life of Dr. Thomas Jones, CH, Cardiff 1992
Elsom, John/Tomalin, Nicholas, The History of the National Theatre, London 1978
Emsley, Clive/Marwick, Arthur/Simpson, Wendy (Eds.), War, Peace and Social Change in Twentieth-Century Europe, Milton Keynes 1989
Emy, H.N., Liberals, Radicals and Social Politics, 1892-1914, Cambridge 1973
Evans, B. Ifor, Short History of the English Drama, Harmondsworth 1948
Evans, Benjamin Ifor/Glasgow, Mary, The Arts in England, London 1947
Farr, Dennis, English Art, 1870-1940, Oxford 1984
Felix, David, Keynes, A Critial Life, Westport/London 1999
Feske, Victor, From Belloc to Churchill – Private Scholars, Public Culture and the Crisis of British Liberalism, 1900-1939, Chapel Hill/London 1996
Fielding, Steven/Thompson, Peter/Tiratsoo, Nick, 'England Arise': Labour Party and popular politics in 1940s Britain, Manchester/New York 1995
Finlayson, Geoffrey, Citizen, State and Social Welfare in Britain 1830-1990, Oxford 1994
Fisher, Hugh, The Story of the Sadler's Wells Ballet: The Company, the Dancers and the Ballets, London 1954
Flora, Peter/Heidenheimer, Arnold J., The Development of Welfare States in Europe and America, New Brunswick/London 1981
Ford, Boris (Ed.), The Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain, Volume 7: The Later Victorian Age, Cambridge 1989
Ford, Boris (Ed.), Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain, Volume 8: The Edwardian age and the inter-war years, Cambridge 1989
Ford, Boris (Ed.), Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain, Volume 9: Since the Second World War, Cambridge 1988
Ford, Boris (Ed.), The Cambridge Cultural History, Volume 8: Early Twentieth-Century Britain, Cambridge 1992

Foss, Hubert/Goodwin, Noël, London Symphony: Portrait of an Orchestra, London 1954
Fraser, Lindley, Propaganda, London/New York/Toronto 1957
Freeden, Michael, The New Liberalism: An ideology of social reform, Oxford 1978
Freeden, Michael, Liberalism Divided – A Study in British Political Thought 1914-1939, Oxford 1986
Frey, Bruno S./Pommerehne, Werner W. (Eds.), Muses and Markets, Explorations in the Economies of the Arts, Oxford 1989
Frison, Danièle, La société anglaise en guerre, Paris 1996
Fry, Geoffrey K., The Growth of Government - The Development of Ideas about the Role of the State and the Machinery and Functions of Government in Britain since 1780, London 1979
Fyrth, Jim, Labour's Promised Land: Culture and Society in Labour Britain 1945-1951, London 1995
Gans, Herbert J., Popular Culture and High Culture: An Analysis and Evaluation of Taste, New York 1974
Gilbert, Bentley B., British Social Policy, 1914-1939, Batsford 1973
Gilbert, Bentley B., Britain since 1918, revised and updated edition, London 1980
Gloversmith, Frank, Class Culture and Social Change, Brighton 1980
Glynn, S./Oxborrow, J., Interwar Britain: A social and economic history, London 1976
Grant, Mariel, Propaganda and the role of the state in inter-war Britain, Oxford 1994
Graves, R./Hodge, A., The Long Weekend: A Social History of Great Britain, 1918-1939, London 1940
Green, Michael/Wilding, Michael, La politique culturelle en Grande-Bretagne, Unesco, Paris 1970
Green, S.J.D./Whiting, R.C. (Eds.), The boundaries of the state in modern Britain, Cambridge 1996
Halliday, F.E., An Illustrated Cultural History of England, London 1967
Halsey, A.H., Change in British Society: From 1900 to the present day, Oxford 1995
Harvey, A.D., A Muse of Fire - Literature, Art and War, London/Rio Grande 1998
Harris, John S., Government Patronage of the Arts in Great Britain, Chicago 1970
Harrod, Roy, The Life of John Maynard Keynes, New York/London 1951
Havighurst, Alfred F., Britain in Transition: The Twentieth Century, Chicago/London 1979

Hay, Colin, Re-Stating Social and Political Change, Buckingham/Philadelphia 1996
Hay, J.R., The Development of the Welfare State in Britain, 1880-1975, New York 1978
Hayes, Nick/Hill, Jeff (Eds.), 'Millions Like Us?': British Culture in the Second World War, Liverpool 1999
Heilbrun, James/Gray, Charles M., The economics of art and culture – An American Perspective, Cambridge 1993
Hennessy, Peter, Never Again: Britain 1945-1951, London 1992
Hennessy, Peter, The Great and the Good: An Inquiry into the British Establishment, Policy Studies Institute, Research Report No.654 (March 1986), London 1986
Hession, Charles H., John Maynard Keynes: A personal biography of the man who revolutionized capitalism and the way we live, New York 1984
Hewison, Robert, Culture and Consensus - England, art and politics since 1940, London 1996
Hewison, Robert, In Anger: Culture in the Cold War 1945-1960, London 1981
Hewison, Robert, Under siege: Literary Life in London 1939-1945, London 1977
Hill, C.P., British Economic and Social History, 1700-1975, London 1977
Hobson, G.D., Some Thoughts on the Organization of Art after the War, London undated
Howard, A., RAB: The life of R.A. Butler, London 1987
Hübner, Emil/Münch, Ursula, Das politische System Großbritanniens – Eine Einführung, München 1998
Hutchison, Robert, The Politics of the Arts Council, London 1982
Jacobs, Arthur, Henry J. Wood – Maker of the Proms, London 1994
Jamieson, Lynn/Corr, Helen (Eds.), State, Private Life and Political Change, Basingstoke 1990
Jefferys, Kevin, War and Reform: British Politics during the Second World War, Documents in Contemporary History, Manchester/New York 1994
Jenkins, Alan, The Forties, London 1977
Jenkins, Hugh, The Culture Gap, London 1979
Jennings, Hilda/Gill, Winifred, Broadcasting in Everyday Life: A Survey of the Social Effect of the Coming of Broadcasting, London 1940
Johnson, Lesley, The cultural critics: From Matthew Arnold to Raymond Williams, London 1979
Joseph, Stephen (Ed.), Actor and Architect, Manchester 1964
Kelly, Thomas, Books for the People - An Illustrated History of the British Public Libraries, London 1977

Kennedy, Michael, The Hallé 1858-1983: A History of the Orchestra, Manchester 1982
Kenyon, Nicholas, The BBC Symphony Orchestra – The first fifty years 1930-1980, London 1981
Keynes, Milo (Ed.), Essays on John Maynard Keynes, Cambridge 1975
Kift, Dagmar, The Victorian music hall: Culture, class and conflict, Cambridge 1996
Kirkham, Pat/Thoms, David (Eds.), War Culture: Social Change and Changing Experience in World War Two Britain, London 1995
Kramer, Jürgen, British Cultural Studies, München 1997
Kruger, Loren, The National Stage, Theatre and Cultural Legitimation in England, France and America, Chicago/London 1992
Kymlicka, Will, Liberalism, Community and Culture, Oxford 1989
Langan, Mary/Schwarz, Bill (Eds.), Crises in the British State 1880-1930, London/Melbourne 1985
Laybourn, Keith, The Evolution of British Social Policy and the Welfare State, Keele 1995
LeMahieu, D.L., A Culture for Democracy – Mass Communication and the Cultivated Mind in Britain Between the Wars, Oxford 1988
Lewis, Justin, Art, Culture and Enterprise: The politics of art and the cultural industries, London/New York 1990
Lewis, Peter, A People's War, London 1986
Lloyd, David/Thomas, Paul, Culture and the State, New York/London 1998
Lloyd, T.O., Empire to Welfare State, English History 1906-1985, Third Edition, Oxford 1986
Longmate, Norman, How We Lived Then: A history of everyday life during the Second World War, London 1971
Longmate, Norman, The home front: an anthology of personal experience 1938-1945, London 1981
Loock, Friedrich, Kulturmanagement – Kein Privileg der Musen, Wiesbaden 1991
McCann, Andrew, Cultural Politics in the 1790s – Literature, Radicalism and the Public Sphere, Basingstoke/London 1999
McGuigan, Jim, Culture and the Public Sphere, London 1996
Mackay, Robert, The test of war: inside Britain 1939-1945, London 1999
Mackerness, Edward, A Social History of English Music, London/Toronto 1964
McKibbin, Ross, Class and Culture: England 1918-1951, Oxford 1998
MacLaine, Ian, Ministry of Morale, London 1979
McLennan, Gregory/Held, David/Hall, Stuart (Eds.), State and Society in Contemporary Britain: A Critical Introduction, Cambridge/Oxford/New York 1984

Macleod, Dianne Sachko, Art and the Victorian middle-class – Money and the making of cultural identity, Cambridge 1996
Macleod, Iain, Neville Chamberlain, London 1961
Mander, Raymond/Mitchenson, Joe, The Theatres of London, London 1961
Marshall, A.H., Local Government and the Arts, Birmingham 1974
Marwick, Arthur, The Explosion of the British Society, 1914-1970, London/Basingstoke 1963
Marwick, Arthur, The Deluge: British Society and the First World War, London/Basingstoke 1965
Marwick, Arthur, Britain in the Century of Total War - War, Peace and Social Change 1900-1967, Boston/Toronto 1968
Marwick, Arthur, The Home Front: The British and the Second World War, London 1976
Marwick, Arthur, Class: Image and Reality in Britain, France and the USA since 1930, Glasgow 1980
Marwick, Arthur (Ed.), Total War and Social Change, Basingstoke/London 1988
Marwick, Arthur (Ed.), The Arts, Literature, and Society, London 1990
Marwick, Arthur/Emsley, Clive/Simpson, Wendy (Eds.), Total War and Historical Change: Europe 1914-1955, Buckingham/Philadelphia 2001
Medlicott, W.N., A History of England in Ten Volumes, Volume 10: Contemporary England, London 1967
Mercer, Derrik (Ed.), Chronicle of the Second World War, London 1990
Mesnard, André-Hubert, La politique culturelle de l'Etat, Paris 1974
Miles, Peter/Smith, Malcolm, Cinema, Literature & Society, Beckenham 1987
Minihan, Janet, The Nationalization of Culture, London 1977
Moggridge, D.E., Maynard Keynes: An Economist's Biography, London/New York 1992
Mommsen, Wolfgang J. (Ed.), The Emergence of the Welfare State in Britain and Germany 1850-1950, London 1981
Moody, David A. (Ed.), The Cambridge Companion to T.S. Eliot, Cambridge 1997
Morgan, Kenneth O., The People's Peace – British History 1945-1989, London 1990
Mosley, Leonard, Backs to the Wall: London under Fire 1939-1945, London 1971
Mowat, Charles Loch, Britain between the Wars, 1918-1940, London 1955
Myers, Rollo, Music since 1939, London 1947
Netzer, Dick, The Subsidized Muse: Public Support for the Arts in the United States, Cambridge 1978

Newman, Oksana/Foster, Allan, The Value of a Pound: Prices and Incomes in Britain 1900-1993, Andover 1995
Nicholas, Siân, The Echo of War, Manchester 1996
Noakes, Jeremy (Ed.), The Civilian in War: The Home Front in Europe, Japan and the USA in World War II, Exeter 1992
O'Brien, T.H., Civil Defence, History of the Second World War, ed. Sir Keith Hancock, London 1955
O'Brien, Terence H., British Experiments in Public Ownership and Control, London 1937
O'Donnell, R.M. (Ed.), Keynes as Philosopher-Economist: The Ninth Keynes Seminar held at the University of Kent at Canterbury, 1989, Basingstoke 1991
O'Hagan, John W., The State and the Arts. An Analysis of Key Economic Policy Issues in Europe and the United States, Cheltenham 1998
O'Hagan, John W./Duffy, Christopher T., The Performing Arts and the Public Purse: An Economic Analysis. A Report commissioned by The Arts Council/An Chomhairle Ealaion, Dublin 1987
Oakland, John, British Civilization: An Introduction, London/New York 1989
Owen, David, English Philanthropy 1660 - 1960, Cambridge/Massachusetts 1964
Peacock, Alan, Paying the Piper – Culture, Music and Money, Edinburgh 1993
Peacock, Alan/Rizzo, Ilde (Eds.), Cultural Economies and Cultural Policies, Dordrecht 1994
Pearce, Malcolm/Stewart, Geoffrey, British Political History 1867-1995, London 1996
Pearson, Nicholas, The State and the Visual Arts, Milton Keynes 1982
Pedersen, Susan/Mandler, Peter (Eds.), After the Victorians – Private conscience and public duty in modern Britain: Essays in memory of John Clive, London/New York 1994
Pegg, Mark, Broadcasting and Society 1918-1939, Beckenham 1983
Pelling, Henry, Modern Britain 1885-1955, A History of England, Volume 4, London 1960
Pelling, Henry, Britain and the Second World War, London 1970
Pick, John, Managing the Arts? The British Experience, London 1986
Pick, John, The State and the Arts, Eastbourne 1980
Pirouet, Edmund, Heard Melodies Are Sweet: A History of the London Philharmonic Orchestra, Lewes 1998
Posner, Michael (Ed.), Public Expenditure – Allocation between competing ends, Cambridge 1977

Pronay, Nicholas/Spring, D.W., Propaganda, Politics and Film, 1918-1945, London/Basingstoke 1982
Pugh, Martin, State and Society: British political and social history 1990, London 1993
Rawlinson, Mark, British Writing of the Second World War, Oxford 2000
Reynolds, E.E./Brasher, N.H., Britain in the Twentieth Century 1900-1964, Cambridge 1966
Robbins, Keith, The Eclipse of a Great Power - Modern Britain 1870-1975, London/New York 1983
Robson, William A., The British System of Government, Third, revised edition, London 1948
Rosenbaum, Walter A., Political Culture, London 1975
Rosenthal, Harold, Opera at Covent Garden: a short history, London 1967
Ross, Alan, Colours of War: War Art 1939-1945, London 1983
Rowell, George, The Old Vic Theatre: A History, Cambridge 1993
Rowntree, B. Seebohm/Lavers, G.R., English Life and Leisure: A Social Study, London/New York/Toronto 1951
Royle, Edward, Modern Britain: A Social History 1750-1985, London 1987
Russell, Dave, Popular Music in England, 1840-1914, Manchester 1997
Sabine, Basil, A History of income tax, London 1966
Sabine, Basil, British Budgets in Peace and War, 1932-1945, London 1970
Saunders, J.W., The Profession of English Letters, London 1964
Scannell, Paddy/Cardiff, David, A Social history of Broadcasting, Volume 1: 1922-1939: Serving the Nation, Oxford 1991
Scase, Richard (Ed.), The State in Western Europe, London 1980
Scholes, Percy, The Mirror of Music 1844-1944: A Century of Musical Life in Britain as reflected in the pages of the Musical Times, Volume II, Oxford 1947
Scitovsky, Tibor, Human Desire and Economic Satisfaction: Essays on the Frontier of Economics, New York 1986
Seaman, L.C.B., Life in Britain between the Wars, London 1970
Shaw, Roy (Ed.), The spread of sponsorship in the arts, sport, education, the health service and broadcasting, Newcastle 1993
Shaw, Roy, The Arts and the People, London 1987
Sinclair, Andrew, Arts and Cultures, London 1995
Sinclair, Andrew, The Need to Give: Patrons and the Arts, London 1990
Sinclair, Andrew, Patron is not a dirty word, undated
Sinfield, Alan, Literature, Politics and Culture in Postwar Britain, Oxford 1989

Sked, Alan/Cook, Chris (Eds.), Crisis and Consent - Essays in Honour of A.J.P. Taylor, London/Basingstoke 1976
Skidelsky, Robert, John Maynard Keynes, Volume 3: Fighting for Britain 1937-1946, London/Basingstoke/Oxford 2000
Smith, Harold, L., War and Social Change – British Society in the Second World War, Manchester 1986
Smith, Malcolm, British Politics, Society and the State since the Late Nineteenth Century, Basingstoke/London 1990
Smith, Michael/Parker, Stanley/Smith, Cyril (Eds.), Culture and Society in Britain, London 1973
Speaight, Robert, Drama since 1939, London/New York/Toronto 1947
Spender, Stephen, Citizens in War and after, London 1945
Spender, Stephen, The Thirties and After, London/Basingstoke 1979
Stamm, Rudolf, Geschichte des englischen Theaters, Bern 1951
Stanley, Arthur (Ed.), Britain at War – An Anthology, London 1943
Stevenson, John, Social History of Britain, British Society 1914-1945, Harmondsworth 1984
Strong, Roy, The Spirit of Britain: A Narrative History, London 1999
Storry, Mike/Childs, Peter (Eds.), British Cultural Identities, London/New York 1997
Sullivan, Michael, The Development of the British welfare state, Hemel Hempstead 1996
Sundar, Pushpa, Patrons and Philistines – Arts and the State in British India, 1773-1947, Delhi/Bombay/Calcutta/Madras 1995
Tant, A.P., British Government: The Triumph of Elitism, Aldershot 1993
Taylor, Philip Michael, The Projection of Britain, Cambridge/New York/Melbourne 1981
Thompson, F.M.L. (Ed.), The Cambridge Social History of Britain 1750-1950, Volume 3: Social agencies and institutions, Cambridge 1990
Thorpe, Andrew, Britain in the 1930s - The Deceptive Decade, Oxford 1992
Throsby, C.D./Withers, G.A., The Economics of the Performing Arts, London 1979
Tiratsoo, Nick (Ed.), The Attlee Years, London/New York 1991
Titmuss, Richard M., Problems of Social Policy, History of the Second World War - United Kingdom Civil Series, ed. W.K. Hancock, London 1950
Townley, Stephen/Grayson, Edward, Sponsorship of Sport, Arts and Leisure: Law, Tax and Business Relationships, London 1984
Towse, R./Khakee, A. (Eds.), Cultural Economics, Berlin 1992
Trewin, John Courtnay, The turbulent thirties: a further decade of the theatre, 1960

Trewin, J.C., The Theatre since 1900, London 1951
Trewin, J.C., The Birmingham Repertory Theatre 1913-1963, Birmingham 1963
Trewin, J.C., Shakespeare on the English Stage 1900-1964, London 1964
Tucker, Albert, A History of English Civilization, New York 1972
Turner, E.S., The Phoney War on the Home Front, London 1961
Victoria and Albert Museum, The Victoria and Albert Museum, London 1991
Walvin, James, Leisure and Society, 1830-1950, London/New York 1978
Waters, Chris, British socialists and the politics of popular culture, 1884-1914, Manchester 1990
Weber, Max, Die protestantische Ethik und der 'Geist des Kapitalismus', Textausgabe auf der Grundlage der ersten Fassung von 1904/05, ed. Klaus Lichtblau/Johannes Weiß, Hain Hanstein 1993
Weight, Richard/Beach, Abigail (Eds.), The Right to Belong: Citizenship and National Identity in Britain 1930-1960, London 1998
Weiler, Peter, The New Liberalism - Liberal Social Theory in Great Britain 1889-1914, New York/London 1982
Wheeler-Bennett, John W., John Anderson Viscount Waverley, London/New York 1962
White, Eric Walter, The Arts Council of Great Britain, London 1975
White, Leslie A., The Concept of Cultural Systems: A Key to Understanding Tribes and Nations, New York/London 1975
Whitworth, Geoffrey, The Making of a National Theatre, London undated
Williams, Glyn/Ramsden, John, Ruling Britannia: A political history of Britain 1688-1988, London/New York 1990
Williams, Raymond, Culture & Society, Coleridge to Orwell, London 1958
Williams, Raymond, Keywords - A Vocabulary of Culture and Society, London 1976
Williams, Raymond, Culture, Glasgow 1981
Williams, Raymond, Culture, Democracy, Socialism, ed. Robin Gable, London/New York 1989
Winter, J.M. (Ed.), War and economic development - Essays in memory of David Joslin, Cambridge 1975
Witts, Richard, Artist unknown: An Alternative History of the Arts Council, London 1998
Wright, Gordon, The Ordeal of War, New York/Evanston/London 1968
Yass, Marion, Britain between the two world wars, 1918-1939, London 1975

Yass, Marion, The Home Front: Britain 1939-1945, The Documentary History Series, Hove 1971
Young, Percy M., A History of British Music, 1967
Ziegler, Philip, London at War 1939-1945, London 1995

II.2. Articles and Essays

Bartlett, K.W., Englands Musikleben seit 1933, Melos - Zeitschrift für Neue Musik (November 1946), 77-79
Baumol, W.J./Bowen, W.G., Arguments for Public Support of the Performing Arts, in Blaug, Mark (Ed.), The Economics of Arts, London 1976, 42-57
Beckett, Ian F.W., Total War, in Emsley, Clive/Marwick, Arthur/Simpson, Wendy (Eds.), War, Peace and Social Change in Twentieth-Century Europe, Milton Keynes 1989, 26-44
Bell, Quentin, Recollections and Reflections on Maynard Keynes, in Crabtree, Derek/Thirlwall, A.P. (Eds.), Keynes and the Bloomsbury Group, The Fourth Keynes Seminar held at the University of Kent at Canterbury 1978, London/Basingstoke 1980
Blaug, Mark, Rationalising social expenditure – the arts, in Posner, Michael (Ed.), Public Expenditure - Allocation between competing ends, Cambridge 1977, 205-219
Booth, Michael R., East End and West End: Class and Audience in Victorian London, Theatre Research International 2 (1977), 98-103
Brebner, J. Bartlet, Laissez Faire in Nineteenth-Century Britain, Journal of Economic History 8 (1948), 59-73
Briggs, Asa, The Cultural and Social Setting, in Ford, Boris (Ed.), The Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain, Volume 7: The Later Victorian Age, Cambridge 1989, 1-38
Clarke, Peter, J.M. Keynes 1883-1946: 'The best of both worlds', in Pedersen, Susan/Mandler, Peter (Eds.), After the Victorians – Private conscience and public duty in modern Britain: Essays in memory of John Clive, London/New York 1994, 171-187
Clemens, Gabriele, Die britische Kulturpolitik in Deutschland: Musik, Theater, Film Literatur, in Clemens, Gabriele (Ed.), Kulturpolitik im besetzten Deutschland, Stuttgart 1994, 200-218
Clune, Maggie/Day, Gary/Maguire, Chris, Decline and Fall? - The Course of the Novel, in Bloom, Clive/Day, Gary (Eds.), Literature and Culture in Modern Britain, Volume Two: 1930-1955, London/New York 1997, 50-69
Colls, Robert, Englishness and the Political Culture, in Colls, Robert/Dodd, Philip (Eds.), Englishness: Politics and Culture, 1880-1920, London 1986, 29-61

Croft, Andy, Betrayed Spring: The Labour Government and British Literary Culture, in Fyrth, Jim, Labour's Promised Land: Culture and Society in Labour Britain 1945-1951, London 1995, 197-223
Cunningham, Hugh, Leisure and culture, in Thompson, F.M.L. (Ed.), The Cambridge Social History of Britain 1750-1950, Volume 3: Social agencies and institutions; Cambridge 1990, 279-339
Davies, Andrew, Leisure in the 'classic slum', 1900-1939, in Davies, Andrew/Fielding, Steven (Eds.), Workers' Worlds: Cultures and communities in Manchester and Salford, 1880-1939, Manchester/New York 1992, 102-132
Day, Gary, Introduction in Bloom, Clive/Day, Gary (Eds.), Literature and Culture in Modern Britain, Volume 2: 1930-1955, London/New York 1997
Drewniak, Boguslaw, The Foundations of Theater Policy in Nazi Germany, in Cuomo, Glenn R. (Ed.), National Socialist Cultural Policy, New York 1995, 67-94
Eley, Geoff, Finding the People's War: Film, British collective memory and World War II, American Historical Review 106 (2001), 818-838
Ellwood, D.W., 'Showing the world what it owed to Britain': foreign policy and 'cultural propaganda', 1935-45, in Pronay, Nicholas/Spring, D.W. (Eds.), Propaganda, Politics and Film, 1918 - 1945, London/Basingstoke 1982, 23-49
Esher, Lionel, The plot to save the artists, Times Literary Supplement, No. 4370, 2 January 1987, 12-13
English, John, Leisure and the Performing Arts, in Joseph, Stephen (Ed.), Actor and Architect, Manchester 1964, 75-86
Fennell, Graham, The Second World War and the Welfare State in Britain: Sociological Interpretations of Historical Development, in Jamieson, Lynn/Corr, Helen (Eds.), State, Private Life and Political Change, Basingstoke 1990, 75-95
Fenner, Christian, Politische Kultur, in Schmidt, Manfred G. (Ed.), Die westlichen Länder (= Nohlen, Dieter (Ed.), Lexikon der Politik, Band III, München 1992), München 1992, 359-366
Foss, Brian, Message and Medium: Government Patronage, National Identity and National Culture in Britain, 1939-45, Oxford Art Journal 14 (1991), 52-72
Frey, Bruno, Art: The Economic Point of View, in Peacock, Alan/Rizzo, Ilde (Eds.), Cultural Economies and Cultural Policies, Dordrecht 1994, 3-16
Frye, Northrop, Antique Drum, in Bloom, Harold (Ed.), Modern Critical View: T.S. Eliot, New York 1985, 19-30

Fuller Peter, The Visual Arts, in Ford, Boris (Ed.), Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain, Volume 9: Since the Second World War, Cambridge 1988, 99-145
Giddings, Robert, Radio in Peace and War, in Bloom, Clive/Day, Gary (Eds.), Literature and Culture in Modern Britain, Volume Two: 1930-1955, London/New York 1997, 132-162
Glasgow, Mary, The Concept of the Arts Council, in Keynes, Milo (Ed.), Essays on John Maynard Keynes, Cambridge 1975, 260-271
Gloversmith Frank, Defining Culture, in Gloversmith, Frank (Ed.), Class, Culture, and Social Change: A New View of the 1930s, Brighton/New Jersey 1980, 15-44
Griffiths, Paul, Music, in Ford, Boris (Ed.), Cambridge Guide to the rts in Britain, Volume 9: Since the Second World War, Cambridge 1988, 49-83
Hall, Fernau, Ballet, in Ford, Boris (Ed.), Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain, Volume 9: Since the Second World War, Cambridge 1988, 85-97
Hall, Stuart, The rise of the representative/interventionist state, in McLennan, Gregory/Held, David/Hall, Stuart (Eds.), State and Society in Contemporary Britain: A Critical Introduction, Cambridge/Oxford/New York 1984, 7-49
Hall, Stuart/Schwarz, Bill, State and Society, 1880-1930, in Langan, Mary/Schwarz, Bill (Eds.), Crises in the British State 1880-1930, London/Melbourne 1985, 7-32
Harris, John S., Decision-Makers in Government Programs of Arts Patronage: The Arts Council of Great Britain, Western Political Quarterly XXII (1969), 253-264
Harris, José, Social planning in war-time: some aspects of the Beveridge Report, in Winter, J.M. (Ed.), War and economic development – Essays in memory of David Joslin, Cambridge 1975, 239-256
Harris, José, Some Aspects of Social Policy in Britain during the Second World War, in Mommsen, Wolfgang J. (Ed.), The Emergence of the Welfare State in Britain and Germany 1850-1950, London 1981, 247-262
Harris, José, Political ideas and the debate on State welfare, 1940-45, in Smith, Harold, L. (Ed.), War and Social Change – British Society in the Second World War, Manchester 1986
Harris, José, Society and the state in twentieth-century Britain, in Thompson, F.M.L. (Ed.), The Cambridge Social History of Britain 1750-1950, Volume 3: Social agencies and institutions, Cambridge 1990, 63-117
Harris, José, Political Thought and the Welfare State 1870-1940: An Intellectual Framework for British Social Policy, Past and Present 135 (1992), 16-41

Harris, José, Political thought and the state, in Green, S.J.D./Whiting, R.C. (Eds.), The boundaries of the state in modern Britain, Cambridge 1996, 15-28

Hayes, Nick, An 'English War', Wartime Culture and 'Millions Like Us', in Hayes, Nick/Hill, Jeff (Eds.), 'Millions Like Us?': British Culture in the Second World War, Liverpool 1999, 1-32

Hayes, Nick, More than 'Music-while-you-eat'? Factory and Hostel Concerts, 'Good Culture' and the Workers, in Hayes, Nick/Hill, Jeff (Eds.), 'Millions Like Us?': British Culture in the Second World War, Liverpool 1999, 209-235

Hill, Jeff, 'When Work is Over': Labour, Leisure and Culture in Wartime Britain, in Hayes, Nick/Hill, Jeff, 'Millions Like Us?': British Culture in the Second World War, Liverpool 1999, 236-260

Hodgkinson, Jo, The Bureaucrat and the Artist, in Pick, John (Ed.), The State and the Arts, Eastbourne 1980, 108-118

Howard, Michael, Total War in the Twentieth Century: Participation and Consensus in the Second World War, in Bond, Brian/Roy, Ian (Eds.), War and Society – A Yearbook of Military History, London 1975, 216-226

Jefferys, Kevin, British Politics and Social Policy During the Second World War, Historical Journal 30 (1987), 123-144

Jessop, Bob, The Transformation of the State in Post-war Britain, in Scase, Richard (Ed.), The State in Western Europe, London 1980, 23-93

Jones, Stephen, G., State intervention in sport and leisure between the wars, Journal of Contemporary History 22 (1987), 163-182

Kaase, Max, Sinn oder Unsinn des Konzepts 'politische Kultur' für die Vergleichende Politikforschung, oder auch: Der Versuch, einen Pudding an die Wand zu nageln, in Kaase, Max/Klingemann, Hans-Dieter (Eds.), Wahlen und politisches System, Opladen 1983, 144-171

Katz, Geraldine, Public Support for the Arts in Britain, in Netzer, Dick (Ed.), The Subsidized Muse: Public Support for the Arts in the United States, Cambridge 1978, 196-204

Kennedy, Michael, Music, in Ford, Boris (Ed.), The Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain, Volume 7: The Later Victorian Age, Cambridge 1989, 268-295

Kennedy, Michael, Music, in Ford, Boris (Ed.), The Cambridge Cultural History, Volume 8: Early Twentieth-Century Britain, Cambridge 1992

Kruger, Loren, Placing the Occasion: Raymond Williams and Performing Culture, in Dworkin, Dennis L./Roman, Leslie G. (Eds.), Views beyond the Border Country - Raymond Williams and Cultural Policy, New York/London 1993, 55-71

Leventhal, F.M., 'The Best for the Most' - CEMA and State Sponsoring of the Arts in Wartime, 1939-1945, Twentieth Century British History 1 (1990), 289-317
Lingle, Christopher, Public Choice and Public Funding of the Arts, in Towse, R./Khakee, A. (Eds.), Cultural Economics, Berlin 1992, 21-30
Marwick, Arthur, Social Change in Britain, An Oration delivered at Birkbeck College, London, 20th October 1970, London 1970
Marwick, Arthur, People's War and Top People's Peace? British Society and the Second World War, Sked, Alan/Cook, Chris (Eds.), Crisis and Consent - Essays in Honour of A.J.P. Taylor, London/Basingstoke 1976, 148-164
Marwick, Arthur/Emsley, Clive, Introduction to Emsley, Clive/Marwick, Arthur/Simpson, Wendy (Eds.), War, Peace and Social Change in Twentieth-Century Europe, Milton Keynes 1989, 1-25
Marwick, Arthur, War and the Arts - Is There a Connection? The Case of the Two Total Wars, War In History 2 (1995), 65-86
Mason, Tony/Thompson, Peter, 'Reflections on a revolution'?: The political mood in wartime Britain, in Tiratsoo, Nick (Ed.), The Attlee Years, London/New York 1991, 54-70
Masters, David, Going Modern and Being British: Art in Britain 1930-1955, in Bloom, Clive/Day, Gary (Eds.), Literature and Culture in Modern Britain, Volume Two: 1930-1955, London/New York 1997, 191-215
Mazza, Isidoro, A Microeconomic Analysis of Patronage and Sponsorship, in Peacock, Alan/Rizzo, Ilde (Eds.), Cultural Economies and Cultural Policies, Dordrecht 1994, 3-53
Mellor, David, British Art in the 1930s: Some Economic, Political and Cultural Structures, in Gloversmith, Frank (Ed.), Class, Culture and Social Change: A New View of the 1930s, Brighton/New Jersey, 1980, 185-207
Mortier, Janie, Les origines de l'Arts council: l'État britannique se découvre une mission culturelle à la faveur de la guerre, in Frison, Danièle (Ed.), La société anglaise en guerre, Paris 1996, 181-190
Newsinger, John, My Country, Right and Left: Patriotism, Socialism and George Orwell, 1939-1941, in Kirkham, Pat/Thoms (Ed.), David, War Culture: Social Change and Changing Experience in World War Two Britain, London 1995, 29-37
Peacock, Alan, Economics, Cultural Values and Cultural Policies, in Towse, R./Khakee, A. (Eds.), Cultural Economics, Berlin 1992, 9-20
Peacock, Alan, Keynes and the Role of the State, in Crabtree, Derek/Thirlwall, A.P. (Eds.), Keynes and the role of the state, The Tenth Keynes Seminar held at the University of Kent at Canterbury, 1991, Basingstoke/London 1993, 3-36

Peacock, Alan, Economics, Inflation, and the Performing Arts, in Baumol, Hilda and William J., Inflation and the Performing Arts, New York/London 1984, 107-126
Peacock, Alan, Welfare Economics and Public Subsidies to the Arts, The Manchester School of Economics and Social Studies 37 (1969), 323-335
Petropolous, Jonathan, A Guide through the Visual Arts Administration of the Third Reich, in Cuomo, Glenn R. (Ed.), National Socialist Cultural Policy, New York 1995, 121-154
Pye, Lucian W., Political Culture, International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, Volume 12, 218-225
Richardson, Robert, Closings and Openings: Leading Public Art Galleries During the Second World War, in Kirkham, Pat/Thoms (Ed.), David, War Culture: Social Change and Changing Experience in World War Two Britain, London 1995, 87-97
Ridley, F.F., Tradition, Change and Crisis in Great Britain, in Cummings, Milton C./Katz, Richard S. (Eds.), The Patron State - Government and the Arts in Europe, North America, and Japan, New York/Oxford 1987, 225-253
Rowell, George, The Drama of Wilde and Pinero, in Ford, Boris (Ed.), The Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain, Volume 7: The Later Victorian Age, Cambridge 1989, 144-151
Scannell, Paddy, Music for the Multitude? The Dilemmas of the BBC's Music Policy, 1923-1946, Media, Culture and society 3 (1981), 243-60
Shaw, Roy, Sponsoring the Arts, in Shaw, Roy, The spread of sponsorship in the arts, sport, education, the health service and broadcasting, Newcastle 1993, 13-32
Shaw, Roy and Gwen, The Cultural and Social Setting, in Ford, Boris (Ed.), Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain, Volume 9: Since the Second World War, Cambridge 1988, 2-44
Sladen, Chris, Holidays at Home in the Second World War, Journal of Contemporary History 37 (2002), 67-89
Smith, Dennis, Englishness and the Liberal Inheritance after 1886, in Colls, Robert/Dodd, Philip (Eds.), Englishness: Politics and Culture, 1880-1920, London 1986, 254-282
Smith, Malcolm, The changing nature of the British state, 1929-59: the historiography of consensus, in Brivati, Brian/Jones, Harriet (Eds.), What difference did the war make?, London 1993, 37-47
Southern, Hugh, The Tune and the Piper: Inflation and Financial Support of the Performing Arts, in Baumol, Hilda and William J., Inflation and the Performing Arts, New York/London 1984, 160-172
Stansky, Peter, Henry Moore and the Blitz, in Bean, J.M.W., The Political Culture of modern Britain: Studies in memory of Stephen Koss, London 1987, 228-242

Summerfield, Penny, The 'levelling of class', in Smith, Harold, L. (Ed.), War and Social Change - British Society in the Second World War, Manchester 1986, 179-207
Taylor, Ian, Labour and the impact of war, 1939-1945, in Tiratsoo, Nick (Ed.), The Attlee Years, London/New York 1991, 7-28
Taylor, Philip M., British official attitudes towards propaganda abroad, 1918-1939, in Pronay, Nicholas/Spring, D.W. (Eds.), Propaganda, Politics and Film, 1918 - 1945, London/Basingstoke 1982, 23-49
Thorpe, Andrew, Britain, in Noakes, Jeremy, The Civilian in War: The Home Front in Europe, Japan and the USA in World War II, Exeter 1992, 14-34
Towse, Ruth, Achieving Public Policy Objectives in the Arts and Heritage, in Peacock, Alan/ Rizzo, Ilde (Eds.), Cultural Economies and Cultural Policies, Dordrecht 1994, 143-165
Weight, Richard, 'Building a new British culture': The Arts Council Movement 1943-53, in Weight, Richard/Beach, Abigail (Eds.), The Right to Belong: Citizenship and National Identity in Britain 1930-1960, London 1998, S. 157-180
Weight, Richard, State, Intelligentsia and the Promotion of National Culture in Britain, 1939-1945, Historical Research 69 (1996), 83-101
Willatt, Hugh, How the Arts are Promoted, in Pick, John (Ed.), The State and the Arts, Eastbourne 1980, 21-46
Williams, Raymond, Minority and popular culture, in Smith, Michael/Parker, Stanley/Smith, Cyril (Eds.), Culture and Society in Britain, London 1973, 22-27
Williams, Raymond, The Arts Council, Political Quarterly 50 (1979), 157-171
Williams, Raymond, 'Bloomsbury' as a social and cultural group, in Crabtree, Derek/Thirlwall, A.P. (Eds.), Keynes and the Bloomsbury Group, The Fourth Keynes Seminar held at the University of Kent at Canterbury 1978, London/Basingstoke 1980, 40-67
Williams, William Emrys, The Pre-History of the Arts Council, Adults Learning 8 (1996), No.4, 94-96
Woolf, Michael, Theatre: Roots of the New, in Bloom, Clive/Day, Gary (Eds.), Literature and Culture in Modern Britain, Volume One: 1900-1929, London 1993, 100-119
Woolf, Michael, In Minor Key: Theatre 1930-55, in Bloom, Clive/Day, Gary (Eds.), Literature and Culture in Modern Britain, Volume Two: 1930-1955, London/New York 1997, 86-106

INDEX