



The
University
Of
Sheffield.

M. Powell

The emergence of the English art school system

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

2023



The
University
Of
Sheffield.

The emergence of the English art school system

Michael Powell

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

The University of Sheffield
Faculty of Social Sciences
School of Education

April 2023

Abstract

This thesis deploys a Foucauldian genealogy to critique the historical emergence of the English art school system.

The first part considers the ancient values that transform the idea of the artist as distinctly different from that of the artisan; the second part considers the transformation of art itself, from serving the wealthy patron to its co-option by government to improve public taste and national economic success. This gave rise to a national system of art education. The third part considers the final emergence of the English art school in its modern form, and almost simultaneously, its disappearance as an autonomous institution within the wider education ecology. This was described at the time as the ‘Murder of the Art Schools’.

This thesis contends that, rather than being murdered, the art schools were seen in the end, despite centuries of development and state support, to have failed in their aims either to raise the level of public taste or to provide professional training for industries which depended on good design and craftsmanship.

Subsequently, the art schools became irrelevant as a state concern and were absorbed into the polytechnics. This thesis further contends that far from being the radical, creative centres of their own imagining, the art schools were often regressive, hierarchical, solipsistic, prone to the whims of charismatic individuals and in thrall to their own historical origins. They had scarcely advanced in any meaningful sense over several centuries.

Ultimately, the English art school system, in the view of the state, became both irrelevant and obsolete.

Acknowledgments

I'm extremely grateful to Dr Ansgar Allen for providing not only the initial stimulus to undertake this thesis, but also for encouraging the direction of travel.

I am also grateful to the tutors of the EdD programme, each one brought invaluable knowledge and insight that shaped my experience. Thanks also to my cohort; your companionship helped with the hard times.

I could not have undertaken this journey without the continued support of my family; to Tina and Rachael, thank you both.

Contents

Abstract.....	3
Acknowledgments.....	4
Contents	5
1 Introduction.....	9
1.1 First thoughts	9
1.2 Not a conventional thesis	11
The doctrinal axis.....	12
The administrative axis	13
The values axis.....	13
1.3 Why a genealogy? Why now?	14
Methodological considerations	18
1.4 Summary of chapters	22
Part one, Foundational Discourses.....	22
Part two, A Dog Chasing its own Tail.	23
Part three, The Murder of the Art Schools.....	23
Last thoughts.....	24
1.5 What is the English Art School?	25
2. Foucault’s Genealogical Method: ‘an analytics, not a theory’.....	29
2.1 Genealogy – the what.....	32
Ursprung - origin.....	34
Herkunft – descent	35
Entstehung – emergence	36
Wirkliche Historie – effective history.....	37
A History of the Present.....	38
2.2 Genealogy – the why	39
2.3 Genealogy – the how	44
The Dispositif.....	46
Problematization	48
2.4 The value of genealogy for this inquiry	49
3. Classical Antiquity: authenticity and authority.....	51
3.1 Pliny (77CE-79CE): <i>Naturalis Historia</i>	52
Pliny on the origin of Painting and Portraiture	54
3.2 Cennini (1437): <i>Il Libro dell’ Arte</i>	58

	Cennini on the study of art, and the conduct of artists.....	59
3.3	Alberti (1450): <i>Della Pittura</i>	62
	Alberti: Aesthetics as Science, Painting as Knowledge.....	64
3.4	In summary	65
4	The shifting axes of early art education	68
4.1	Early art education: apprentices to artists; guilds to academies.....	69
4.2	A Matter of Values: English and Italian texts.....	71
4.3	The Whitehall Group: early English connoisseurs, collectors and patrons.....	73
4.4	The Origins of the Academy	75
4.5	The schools of the most excellent artists often produce donkeys.	78
4.6	The Royal Society of Arts and The Royal Academy: Opportunity and Schism.....	81
	The Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce	82
	The first exhibition of contemporary art in 1760.....	83
	The schism	84
	The Royal Academy	84
4.7	In summary	87
5	The State takes an interest: Late-Georgian radicals and Victorian Systemisation.....	89
5.1	1835, the Select Committee	90
5.2	The Government School of Design: Doctrine and Values.....	94
5.3	Fumbling towards a national system: Values and Doctrine.....	96
5.4	1849, Report of the Select Committee on the Government School of Design.....	103
5.5	1853, First Report of the Department of Practical Art: policy as dispositif.....	105
5.6	Art education gets a new home: the Department of Science and Art	107
5.7	1864, Report of the Select Committee on the Schools of Art.....	108
5.7	In summary: values and doctrine in conflict, alternative systems of art education.....	110
	An alternative system 1: the Slade School.....	112
6.	‘A Dog Chasing its own Tail’, the Modern Age; 1900 – 1957.....	114
6.1	Art education gets another new home: the Board of Education.....	115
6.2	General Reports on Higher Education for 1902.....	116
6.3	Should we stop teaching art? The Arts and Crafts Movement.....	118
	Governmentality: doctrine aligned along class lines	120
6.4	The Board of Education: Circular 775, 1911	124
	The Board of Education examinations system: 1913-1946	125
	Art and industry in the 1930s.....	126

	An alternative system 2: the Euston Road School	127
6.5	The Ministry of Education: <i>Education After the War</i>	128
6.6	Post war developments.....	130
	Ministry of Education Pamphlet No. 6: Art Education 1946.....	130
	The Committee on Art Examinations, 1947	132
	Report of the Committee on Art Examinations, 1948; The Bray Report.....	132
	The National Advisory Council on Art Examinations: The Freeman Report.....	134
	The National Advisory Council on Art Examinations: Second Freeman Report	135
6.7	In summary	136
7	Beware the Stork King.....	138
7.1	The Coldstream era: 1958 – 1970	138
7.2	Ministry of Education: Circular 340, July 1958.....	139
7.3	The National Advisory Council on Art Education.....	141
	The First Report of the NACAE	141
	The First Report: Raising Standards	143
	The First Report: Matters of Administration	144
	The First Report: Matters of Doctrine.....	146
	The First Report; Matters of Value	147
7.4	Sowing Dragon’s Teeth: The National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design	151
	Governmentality in operation: the Values of the NCDAD, Memorandum No.1.....	152
	Governmentality in operation: Fast and draconian, the process of validation	153
7.5	The NACAE: Matters of Values.....	156
7.6	Unintended consequences; the intersection of Doctrine and Administration	160
7.7	In Summary.....	161
8	Second Class Citizens, a Policy for the Arts, and the Looming Threat.	164
8.1	Second class citizens: the Second Report of the NACAE, <i>Vocational Courses in Colleges and School</i>	165
8.2	Values as policy: ‘A Policy for the Arts: the first steps’, Jennie Lee	166
8.3	Retrospective policy formation: the 1965 Addendum to the First Report of the NACAE .	168
8.4	Crosland and the Woolwich Polytechnic Speech.....	169
8.5	Polytechnisation; the looming threat.....	171
8.6	The End of the Art School: <i>The Future Pattern of Higher Education within the F.E. System</i> White Paper and the implementation of ‘polytechnisation’	172
8.7	‘Manifestations of unrest’: student response to changes in the art school system.....	175
8.8	Matters of doctrine; modernists, theorists, designers and historians.....	177

8.9	The official response to the student unrest: The Select Committee on Education and Science (Student relations).....	179
8.10	Select Committee; observations from the Report	180
	The nature of Art Colleges.....	180
	The basic qualification for an artist.....	180
	Intrinsic problems with the DipAD – the academicization of art	180
8.11	Problems of administration	181
8.12	Doctrinal divisions	181
8.13	In summary	182
9.	The Joint Report of the NACAE and the NCDAD: The Structure of Art and Design Education in the Further Education Sector 1970.....	184
9.1	Matters of Value	185
9.2	Matters of Administration.....	187
9.3	Matters of doctrine.....	189
9.4	The role of fine art in Diploma Courses.....	189
9.5	Future Developments; Warren Piper and section 10 of the Joint Report.....	190
9.6	The Government response to the Joint Report; Department of Education and Science Circular 7/71	194
9.7	In Summary.....	195
10.	The polytechnics and beyond: art and the massification of HE.....	197
10.1	More students, more courses, fewer colleges, new disciplines.....	197
10.2	Descent; from government support to government attack	200
	The doctrinal axis.....	206
	The administrative axis	207
	The value axis	207
10.3	In summary	209
11.	Last thoughts.....	210
11.1	Contributions.....	213
11.2	Further research	215
11.3	Personal reflection	217
12	Bibliography	218
	Foundational Texts.....	231
	Policy Documents	232
13	Appendix 1: Timeline	236

1 Introduction

To think means to experiment and to problematize. Knowledge, power and the self are the triple root of a problematization of thought¹ (Deleuze, 2006, p. 116)

1.1 First thoughts

This thesis arose from a personal and professional crisis. I feel it would be useful, therefore, to frame it with a personal note that offers some insight into how I experienced this crisis that became the motive for the thesis that follows.

I should enjoy my work, but increasingly I do not. I have spent a significant part of my life in art education, firstly as a student, latterly as an academic. I have attained senior levels, and have been responsible for initiating two very successful BA Honours degree courses. A pleasingly large number of my students have gone onto rewarding careers, several of them have attained high status in their respective industries. I've engaged with other institutions interested in successful art and design practice, and liaised closely with industry to ensure students are capable of entering and contributing to highly competitive fields of design. I've also been involved in initiatives intended to counter a growing indifference and hostility towards art and design. This hostility initially came from the government and certain sections of the press most noticeably, but lately increasingly from within my own university. I was also increasingly aware that colleagues would state that things were better in the past, and that things would be better if we were (as we had previously been) managed within a School of Art and Design. There was also friction between colleagues that aligned themselves to fine art or design practice; it was evident that they held opposing doctrinal viewpoints. These three notions; that the past was better, that things would be better if we were located within an art school, and that fine art was superior to design (and vice-versa) seemed to be deeply held, almost commonsensical. These notions seemed to warrant some investigation. Where had they come from? Why did they exert such an influence over colleagues? Were things better in the past, under the administration of an art school?

In my own experience, it feels as though increasing amounts of energy seem to be wasted on fighting the same pointless battles with management. There seems to be an institutionalised

¹ In Foucault, *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and other writings 1977-1984*, this is translated as 'To think is to experience, to problematize. Knowledge, power, and the self are the triple foundation of thought'. (1988, p. xxiv)

indifference to the values myself and my colleagues hold; that art and design pedagogy is fundamentally different to the practice in other areas of the faculty. There is little celebration of our achievements, quite unlike the all-users emails celebrating another research grant or successful post-grad student. It often feels as if there is a dominant doctrinal tendency among management, perhaps located in the fact that none of the senior management team are from art and design disciplines. This perhaps accounts for a tendency to overlook that our practices is different; different, but in our specific context, appropriate, successful, and with a long historical provenance.

When I was a student, between 1982 and 1983 I went to an art school. Then I did a degree at a polytechnic, in a School of Art and Design, from 1984 to 1987. Ten years later I did a Master's degree in Design at a New University, but still in a School of Art and Design. When I first taught, I did so in a School of Art and Design. Then it was amalgamated with the School of Humanities, and the first real indication of future problems began to appear. Relatively soon, almost all of the senior management positions were occupied by Humanities staff. None of them had any experience of, or appeared to have any interest in, studio-based practice which was the cornerstone of the design education I was engaged in. Then the subjects I worked in were transferred out of the school - which had now rebranded itself as a 'Faculty' (perhaps to be more in keeping with a 'proper' university, rather than a former polytechnic?), into a faculty dominated by Computer Science and Engineering. The sense of cultural dislocation got worse, and at every stage it felt as though efforts were being made to normalise our practice and bring it more closely into line with that of the academic parts of the university. Studio space, studio time, and specialist resources had to be fought for over and over again. Even the admissions process began to replicate academic courses; interviews were abandoned, portfolio inspections became irrelevant. Decisions were made on the basis of an accumulation of UCAS points, not on evidence of prior artistic ability or interest. Staff morale sank, then plunged even further, then the staff who were able to return to commercial practice did so.

I realised that I did not have either the historical perspective to understand what was happening, nor the vocabulary to articulate the situation as it developed. Somehow, despite a life lived within art education, I did not understand the history of my own discipline or have a critical framework with which to analyse my situation. From this experience, how a system I was hardly aware of until it had almost disappeared had shaped me as a subject and how I uncritically manifested that system, became the basis for this thesis.

That was 2015, and events (and the thesis itself) have taken a rather different course since then. Whatever the original intentions were for undertaking an EdD, they were soon overtaken by the reality of managing continual professional retreats, retrenchments, dismemberments, and the accelerating attrition of my professional identity together with the demands of the EdD itself. Coming from an arts practice background, and lacking the comforts (assuming there are any) of prior knowledge or a pertinent disciplinary background has been a challenge. For that reason, at least, I suspect this will be a rather unconventional EdD thesis.

One of the intentions of this thesis is to reflect on my experiences before they are lost, and to consider them not as if I were in isolation, but as a combatant in a battle long since lost. The experience is now that of being an occupant within the fading remnants of a defeated resistance, surviving in occupied territory, continuing to lose ground, clinging on to misremembered fragments of historical practice as a defensive strategy, without which then the last remnants of my identity will be lost, and the annexation of art education by hostile forces complete. As I see it, it has not been a combat of equal forces, coups are no longer possible, the war is already lost. Here, indeed, I believe there is resonance in what might be described as the fatalism of Foucault's analysis of power:

I have the feeling knowledge can't do anything for us and that political power may destroy us. All the knowledge in the world can't do anything against that. All this is related not to what I think theoretically (I know that's wrong) but I speak from my personal experience. I know that knowledge can transform us, that truth is not only a way of deciphering the world (and maybe what we call truth doesn't decipher anything) but that if I know the truth I will be changed. And maybe I will be saved. Or maybe I'll die but I think that is the same anyway for me. (Foucault, 1988, p. 14)

1.2 Not a conventional thesis

I've spent my life in art education, either as pupil, student or teacher. My lived experience is constituted and made visible by the phenomena under examination in this thesis, and who I am has also been shaped by these phenomena that collectively constitute the idea and experience of 'art school.' Undertaking a thesis of this kind is, as Ball (2016a) says:

... an exercise in finding and exploring my own limits and limitations. That is, as an educator, of sorts, I must confront the impossibility of my role and the possibility of being something else. (para. 1)

The thesis therefore required these several observable themes that recur to be examined. My experience suggested that they seem to exert a tidal influence, pulling first this way, then that. Over the past decade, the tide seems to have turned firmly in a direction that feels hostile, indeed antithetical to art education as I had previously encountered it. These themes can be

considered as forces, or axes, along which art education shifts in a constant state of flux. These axes, and the state of flux, can be conceived of as more mutable than a matrix or network of power relationships and more akin to the thin translucent surface of a soap bubble. The colours of the bubble shift and shimmer, and this is the only visible sign of the constant tension as it attempts to maintain a state of stability, whilst all the time it is under pressure to collapse.

These themes or axes of force take concrete forms, the exploration of which shaped the thesis. As Quentin Bell (1963) wrote, in *The Schools of Design*, two of these axes are the ‘separate but interlinked difficulties; administrative and doctrinal’ (pp. 253-254) of the art school system. The third axis is the values of those involved in the system. Allen (2015) contends, ‘Values are embodied in the various activities and techniques available to education, techniques that instrumentalise our hopes, fears, vulnerabilities and emotions’ (para. 14) These three axes, *administrative*, *doctrinal* and *values* form the scaffolding of the thesis. Utilising these concepts - and they are not unproblematic in themselves - the thesis sets out to explore the origins and descent of these forces, and explore the dynamic interplay between them as they coalesce to form the art school and its attendant educational system as a particular apparatus, a discursive formation, a *dispositif*, with its attendant policies, curricula, texts, and systems.

In each of the subsequent chapters, consideration is always given to the axes of force as the ebb and flow within the general chronology. Broadly speaking, the doctrinal considerations occupy the earliest chapters which cover the early historical origins of the *dispositif* under review, whilst administration becomes of increasing concern in the later chapters as art education comes under increasing governmental oversight. Values run throughout, as individual actors contort themselves to accommodate the tensions within the axes of force.

The doctrinal axis

The doctrinal axis concerns art education as a vehicle for external phenomena which mutate over time, for example; art for moral purpose; art for economic purpose; art as part of a project of national identity. Doctrine often operated as a series of prohibitions on particular activities and was enacted through curricula, shaped by the values of the principal actors. Doctrine is a useful means by which to explore what art is, what it is for and for whom. It is here that the hierarchy of disciplines takes shape, for example fine art (painting) emerging as the apex of a system of knowledge; and a model of art education with fine art at its summit as the mechanism that shapes that episteme.

As doctrine evolves, other cultural and political contexts are foregrounded; from the practice of High Art and the Academy in reinforcing national identity (Bell, 1963 Carline, 1968) through Utilitarianism in art as an economic activity (Sutton, 1967, Macdonald 2004, Quinn, 2011b), to the artist's increasing emancipation and irrelevance (Pevsner, 1940). The education apparatus assembled in England in the 19th century was arguably a product of the first liberalism, a mixture of reluctance, penny-pinching, and necessity (political and economic) driven by a factory-based model of performance management that was payment by results (Ball 2018). Much of this is contained in foundational texts which are used to shape the discursive formation of art education.

The administrative axis

The administrative axis covers the multitude - particularly from the nineteenth century onwards - of committees, reports, policies, government statements and the schools/ state apparatus, including examinations, curricula, and the prohibitions on what can be taught, or who cannot be taught, often manifested along class lines. From its earliest origins to the final art schools in the 1970s, art education was one small part of the national education structure, and as Ball (2018) suggests;

to call the school system a system suggests more coherence than is deserved. Rather than a system we have, and have had since its inception, a rickety, divided, unstable, and often ineffective, but nonetheless overbearing, educational apparatus (p. 208).

Although Ball was not talking about the art schools, his observation is equally applicable to the system such as it was that evolved slowly over a century and a half before vanishing into the polytechnics in the early 1970s.

The values axis

Art education was rigidly divided along class lines. Best and Andrew (1972) characterise 19th-century education policy as deliberately patterned to perpetuate class differences, magnifying 'its structure in detail'. Perkin describes this as putting 'education in a straightjacket of class'. (Perkin 1969) and Tawney (1931) wrote that 'the hereditary curse of English education has been its organization along the lines of social class'. (Best et al, in Bell 2018, p. 217)

In addition to art education being organised along class lines, art was co-opted to embody class divisions within the public culture; Horne (1986) relates how public art was constructed along specific aesthetic and symbolic axes that reinforced English Imperialist exceptionalism, and art education was contorted to produce imperial artists. This continued throughout the period under

review in the thesis, although latterly there were attempts to democratise public art. Largely, art education had, as an ancillary role, the education and improvement of public taste (Pevsner, 1940; Ministry of Education, 1965).

Within my experience, the class system still operated but somewhat more covertly, under the guise of the portfolio and interview process which sifted applicants, often on their pre-existing ability to conform most closely to the values of the course, and more overtly in the hierarchy of disciplines visible in the management and administration of the art school and made concrete in the physical buildings; at my art school in the early 1980s, fine art occupied the best studios, the graphic designers were housed in portacabins. In my current university, fine art still occupies a purpose-built building, my subjects (graphic design, animation, game art, comic art) are shoehorned into repurposed call-centre style office buildings.

These three themes will weave throughout the thesis, taking centre stage or retreating to the wings according to the specific period under review.

1.3 Why a genealogy? Why now?

Although Foucauldian genealogy has been deployed relatively widely to examine education, particularly schools, it has not been used as a technique with which to examine the emergence of the English art school system. In essence the system examined here briefly existed as an autonomous sector within the wider English higher education ecology from around 1945 to 1970. The nature of a genealogy also requires consideration of the long prior-history and the subsequent post-history of that period, particularly as it pertains to my own experience 1982 - 2023. As Koopman (2013) suggests:

... Foucault can be profitably read as equipping us with resources we can use to perform our own critical inquiries of our own present. Foucault helps us see our way to a practice of philosophy as a critical inquiry into the complex and contingent formation of the present in which we find ourselves. (p. 12)

The originality of this thesis further resides firstly in its investigation of the art school system as a particular discursive formation, distinct from but increasingly subsumed within the wider educational ecology; secondly in its localised and contextualised approach; it is a genealogy undertaken from within the system it purports to investigate. Thirdly, the thesis contributes to the challenge raised by Llewellyn (2015) when he suggested that; ‘At present, the bookshelf marked ‘Art School History’ is understocked and this is something that future scholarship needs to challenge.’ (p. 153)

It also seeks to build upon and extend the work of previous literature on the English art school system (Bell 1963, Sutton 1967, Carline 1968, Ashwin 1975, Strand 1987, Tickner 2008, Quinn 2016) and to challenge the orthodox view of the English art school as a liberal and creative good, most memorably characterised as such by practitioners (such as Heron 1971). Thus, I believe this genealogy contributes to the literature by rethinking the very nature of the art school system and its practitioners, their practices and the location within the wider educational ecology

I read widely and voraciously for this thesis, finding some solace among the books, papers and archives. To a certain degree, I was perhaps intent on immersing myself in ‘the great and tender Freemasonry of useless erudition’ (Foucault, 1980, p. 79) as an escape from the daily grind of neo-liberal utilitarianism that was my more normal routine. The readings evolved as the thesis progressed; they are methodologically messy, incomplete and partial. I did not approach this task as an historian, or an archivist, but as a practitioner who wished to feel firm ground under his feet. To find that what I had experienced, and what was being lost on an almost daily basis, had some substance, however convoluted, compromised and contradictory those origins may have been. In fact, deploying genealogy meant not just moving beyond the notion of ‘firm ground’, but more significantly in moving my position beyond the *desire* to find firm ground. In this, the thesis became a struggle for liberation.

The full extent of the historical texts engaged with can be seen in the Bibliography, but several sources are worth highlighting at this point. After encountering his work so often in the books covering the Coldstream era, I read Pevsner’s (1940) *Academies of Art*. From reading Ashwin (1975) and Strand (1987) particularly, I felt compelled to explore the NACAE/NCDAD² archives at the National Archive in Kew. As indicated earlier, my methodological approach was somewhat unorthodox; a more conventional scholar would have visited the archive much earlier, but as I was developing my approach as a consequence of the writing, the visits were relatively late in the writing process. By this point, however, I had a mental conception of the area of investigation and – perhaps more significantly – a sense of the individuals involved. I

² The National Advisory Council of Art Education (NACAE) was appointed in 1958 to advise on the structure of art education. Among its first activities was the setting up of the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design. The NCDAD can be considered the operational wing of the NACAE, charged with the approval of courses to teach the new DipAD qualification, and with the administration of the DipAD itself.

simply wanted to get closer to their presence through the traces they left in the archive. It was surprisingly moving, and one of the highlights of the whole thesis writing endeavour.

The early history of art education as it is pertinent to the later emergence of a uniquely localised English art education was accounted for by reading Bostock (1885); Herringham (1899); Penty (1906); Ashbee (1911); Hoag (1970); Spencer (1970); Panofsky (1972); Hurtado (1993); Sproll (1994); Kill (2006); Burns (2011), and Quinn (2011b, 2014, 2016).

To gain a broader cultural context, and in particular to try and identify a sense of ‘Englishness’ and the English establishment’s ability to draw the most muddled and ineffective conclusions from the many Select Committees, and how a particular form of class-centred nationalist-exceptionalism recast that muddle as exemplary, I read Horne (1969, 1984, 1986); Sproll (1994); and Barnett (1995).

The key historiographical texts were written during a decade in which the authors must have felt that the great questions of art schools had been settled, and that the constant upheavals and struggles of the art school system were safely behind them, and that – at long last – a system was in place which could explore its turbulent past from the beginning of a new age of stability and success. In fact, they were writing at the very point that ‘the murder of the art schools’ (Heron, 1971) was about to take place. Far from a secure and stable future, the art school system would be subsumed into a larger system of technical education, initially the Polytechnics, and latterly as faculties of diminishing importance within the numerous provincial branches of what Caston (1979) identified as ‘the separate campuses of the University of the United Kingdom.’ (p. 183)

The immediate historical period leading up to the Coldstream era is admirably covered by Bell (1963); Carline (1968); Ashwin (1975); all of whom wrote in a spirit of optimism that art education had earned its equitable status as an autonomous, degree awarding entity that had parity with the universities. Even Strand (1987) was able to take an optimistic view that polytechnisation had not been the disaster that had been feared, although he was writing from a senior position within the CNAA that had replaced the NCDAD. Macdonald (2004) and particularly Romans (2004, 2007) take a more measured view of the same period. Romans’ work is particularly bracing in this respect.

The early 2010s saw a number of events that explored the art school and art education more widely, including a University College London (UCL) two-day conference ‘Art Schools: Invention, Invective and Radical Possibilities’, the Lanchester Gallery Projects, Coventry, two-day symposium ‘What is to be Done? The Coventry Echo’ to analyse the legacy of art education of the past for art education of the present day, and the 2011 conference ‘Reflections on the Art School’, part of the Tate’s ‘Art School Educated’ research project. This last generated a book, *The London Art Schools: Reforming the Art World, 1960 to Now*, edited by Nigel Llewellyn, that contains a number of chapters that deal with the post-Coldstream educational landscape, particularly those by Westley and Williamson covering studio practice and pedagogy.

Considering other publications, there have been a small but welcome number of focused case studies on individual institutions, such as Weinberger and Madge’s ‘*Art Students Observed*’ (1973) which covers the experimental period in Lanchester (later Coventry) Polytechnic’s School of Art, this is further explored by Dennis (2014) in *The Ascent from the Maelstrom; Art Students Observed and its descriptive resonance 40 years on*; Tickner’s *Hornsey 1968: The Art School Revolution* (2008); Smith’s *The Company of Artists: The Origins of the Royal Academy of Arts in London* (2012); and the University of Brighton recognised its origins as an art school in its 2009 book *Art and Design at Brighton: 1859-2009: from Arts and Manufactures to the Creative and Cultural Industries* by Woodham and Lyon. More generally, Elkins (2001) *Why Art Cannot be Taught* contains an excellent condensed discussion of the history of the art school and its unique practices among other interesting observations.

For personal accounts of the experience of art school in the immediate pre-Coldstream era, and in particular an erudite description of the practical influence of Pasmore, Hamilton and the Basic Course of Design on a provincial English art school there is Walker (2003), *Learning to Paint: A British Art Student and Art School 1956-61.*; further personal recollections are James (2016), *Art Schools in England 1945 - 1970: an anecdotal history* and Scarsbrook (2021) *Artists and the art school: experiences and perspectives of fine art education & professional pedagogies in London art schools, 1986-2016*.

For discussions of art school education specifically in the English post-Coldstream era; Miller (1985); Candlin (2001); Elkins (2001); Cornock (1983, 2003); Walker (2003); Romans (2005); Thompson (2005); Tickner (2008); Nicolson (2010); Aspinall (2012); Beck and Cornford (2012); Williamson (2013); Dennis (2016); Llewellyn (2015); Mitchell (2015); Addison,

Georgakia, Nirta (2016); Houghton (2016); Lee (2016); Hunt (2018); Willer (2018); McLoughlin (2019); are among recent works covering this relatively under examined period. Beth Williamson's 2013 paper *Recent Developments in British Art Education: "Nothing Changes from Generation to Generation except the Thing Seen"* is a concise but thorough survey with fascinating insights into the radical pedagogic excesses that some practitioners were capable of under the art school system as shaped by the Coldstream reforms.

Addison, Georgakia and Nirta (2016) suggest that this period is a 'still visible yesteryear located on a horizon that has received less attention than the moment following the Coldstream and Summerson reports.' (p. 2) Llewellyn (2015) in *The London Art Schools: Reforming the Art World, 1960 to Now*, further suggests that; 'At present, the bookshelf marked 'Art School History' is understocked and this is something that future scholarship needs to challenge.' (p. 153) This list suggests that the bookshelf marked 'art school history' is far from understocked, but I would suggest that in fact, compared to other aspects of the educational ecology, the art school is relatively under explored.

The texts listed here shaped my understanding of the art school as a distinctive discursive formation, and the work contained therein informed the development of the thesis. This thesis, then, builds on the existing texts, seeks to add something to Llewellyn's 'understocked bookshelf', while at the same time being unique in utilising Foucault's genealogy as an analytic technique.

Methodological considerations

The more Foucault I read, and the more I read about Foucault, the less I think I understand him, but perhaps at the same time, the more I understand myself. (Ball, 2016a, para. 1)

It seems axiomatic, yet it is worth making explicit; the now, of this moment of writing, is not the now of when I started. A long time has passed since embarking on this thesis in 2018, and I am not the person I was when I started it. This is partly the inevitable process of ageing, but also a growing awareness of the reality of where I am in my career trajectory - closer to the end than the beginning, without doubt. It is also because the thesis itself has enacted a significant change upon me as - in some senses - the subject of the thesis.

As has been previously suggested, the unconventional manner in which the thesis evolved, and a lack of prior disciplinary location, meant that the methodology evolved as part of the process of writing the thesis. I did not start with a pre-adopted methodological framework, rather I

started with a desire to bring about some means of ‘thinking differently,’ and over the initial period of the EdD decided to use Foucault’s work to provide an appropriate theoretical framework, largely because Ball (2019) suggested the use of Foucault’s later work to ‘think differently’ (*penser autrement*) about teaching and learning’ and ‘his intention to destabilise, to make things “not as necessary as all that.”’ (Ball 2019, p. 133)

Further investigation suggested that Foucault provided key concepts that would provide a critical and analytical framework, within the overall genealogical project; firstly, the notion of origins, descent and emergence; secondly, the *dispositif*, an apparatus or ‘grid of intelligibility’ (Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982), comprising the various institutional, physical and administrative mechanisms and knowledge structures that constituted the art school system and thirdly, governmentality.

Foucault, as a philosopher of contestation and difference, seeks to undermine self-evidences and open up spaces for acting and thinking differently about our relation to ourselves and to others, and identify and refuse and transgress the horizon of silent objectification within which we are articulated. Such critique enables us to recognise that the things, values and events that make up our present experience ‘have been constituted historically, discursively, practically’ (Ball 2019, p. 133)

This thesis also uses Foucault as it seeks to explore ‘the union of erudite knowledge and local memories’ (Foucault, 1976a, p. 83). Ball (2019) suggests that;

Overall, in educational studies there has been a tendency to interpret and use Foucault as a philosopher of oppressions, drawing primarily on the work of his middle period and its focus on the problem of power, and in particular on Discipline and Punish. (p. 133)

In the case of this thesis, Foucault is used less as a philosopher of oppressions, and more for his capacity to deploy genealogy as *critique*, to think critically, and to disconcert. It will not, however, offer any remedies; I am mindful of Foucault’s assertion that ‘we cannot conceive of alternatives within the discursive possibilities we currently inhabit.’ (Foucault, in Ball, 2019 p. 134)

Utilising Foucault also provided access to a rhetorical device, and a vocabulary that seemed best suited to provide a rich description of the experience; that is, to use the concept of conflict, especially that of a civil war fought between and among closely linked groups of practitioners.

I confess to a degree of uneasiness with this metaphor; there is some discomfort with utilising civil war as a rhetorical device; it felt overly-dramatic (and actually, given that there is a real war in Europe at the time of writing, somewhat in poor taste). Nonetheless, the metaphor

usefully gives access to a vocabulary that feels right for describing the experience of working in art education this past quarter century. As the thesis developed, it was clear that the metaphor requires some modification and adjustment but nonetheless, it does convey an appropriate sense of passion, futility and dismay that accrued as I examined art education more closely and began to re-conceptualise my experiences accordingly.

The thesis also deploys Foucauldian analytics to consider key texts and the descent of a system of values, doctrines and administrative practices, concerned as they are with the rituals of power and the construction of knowledge. The *idea* of art school is willed into being through these texts, and as such, can be seen to emerge from within these texts as much within buildings of brick and glass, or within practices inside the studio walls.

This thesis is not primarily about generating more knowledge, but more concerned with interrogating what is thought to be known, approaching knowledge more for the purposes of cutting (Foucault 1977, p. 247), exploring not just what happened, but how what happened shaped and continues to shape my experience of being an art educator. It seeks to trace the lingering institutional memories, the whispers, echoes and remnants of what had been, and of what might have been, leaving ghostly traces at each new manifestation of the system of art education. As will be seen, nothing ever quite got wholly eliminated, ideas and conceptualizations that did not reach fruition also shaped the development of art education in the same way in which an unseen but constant wind will shape a tree over decades.

As Deacon (2002) suggests;

Foucault's work makes possible a new and multifaceted history of education that goes beyond conventional, usually progressive, narratives to expose contingencies and discontinuities as much as imperatives and continuities; it helps to explain, and demands that we rethink (without abandoning) longstanding tendencies to associate education with such homilies as personal development, intellectual advancement, cultural transmission or economic growth. (p. 435)

It should be stated however, that 'for my purposes here Foucault is a starting point not a subject.' (Ball 2016a, para. 2)

One of the challenges that had to be faced with this thesis was that it did not originate within a disciplinary field. This determined an evolutionary methodological approach, as I was not able to approach it as if there were a discrete disciplinary 'problem' that could be 'solved' by the research, nor did I occupy a field of practice within which to determine a methodological approach. Working from a non-discipline specific approach meant to some extent having to

evolve a methodological approach as a process within the study which was messy, evolutionary, responsive to the material *and* to the thesis as it emerged. As the thesis developed, it was clear that the process demanded a wider set of tools than a conventional investigation of the archive. In particular, the issues raised in the later sections covering the Coldstream decade³ warranted a closer examination than was possible from simply reading the existing texts, such as Ashwin (1975); Bell (1963); Carline (1968); Strand (1987).

For this reason, I undertook several visits to the National Archive in Kew to explore the NACAE archive in full. This, alongside engaging with more recent such as Walker (2003); Romans (2005); Thompson (2005); Tickner (2008); Nicolson (2010); Aspinall (2012); Beck and Cornford (2012); Williamson (2013); Dennis (2014); Llewellyn (2015); Mitchell (2015); Addison, Georgakia, Nirta (2016); Houghton (2016); Lee (2016); Hunt (2018); Willer (2018); and McLoughlin (2019) allowed for a fuller engagement with the source material and with more modern interpretations of art school history than would have been possible with Ashwin et al.

Engagement with the archive was just one element in a larger way of thinking which incorporated the reading of historical documents with personal reflection. Within this messy, evolutionary analytical framework, I developed a desire to move beyond the limited scope of the historical texts and to engage with the source material for myself, to physically sift through the archive and experience the details, the minutiae, the voices of the participants and encounter the material that was omitted from the accepted accounts of the period. It should be pointed out, however, that the archive was closed until the early 2000s and so, other than Strand who was a member of the NCDAD, none of the early writers would have had unrestricted access to the archive.

³ The 'Coldstream decade' covers the period from the publication of the NACAE's First Report in 1960 to its final Report (jointly with the NCDAD) in 1970. This short span of time (with some overlap before and after) is significant in that it marks the complete emergence of the art school as a distinct discursive formation, and almost immediately its end as an autonomous entity within the higher education system. Following the publication of the Joint Report, the art schools were absorbed entirely into the polytechnic system in which they became just another department or school within a larger educational bureaucracy. See chapters 7-9 for more on this era.

1.4 Summary of chapters

Part one, Foundational Discourses.

‘What is more helpful than a mere chronology is to discern broad patterns in the development of ideas about arts education.’ (Fleming, 2010, p. 10) Apart from the section exploring Foucault/Genealogy, the following sections aim to make visible Fleming’s ‘broad patterns’ as they emerge from recovered classical texts, and are co-opted by contemporary actors within specific cultural and economic contexts to shape art schools as an educational system or apparatus with distinct themes located along axes of value, doctrine and administration.

The first part is concerned with uncovering the origins of a number of foundational concepts that constitute the discursive formation of art and artists, and that later would be used to shape the art education system along particular axes. Several themes emerge and are deployed to construct an immature form of the art school system; an incomplete discursive formation which nonetheless includes a nascent hierarchy of disciplines; the formation of the artist as an exceptional individual of high social status distinct from the artisan; the identification of a spiritual dimension to art and by extension to the body of the artist; defining techniques of practice and establishing figurative realism as the principal mode of representation. This ancient knowledge acts in the same manner as a reef in the sea, unseen perhaps, but making its sunken presence felt in how it disturbs the surface, how it shapes currents around it.

Chapter 2 discusses the deployment of Foucault’s Genealogy as an analytic tool by which the formation of the art school, as a system, as a phenomenon and a lived experience can be rethought.

Chapter 3 explores the earliest texts from which emerge several themes that later form the values and doctrines that underpin the formation of the art school system. These texts are used to project hierarchical conceptions of art practice, and to elevate the artist from his previously low status from Guild-artisan to Independent-artist. This requires new models of the production, support and consumption of art to be brought into being.

Chapter 4 examines the shifting axes of early art education, early doctrinal formations founded on the interpretation of a small range of classical texts and the emergence of three doctrinally distinct approaches to art education.

Part two, A Dog Chasing its own Tail.

The second part of the thesis covering the period from the 1830s to the 1880s considers a visible point of disruption as government begins to actively direct art education towards national economic and cultural goals. This introduces another doctrinal element, with competing conceptions of a system of art training emerging that are aligned along the axes of ‘high’ fine art and ‘low’ design. As the state begins to align art and design practice with serving national economic utility and shaping national cultural identity, government directs investigation into the most suitable means of educating artists to meet this national imperative. As Dohmen (2020) outlined:

notions of art, design, drawing and art education were closely intertwined in nineteenth-century Britain and fuelled fierce debates in a field riven with overlapping binaries, such as polite accomplishment versus fine art, art versus industry, culture versus commercialism, and craft versus mechanical production. As the industrial revolution marched on, the terms ‘art’ and ‘industry’ became focal points for these controversies, and their understanding was far from static. (p. 24)

Chapter 5 examines the setting up of the 1835 Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures, as a clearly recognisable point of disturbance in the evolutionary trajectory of the English art school system; it marks a distinct rupture between the academic model that served the dilettante clientele of Georgian collectors and attempts to find new models that might be better suited to meet the challenges brought about by significant social and economic changes in the late Georgian period.

Chapter 6 further discusses the development of the art school *dispositif* during a period of significantly increasing governmentality; from the end of the Cole and Redgrave National System of Instruction; the end of government examinations; a greater degree of autonomy; and conflicting doctrines and values seeking dominance. In some respects, this could be seen as a period of apparent liberalisation within a wider scheme of general educational reform during the era.

Part three, The Murder of the Art Schools.

This section owes its title to a polemic published in ‘*The Guardian*’ of October 12th 1971, where Patrick Heron ‘one of the half dozen important British painters of the twentieth century’ (McNay, 1999) wrote an article entitled *Murder of the Art Schools* in which he attacked the government scheme to absorb the – only recently and briefly – independent art schools into polytechnics.

This part traces the system in its modern phase, from the 1900s to the 1950s; the competing axes of dominance (the ancient hierarchy of disciplines), the struggle for design to gain recognition as a distinct practice, the further co-option of art to improve the public taste, the fragmentation of fine art under the influence of modernisers and their localised variant of the Bauhaus philosophy. This section also examines the brief period of autonomy in the modern age, 1960-1974 and then the period from 1975 into the early 2000s, including the absorption of art schools into firstly, the polytechnics, and secondly, into the ‘new universities.’

Chapter 7 examines the continuing development of the art school *dispositif* during the post second world war period. This period encompasses the Coldstream era with its attendant reduction in the scale of art education and a desire to achieve parity with the Universities resulting in a new national qualification. Consideration is given to the intensification of administrative control over art education from the overarching principles to attempts to direct curricula.

Chapter 8 considers the implications of the implementation of the Coldstream reforms; the proposal to alleviate capacity problems in the new qualification system by developing vocational courses giving rise to ‘second class citizens’ in the art school population, further attempts by government to direct art policy, the conception of polytechnics and the student unrest that arose in part from the Coldstream reforms and other pressures within the art school system.

Chapter 9 examines the 1970 Joint Report from the NACAE/NCDAD which sought to address the problems that had arisen since the reshaping of the art school system after the introduction of the DipAD, and the imminent absorption of the art schools into the polytechnic system.

Chapter 10 charts the art school system as it dissipated into the polytechnics, and the consequent ending of direct government engagement with art education as a distinct entity within the wider educational ecology. It also considers the increasing marketisation of art education within initially the polytechnic system, and latterly within the monotheistic university sector, with rising student numbers, increasingly diverse courses and new disciplines. This period covers my lived experience as art student, and art educator.

Last thoughts

Chapter 11 ‘Last Thoughts’ seeks to restate the aims and intentions of the thesis, together with consideration of its contribution to the educational discourse and Foucauldian scholarship. It

also considers the limitations of the thesis, its paradoxical nature and its locally situated viewpoint. A brief discussion of possible future research that extends the work of this thesis is included. Finally, the thesis concludes with some personal reflection, its emergence from a messy, evolving production, how that shaped the methodology and lastly the impact it has had on the researcher.

1.5 What is the English Art School?

Before embarking on the thesis proper, it would be useful to at least attempt a sketch of what the art school was like. Certainly, until recently, the art school offered a pedagogical experience that was uncommon within the higher education sector. The current iteration exists wholly within the monotheistic universities of the UK, what Dunn (2021) refers to as ‘the standardisation of British art schools.’ By monotheistic I am referring to the homogenisation of the art school system; individual art schools that had not been previously absorbed into polytechnics were instead amalgamated into administrative agglomerations that, in order to survive, consciously aped the academic university. As Dunn (2021) states:

In 1986, seven of the leading London art schools came together to form the London Institute. In 2003/4, the Institute received university status, and Central Saint Martins, Camberwell, Chelsea, London College of Communication, London College of Fashion and Wimbledon College of Arts became the University of the Arts London (UAL). Similar umbrellas popped up elsewhere, the University for the Creative Arts, for example, sheltering art schools in Surrey and Kent which had once operated independently... Gaining university status was one of the worst things that could have happened to art schools. (para. 3)

It is the loss of the potential that these individual and different experiences held, I suspect, that energises the sense of regret that powers this thesis, rather than a more specific loss based on my personal experience of the art school system which was far from entirely positive. I should be mindful that I should not romanticise the art school system, as to do so would be to deny the actual experience. And there is an obligation to speak truth to self.

The art school was a radically different formation at different stages of its development, and the experience of those attending in, say, the Victorian period would have been incomparable with students attending in the post-war, pre-Coldstream period, or my experience as a student in the 1980s, and less still with my experience as an academic in the first two decades of the twenty-first century. The anecdotal (and in view of the elapsed time between experience and writing, probably nostalgic) literature of Walker (2003); Lee (2016); James, (2016); Willer (2018) suggest a ‘golden age’ where post-war democratisation of higher education and liberalism meshed with a solidly traditional teaching of technical skills, a viewpoint of the early

1960s refuted by the authors of *On the Reasons for a Revolution* (1969) for whom art education had become irredeemably bourgeois, and tainted by its devotion to past practices.

It was my experience in the 1980s, and James (2016) concurs, that there was;

a popular belief that art schools were racy and “Bohemian”. Its origin is hard to pin down but seems to have emerged in the second half of the Nineteenth century, particularly in connection with the unconventional behaviour of some artists, including members of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, and some of those British artists who had studied at the academies and studios of Paris both saw and, in many cases, participated enthusiastically in “*la vie bohémien*” and thus brought home a reputation for loucheness in marked contrast to the actual lives of most of their counterparts in the art schools of Britain. (chap. 6, para. 14)

This was not a fully accurate view of art schools. As James (2016) recounts:

The nature of most municipal art schools, certainly those outside central London, was staid in the extreme, and remained so. In any case, for much of their history the character of art schools had been... defined by the crafts and trade courses they offered. A majority of courses offered by art schools... were vocational and aimed firmly towards eventual employment in particular fields of industry and commerce. (chap. 6, para. 15)

After the Victorian era of expansionism and localisation, and until the Coldstream reform, art schools were widely distributed around the country. James (2016) again:

By the end of the 1930s schools of art and crafts were to be found in towns and cities, large and small, throughout the country. There were twenty such schools in the counties of Kent and East Sussex alone. In the late 1940s and throughout the 1950s art schools offered a welcome to many young school leavers who had little or no clear idea what they wanted to do by way of eventual employment. (James, 2016, chap. 6, para. 1)

Teaching practice was for the most part very much based on the ‘atelier’ system, with a small number of students working with a ‘master’, on a prescribed activity, such as life drawing, or painting, or modelling from the figure⁴. This remained the case even in my experience in the 1980s, but rapidly diminished in concert with the massification of higher education (in which art and design courses shouldered more than their fair share of the burden), and the demands

⁴ John Walker (2003) describes the teaching experience at Newcastle in the late 50’s: A daily routine soon emerged: a tutor would set a group of students an exercise in the morning, then he would leave to work in his studio. At about four in the afternoon he would return to see what had transpired. There were times when we were baffled by the exercises set and misunderstood what the tutor was after, so when he returned he discovered the day had been wasted. (p. 22) This was my experience thirty years later, and in the 2010s I still managed staff for whom this was an acceptable teaching practice. The introduction of fees and the NSS eventually brought this mostly to an end.

of cost reduction and efficient resource utilisation that was a principal driver behind the polytechnic system. (See chapter 8)

The physical manifestation of the art school varied enormously, from the provincial high Gothic of Manchester and Sheffield (the latter had been bombed flat during the second world war), and the ultra-modern (for the time) system architecture and modernism of schools like Chelsea. Most of the municipal schools of art shared accommodation in civic buildings with other services, such as public libraries, or museums and art galleries.

By the start of the twentieth century there were a great many publicly funded art schools and technical institutes across the country, varying greatly in size and offering courses in many different activities: in the trades and crafts, including painting and decorating, signwriting, commercial art, stone carving, dressmaking, pen lettering, bookbinding and printing, as well as subjects in the fine arts, such as drawing, painting, engraving and modelling. Dunn (2021) states:

There used to be a strong tradition of arts and crafts in Britain. Almost every county had its own art school, and every art school its own specialist practices. It wasn't unusual to walk into one in the 1970s and find etching in one corner and stained-glass window making in another. (para. 1)

The art school of the Coldstream decade, 1960-1970, saw the institution in crisis, much reduced in number and geographical spread, diminished in influence and relevance. For a very brief period, the art schools were scrutinised by the public and the press, viewed as a hotbed of radicalism or regressive historicism in equal measure, often the same institution at the same moment. The post Coldstream period saw a diminishing reliance on the teaching of skills, saw a commensurate increase in conceptual or experimental practices, and then a sudden disappearance from public view as art schools were absorbed into the polytechnics.

By the time I attended art school in 1982, the former grounding in technical skills was more than a decade in the past, and there was very little formal teaching or instruction of any kind. There was what Collins referred to as 'the residue of an inherited, transmitted culture... present.' (in Willer, 2018, p. 5) My experience of the art school system was that it taught nothing, nor did it prepare me for a career, nor even making a basic living. The curriculum was under theorised, graduates were wholly lacking in practical skills, and there was an almost total absence of relevance to the external art and design world. In this aspect, it had not developed from that described in Madge and Weinberger's 1973 account of art student's experience of

the art school system, *Art Students Observed*. As they stated at the time; ‘Socialisation into art is ... socialisation into nobody quite knows what.’ (p. 15)

As an institution, the art school was arguably regressive despite its appearance of bohemian largesse. Department of Education and Science figures for polytechnics in 1982 show that only 14 % of their total teaching force was women. (Miller, 1985, p. 25) In my art education after leaving school (one year of Foundation, three years of a BA Hons degree and two years of a Masters, six years in total), I did not encounter a single female member of staff. There was considerable ‘inherent chauvinism and bullying of the students.... the patriarchal ideology of Romantic art’ (Chaplin in Dennis, 2014, p. 26) was ever present in the material, the staff being 90% male with an attendant ‘mysticism and posturing of such an approach to teaching.’ (Dennis, 2014, p. 26)

It has been claimed that each department or course was the personal fiefdom of some charismatic, wayward individual, some of whom were wholly unsuited to the task that faced them; ‘art education at the time... being such an inchoate enterprise.’ (Dennis, 2014, p. 25) This was certainly true in my experience, where my degree course was run entirely at the capricious whim of the course leader. The only students that seemed to profit from this system were those that had existing connections, social capital or wealth that eliminated the necessity to earn a living, or those who worked out how to manipulate the staff’s predilections to their own advantage. According to Dennis (2014) the ‘ludicrously romanticised self-glorifying cant that comprised the teaching practice in art schools is absolutely institutionalised, and the institutions are bourgeois institutions’ (p. 17).

In short, the art school was many different institutions (physically, doctrinally, and administratively) according to the prevailing cultural, political and economic context of the time in which it was formed and the locality in which it was situated. There were, though, concepts, themes, trends, knowledges and practices that were transmitted from era to era, and these, in as much as they can be said to constitute the discursive formation of the art school, will be traced and examined in the subsequent chapters.

2. Foucault's Genealogical Method: 'an analytics, not a theory'

Let us give the term genealogy to the union of erudite knowledge and local memories which allows us to establish a historical knowledge of struggles and to make use of this knowledge tactically today. (Foucault, 1980, p. 83)

This chapter explores key concepts from the work of Michel Foucault in order to develop a philosophical and analytical framework through which to discuss the historical emergence of the English art school system. The adoption Foucault's conceptual approach enriches the thesis by applying genealogical concepts in ways which aim to interrogate the documentary traces that shape the historical account of the English art school movement, recounting its shaping, its contortions, retreats and dead-ends from its early origins, through to the development of a nationalised system of art education outlined by the 1960 Coldstream report. Consideration will also be given to the challenges to the first Coldstream report, to the 1965 addendum, and to the final 1970 Joint Report which sought to address the challenges raised to the Coldstream conception of a national art education system.

In order to account for the full complexity of this evolution, an appropriately rigorous analytical process was required to provide both an intellectual framework through which the dispersion and resolution of the art school system could be properly documented, and a structure that would allow for the full complexity of relationships within that dispersion/resolution to be examined. Over the preceding several years of the EdD, leading up to the thesis, a number of theoretical frameworks were explored with a view to managing the seemingly contradictory demands of close attention and focus and accounting for the dispersion encountered in an educational system that evolved over several hundred years, but with the major developments happening in increasingly closely spaced clusters of activity.

This process was at times painful, protracted and never less than demanding as there was a desire 'to do justice' to the story of the English art school in all its manifestations, and to mark its passing whilst paying close attention to the how and why. There was also the desire to understand how I have become what I am, particularly in regard to my centrality to the research subject. Such an analysis required more than a universalising or general theory; it required a systematic critique that would properly examine a system that manifested as a net wrapped around a core of practice that runs through time like DNA. It required an analytical process that embraced complexity, and refuted simplification or unity. As Foucault (1984) suggested:

...criticism is no longer going to be practiced in the search for formal structures with universal value but, rather as a historical investigation into the events that led us to constitute ourselves and to recognise ourselves as subjects of what we are doing, thinking, saying. (in Rabinow, pp. 45-46)

Michel Foucault (1926-1984) was ‘at the time of his death... perhaps the single most famous intellectual in the world’ or so claims Miller. (in Prado, 2000, p. 1) Foucault has also maintained an intimidating reputation as being difficult. Prado bracingly describes Foucault’s writings as ‘not difficult in the way that Immanuel Kant’s are difficult. But his mode of expression and his style are unfamiliar enough to North American readers to mislead and even to irritate them, thereby making what is not inherently difficult nonetheless inaccessible.’ (Prado, 2000, p. 3) Additionally, Prado points out that Foucault was ‘a public figure, a celebrity in a way academics never are... As a consequence, not only must his readers and interpreters contend with his substantial and diversely oriented primary writings, they must also deal with a profusion of interviews, many anthologized, in which Foucault has too much to say about his own work.’ (Prado, 2000, p.11) Foucault also had a ‘revisionist’ view of his own work and tended to retrospectively reformulate his earlier work in the light of current work.

How did I arrive at Foucault, given his reputation as difficult, labyrinthine, opaque? In part, because the desire to undertake the EdD was driven by a nascent desire to remake myself; or as Foucault put it; ‘When I write I do it above all to change myself and not to think the same thing as before’. (Foucault, 1991b, p. 27). I can recall the moment I decided to pursue a research degree, and the feelings it evoked; curiosity, anxiety, and above all an acknowledgement that I was coasting – and had been coasting for years – in my career. Additionally, I have always found myself sceptical about history as it presented itself through school, through art school and at polytechnic. It always seemed too neat, too linear, and above all I never felt it reflected or illuminated my story. I felt in it, but also outside it. As Paul Veyne (2010) writes:

a sceptic... is a dual being. So long as he keeps on thinking, he remains outside the fishbowl and can watch the fish swimming round and round inside it. But given that one has to live, he then finds himself within the bowl, a fish like all the rest... (p. 2)

I wanted to understand *who I was, how I came to be here, and what the here actually was*. As Prado (2000, p. 13) puts it: Foucault insists that the goal of his work... was ‘to create a history of the different modes by which... human beings are made subjects’ and further ‘(he) lists as one of the most basic questions he considers that of how the human subject took itself as the object of possible knowledge.’

The necessary limitations of this thesis preclude a more comprehensive analysis of Foucault's multiple outputs, and these are recounted with considerable erudition in the work of Rabinow (1991); Dean (1994); Tamboukou (1999); Prado (2000) and Koopman (2013) among many others. More recent work, such as that of Ball (1990; 2016a; 2019), attempts to work with Foucault around and within education, particularly in relation to the formation of the self and identity, and Dean (2015) presents a challenge to 'defending Foucault.' It is, I feel, important to engage *with* Foucault but always with an awareness of Foucault's specific temporal, geographical and cultural context. My use of Foucault is equally temporally, geographically and culturally localised; it is also partial, incomplete and ongoing. Each new encounter with Foucault, or papers about Foucault, not only adds to the Foucault I know, but alters and shades what I previously knew.

For me, Foucault's expansive thinking, integrating and synthesizing as it did rather than seeking to reduce complex, messy, contingent experience to a reductive, simplifying, universal theory chimed with my lived experience, both as an academic and as a somewhat dissatisfied artist. My lived experience suggested that something of value seemed to be disappearing before my eyes, and also that the disappearance had accelerated dramatically in recent years. Whilst trying to grasp this phenomenon, to give it shape and render it visible – at least to speak of it – the invocation of memory felt increasingly like an act of imagination, and that the history needed to be recovered from the act of disappearance. In part then, this thesis is intended as a work of remembrance as much as to contribute to the scholarly archive/debate, to be an acknowledgement of what has passed but also to look critically and unflinchingly at the past, and not romanticize, misrepresent or misremember.

These philosophical leanings circled around to Foucault's genealogical inquiry as an appropriate investigatory process. In doing this, I would concur with Ball (2013), and state categorically that 'I do not do Foucault, and I am not a Foucauldian' (p. 1). By agreeing with Ball's statement, I am intentionally aligning my thesis primarily along an axis of being *about* the English art school, and my experience of it, and much less *about* Foucault, or contributing to Foucauldian scholarship. And I would further agree that 'reading Foucault was a struggle and a shock, but also a revelation.' (Ball, 2013, pp. 1-2) In grappling with Foucault, and by applying it to the long, tangled and often romanticised history of the English Art School, I hope that I can rise to 'the challenge which is not to agree with Foucault but to be disconcerted by him, to be made to think in new spaces and to consider new possibilities for thought.' (Ball,

2013 pp. 4-5) As outlined above, even as each new reading of Foucault or about Foucault adds to my conception of ‘Foucauldian’, Foucault is not the main focus of the thesis; instead, rather than writing *about* Foucault, I am intending to *use* his genealogical technique as a critical tool to, as Koopman (2013) says: ‘Make sayable and visible... the problematizations of our present’ (p. 24).

It would also be prudent, within the limitations of this thesis, to be mindful of Koopman and Matza’s pragmatic instruction to those who would choose to utilise Foucault; ‘Inquirers can and should take what they need from Foucault while leaving the rest to the side.’ (Koopman, and Matza, 2013, p. 831) However it is also necessary to heed Prado’s warning that:

Many of Foucault’s most intriguing ideas are often articulated in uncharacteristically compact ways, and as often buried in a mass of detail. The brief way he puts this complex question serves as a warning to those who are tempted by his style to skim over what they think inessential. (Prado, 2000, p.13)

With these suggestions acknowledged and firmly in place, this chapter sets out to explore; firstly, what Foucault’s genealogy is; secondly why it was selected as an appropriate analytical process by which to investigate the historical evolution of the English art school; and thirdly how genealogy can be used to investigate the English art school as a specific historical *episteme*. It does this by evaluating the relevant literature on genealogy, and a range of adjacent topics that illuminate the development of an analytics rather than adopting or subverting a universalising theory with which to examine the English art school. In so doing, the thesis concentrates on some elements of Foucault’s prodigious outputs to the exclusion of others. In enacting Koopman and Matz’s advice to *take what they need while leaving the rest to the side*, I gratefully acknowledge and accept, Paul Rabinow’s comment that ‘the resultant distortion is duly noted, and responsibility accepted’ (1991, p. 27)

2.1 Genealogy – the what

To understand how we have become what we are requires, following Foucault, not a theory but an ‘analytics’ which examines how technologies of power and knowledge have, since antiquity, intertwined and developed in concrete and historical frameworks. (Deacon, 2002, p. 89)

Foucault has a formidable reputation, and multiple interpretations of his work are possible. There is no shortage of texts, treatises, essays and polemics on what, exactly, he was trying to achieve. But some have nonetheless argued that Foucault was basically, or before all else, a historian. As Mark Poster (1982) wrote, in *Foucault and History*; ‘Although Foucault’s work is read by anthropologists, sociologists, psychologists, philosophers, literary critics, and

historians, the basic impact of his work is historical.’ Noirel (1994) suggests a more nuanced reading, arguing that ‘misunderstandings... continued to pit Foucault against historians’ (p. 549) and that this misunderstanding was, in essence, that ‘historians underestimated the fundamentally philosophical nature of Foucault’s work.’ (Revel, in Noirel, p. 549)

The disciplinary contradictions in Foucault's work suggest multiple, perhaps infinite, readings and rereading's of the work. Tamboukou (1999) points out that there is ‘... a vast literature related to the genealogical method as well as various readings of it, which, although not always outright contradictory, unfold the Foucauldian method in various dimensions’ (pp. 3-4)

In *Nietzsche, Genealogy, History*, Foucault (1977) argued ‘that genealogy is effective history understood as the “affirmation of knowledge as perspective”’ (p. 90). Foucault offers a new way of thinking about history, writing history, and deploying history in current political struggles. Poster (1982) suggests that:

If Foucault is the *enfant terrible* who would destroy the human sciences, he is also one of their most fascinating practitioners, reshaping their contours according to an original if most peculiar historical practice. Foucault is an antihistorical historian, one who, in writing history, threatens every canon of the craft. (p.116)

It is, in that context at least, wryly amusing that Foucault once introduced himself to an audience of historians saying, ‘I am not a professional historian: nobody is perfect’ (cited in Megill, 1987, p. 117)

This section sets out to organise a pragmatic and useful understanding of genealogy; firstly, by articulating what is distinctive about genealogy as an analytical historical process, secondly by articulating why it provides a suitable methodology to explore the evolution of the English art school and thirdly, by outlining how this methodology will be applied to an examination of the historical evolution of the English art school system. As well as Foucault’s own often gnostic texts several scholars have become essential guides and inseparable companions in my attempts to grapple with genealogy. I am deeply indebted, then, to Rabinow (1991); Tamboukou (1999); Prado (2000); Koopman (2013); Dean (2015); and Ball (1990, 2013a, 2016a) in providing entry points and maps to the genealogical labyrinth. With no background in the social sciences, history or philosophy, I have often felt lost at sea, and these scholars have provided maps and a compass by which I can attempt to navigate. Much reassurance has been taken from Tamboukou’s pragmatic suggestion that ‘there is no way of truly understanding what genealogy is about, other than by concentrating on a genealogy per se... This is the first stage

that inevitably leads to the adventure of writing one's own genealogy.' (Tamboukou, 1999, p.40)

In his 1971 essay, *Nietzsche, Genealogy, History*, Foucault took Nietzsche's work on genealogy as a starting point for a radical reinterpretation of the historical method. As Prado writes:

Nietzsche's inversion of the particular over the universal was a philosophical revolution as momentous as Kant's "Copernican" inversion of the subjective over the objective. Foucault emulates Nietzsche with three inversions of his own. He inverts interpretative significance of the marginal over the ostensibly central; he inverts the constructed over the supposedly natural; and he inverts the originaive importance of the accidental over the allegedly inevitable. (p.33)

According to Prado, Foucault 'effectively articulates the basic conception of his own genealogy in expounding Nietzsche's. He continues by suggesting that: 'Foucault develops Nietzsche's idea that history is misconceived as "an attempt to capture the exact essence of things." He argues that history is flawed if conducted as a search for origins in the sense of essential beginnings.' (Prado, 2000, p.33) Foucault builds from his reading of the Nietzschean concepts of *Ursprung* – origin, *Herkunft* – descent and *Entstehung* – emergence, as foundational principles by which to move beyond the traditional conception of history. In his view:

The purpose of history, guided by genealogy, is not to discover the roots of our identity, but to commit itself to its dissipation. It does not seek to define our unique threshold of emergence, the homeland to which metaphysicians promise a return; it seeks to make visible all of those discontinuities that cross us. (1977b, p. 95)

As Ball (2013) says:

Taking his lead from Nietzsche, Foucault's genealogy also consists of a refusal of continuities and of organizing principles to history, there is no timeless and essential secret to be uncovered by history, indeed this is an adolescent quest, he says. (p.33)

Perhaps the most succinct articulation of genealogical intent, and the guiding principle behind this thesis, comes from Hook (2005):

Genealogy thus is not directed primarily towards the cultivation of knowledge and certainly not the 'discovery of truth' but rather towards the generation of critique. (p. 7)

Ursprung - origin

Foucault constantly warns against the seduction of the origin as 'the site of truth' 'the moment of greatest perfection' that is 'always precedes the Fall.' (Foucault, 1977b, p. 79) and asks: 'Why does Nietzsche challenge the pursuit of the origin (*Ursprung*), at least on those occasions when he is truly a genealogist? First, because it is an attempt to capture the exact essence of

things, their purest possibilities, and their carefully protected identities; because this search assumes the existence of immobile forms that precede the external world of accident and succession. The search is directed to “that which was already there”. Foucault suggests an alternate strategy and says:

...if the genealogist refuses to extend his faith to metaphysics, if he listens to history, he finds there is “something altogether different” behind things: not a timeless and essential secret, but the secret that they have no essence, or that their essence was fabricated in a piecemeal fashion from alien forms. (1977b, p. 79)

History is far from divine, growing instead from a multitude of local concerns, shaded by personal enmities, prone to multiple interpretations and revisions before solidifying into the accepted prevalent historical view.

Herkunft – descent

As much as the easy seduction of the purity of the origin is to be resisted, then so to the easy linearity of *Herkunft* – Foucault suggest that Nietzsche uses this interchangeably with origin – but it more precisely denotes descent, or a lineage, heritage or inheritance. In tracing any historical movement across time, there will appear to be an almost linear advancement or development. Foucault identifies that ‘the analysis of *Herkunft* often involves a consideration of race or social type.’ From the genealogist’s point of view, however, it more apposite to consider that:

the traits it attempts to identify are not the exclusive generic characteristics of an individual, a sentiment, or an idea... rather, it seeks the subtle, singular, and subindividual marks that might possibly intersect in them to form a network that is difficult to unravel. (Foucault, 1977b, p. 81)

This network is a much more complex visualisation of history than is suggested by the more linear evocation of descent. In this spiderweb of connections, this ‘hourglass of threads’ (Koopman, 2013 p.48) there are multiple beginnings, endings and reversals that can be followed and unravelled which ‘permits the discovery, under the unique aspect of a trait or a concept, of the myriad events... through which they were formed.’ (Foucault, 1977b, p. 81) More than this is the acknowledgment that these events, however seemingly insignificant, are what constitutes the historical momentum and should be accorded their proper place in the schema:

To follow the complex course of descent is to maintain passing events in their proper dispersion; it is to identify the accidents, the minute deviations – or conversely, the complete reversals – the errors, the false appraisals, and the faulty calculations that gave birth to those things that continue to exist and have value for us; it is to discover

that truth or being does not lie at the root of what we know and what we are, but the exteriority of accidents. (p. 81)

In recognising descent as a key conception of the genealogical history, Foucault (1977b) again sounds a note of caution; to maintain the proper order of events and incidents and to avoid deploying history to suggest an unbroken, inevitable sequence of events that lead steadily towards the present; ‘Genealogy does not pretend to go back in time to restore an unbroken continuity that operates beyond the dispersion of forgotten things; its duty is not to demonstrate that the past exists in the present, that it continues secretly to animate the present, having imposed a predetermined form on all its vicissitudes’ (p. 81). He further cautions that:

Genealogy does not resemble the evolution of a species and does not map the destiny of a people. On the contrary, to follow the complex course of descent is to maintain passing events in their proper dispersion; it is to identify the accidents, the minute deviations – or conversely, the complete reversals – the errors, the false appraisals, and the faulty calculations that gave birth to those things that continue to exist and have value for us; it is to discover that truth or being does not lie at the root of what we know and what we are, but the exteriority of accidents. (p. 81)

Entstehung – emergence

The third element of the conceptual model Foucault identifies in Nietzsche’s Genealogy is *Entstehung* or emergence, the moment of arising. Again, whilst recognizing its significance as one of the key conceptual elements through which to understand history, Foucault cautions:

As it is wrong to search for descent in an uninterrupted continuity, we should avoid thinking of emergence as the final term of a historical development... These developments may appear as a culmination, but they are merely the current episodes in a series of subjugations... (1977b, p. 83)

There are points at which the web of connections and events intersect and diverge at a tangent, reverse direction or throw off multiple new threads. These are the points of emergence, ‘a particular stage of forces’ when new forces emerge and interact with previous forces, bringing about new historical energies. ‘Emergence is thus the entry of forces; it is their eruption, the leap from the wings to centre stage... (p. 84) Foucault suggests that ‘The analysis of the *Entstehung* must delineate this interaction, the struggle these forces wage against each other or against adverse circumstances, and the attempt to avoid degeneration and regain strength by dividing these forces against themselves. (p. 83)

Thus, emergence gives us a way to talk about discrete historical phenomena in their serial contexts. As the appearance or manifestation of an event, it invites discussions of force and power to enter history, helping genealogy to understand episodic relations of domination.

Wirkliche Historie – effective history

What the close analysis of *Nietzsche Genealogy History* does is construct a new historical process that:

articulates or makes sayable and visible, that is conceptually available, the problematizations of our present. Genealogy thus involves the articulation of that which comprises a singular problematization out of a multiplicity of otherwise disentangled elements. (Koopman, 2013, p. 24)

Foucault resists the temptations of the divine, magical linear historical process which seems to offer reconciliation in the present, in favour of one which refutes those positions as false; ‘The traditional devices for constructing a comprehensive view of history and for retracing the past as a patient and continuous development must be systematically dismantled. Necessarily we must dismiss those tendencies that encourage the consoling play of recognitions.’ (Foucault, 1971, p. 88). The new historical process is inscribed as being “Effective” history’ which ‘differs from traditional history in being without constants’ (p. 86). Foucault can be seen to be using the term ‘traditional history’ as a shorthand for what he viewed at that point as the dominant approach taken in historiography. Explicitly, Foucault suggests that ‘The intention is to compile an ‘effective history’ ... “starting from questions posed in the present”’. (Foucault, in Ball, 2013, p. 38).

This historical process ‘can also invert the relationship that traditional history, in its dependence on metaphysics, establishes between proximity and distance.’ It does this by paying close attention to the overlooked, the unsaid, the profane and local, inverting the classical traditional model of history which ‘is given to a contemplation of the distances and heights: the noblest periods, the highest forms, the most abstract ideas, the purest individualities... Effective history, on the other hand, shortens its vision to those things nearest to it... (Foucault, in Rabinow, 1991 p. 89). As Tamboukou puts it:

as opposed to grand historical events, the genealogical search renders itself attentive to details, many of them having remained unnoticed and unrecorded in the narratives of mainstream history. By rejecting the teleological view of history, genealogy celebrates the philosophy of the event. The way things are is just an event, a random result of the interweaving of relations of power and domination. Genealogy as a method of analysis searches in the maze of dispersed events to trace discontinuities, recurrences and play where traditional historiography sees continuous development, progress and seriousness. (p. 207)

Finally, effective history refuses to pretend to have objective, immaculate conceptions of history. Rather than deploy what might be viewed as the subterfuge of objectivity, Foucault

exemplifies Nietzsche's version of 'historical sense (that) is explicit in its perspective and acknowledges its system of injustice'.

A key Nietzschean insight for Foucault is that truth cannot be separated from the procedures governing its production. The philosopher's task is therefore to criticise, diagnose and demythologise 'truth phenomena'. Consequently, genealogy is concerned with the processes, procedures and apparatuses by which truth and knowledge are produced, in what Foucault calls the discursive regime of the modern era. (Tamboukou, 1999, p. 2) Tamboukou further states that, 'the more the analysis breaks down practices, the easier it becomes to find out more about their interrelation, while this process can never have a final end.' (p. 8) 'Doing... history this way means avoiding the search for depth, and rather having a focus on the superficial, that is on details, on the nitty-gritty, but certainly not the trivial (Dreyfuss & Rabinow, 1983, in Ball, 2013a, p. 38) As Ball suggests, 'this gives rise to a primary focus on practices rather than laws, on discourses rather than rhetorics, on techniques and procedures rather than structures' (p. 38). This analytical insight underpins the final segment of this section, where I consider *how* to do genealogy. This will inform the analysis to be carried out on the evolution of the English art school system. The analysis, then, will consider the intersection between the 'practice of art school' (my lived experience) and the emergence of 'the idea of art school' as a set of discursive formations with historical origins. The point being, as outlined below, to disconcert or at least disturb the present as a means to better understand 'current dangers.'

A History of the Present

'The point' as Ball (2013) puts it, 'is not to make sense of our history in the present but to make it unacceptable. It is about questioning the history that enfolds us, as a violent imposition of truth'. (p. 87) In *Critical and Effective Histories*, Mitchell Dean (2015) examines Foucault's genealogies through the problematics that arise from the use of history in sociological research. Dean reflects on the ontology of genealogy as a 'history of the present' and traces the relations of archaeology and genealogy as a key step that reveals the potential of its genealogical method, to act as a critical and effective history.

The phrase 'history of the present', and the conception to which it points, first appear towards the end of the opening chapter of *Discipline and Punish* (Foucault, 1977a). As Garland (2014) suggests, 'the idea of a 'history of the present' sounds paradoxical at first, and in some ways provocative' (p. 367). Genealogy has been used to show quite effectively that some of our usually taken-for-granted ways of thinking about things are contingent products of messy

history. (Koopman, 2013) Writing the history of the present is another matter. As Dreyfus and Rabinow (1982, p. 119) remark, ‘This approach explicitly and self-consciously begins with a diagnosis of the current situation. There is an unequivocal and unabashed contemporary orientation.’ Or, as Foucault explained to an interviewer in 1984: ‘I set out from a problem expressed in the terms current today and I try to work out its genealogy. Genealogy means that I begin my analysis from a question posed in the present’ (in Kritzman, 1988, p. 262)

2.2 Genealogy – the why

Genealogies articulate problems. But not just any problems. Genealogies do not, for instance, take up those problems that come with supposed solutions readily apparent, or those problems that appear difficult to many but are simple for those few who are in the know. Genealogies are generally not targeted at problems that are themselves readily apparent to everyone or even just to everyone who ought to know them. Genealogies are concerned, rather, with submerged problems. (Koopman, 2013, p. 1)

The evolution of the English art school is of necessity a historical project. It is also irreducibly a social project, and even a cursory examination will show contested origins, progressions, reversals and sudden tangents – it is not a simple, tidy, linear progression either from nor towards a singular immaculate manifestation. As outlined in the previous section, Foucault’s development of the Nietzschean genealogy is eminently suitable for such a history. As Tamboukou (1999) says;

Genealogy conceives human reality as an effect of the interweaving of certain historical and cultural practices, which it sets out to trace and explore. Instead of seeing history as a continuous development of an ideal schema, genealogy is oriented to discontinuities. (p. 3)

Several scholars allude to the eminent suitability of Foucault’s genealogies for examining education as a historically located system of practices. In ‘*Truth, Power and Pedagogy: Michel Foucault on the rise of the disciplines*’, Deacon (2002) writes:

While little of Foucault’s work directly concerns itself with the historically recent phenomenon of mass-based, school-centred, state-sponsored education, it is argued here that it is both possible and useful to distil from Foucault’s oeuvre an account of the centrality of the pedagogical relationship to the rise of western political rationalities, from ancient times to the present (p. 435).

Stephen Ball has also explored the potential for utilising Foucault’s Genealogies to explore education, notably in ‘*Foucault, Power and Education*’ (Ball 2012), and in earlier work with Maria Tamboukou (2003). These writers will feature frequently throughout this section. In ‘*Applying Foucault to Education*’, Audrey Devine-Eller also suggests fruitful possibilities for applying a genealogical approach to the study of education history, and states: ‘Though

Foucault himself never wrote an extended history of the institution of education, he easily could have done. Education... is fundamental in shaping modern western society and its effect on subjects.’ (Devine-Eller, 2004, p. 1)

As Devine-Eller points out, ‘As Foucault insisted, since the prison is so inept at its stated goal of reforming prisoners, there must be some other goal’ and states her intention to ‘focus not on education’s stated goals, but on its often-implicit actual results.’ (p. 1) This will also form part of my work in later chapters. Deacon (2002) also suggests that:

Foucault’s work makes possible a new and multifaceted history of education that goes beyond conventional, usually progressive, narratives to expose contingencies and discontinuities as much as imperatives and continuities. (p. 435)

Again, this will be further explored in later chapters but it seems worth highlighting at this early stage as being particularly resonant in relation to understanding the peculiarities and contradictions that will be mapped out in the historical evolution of the art school system.

My intention in this thesis is to look closely at the English art school with particular attention paid to its multiple origins, descents and emergences. All of these tangled roots and branches have a bearing on what the art school became, and none of them are entitled to an unchallenged dominance regarding the identity of the art school. So then, given that the premise is that the art school has no singular origin, nor ‘final truth’, a deliberate choice was made to use genealogy because of the disturbances to perception and (self-)understanding that it might facilitate. As Tamboukou (1999) says:

A starting point of genealogy is that historically there are no final 'truths' about our nature or the norms our reason dictates to us and therefore there is no essential, natural or inevitable way of grouping or classifying people. In this line of analysis, the genealogist does not look beyond or behind historical practices to find a simple unity of meaning or function, or a changeless significance of ourselves and the world around us. The aim is rather to look more closely at the workings of those practices in which moral norms and truths about ourselves have been constructed. (p. 8)

As Foucault (1980) wrote:

Genealogy prioritises the study of the dynamics of descent and emergence. This implies that the genealogist should target discontinuity rather than continuity in the historical record. The genealogist uses descent as a means of “discovery, under the unique aspect of a trait or a concept, of the myriad events through which - thanks to which, against which – they were formed.” (p. 147)

He also states:

an analysis of descent therefore does not seek to re-appropriate history. Rather, it desires to “identify the accidents, the minute deviations – or conversely, the complete

reversals – the errors, the false appraisals, and the faulty calculations which gave birth to those things that exist and continue to have value for us.” (p. 146)

Thus, an analysis of descent allows the tracing of discontinuity by showing up a series of reversals, ruptures and contingencies that underpin the historical object or event of discourse in question (Bowman, 2005). For Foucault, the emergence of an object or a discourse into the historical framework for analysis does not imply that these represent an origin of any kind. In fact, under the genealogical method, the category of the origin is regarded as a metaphysical invention. As will be shown in chapter 3, the metaphysical invention of ancient origin, collated and given lasting authority by being rendered into text (which persists even after the life of its author has passed) underpins a number of threads that interweave to form art school history. In particular this brought about the development – and continuation into the modern age – of a number of key pedagogic practices and doctrinal hierarchies.

In *What is Genealogy*, Mark Bevir (2008) articulates a number of key points that suggest the suitability of genealogy for my thesis. He argues that:

genealogy is a mode of knowledge associated with radical historicism. More particularly, a genealogy is a critique of ideas and practices that hide the contingency of human life behind formal ahistorical or developmental perspectives. As critical narratives, genealogies are committed to the truth of radical historicism and, perhaps more provisionally, the truth of their own empirical content. (p. 274)

Genealogy also concerns itself with the identification and analysis of problems, as Koopman (2013) puts it:

those problems found below the surface of our lives – the problems whose itches feel impenetrable, whose remedies are ever just beyond our grasp, and whose very articulations require a severe work of thought. These submerged problems are those that condition us without our fully understanding why or how. They are depth problems in that they are lodged deep inside of us all as the historical conditions of possibility of our present ways of doing, being and thinking. Yet despite their depth, these problems are also right at the surface insofar as they condition us in our every action, our every quality, our every thought, our every sadness and smile. (p. 1)

In as much as the evolution – and subsequent disappearance – of the art school represent a ‘problem’ in my life, art school being one of ‘those things that exist and continue to have value for us’ (Foucault, 1980a, p. 146), then genealogy provides an analytical framework to investigate this phenomenon. The *idea* of art school continues to exist in as much as it is a fundamental part of my identity, and informs my daily practice; it is of value to me as a signifier of who I am, especially so in opposition to the dominant culture of the institution in which I

work. It also no longer exists as a physical entity, nor an institution. Its traces linger in practice and values.

However, Dean sounds a note of caution, that ‘the pertinence of this ‘history of the present’ to historical sociologies is the capacity of such history to be situated in an illumination of present reality *without invoking the themes of memory, tradition, and foundations*, and making history the haven in which the constituent subject finds reconciliation. (Dean, 1994 p. 20, my emphasis)

This concept of problematization – which will be explored more fully in the next section – is key to the ‘why’ for deploying genealogy as an appropriate analytical process to examine the history of the English art school, allowing, as it does, full examination not only of the circumstances of the evolution and disappearance of the art school, but also the intellectual capacity to begin to see how the present might be constituted differently. Tamboukou (1999) suggests that ‘Foucault has written that a starting point for 'doing genealogies' should be to focus on a particular problem and then try to see it in its historical dimension; how this problem turned out to be the way we perceive it today’ (p. 13). According to Tamboukou (1999):

Dreyfus and Rabinow (1982) point out that in searching for the problem the analyst should identify some socially shared 'discomfort' about how things are going. Of course, there is always the problem that not all social groups can have shared concerns. The perspective of the analyst is decisive in focusing on a particular problem and this should be admitted and used by the analyst in an attempt to deconstruct possible arbitrary personal feelings and stances with regard to his/her project. (p.13)

The central problem this thesis attempts to articulate is the ongoing (and increasing) alienation I feel in relation to my practice; how much of this resides in the sublimation of unconscious and hidden historical phenomena and values is the subject of the genealogical process.

Koopman (2013) suggests that one of the key aspects of genealogy which is overlooked or underappreciated relates to its potential to rethink future possibilities:

getting clear on the distinction between the fact that our practices are contingent and the history of how these same practices were composed goes a long way toward recognizing the broader import of genealogy. For if genealogy helps us to see how our present was made, it also thereby equips us with some of the tools we would need for beginning the labor of remaking our future differently. (p.130)

This is a key insight, and one that is central to adopting genealogy not only as a historical technique, but also a process of critique with the capacity to constructively remake ourselves. As Koopman (2013) writes, ‘merely knowing that some construction contingently came into

being does not equip us with much if our goal is to remake that construction.’ (p. 130) In relation to the specific problematization of the thesis - the increasing alienation I experience as my practice and values increasingly conflict with present trends in my localised situation - the development of mental ‘tools’ becomes a strategy for reshaping the current experience in order to make it survivable, and to reshape my ‘self’ in response to the conflict at the intersection of ‘self’ and experience.

As Garland (2014) says:

Foucault’s genealogies have, as their starting points, some quite concrete and specific critical observations about the present, and, more particularly, about the analyst’s object of study as it is constructed and experienced in the present. These genealogies begin with a certain puzzlement or discomfiture about practices or institutions that others take for granted. (p. 379)

What that entails for this thesis is recognition that, as Garland (2014) also suggests:

a history of the present always involves a critical distancing from the present, an analytical description of the current situation within which the object of study is constructed and experienced in the present, and a specific problematization that views that object as puzzling in ways that can be made less puzzling by means of historical inquiry. (p. 379)

To reiterate a key conception, Foucault wrote what he called ‘a history of the present’ and within that was the potential to facilitate change within that present. One facilitates change by fashioning concepts that are adequate to that which one would transform. One fashions transformative concepts through inquiry guided by analytic constraint. It is the patient labour of inquiry that gives both form and freedom to the work of severe thought. (Koopman and Matza, 2013) As Garland (2014) says:

Genealogy’s aim is to trace the struggles, displacements and processes of repurposing out of which contemporary practices emerged, and to show the historical conditions of existence upon which present-day practices depend.’ (p. 379)

And Foucault himself, interviewed in 1979, said ‘experience has taught me that the history of various forms of rationality is sometimes more effective in unsettling our certitudes and dogmatism than is abstract criticism’ (in Kritzman, 1988, p. 83)

As Garland (2014) stated:

It is within this genealogical framework that a ‘history of the present’ operates. A history of the present begins by identifying a present-day practice that is both taken for granted and yet, in certain respects, problematic or somehow unintelligible and then seeks to trace the power struggles that produced them. (p. 373)

He continues:

Genealogy is motivated not by a historical concern to understand the past – though any historical claims it makes must be valid, verifiable ones – but instead by a critical concern to understand the present. *It aims to trace the forces that gave birth to our present-day practices and to identify the historical conditions upon which they still depend.* Its point is not to think historically about the past but rather to use historical materials to rethink the present. (p. 373, my emphasis)

In sum, then, ‘why’ utilise genealogy as an appropriate analytical framework through which to explore the evolution of the English art school? It is the capacity for genealogy not only to provide a historical account, but to locate that account in relation to contemporary practices and to facilitate a critical position in relation to the object of investigation. As Bevir (2018) says: ‘genealogy allows for an appropriate self-reflexivity’ and continues: ‘Arguably, the main advantage of this theory of genealogy is simply that it focuses attention on philosophical issues.’ (p. 275) In *Emergence*, (2006) Hacking explicitly stated that ‘(e)mergence is about the past, yes, but it is subtitled a *Philosophical Study*. I never called it history’ (para. 5). Genealogy can be seen to mark the entrance of the philosophical to the realm of history.

Michael Roth (1981, p. 43) puts it, ‘Writing a history of the present means writing history in the present; self-consciously writing in a field of power relations and political struggle.’ It requires that the genealogist suspends attachment to the value of things. As Allen (2014) states:

Genealogy makes a deliberate choice; it refuses to speak of the future, seeking instead to destabilise the present. If it were to remark upon the future, it would have to develop normative commitments that would retroactively jeopardise the project in which it was engaged. According to this project, genealogy seeks to break down our various infatuations with the present, and our longings for the golden ages of the past. It demonstrates the profound historical contingency of all we hold dear and seeks to destabilise all that we think of as stable or proper. Beyond this it will not go. (p. 26)

In the case of this thesis, this requires me to suspend my attachment to any value that I had previously ascribed to the art school as an institution or art education as an especially noble discursive formation. This is not an easy task, and it is not undertaken lightly; the act of destabilisation carries with it risks and threats to my current conception of myself, and the outcome of that cannot be foreseen.

2.3 Genealogy – the how

We conclude by conjuring an image of our philosopher, intent and curious, hunched over a book, somewhere in a far corner of a sprawling archive, chasing the elusive trail of a fact... These chases are not for pure facts that will demonstrate some grand salvific idea. They are chases for a better understanding of some humble aspect of our present that, however, may turn out to be more grand, because more gripping, than we had imagined. (Koopman, Matza, 2013, p. 839)

Genealogy, consequently, requires patience and a knowledge of details, and it depends on a vast accumulation of source material. (Foucault, in Rabinow, 1991, p. 76)

In the previous sections I have outlined what genealogy is and why it is an appropriate analytical framework for the area of research. In this third section I will explore how this researcher might do a genealogical study of the English art school system, and I will do so by investigating a number of texts and authors who have previously attempted to outline how to do genealogy. Once again, I am not setting out to deal specifically with Foucault; that is ground well covered by others. Rather, I am attempting to glean from the many writings about Foucault's genealogies, how to actually enact a genealogy, to construct a road map, or deduce a set of instructions, directions, hints and suggestions as to the act itself. In purposely not engaging at length with Foucault, and instead trying to effectively utilise his analytical process, I am consciously invoking Koopman and Matza's statement of intent:

The larger point of our taxonomic approach... is twofold. First, it highlights how diverse and flexible Foucault's thought is; *it can be used in ways that need not be squared with every last aspect of Foucault's own work. Inquirers can and should take what they need from Foucault while leaving the rest to the side.* Second, the taxonomy shows that *we can do this with a good conscience, but only to the extent that we are self-reflective in doing so.* (Koopman, Matza, 2013, p. 831 my emphases)

Genealogy requires the researcher to approach the research question from the historical record and the current position simultaneously, attempting to use each position to inform and reform the other. Attention is duly paid not only to what was said, but also what was left unsaid, or unwritten, or excluded from the record. The gaps and absences, the voices of those that resist, or are removed from the record are as revealing as the traces that are allowed. As Koopman says, the starting position is this: 'The genealogist wants to know how that which existed came into existence in the first place.' (Koopman, 2017, p. 354) And more, as Gehl asks: "why this; why now?" These sorts of questions compel us to start with our current moment and start working backwards, tracing ways of thinking, practices, and objects back through time. Why is this practice, idea, or technology knowable now? What sorts of practices or ideas does it suppress or silence? How did those practices or ideas or technologies come to be suppressed or silenced?' (Gehl, in Koopman, 2017) Foucault has written that a starting point for 'doing genealogies' should be to focus on a particular problem and then try to see it in its historical dimension; how this problem turned out to be the way we perceive it today.

As outlined in the introduction, the art school has essentially disappeared as a physical artefact and - except in the living memory of a diminishing group of participants - as a distinctive educational experience. Therefore, any exploration of it is now reliant on an exploration of

archival text; plans, communications, policy papers, statement and counter-statement, polemics, discussions in the press, reminiscences, books, journals, articles and reference to my own unreliable memory – the wider discourse of the art school in the historical record. This needs to be carefully addressed, as using a Foucauldian process requires attention not only to the archive but acknowledgement/acceptance of, as Ganahl (in Koopman, 2017) remarks, Foucault's 'non-methodology.' For Ganahl, Foucault is not at all a systematic philosopher:

I see him as a historian driven by philosophical questions, his concepts emerge from archival studies. I really like that, it's one of the main reasons I'm attached to his work. It can be really frustrating, however, to realize that even main concepts like 'statement', 'discourse' or 'archive' are not properly defined in his writings. (in Koopman, 2017, p. 6)

Hook (2005) provides an insight into the conception of genealogy that informs this thesis:

Foucault offers us less than a structured 'methodology' of genealogy. What he does offer is a set of profound philosophical and methodological suspicions toward the objects of knowledge that we confront, a set of suspicions that stretch to our relationships to such objects, and to the uses to which such related knowledges are put. Foucault's genealogical method, in short, is a methodology of suspicion and critique, an array of defamiliarizing procedures and reconceptualizations that pertain not just to any object of knowledge, but to any procedure of knowledge production. (pp. 4-5)

If we attend carefully to Foucault's analysis, we discover that his diagnostic account of our contemporary experience involves two crucial elements, each of which he would subsequently investigate by means of genealogical inquiries. First is a specification of an apparatus of regulation; second is the identification of a historically specific 'problematization.' (Garland, 2014)

The Dispositif

Foucault (1988) suggested that a starting point for doing genealogies should be to focus on a particular problem, and then to try to see it in its historical dimension:

'I set out from a problem expressed in the terms current today and I try to work out its genealogy. Genealogy means that I begin my analysis from a question posed in the present.' (p. 262)

'Following the first step of isolating the problem', Tamboukou suggests:

the analyst is tracing the current practices that could relate to the diagnosed 'problem' and finally she or he is trying to formulate the network of relations between the practices and the problem. Situating the problem in a system of relations that can account for the socially shared discomfort is a turning point for 'doing genealogy' and is immediately related to the Foucauldian methodological concept of *dispositif*. (p. 13)

Dispositif is, as Dreyfus and Rabinow (1982) suggest:

(a) troublesome term (that) has no satisfactory English equivalent. Foucault's translators have employed "apparatus," a word that conveys Foucault's pragmatic concern that concepts be used as tools to aid in analysis, not as ends in themselves. But it remains excessively vague. (p. 120)

Dreyfus and Rabinow suggest instead of apparatus, the term 'grid of intelligibility' whilst 'acknowledging that the disadvantage of this translation is that it underestimates Foucault's attempt to reveal something about the practices themselves.' (p. 120) As Foucault sees it:

a dispositif is a system of relations that can be established between heterogeneous elements, discursive and non-discursive practices, 'the said as well as the un said' and A dispositif can include 'discourses, institutions, architectural arrangements, regulations, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophic propositions, morality, philanthropy, etc.' (Foucault, in Gordon, 1980, p. 194).

There is always 'an urgent need' (Foucault, in Gordon, 1980, p. 195) to which the functioning of the dispositif responds: 'the dispositif is essentially of a strategic nature, which means assuming that it is a matter of a certain manipulation of relations of forces, either developing in a particular direction, blocking them, stabilising them, utilising them, etc.' (Foucault, in Gordon, 1980, p. 196). Being inscribed in a play of power the dispositif also relates to certain types of knowledge that derive from it, but also condition it. In Foucault's view therefore, the analyst has a dispositif when she or he has succeeded in isolating a cluster of power relations sustaining and being sustained by certain types of knowledge (Foucault, in Gordon, 1980, p. 196).

Deleuze has underlined two important consequences arising from a philosophy of dispositif:

the rejection of universals and a drive away from the Eternal and towards the new. As he has pointed out, in each dispositif it is necessary to distinguish the historical part, what we are (what we are already no longer) and the current part, what we are in the process of becoming (Deleuze, in Armstrong, 1992, pp. 163-164).

The dispositif, then, is 'a grid of analysis constructed by the historian. But it is also the practices themselves, acting as an apparatus, a tool, constituting subjects and organizing them.' (Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982, p. 121)

Tamboukou (1999) suggests that:

In posing genealogical questions one can never be sure that one could ultimately find any 'satisfactory answers'. This is the risk, the adventure and the fascination of the exercise' (p. 14).

Although the art school system has disappeared as a physical institution, its doctrines, practices and values continue to shape my present experience and that of my colleagues and students. This is the present that needs to be disturbed, where the problem at the heart of the thesis lies

hidden. In part, any subsequent exploration of it is of necessity an archival expedition. As Foucault stated: 'Genealogy is gray, meticulous, and patiently documentary. It operates in a field of entangled and confused parchments, on documents that have been scratched over and recopied many times.' (Foucault, 1977b, p. 145) It is an irony that the art school system, concerned as it was primarily with the production of visual artefacts (at least until its very latter years, arguably) now must render up its hidden history through the retrieval and perusal of written texts. The system can now only be imperfectly retrieved through close attention to the texts, the traces of 'the processes, procedures, and apparatuses whereby truth and knowledge are produced.' (Tamboukou, Ball, 2003, p.4)

Problematization

In a 1983 interview cited in Koopman (2013), Foucault states:

I am trying to analyse the way institutions, practices, habits, and behaviour become a problem... the history of thought is the analysis of the way an unproblematic field of experience, or a set of practices, which were accepted without question, which were familiar and 'silent', out of discussion, becomes a problem, raises discussion and debate, incites new reactions, and induces a crisis in the previously silent behaviour, habits, practices, and institutions. (p. 94)

As Koopman suggested, 'the historical events that the genealogist studies are complex constructions formed at the intersection of a multiplicity of temporal vectors. The genealogist thus recovers time through the lens of the contingent and complex intersections that form eventalizations or what Foucault would later call problematizations.' (pp. 358-9) Garland (2014) further suggests that problematization is essential to the effective implementation of genealogy:

One of the most vital aspects of scholarly practice is the identification and specification of productive research questions. And though this point is rarely noted, much of the critical efficacy of Foucault genealogies is attributable not to his historical analyses but instead to his initial specification of the problem to be explained. (Garland, 2014)

And further:

Anyone wishing to adopt Foucault's approach ought to be aware of this preliminary work of diagnosis, conceptualization, and problematization because effective genealogy depends upon it. (Garland, 2014, p. 367)

According to Koopman and Matza (2013), Foucault asserted that *problematization* was the term that offered 'the best general account of his analyses of historical conditions of possibility.' (p. 827)

They further suggest that:

Problematization focuses inquiry on the problematic conditions of possibility that both motivate and constrain the elaboration of responsive practices. For a history of problematizations, the primary objects of inquiry are assemblages of problems and practices. The idea is that problems at the depths induce practices and that, in turn, surface practices reciprocally entrench their own depth conditions. (p. 827)

They also suggest that for Foucault, ‘a problematization is both an *object of inquiry* and an *act of inquiry*.’ (p. 827)

2.4 The value of genealogy for this inquiry

In genealogical analysis, reason is a complex phenomenon which can neither be rejected nor accepted wholesale. Knowledge and truth exist but only as they apply to specific situations. Thus, the genealogical perspective is embedded in ‘the relation between forms of discourse, the historical struggle in which they are immersed, the institutional practices to which they are linked, and the forms of authority they presuppose’ (Dean, 1994, p. 71)

The genealogical approach isolates the contingent power relations which make it possible for particular assertions to operate as absolute truths. It is ‘the history of problematizations, that is the history of the way in which things become a problem’ (Foucault, 1996, p.414). Genealogical investigation can disrupt the periodizations and unity of domains embedded in traditional history. Genealogy reveals discontinuities, recurrences, and unexpected backlashes as well as unexpected continuities: ‘the unearthing of discontinuities between systems of knowledge is not an assumption of [Foucault’s] method, but a consequence of it’ (Davidson, 1986, p. 223) Genealogy is a history without constants. (Tamboukou and Ball, 2003, p. 7)

As the next chapter will show, the history of the English art school is temporally lengthy, repeatedly contested, has multiple origins and multiple implicit and explicit purposes. To do this complexity justice requires a philosophical and analytical framework that is expansive enough to encompass this dense network of events, actions, and discourse but also rigorous enough to avoid falsely romanticizing the history, to solemnly declare some authentic origin, or to justify some fanciful reconciliation and consolation. Such an analytic must also be capable of sustaining self-reflection, recognizing the author’s centrality to the interpretation of the events being studied, and also provide for the capacity to rethink contemporary situations.

In focusing my attention on the emergence of genealogy as a set of methodological strategies for research, I have come to the conclusion that there is no way of truly understanding what genealogy is about, other than by concentrating on a genealogy per se... This is the first stage that inevitably leads to the adventure of writing one’s own genealogy. (Tamboukou, 1999, p. 40)

In the next chapters, I will outline the emergence of the English art school system; firstly, by recounting the early formation of the artist as a subject requiring educating; secondly by exploring the early apparatus of regulation; thirdly the English art school in the late-twentieth century as ‘a complex ensemble of norms, knowledges, power relations and practices’ that Foucault (1976) describes as a ‘*dispositif*’. In so doing, I am mindful of what Koopman (2013) has to say regarding genealogy:

A genealogical view presents practices (which are complex compositions of techniques, beliefs, styles, powers, knowledges and ethics) as emerging in and through problematizations and the reconstructive responses provoked by these problematizations. In their nominal dimension, problematization function to render problematic certain old practices at the same time that they establish a basis for the elaboration of certain new practices. Problematizations as such act as a kind of hinge by way of which we transition out of old practices and into new ones. They function as the basis on which both old practices recede and new practices emerge. (p. 101)

This seems to both describe the English art school as a system in which repeatedly ‘problematization function(s) to render problematic certain old practices at the same time that they establish a basis for the elaboration of certain new practices’ and the phenomenon of its emergence as a system; and in doing so provides the rationale for utilising a genealogical approach as the basis for the enquiry. Additionally, interwoven through the historical account, I will set out to identify the historically specific ‘problematizations’, that is, how the English art school came to be regarded as a specific kind of problem for specific authorities at a certain point in time, and how from those necessary contortions the current situation is arrived at.

3. Classical Antiquity: authenticity and authority

In exploring the emergence of the English art school system in the 20th century, this thesis starts with some rather ancient precursors. These texts are significant in that they permeate the history that art school tells itself and, perhaps more significantly, they continue to inform and shape current practice. I make no attempt to link these fragments systematically, as if aspiring to a comprehensive historical and philosophical account of a period. Rather more modestly, by exploring a number of key historical texts, I intend to trace the passage of fragments and traces of ideas and show how, as they recur over time, these fragments and traces attain a doctrinal strength; they become in some sense the nearest art education has to a foundational discipline.

As Lee, (2016) succinctly put it:

The history of art teaching in Europe can be summarised without serious misrepresentation. It was never complicated, the same fundamental principles applying for at least three millennia. (para. 4)

These ‘fundamental principles’ were transmitted through history, embedded within institutional structures, and later absorbed into the multiple axes of practice and philosophy that coalesced to constitute the art school system in England. This early period can be thought of as the stage in which the idea of a system of education for artists originates in fragmentary texts that, over a period of time, constitute a discursive formation in which the artist emerges as an object that was a distinctly different formation than that of the artisan, which preceded it.

As Lee (2016) says:

We know little of art teaching methods in the classical world, though we can surmise with probable accuracy how the virtuosity of an Apelles or a Praxiteles came about. What alternative can there have been to a system of apprenticeship? It is unlikely that the scores of accomplished, unnamed sculptors working on the Acropolis in, say, 438BC, a year when artistic activity on the evolving Parthenon was at its height, could have been trained in any other way. (para. 6)

The texts examined here, Pliny’s *Naturalis Historia*, 77-79BCE; Cennini’s *Il Libro d’ell Arte*, 1437; and Alberti’s *De Pictura* in 1450; have their roots in still more ancient, recovered texts. This antiquity would be an effective device for establishing an authority on which early art educational doctrine could be founded. The texts considered here should not be considered for their temporal proximity to each other or to the later English art school system; nor should they be considered as if they represented a smooth, evolutionary necessary progression in ideas or

discourse. Instead, they articulate a system of values and knowledge that would run like DNA through art education shaping the future in ways the authors could not have imagined.

Remote though they are, they each contain value statements that are passed on, reinforcing and repeating statements that over time coalesce to form the doctrinal foundations that formulate the idea of the artist. As each is passed on, modifying and adding elements, new knowledge is constructed to suit local contexts. The period from classical antiquity to the renaissance is often portrayed as a period of loss and recovery, from civilisation, through barbarism and then a recovery of civilisation through the rediscovery and application of classical principles. This is a simplification, but also becomes a powerful narrative that provides essential energy to drive developments in the education and practice of art. For the purposes of elucidating an evolving *dispositif*, Foucault's 'heterogenous ensemble', it will be necessary to focus attention on extracting from key texts the 'discourses, institutions, architectural forms, regulatory decisions, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral and philanthropic propositions – in short, 'the said as much as the unsaid' (Foucault; 1977, p. 194) as they appear, reappear, evolve and resolve over time and across multiplying texts.

3.1 Pliny (77CE-79CE): *Naturalis Historia*

Pliny the Elder compiled the *Naturalis Historia* between 77CE and 79CE. Over 37 volumes, the *Naturalis Historia* is 'a comprehensive and learned work, covering as wide a field as Nature herself' (Pliny the Younger, in Firth, 1900: 3, p. 5) and constitutes the single most authoritative source for painting in the antique age. Book 35, *An Account of Paintings and Colours* is situated between Book 34, *The Natural History of Metals* and Book 36, *The Natural History of Stones*.

The *Naturalis Historia* is not only a comprehensive technical treatise on contemporary techniques and materials of painting, assembled from fragments recovered from across the Roman empire; more significantly it also sought to elevate the practice of painting above mere artisanship, and to confer considerable social status on individual painters. It set a precedent for much of the subsequent discourse that informs the development of the English art school. Pliny alludes to the powerful notion of recovering fragments of a lost art and a civilising activity from an earlier civilised age:

I shall begin then with what still remains to be said with reference to painting, an art which was formerly illustrious, when it was held in esteem both by kings and peoples, and ennobling those whom it deigned to transmit to posterity. (Pliny, Chap.1, in Bostock, 1855)

This powerful, romantic vision was to become a recurring motif in the development of art education, it can almost be considered as the base material from which the *idea* of art school is constructed. Subsequently, classical antiquity functions firstly to legitimise claims for art and artists to warrant high social status, secondly to align art and artists with the power holding classes. Artists, as they became dependent on the individual patronage of powerful clients, would use classical iconography to flatter clients and to legitimise their power, and validate their claims to wealth. Thirdly, the notion of rediscovery, or later, *renaissance*, enabled its claimants to differentiate themselves from predecessors, individually and societally. This motif will reappear at frequent, regular intervals in the later chapters, but it is significant to identify the source of its power; the evocation of the power and civilisation of Rome. The fact of the survival of Pliny's *Naturalis Historia* – even if it is only an early version, the final edited version having been lost - is remarkable. Other sources for classical formation remained lost.

Prior to this, there were undoubtedly technical treatises and accounts of artists' work – and, of course, the art work itself. But most were lost. Juba II, client King⁵ of the Roman Province of Numidia⁶ is reputed to have written eight volumes of art treatise called *On Painting*. These may have formed part of Pliny's material, for as Pliny said of his own research, it was:

gained by the perusal of about 2000 volumes, of which a few only are in the hands of the studios, on account of the obscurity of the subjects, procured by the careful perusal of 100 select authors; and to these I have made considerable additions of things, which were either not known to my predecessors, or which have been lately discovered. (35, 1; Dedication)

By accident of survival and recovery, Pliny's work became the seed for subsequent developments, and whatever alternative conceptions of art and artists would remain marginalised at best, or rendered invisible⁷. For the purposes of this thesis, Pliny's work can also be seen to contain within it some foundational myths that will over subsequent reinterpretations and retellings come to shape the discourse around art education, and indeed its eventual discursive formation as a concrete entity.

⁵ The term 'client kings' denotes a range of monarchs and quasi-monarchs of non-Roman peoples who enjoyed a relationship with Rome that was essentially harmonious but unequal.

⁶ Numidia approximates to contemporary north-east Algeria, and perhaps colony would be a more accurate description.

⁷ In using the terms art and artists, it should be remarked that I am quite consciously only referring to the western canon of art as it later applied to the English art school. There were, and are, alternative forms of art and art history that did not rely for their foundation on translations of classical Roman and Greek texts.

Although so much was lost, and that loss is to be regretted, sufficient traces of knowledge remained to be transmitted, in however corrupted, limited or reduced form, through the subsequent centuries in various forms. Numerous, now unknown, artists, artisans and technicians must have made notes on preparations and techniques that were recorded in sufficient permanence as to be recovered and recorded in part by Pliny. Herringham, in her translation of Cennini's *'Il Libro Dell'arte'*, remarked:

Pliny the elder seems to have taken a great interest in painting... He principally compiled from Greek authorities. These scraps of information in Pliny about practical work must have been picked up here and there from craftsmen, or from workshop notebooks, and one such document dating from the period of the Roman Empire has been preserved, namely, the Leyden Papyrus, found in a tomb at Thebes, and dating from the third or fourth century A.D.' (Herringham, xxii, 1899)

The significance of the remarks is twofold; firstly, that Pliny was still being cited as an authoritative source for technique as late as the turn of the 19th Century, and secondly that the source for Pliny's writing was the 'scraps of information' left by craftsmen; artisans, not artists.

Pliny on the origin of Painting and Portraiture

On the origin of painting, Pliny acknowledges – somewhat cursorily, perhaps – the earliest developments of Greece, but dismisses the even earlier influence of Egypt.

We have no certain knowledge as to the commencement of the art of painting, nor does this enquiry fall under our consideration. The Egyptians assert that it was invented among themselves, six thousand years before it passed into Greece; a vain boast, it is very evident. As to the Greeks, some say that it was invented at Sicyon, others at Corinth; but they all agree that it originated in tracing lines round the human shadow. (35, 5)

Pliny's chapters on painting in the *Naturalis Historia* begins with the contention that painting 'has now completely fallen into desuetude.' (35, 2) from its prior status where it had been 'an art which was formerly illustrious, when it was held in esteem both by kings and peoples' and additionally, 'with reference to the dignity of this now expiring art.' (35, 11) This desire to recover not only a practice, but the esteem with which it was formerly held forms a powerful strand throughout the history and development of a system of art education, as will be seen in subsequent sections.

Pliny also set out to elevate portraiture to the highest status in painting, as 'ennobling those whom it deigned to transmit to posterity' and that 'Correct portraits of individuals were formerly transmitted to future ages by painting.' Pliny also argues not only for portraiture as a record and validation of 'success in life, but for the public (rather than private) display of art;

‘... it is my opinion, that nothing can be a greater proof of having achieved success in life, than a lasting desire on the part of one's fellow-men, to know what one's features were.’ (35, 2) Pliny establishes even at this early date, a hierarchy of practice that remained in place almost throughout the entirety of the English art education system: portraiture is the supreme preoccupation of the artist, that its primary purpose is the remembrance of ennobled individuals. (35, 2).

He also extols the civic virtue attendant on making paintings public, rather than being sequestered in private villas, whilst also demonstrating political astuteness by praising emperors and nobles:

It was the Dictator Cæsar that first brought the public exhibition of pictures into such high estimation. After him there was M. Agrippa, a man who was naturally more attached to rustic simplicity than to refinement... we have a magnificent oration of his... on the advantage of exhibiting in public all pictures and statues; a practice which would have been far preferable to sending them into banishment at our country-houses. (35, 9)

Pliny attributes a particular ethos and set of practices that may come from Apelles’s lost treatise on the art of painting; firstly, that of drawing every day, and secondly that of submitting his work to public scrutiny and critique. Both of these, as will be seen in subsequent chapters, make a significant contribution to the idea of art school as a discipline, artistic character, or practice.

As Pliny says:

It was a custom with Apelles, to which he most tenaciously adhered, never to let any day pass, however busy he might be, without exercising himself by tracing some outline or other; a practice which has now passed into a proverb⁸. It was also a practice with him, when he had completed a work, to exhibit it to the view of the passers-by in some exposed place; while he himself, concealed behind the picture, would listen to the criticisms that were passed upon it; it being his opinion that the judgement of the public was preferable to his own, as being the more discerning of the two. (35, 36)

This critique had limits, however. When a cobbler commented on his mistakes in painting a shoe, Apelles made the corrections that very night; the next morning the cobbler noticed the changes, and proud of his effect on the artist's work began to criticise how Apelles portrayed

⁸ The Latin form of which, as given by Erasmus, is ‘*Nulla dies abeat, quin linea ducta supersit.*’ ‘Let no day pass by, without an outline being drawn, and left in remembrance.’

the leg – whereupon Apelles emerged from his hiding-place to state: *‘Ne sutor ultra crepidam* – Let the shoemaker venture no further than the shoe.’

Additionally, Apelles is credited with utilising geometry and proportion to achieve *Charis* (grace) in his painting – another foundational principle that would appear in art school curricula, especially so in Architecture – and for articulating the dangers of perfectionism. Perfectionism can lead to overpainting; Apelles suggested that Protogenes knew when his painting was finished: *quod manum de tabula scirat* – He knew when to take the hand from the picture.

With regard to the display of pictures, Pliny suggests that the fame should accrue to the artists, and not to the patrons of the artist; ‘as for fame, that has been reserved solely for the artists who have painted pictures;’ and suggests – once again taking a view of modesty over ostentation – that public (and indeed, portable) display is the most prudent response to art, in which the ‘men of ancient times’ demonstrated their culture not by lavish displays of frescos and statuary, ‘it not being the fashion in their day to colour the party-walls of houses from top to bottom’ but instead:

with them, it was not the practice to decorate the walls of houses, for the gratification of the owners only; nor did they lavish all their resources upon a dwelling which must of necessity always remain a fixture in one spot, and admits of no removal in case of conflagration. (35, 37)

Instead, ‘with all those artists, art was ever watchful for the benefit of whole cities only, and in those times a painter was regarded as the common property of all.’ (35, 37)

Pliny also is perhaps the originator of the myth of a portrait so life-like that the eyes seem to follow one around the room.

More recently, lived Amulius, a grave and serious personage, but a painter in the florid style. By this artist there was a Minerva, which had the appearance of always looking at the spectators, from whatever point it was viewed. (35, 37)

Pliny also recounts that some artists, in the quest for realism or natural effect, used all-too-human sitters to pose for their work, something that was to continue throughout painting’s primacy as the sole means to reproduce a likeness and to preserve it for the record.

Arellius was in high esteem at Rome; and with fair reason, had he not profaned the art by a disgraceful piece of profanity; for, being always in love with some woman or other, it was his practice, in painting goddesses, to give them the features of his mistresses; hence it is, that there were always some figures of prostitutes to be seen in his pictures. (Pliny: 35, 37; also Alberti: 2, 10)

Having recounted the contemporary position on painting, and before embarking on Book 36, *The Natural History of Stones*, Pliny concludes his work on painting with the splendidly resigned, ‘On painting we have now said enough, and more than enough; but it will be only proper to append some accounts of the plastic art⁹.’ (Pliny, Chap. 43, in Bostock, 1855)

Having established firstly, Rome’s singular status in the production and appreciation of painting, Pliny further catalogued specific instances of idealised beauty, correct composition, the quality of painting and individual painters, the instruction of painting, payment of artists and laudable artistic practice. What Pliny outlines in the *Naturalis*, and especially with his vivid snapshots of each painter is a range of discourses and practices, qualities that would go on to act as foundations on which the subsequent development of art education, enabling it to be constructed along specific technical and social axes. These early articulations of a range of ideals, techniques and practices would gain and lose influence according to contemporary tastes and views as they evolved towards concrete expression in the discursive formation that became the art school. For Pliny, the purpose of painting was to highlight the supremacy of the social order portrayed, the primacy of noble portraiture over other forms of painting, the foregrounding of figurative realism, deploying political flattery, the symbolism, allegory and metaphor that would underpin historical paintings and that the fame should accrue to the artists, not the collector, for example. Although it was undoubtedly nakedly nationalistic, partial, and overlooked earlier precursors, the *Naturalis Historia* outlined a full *dispositif* that would shape English art education in subsequent centuries.

This would not be immediate, however. *Naturalis* subsequently became an obscure text until the quattrocento; and later still for the English, finally being made available in translation by Philomena Holland in 1601. Not for the last time, the English art system would lag behind European developments. For the most part, until the latter part of the 17th century, the English art system remained focussed on the artisanal, formed around craft guilds, and there was no

⁹ Pliny evidently regarded painting as the superior art form, and contrasted it with the excesses of more decorative sculptural forms that were contemporaneously fashionable when he compiled the *Naturalis Historia*; ‘I shall begin then with what still remains to be said with reference to painting, an art which was formerly illustrious, when it was held in esteem both by kings and peoples, and ennobling those whom it deigned to transmit to posterity. But at the present day, it is completely banished in favour of marble, and even gold. For not only are whole walls now covered with marble, but the marble itself is carved out or else marqueted so as to represent objects and animals of various kinds. No longer now are we satisfied with formal compartments of marble, or with slabs extended like so many mountains in our chambers, but we must begin to paint the very stone itself!’ (35, 1; The Honour Attached to Painting)

immediate need for treatises of this kind to support and sustain an educational system for some time to come.

3.2 Cennini (1437): *Il Libro dell'Arte*

Il libro dell'arte (the Craftsman's Handbook) by Cennino Cennini (~1437) contains a lengthy, detailed technical treatise on the techniques of paint and painting as practised by Cennini and his contemporaries, clearly based on the knowledge of antique techniques that Cennini gained by study of the work of Pliny and Apelles. (trans. Herringham, 1899) As such it forms an invaluable teaching resource for any putative art school of the age. The historical descent of *Il Libro* is complex, and not without dispute. (Burns, 2011) There were a number of differing manuscripts available to scholars, and variant translations abound, each taking a culturally specific stand on matters of technique, or the nuances of language, Cennini's intent, and the purposes for which it should be used. Space precludes a detailed overview of this complex evolution; it is well covered by Thea Burns' (2011) *Cennino Cennini's Il Libro dell'Arte: a historiographical review*. For the purposes of this thesis, it is sufficient to note that *Il Libro* was to assume an unanticipated significance in the development of art education in England which will be explored in a later chapter.

Burns (2011) suggests that the potency of Cennini's text for later English artists lies in that:

Il Libro described an idealised vision of perfect practice removed from the needs of contemporary workshops. Cennini's insistence on the education of the apprentice at the artists' guild - years of apprenticeship, apprentice's conduct, training under a master - signalled his interest in regulating instruction and conduct... The Libro favoured professionalism. (p. 4)

In its reliance on authority and tradition, Cennini's *Libro dell'Arte* reflected the forms and usages of the late mediaeval corporation (Cochrane, in Burns, 2011, p. 9) and this was one of its principal sources of appeal to English artists of a romantic inclination, as will be seen in Chapter 6 where the 1930s mediaeval modernism of William Morris, Charles Ashbee, Arthur Penty and Frank Pick among others, presented a challenge to the utilitarian orthodoxy of art education of the time.

What is clear is that the multiple interpretations of *Il Libro* allow multiple, sometimes contradictory, notions to be carried forwards, including technical treatise, spiritual guide, manifesto for corporate professionalism, and pedagogic manifesto. These contradictory impulses – a reminder that 'there is necessarily much uncertainty in a panorama so fragmentary

and full of lacunae.’ (Burns, 2011, p. 10) would manifest throughout the evolution of the English art school system, as will be seen in subsequent chapters.

For others, Cennini is subjected to a more spiritual interpretation, as Herringham noted in 1899:

Besides definite instruction, I think we get from Cennini just a glimpse into the moral and aesthetic sympathies of these painters... we perceive the spiritual qualities which his subtle and refined technique help to depict.’ (p. x)

Given that of 189 Chapters, only 3 glancingly refer to spiritual matters, it would appear that some interpreters have taken a generous view of Cennini’s musing on the spirituality of painting, and somewhat conflated it, perhaps to reinforce their own impulses. As Burns (2011) states:

(v)arious groups or individuals manipulated the treatise’s artistic identity to suit their purposes, especially those who sought an art that embodied spiritual values to recreate the ethos of community of the mediaeval artist’s workshop and/or to revive past artistic techniques. (p. 4)

Among those artists would be Herringham, as seen in the introduction to her influential English translation cited above, and the overarching artisanal ethos of the Arts and Crafts Movement which will feature in chapter 6. Cennini’s *Il Libro* would find itself co-opted into the long running doctrinal conflict that would be a feature of the contested evolution of the art school, as will be explored in subsequent chapters, something that cannot have been anticipated by either Cennini or his many interpreters.

Cennini on the study of art, and the conduct of artists

In Chapter 2 – *How some persons study the arts from nobleness of mind, and some for gain*, Cennini suggests how artists might evolve their practice from some initial innate talent or interest:

It is the impulse of a noble mind which moved some towards this art, pleasing to them through their natural love. Their intellect delights in invention; and nature alone draws them’ they next wish to find a master, and with him they place themselves in love of obedience, being in servitude that they may carry their art to perfection. (Chapter 2, pp. 2-3)

He also echoes Pliny with a distinction made between art pursued for noble reasons and that pursued for more prosaic, commercial or pragmatic reasons. This distinction would continue to influence attitudes towards art, and consequently for art education, for centuries to come; as Cennini wrote in 1437:

There are some who follow the arts from poverty and necessity, and also for gain, and for the love of art; but those who pursue them from love of the art and true nobleness of mind are to be commended above all others. (Chapter 2, pp. 2-3)

Art training at this time still utilised the apprenticeship model, as outlined by Pliny, and organised into trade Guilds through the mediaeval period, (Burns, 2011, p.9) not only as the appropriate means to train artists, but as a way of controlling entry to and professionalising the craft. Cennini identified himself as, ‘an unimportant practicing member of the painting profession’ (Burns, 2011, p.1) and served a 12-year apprenticeship to the Florentine Master, Agnolo Gaddi.

Cennini outlines this lengthy training process in Chapter 27 – *How you should endeavour to copy and design, following a master as much as you can*. Firstly, comes untutored practice by copying existing works of recognised masters; ‘Having practised drawing a sufficient time on tablets as I have before directed, always take the best subjects which you can find, done by the hand of great masters.’ (Chapter 27, p. 14) Secondly, subsequently seeking out apprenticeship to the best master available:

If you live in a place where there are a good many masters, so much the better for you. But I counsel you always to choose the best and most famous; and daily following him, it will be against nature of you do not come close to his manner and style; for if you copy to-day from this master and to-morrow from the other, you will not acquire the manner of either; and you will distract your mind. (Chapter 27, p.14)

In Chapter 28 – *How, more than from the masters, you should draw continually from nature* Cennini also insists that the artist should also practice directly from nature, and that by doing so, even more so than from working under a master, will immeasurably benefit from this practice:

Remember that the most perfect guide that you can have and the best course (helm), is the triumphal gateway of drawing from nature: it is before all other example, and with a bold heart you may always trust to it, especially when you begin to have some judgement in design. (Chapter 28, p. 15)

He also encourages the apprentice artist to develop good work habits; ‘continue always, and without fail, to draw something every day, not too little to be enough, and it will do you excellent service.’

As will be seen later, these practices would become central to English art education as it emerged into the modern era. The significance lies in the longevity of the practice; here outlined in the instruction manual of a professional painter of around 1400 and, as will be seen, later codified in the curricula of various iterations of the English art school from 1860 onwards, and

even as late as the 1960s-1970s (in the First Coldstream Report of 1960 and the subsequent Joint Report of 1970) these practices would be the site of significant doctrinal conflict as factions fought over the key values that art education should manifest.

Cennini reiterates these good work habits, with the explicit caution that learning by observation, mimicry and through practical activity are key to achieving success in art – and not merely by reading – in chapter 67, ‘But seeing others work and practicing with your hand will make you understand better than seeing it written.’ and again, in chapter 71, ‘But by seeing others work, you will understand better than by reading.’ This emphasis on developing skill through practice rather than theoretically would reappear as a point of doctrinal conflict during the debates on the art education reforms of the 1960s. Government intervened to direct a new level of qualification that had parity with a university first degree and theory, that until that point had been largely irrelevant, found it had gained unexpected importance in conferring academic status on the practice of art.

The key texts for the more spiritual interpretation of Cennini’s instructions may be found in Chapter 29 – *How you should regulate your manner of living so as to preserve decorum, and to keep your hand in proper condition; and what company you should frequent; and how you should select and draw a figure in relief.* In this chapter, Cennini outlines the temperate behaviour conducive to the best practice of art, whilst also elevating the practice of art to a level with that of the other human sciences. He writes:

Your manner of living should always be regulated as if you were studying theology, philosophy, or any other science; that is to say, eating and drinking temperately at least twice a day, using light and good food, and but a little wine; sparing and reserving your hand, saving it from fatigue as throwing stones or iron bars, and many other things which are injurious to the hand, wearying it. There is still another cause, the occurrence of which may render your hand so unsteady that it will tremble and flutter more than the leaves shaken by the wind, and this is the frequenting too much of the company of ladies. (Chapter 29, pp. 19-20)

He further suggests that the artist should seek out like-minded companions:

always retire alone, or with companions who are inclined to do so as you do, and are not disposed to hinder your work; and the more intellectual these companions are, the better it will be for you. (Chapter 29, p. 16)

By which means he would seem to suggest that the artist is best served by a frugal and temperate lifestyle, and with the companionship of other artists. These small injunctions will be seen to resonate with certain idealists later in subsequent chapters; indeed, chapter 2 sketches out one of the essential, ultimately unresolved issues in the later development of a system of

art education – the tension between what might be termed the noble view (art for the celebration of God or commemoration of the nobility) and art for utilitarian or commercial purposes (decoration, illustration, low subjects) and chapter 27 and 29 identify modes of practice that will underpin the practical teaching of art for considerable historical period.

3.3 Alberti (1450): *Della Pittura*

If Pliny and Cennini can be said to have outlined the earliest formal account of art practice through historical archives (such as they were), contemporary anecdote, observation and hints then Leon Battista Alberti's *Della pittura* (Of Painting) is, according to Spencer (1970) significant

the first modern treatise on the theory of painting... although it appeared at a moment when the old and the new order in art were still existing side by side in Florence, it broke with the Middle Ages and pointed the way to the modern era. (para. 1)

In contrast to Cennini's almost contemporary *Libro dell' arte*, which summed up preceding medieval practice, *Della pittura* 'prepared the way for the art, the artist, and the patron of the Renaissance.' (Spencer, 1970. Para 1) For the purposes of this thesis the significance of Alberti is that he moves beyond Pliny and Cennini who recorded historical technique and anecdotal accounts of art practice and instead consciously invokes a new *system of knowledge* centred around painting, a painterly episteme, articulated in three books:

the first, entirely on mathematics, causes this pleasant and most noble art to spring from its roots in Nature. The second book places this art in the hands of the painter, articulated as it is in its parts and with a full explanation of it. The third shows how the painter should be and how he should acquire proper knowledge to master every aspect of the art of painting. (Sinisgalli, (2011) pp. 17-18)

Art education during this period of transition, from the mediaeval practices described by Cennini to the renaissance practices that arise from Alberti's 'radical overstatements and criticism of past practices' (Spencer, 1970) is still firmly bound to a system of training acquired under the master and apprentice system, and as such does not significantly deviate from the ideal path laid out by Pliny and Cennini and practised by countless artists through this historical period. There is no conception as yet that art might form part of a general education system. Indeed, there was at the time no conception of a general education system; this would emerge only in the latter part of the 19th century, and art would play its part in that emergence. Art education at this juncture remains as it had been for centuries, primarily a system of correct technical training in the practical means of production. Nonetheless, Alberti advocates an approach to the practice of art which 'gives the artist and his art the means of breaking away

from such a system to attain the individualism familiar since the High Renaissance.’ (Spencer, 1970)

Alberti's aim in writing *Della pittura* becomes clear in the Dedication. Addressing it to the patron and Master, Brunelleschi, he is already indicating the death of the guild system, and – in an echo of Pliny – lamenting lost knowledge:

I used to wonder and to regret at the same time that so many excellent and divine arts and sciences, which we see, through their works and copious historical accounts, during those very virtuous days of distant past, are thus now missing and almost entirely lost. Painters, sculptors, architects, musicians, geometricians, rhetoricians, augurs, and similar most noble and marvellous intellects today are found very rarely and [are] little to be praised. (Sinisgalli, (2011) p. 17)

As Sinisgalli (2011) continues:

from this point on, art is no longer dependent upon a medieval church system for its commissions. Instead, its existence requires a wealthy and educated lay patron. This changed relationship between the commissioner of art, and the producer of art is profound, and has lasting consequences for the consumption and production of art. (p. 17)

Alberti's aim is not just to acknowledge the ascendancy of the wealthy, knowledgeable patron, but also to raise the status of the painter from the level of a craftsman and confer upon him the status of an independent artist.

According to the Spencer (1970), Alberti's energies were rarely directed towards uncovering new knowledge for a restricted group of fellow humanists, but rather towards making the knowledge acquired by the humanists available to a wider audience. As he states:

In the ameliorative sense of the word, he was a populariser. *Della pittura* partakes of this tendency in Alberti's work. His aim in this treatise is one of making the new humanist art of Florence understandable and desirable for a larger group of artists and patrons. (p. 3)

Spencer suggests that there is evidence that Alberti did paint, draw, sculpt and possibly engrave, ‘(f)rom his practical experiences, he was able to consider the significance of the works of contemporary Florentine artists, such as Brunelleschi, Donatello and Masaccio’ (p. 13).

As will be seen in later chapters, *Della pittura* became one of the chief sources for later treatises on the art of painting, and an immensely influential book during the Italian Renaissance. Alberti was in a unique position to appreciate, record, and advise the painters and architects of the early Florentine Renaissance. *Della pittura* provides instructions for artists which would become the canon for Renaissance art: in particular the inclusion of naturalistic details, *istoria* (varied

postures and facial expressions), and linear perspective. It takes elements of Pliny and Cennini's earlier works, elaborates a scientific theory of aesthetics and becomes a cornerstone for the future development of a systemised art education.

Spencer also identifies its significance as a foundational text in that, 'at each appearance of the text it has been taken up by art theorists of the moment and woven into their own concepts of the art of painting' (p. 13).

Della Pittura would exert a powerful influence on the formation of the Royal Academy as it became the locus for the correct practice of painting in eighteenth century England, and consequently it added another thread to the complex tapestry of influences, doctrine and formative values that would shape the English art school as it began to emerge as a distinct discursive formation, increasingly independent of its artisanal, apprenticeship training origins.

Alberti: Aesthetics as Science, Painting as Knowledge

The significance of Alberti's treatise is that it systemises the process of painting and elevates it from a craft to a system of knowledge within the human sciences that were contemporaneous with Alberti's works. By identifying and articulating three underlying principles in *Della pittura*, Alberti formalises discursive regularities that frame the commissioning, production and consumption of art within a philosophical matrix that locates the viewer as the centre of an objectively real universe, as represented by the artist, with specific intent. Spencer highlights that:

The essence of Alberti's aesthetics, as well as its relations to his thought, can perhaps be best apprehended through an investigation of three topics basic in the treatise; his approach to visible reality, *la più grassa Minerva*¹⁰, his use of the mathematical

¹⁰ *La più grassa Minerva* has no direct English translation, but Spencer (1970) suggests it has two levels of meaning. The first, he says, 'derived from Cicero, refers to a more popular sort of knowledge or the propagandizing nature of the treatise... the second, that whereas mathematicians examine the form of things separated from matter, 'since we wish the object to be seen, we will use a more sensate wisdom'. Alberti's interest, then, is in *form not separated from matter and in form as it is visible*. This implies matter which, in turn, must be located in space and light to be visible. Ultimately all this will refer back to its basis in man by whom these things are known.

sciences as a means of controlling this reality, *mathematica*¹¹, and the means and aim of humanist painting, *istoria*¹².' (Spencer, 1970)

No doubt Alberti's education and his desire to impress the prospective patron account in large measure for his emphasis on antiquity. According to Spencer (1970):

themes from antiquity in painting were new and almost unheard of in the opening years of the fifteenth century. Alberti was introducing his contemporaries to a body of knowledge which was as new and interesting to them as it was to him. (p. 13)

3.4 In summary

This thesis considers the emergence of the art school system along three axes; value, doctrine and administration. The rather lengthy examination of the ancient texts in this chapter is concerned with what Foucault referred to as 'writing a history... that would make the present situation comprehensible.' (Foucault in Koopman, 2013, p. 26) It is necessary to make this buried past visible in order to establish the thesis 'at the intersection of reflection and intervention' (p. 26) and to begin to engage with the genealogical aspect of the project. Why, as Koopman asks, 'should an inquiry that is avowedly historical in orientation have any important bearing... on the present?' (p. 28)

The answer is not that 'the present is where we find ourselves' (p. 28) but more that

Foucault was... concerned about the present precisely because he understood the present to be the site of the temporal and historical processes through and in which we constitute ourselves as subjects. To study the present situation in which we find ourselves requires that we study these situations as historically and temporally located amidst ongoing processes of change.' (pp. 28-29)

¹¹ Mathematics in Alberti's theory is a means, not an end. In *Della pittura* geometry and the 'maxims of mathematicians' are introduced in order to arrive more quickly and more directly at the basic problems of painting. The emphasis on mathematics in Alberti's theory is more appearance than reality. The fundamentals of the art of painting which are based on geometry occur almost exclusively in the first book where they occupy somewhat less than half of the total space devoted to the rudiments of the art. Alberti's most obvious contribution to the art of painting--on a mathematical level--is his exposition of the one-point perspective system which makes its first appearance in theory in this work. Based on reason and sensory data controlled by mathematics, the construction provides the artist with *a means of creating apparent space* in his painting. (Spencer, 1970)

¹² The term *istoria*, for which no present-day verbal equivalent exists, is introduced by Alberti towards the middle of the second book; the concept of *istoria* dominates the whole treatise and it is developed at length in the last half of the work. Any reinterpretation of the word must be derived from the treatise itself without dependence on seventeenth- and eighteenth-century histories, stories, or 'histories'. For Alberti the term *istoria* was of greatest consequence--he puts it at the pinnacle of artistic development. Painting was not to impress by its size but rather by its monumentality and dramatic content. 'The greatest work of the painter is not a colossus, but an *istoria*. *Istoria* gives greater renown to the intellect than any colossus.' (Spencer, 1970) The themes he urges are primarily derived from ancient literature, yet this is not to be merely an art of illustration. The figures are to be so ordered that their emotion will be projected to the observer. (Spencer, 1970)

In that respect, the earliest texts examined in this chapter are not distant or remote. From these earliest iterations of art as system of knowledge (one that required a system of training to be developed) the foundational texts were deployed to establish a system of values that underpin the subsequent development of the idea of the art school. Values that, as will be seen in subsequent chapters, continued to shape the development of the art school system and therefore my own subjective experience within that system. Values, then, constitute the major axis of this early stage of emergence.

Pliny codifies a number of characteristics that would form a foundation on which future development of art education would rest. Notably, it sets out that painting was a noble activity that had fallen into disregard and that it was an ancient science that had to be recovered from obscurity, a theme that was to recur as writers and artists established and re-established painting. Pliny also set out a hierarchy of practice, with painting at its apex. This doctrinal supremacy remained in place despite repeated challenges throughout the history of art schools, even after painting had been stripped of its historical significance and centuries of technical skills training were abandoned in the English art schools of late 1960s.

Cennini sits at a transitional moment, between the mediaeval guilds as a means of controlling art practice, with the apprentice model as the primary means to acquire an art education and the church as the principal patron, and Alberti's depiction of painting as an *episteme*, with the educated private patron, and the artist raised in status to cultured professional. For the Victorian English, Cennini also came to represent a moral and spiritual approach to painting, articulating both specific conduct for painters and suitable subjects for painting; above all else, painting from nature.

Finally, Alberti's *Della pittura* is the first modern treatise to espouse a theory of painting. Although it appeared at a moment when the old and the new order in art were still existing side by side in Florence, it broke with the Middle Ages and pointed the way to the modern era. Alberti approached art as if it were one of the human sciences, and advocated a system of thought that would support the positioning of painting in particular as an elite, humanist undertaking, dependent as much on the production of wealthy, discerning, knowledgeable patrons as artists themselves, and thus an elevated practice above the concerns of artisans and craftsmen.

Scattered across several centuries as they are, these texts form a nexus around which a nascent system of art education begins to coalesce within a matrix of patronage, production, and consumption. This system itself would in turn require the development of policies and state interventions incorporating these foundational texts – although seldom acknowledged as such – within a system of training and practice that could call on classical antiquity to provide a cloak of philosophical authority.

What seems most remarkable is that both Pliny and Alberti articulated a romanticised notion of loss and recovery that reproduces itself throughout the history of the art school. It is almost as if the art school itself was created from this lament, or that it formed the materials from which the idea of art school was constructed.

4 The shifting axes of early art education

This section examines the shifting doctrinal axes of early art education, and the early formation of a system for the education of artists. The early stages of this period saw a range of texts on art and artists become available in English. These texts serve as a means of transmission, devices in which the values of the Pliny are preserved, contemporary Italian proselytising and localised conceptions of art and the artist are added, and the whole assemblage carried forwards.

They are significant for a genealogical study of art school history in that they function as ‘depth problems,’ problems that are lodged ‘deep inside us... and that shape the historical conditions of possibility of our present ways of doing.’ (Koopman, 2013, p. 1) In other words, these texts, as they are both transmitted and then buried, form the conceptual framework within which the idea of art education can be formulated. The values contained within these texts constructs the thought-space in which doctrine emerges from obscured origins and takes concrete form in curricula and institutes, the apparatus of art education.

This period begins to manifest distinct doctrinal positions with regard to; firstly, the instruction of the artist as to the ‘right mind’; secondly, the conception of ‘fine art’ as a set of procedures and processes that included the production, collection and appreciation of paintings (and to a lesser extent, sculpture); and thirdly, the acquisition and development of drawing as a technical skill to support cartography, industrial design and architecture rather than to support the development of a painting or sculpture. These tendencies, arising from the diverse historiographical origins of art education were distinct, contradictory, deeply held by their proponents and their resolution was to dog art education throughout its subsequent history.

Nikolaus Pevsner (1940) also had this to say on the state of affairs at this point:

If we now try to sum up what the social history of art created during the seventeenth century, it must be said that at its end three types of artist stood side by side. First there was the master in the medieval sense, who supplied from his workshop both private customers and clerical or secular authorities. This was still the most usual type in Italy, in Flanders, in England and in Germany. Secondly, there was the academician, as he existed only in Paris. He also usually worked for individual clients or public bodies, with whom he had direct dealings. His social position was higher than that of most of his foreign colleagues, but he had become so much of a servant to the court that he was less free in his art than they. And thirdly there was the Dutch painter who enjoyed complete freedom, and worked in his studio for nobody in particular. The first of these three types was doomed when the Enlightenment and the French Revolution destroyed

the guild and the last remains of the medieval style of life; the other two, however, both created by the seventeenth century, represent the fundamental social polarity which determines the attitude of the artist up to the present day. (p. 138-139)

These three archetypes, and the different doctrines at the head of which they stood, remained intact for the next two centuries, stubbornly embedded within early attempts to formulate an art education, and leading to schisms that would never be fully resolved.

4.1 Early art education: apprentices to artists; guilds to academies

Early art education, little as there was, primarily took the form of apprenticeships within craft guilds with ‘the idle or industrious apprentice, clothed and boarded by a master, aspiring to the master’s daughter’s hand, or his model’s body, toiling and sleeping in his master’s shop, and roystering outside on holy days.’ (Macdonald, 2004, p. 21). As Macdonald further states: ‘unless he was a monk, the medieval artists-craftsman was a member of a guild.’ (p. 20) The guilds, dating back to Norman times, were powerful associations for ‘mutual aid and protection’ with a sophisticated system of ‘oath and charges of acceptance, entrance fee, annual subscription, common purse, insurance scheme, ordinance and patron saint.’ (p. 20) These were strictly hierarchical bodies that protected their specialist craft skills and arcane knowledge by rigorously controlling how knowledge was spread.

For the most part, there was no necessity to record in written form any instructions or educational texts as part of the guild system. As Burns (2011) notes; ‘apprenticeship foregrounds learning by discipleship. Trades even today are learned by observation and practice with minimal verbalized explanation.’ (p. 9)

Burns further describes the situation:

Technical information, transmitted primarily through oral traditions, was preserved within a guild context. Mechanical arts were practised by manual workers, and medieval scholars had little interest in craft techniques. Writings concerned with practical activities were reflective and aphoristic, not directly descriptive and operational. (p. 9)

In his book, *Draw they Must*, Richard Carline (1968) explores the early history of art education in England. He identifies the guilds as the key apparatus for the propagation and preservation of art practice. ‘Saxon and Norman techniques relied heavily on the craft guild and apprenticeships to pass on skills.’ (p. 10) Nikolaus Pevsner (1940), in *Academies of Art Past and Present*, describes the early training available to an artist; ‘...up to Michelangelo’s time medieval methods had still been unchallenged.’ He describes the apprentice system thus:

At about twelve a boy could enter a painter's shop as an apprentice and would in two to six years' time learn everything necessary from colour-grinding and preparing grounds to drawing and painting. At the same time he was expected to do all kinds of services in his master's house. After the end of his apprenticeship he could go out as a journeyman and then, when some more years had passed, obtain his mastership certificate from the local company of painters or the company to which the local painters happened to belong, and he could settle down as an independent painter. (p. 34)

This system had produced generations of artisans perfectly suited to producing the art required by the medieval state; stained glass, church decoration and statuary; paintings and tapestry for nobility. The artisan's lowly social status was one factor in driving developments in Italy that were to have profound consequences for art education; firstly, the artists social status was to be enhanced '... to make him a member of an academy... would demonstrate that his social rank was just as high as that of a scientist or another scholar.' (Pevsner 1940, p. 54) and secondly, 'Art is to be sundered from handicraft. The painter is to be taught knowledge more than skill.' (p. 35)

Pevsner recounts the earliest stirrings of the challenge to the guilds, the evolution of the academy of arts. The earliest of these is attributed to Leonardo da Vinci, although Pevsner doubts whether it was 'a regulated institution' (p. 26), being more likely a sociable gathering of artists for the exchange of knowledge, discussion of each other's work and further discussion on what means could be used to elevate their social standing from mere artisans to respected members of the upper reaches of society. Pevsner continues; 'The new conception of the artists position in society entailed a new conception of art education.' (p. 34) and further, that this was a 'new and at the time utterly revolutionary syllabus.' This consists of, firstly, 'perspective, then the theory and practice of proportion, and then drawing from his Master's drawings, drawing from reliefs, drawing from nature and in the end to the practice of his art. (p. 35)

As will be seen over subsequent chapters, this curriculum was to prove remarkably resilient, forming the basis for art education almost entirely unaltered and unchallenged from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century. It certainly forms the basis for the foundational texts that would begin England's slow progress towards an art education system. Additionally, it marks the point at which art begins its bifurcation from craft and emancipation from the guilds, which was, as Pevsner rightly suggests, to have profound and almost entirely unforeseen consequences. Separation from the guilds and the artisanal relationship to society brought about a profound recalibration of the position of the artist in relation to that society.

4.2 A Matter of Values: English and Italian texts

During the latter part of the fifteenth and early part of the sixteenth century, a number of key texts became available in English that would shape the practice of fine art and the education of artists. In 1469 Johann and Wendelin of Speyer printed the first modern version of Pliny's *Naturalis Historia*; in 1528 Baldassare Castiglioni published *Il Cortegiano*, (which was translated to English in 1561 as *The Courtier* by Sir Thomas Hoby); in 1531, Sir Thomas Elyot produced an English text based on *Il Cortegiano* called *Boke named the Gouvenor*¹³. These were followed in 1550 by *Le Vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori, ed architettori* (*Lives of the Most Excellent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects*) from Giorgio Vasari.

This latter was significant in that it established a formal canon of artists and art practice that would over time form the basis for discipline of Art History. Vasari worked extensively for the Medici in Florence and Rome; indeed, *Lives of the Most Excellent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects* is dedicated to the Grand Duke of Tuscany, Cosimo I de' Medici. Taking its cue from Pliny, it formalised Painting, Sculpting and Architecture as the Fine Arts, a part of the Human Sciences as defined by Alberti in *Della Pittura*; eulogised the supremacy of contemporary Italian art; and perhaps most significantly formulated the idea of '*rinascita*'¹⁴ (*rebirth*).

Pevsner (1940) is unequivocal about Vasari's position: 'Vasari's *Accademia del Disegno* stands at the beginning of the evolution of modern academies of art.' (p. 42) and adds, '(Vasari's) plan... was to do away entirely with the medieval system of guilds for artists.' (p. 54) The significance of this cannot be overstated: this would revolutionise the social situation of artists 'as everywhere, both painters and sculptors had since the Middle Ages belonged to guilds or companies.' (p. 43)

The books from Hoby and Elyot brought art education to the English nobility. Hitherto education had led only to the practice of law or the priesthood. These books introduced to

¹³ Foucault refers to Elyot's *The Governour* in his lecture on Governmentality at the College de France, 1st of February 1978, referring to it as 'taking the position of hidden and muted opposition to Machiavelli.' (p. 90)

¹⁴ There is insufficient space within this thesis for a full examination of the origins of the term *The Renaissance*. In its fullest sense as discrete historical period it is credited to Jules Michelet's *Histoire de France, Volume 7* (<https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k6103175f/f490.item.r=vasari#> accessed 11/02/22) and more recently – particularly in the focus on a specifically Italian Renaissance, with Jacob Burckhardt's *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, 1860. Bullen asserts that while the word had distinct origins and usage that predate the modern conception of The Renaissance, Michelet and Burckhardt created a 'more rounded and more vivid picture... than had existed before.' (Bullen, B. *The Modern Language Review*, vol.76, no.2, April 1981, p. 311)

England the novel concept of the gentry and members of the Court as connoisseurs of the arts. Here then is the first suggestion that the English reader should study the history and practice of art, and that the representation of landscape and interiors should be naturalistic rather than symbolic or representational, and that this naturalism should be the result of a period of specific education or training.

A third English text was Richard Mulcaster's *Elementarie*, first published in 1582. In it, Mulcaster set out a pedagogical guide which, as well as an attempt to make English language and culture more respected and accessible, discussed the centrality of art as a fundamental component of education in its fullest sense. He specifically listed 'five principles, reading, writing, drawing, singing, and playing'¹⁵ that studied together would 'be the onelie artificiall means to make a minde capable of all the best qualities, which ar to be engrafted in the minde' (Mulcaster, 1582, p. 24)

Mulcaster introduces the notion of art forming part of a rounded general education to develop the fullness of a person's intellect, and further hints both at the practical benefits of a visual education, and at the development of more advanced skills at some later, post-school opportunity. Given that he was based within the Grammar School of the time, it is unlikely he would have been hinting at an apprenticeship or membership of a craft guild at this time, but – flowery language aside – he presents an intriguing early advocacy for art within a general educational scheme.

In 1606, Henry Peacham, the son of a Hertfordshire clergyman, graduate of Trinity College Cambridge and schoolmaster at Kimbolton Grammar School, published the *Art of Drawing*. During this early part of the Seventeenth Century, the introduction of copper-plate engraving had energized the consumption of reproductions of fashionable portraits and works of art by known Masters. Carline (1968) asserts that 'while art education had been subject to discussion under the Tudors, it was not until the seventeenth century that the study of art began to assume a more practical form. If this was due to any one single factor, it was the introduction of copper-plate engraving.' (p. 24) He further highlights this significance, saying:

¹⁵ 'The thinges be five in number, infinite in use, principles in place, and these in name, reading, writing, drawing, singing, and playing. Why & wherefor these five be so profitable and so fit for this place, it shall appear hereafter, when their use shall com in question. In the mean while this is most trew, that in the right course of best education to learning and knowledge, all these, & onelie these be Elementarie principles, and most necessarie to be delt with all. (Mulcaster, 1582, 5)

The use of this new method... was now acquiring a wide appreciation. Engravers were soon busily employed by publishers like Sudbury and Humble or William Peake. This diffusion of prints led to a steady demand for books on how to draw or etch. One of the first to meet this demand was Henry Peacham, whose *The Art of Drawing* appeared in 1606. (p. 24)

The real importance of Peacham's efforts was, as Carline (1968) suggests, '(the) endeavour to promote a wider appreciation of art – the first attempt to do so in the English language.' (p.29)

4.3 The Whitehall Group: early English connoisseurs, collectors and patrons

'The concept of "Fine Art", confined to painting and sculpture and elevated above the crafts of everyday life, did not fully merge in Great Britain until well into the eighteenth century, and it was only then that art teaching in a systematic form began to take root'. (Carline, 1968, p. 9)

The seventeenth and early eighteenth century show growing evidence of an awareness of the fine arts and the desirability for an adjunct education, if not among the general population, then certainly among the nobility for whom the collection and appreciation of art became more overt. Charles 1st (1600-1649), after visiting Madrid in 1623¹⁶, became a collector of European and Italian Renaissance works, amassing a significant collection that included works by Raphael, Da Vinci, van Dyck, Holbein, Caravaggio, Titian, Mantegna and others and that also encompassed Greek and Roman busts and statues from classical antiquity. Charles understood from his visit to the Spanish capitol the potential of a royal collection for power projection and cultural influence. His visit directly inspired him to create a gallery and sculpture gardens in Whitehall, specifically for the purposes of showcasing his collection of fine art¹⁷. Following his execution in 1649, the collection numbering around 1,500 pictures and 500 sculptures was sold off by the Commonwealth Government.

Early English art collecting¹⁸ and patronage of artists was centred on Palace of Whitehall, the main residence for the English monarchy and its attendant concentric rings of administrative,

¹⁶ For a full account of this visit, 'The End of the Spanish Match' by Brennan C. Purcell, Cambridge University Press <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3133525>. Reading this, it is hard to imagine how Charles or George Villiers, 1st Duke of Buckingham had any time free in which to purchase Renaissance art works, nor could they have imagined how their purchases would significantly shape the future history of art education in England.

¹⁷ The scale of this collection can be gleaned from a perusal of either of the two inventories of Charles I's art collection: one carried out by the king's keeper or surveyor (curator), Abraham van der Doort, from 1638 to 1640 and the 'Inventories and Valuations of the King's Goods' drawn up under the authority of the Commonwealth in the immediate aftermath of the king's execution on 30th January 1649. ([Royal Collection Trust](#), accessed 11/03/22)

¹⁸ For deeper insight into the culture of collecting that took hold in England during this period, see Coltman, V. *Classical Sculpture and the Culture of Collecting in Britain since 1760*. Oxford University Press, 2009

military, economic and cultural power. The early collectors – identified by Sir Oliver Millar¹⁹ as the ‘Whitehall Group’ – included Charles 1st, the Duke of Buckingham and Earl of Arundel, and an extensive retinue of agents, dealers and envoys who in turn relied on a network of connoisseurs, middlemen and looters to locate the artwork and initiate the process of acquisition, transportation and eventual ownership and display. Arundel in particular has been credited as ‘arguably the greatest collector in early Stuart England.’ (Wood, 2018, p. 30)

Arundel had organized a network of artists and art dealers across Europe to facilitate the collection of existing fine art including classical antiques and renaissance work and to support the production of contemporary art. He was an early English patron of artists such as Inigo Jones²⁰, Daniel Mytens, Wenceslaus Hollar, Anthony van Dyck, and Peter Paul Rubens. In this, he was somewhat more than a mere collector of existing art; as a patron he was not only able to acquire high-quality artworks but to commission new work from European artists.

The Whitehall group also included George Villiers, 1st Duke of Buckingham who accompanied Charles 1st to Madrid and saw the collection of Philip III of Spain; William Herbert the 3rd Earl of Pembroke; his brother Philip, the 4th Earl; James Hamilton, Earl of Arran and advisors and agents including; Balthazar Gerbier; Daniel Nijs; William Petty; Inigo Jones; Sir Dudley Carleton; Abraham van der Doort, Nicholas Lanier and Ben Jonson. The desire to meet the demands of these aristocratic collectors must have been at the forefront of the minds of those who wished to constitute an Academy for art education set up in much the same manner as contemporary Academies in Italy, France and the Netherlands; not only to satisfy demand for fine art, but also to satisfy the chauvinistic impulses of the English ruling classes that their taste and culture could be met by English artists producing English fine art.

¹⁹ Sir Oliver Millar, (1923-2007) surveyor emeritus of the Queen's pictures... one of Britain's most eminent art historians. (obit: [The Guardian, May 2007](#) accessed 11/03/22)

²⁰ Inigo Jones, was ‘the son of a clothworker, began his career as a joiner, but ended up as Surveyor of the Office of Works with a huge budget of £8,000 a year. He had the single greatest influence on court culture because he developed a new architectural idiom, devised many court masques, and advised on the purchase of works of art. Jones, who had travelled in Italy and knew the language, was one of the few people in Britain at this time to own a copy of the 1568 edition of Giorgio Vasari’s famous lives of Italian artists (it is now at Worcester College, Oxford). He used it as a manual for making attributions, and, as was his habit, annotated it heavily.’ For a fascinating insight into the network that enabled fine art collecting during this period, see Wood, J. 2018, ‘*Artists and Agents. Connoisseurship at the Caroline Court*’, in Charles I: King and Collector (exh. cat. Royal Academy of Arts, London, 2018) Royal Academy of Arts, London 2018, pp30-35

Wood (2018) states:

The Court was an arena for national and international politics, where an elite from both inside and outside London could make contact with people from overseas, glimpse international culture, and not least, indulge in luxury consumption. (p. 33)

Although this might seem a diversion from the slow development of an English Art School system, the significance of these aristocratic collectors is threefold; they supported the consumption of existing art; they stimulated the production of new art; and they were receptive to the lessons contained in the writings of Hoby, Vasari and others. This last would seed a desire to found a specifically localised English art education along academic principles that would develop the production of English art, and develop the appreciation of art as an historical and cultural entity.

4.4 The Origins of the Academy

In 1563, influenced by Giorgio Vasari, Cosimo I de' Medici founded the *Accademia delle Arti del Disegno*, or 'Academy and Company of the Arts of Drawing' in Florence. This was the first modern Academy of Art, the prototype for subsequent western schools of art. It consisted initially of two parts; the Company was akin to a guild for all working artists, while the Academy was for more eminent artistic personalities of Cosimo's court, and supervised artistic production in Tuscany. Even in its earliest iterations, the Art School cleaved between the artisanal Craft Guild and the high practitioners of Fine Art. The Academy, being the physical manifestation of the correct instruction of artists, was to come to define the education of art, and – depending on one's point of view – 'assume the role of hero (by) ushering in self-governance and the end of the guild system or villain (by) opposing the avant-garde in a continuous drama'.²¹

For the English, there was no Academy at this juncture. Instead, the treatises that Hoby and Elyot wrote, based as they were on Castiglione's imaginary discussions at the Court of the Duke of Urbino, were manifestly intended for the correct instruction of the English nobility, rather than founding manifestos for an educational establishment. In this, they were really instructions for the amateur pursuit of painting as a noble pastime, rather than a tract outlining the possible training regime for professional painters. Indeed, at this time there was scarcely

²¹ From *The History of the Accademia di San Luca, c. 1590–1635: Documents from the Archivio di Stato di Roma*; <https://www.nga.gov/accademia/en/intro.html>

any opportunity for professional artists, outside of the Guilds established to provide craft material for the Church.

In parallel with a growing appreciation for the fine arts and a desire to discuss art education, even if only, as Carline (1968) puts it, ‘a means of providing men of leisure with an additional source of interest and accomplishment,’ (p. 30) the early seventeenth century saw the development of copper plate engraving as a production technique that allowed for the illustration of books to become more widespread. Carline again suggests that ‘throughout the seventeenth century the practical realization of any schemes for art teaching in schools was doomed, as in the previous century, by the lack of artists able to teach.’ (p. 30) Artists were still taught by lengthy apprenticeship to a master, where they worked in a studio production line system, often assisting the master on the completion of large pieces of work by painting in a cartoon²² completed by the master, or in producing variations and copies of the master’s works. Art education outside of this system was still an uncertain prospect.

Despite the growth of the connoisseurs, collectors and patrons, the English lagged significantly behind Italy in the establishment of an Academy of Art. Suggestions for academies of various doctrinal tendencies began to appear from the mid-seventeenth century. In 1635 Sir Francis Knyaston²³ established ‘a noble academy which failed.’ (Cust, 2014, p. 337) In 1648, Sir William Petty submitted his project for a college, which, although never to be realised, contained some revolutionary proposals. He intended to include art teaching as one of the mainsprings of education:

We wish that a society of men might be instituted as careful to advance arts as the Jesuits are to propagate their religion. (Carline, 1968, p. 29)

²² In an art historical context, cartoon refers to a full-scale preparatory drawing for a fresco, oil painting or a tapestry. The word comes from the Italian *cartone*, which simply means a large sheet of paper or card. During the Renaissance, artists transferred their designs to the wall or canvas by making pin pricks along the outlines of a drawing and then rubbing powder or dust across the back of the sheet to create a mirror image of the composition. This procedure – known as “pricking” or “pouncing” – often damaged the paper and many cartoons do not survive as a result. However, there are some fine examples of this technique, such as Raphael’s *Young man asleep on the ground* (1504; National Gallery, London) This process would enjoy a revival in the 19th century, particularly in connection with the decoration of the new Houses of Parliament. The revival of the technique relied heavily on the English translation of *Cennini's Libro dell'Arte* (1899) by the professional tempera painter and copyist Christiana Herringham (1852-1929)

²³ It set out to emulate the French noble academies of the day by providing an education in the “noble and generous qualities and exercises” of “riding, fencenig, dancing and painting”, but at the same time offered a programme of intellectual pursuits (in mathematics, astronomy, physic, languages and heraldry) It flourished briefly in 1635 and the early part of 1636, with the enthusiastic support of the king, but then collapsed at the onset of plague in London in June 1636 and never recovered. (Cust, 2014, p. 337)

His college was to combine a programme of teaching with the formation of a museum to contain, as he explains ‘the rarest paintings and statues.’ (p. 29) Had this museum proceeded, it would have predated Elias Ashmole’s collection (the nucleus of the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford) by more than thirty years. According to Carline, Petty’s aim was to ‘provide education rather than indulge in collecting.’ (p. 29) Petty,²⁴ according to Carline, ‘was (a) protagonist of art teaching in this enlightened age – he had studied painting in France before becoming a surveyor²⁵ in Ireland.’ (p. 29)

Petty’s academy would have differed fundamentally from the academy of Kynaston, which was intended only for the gentry. He proposed education on a wider, more democratic basis, catering for girls as well as boys. Carline states:

The teaching included drawing because, ‘it develops the power to observe and, as he puts it, by “expressing the occupation of the mind”, it “performeth what by words is impossible”’. (p. 30)

One cannot disagree with Carline’s assertion that ‘no such proposal to educate through art had ever been made previously, and not very often subsequently.’ Carline regrets that Petty’s project:

embodying so many progressive ideas, was doomed. It was launched, by mischance, just as King and Parliament were about to become embroiled in conflict, and the political environment was not favourable to its resuscitation later. (p. 29)

²⁴ According to Karl Marx, Petty was a ‘frivolous, grasping, unprincipled adventurer’. Samuel Pepys called him ‘the most rational man in England.’ See <http://www.hetwebsite.net/het/profiles/petty.htm>. His biography is full of unlikely opportunities and conjunctions, encompassing cabin boy, enlisting in the Royal Navy, (an institution firmly on the Parliamentary side in the Civil War) a medical career that included resuscitating the corpse of a hanged woman, doctor of medicine, professor of anatomy, fellow and vice-chancellor of Brasenose College, Oxford, the chair in music at Gresham College in London, physician-general in Cromwell’s army in Ireland and – by dint of his practical experience gained in nautical charting, and by using thousands of unemployed soldiers – tackling the task of the Irish land survey in just 13 months instead of the predicted 13 years. He is now more known for being a founder of modern economic thought.

²⁵ Surveyor is a somewhat evasive description; between his arrival in Ireland in 1653 and his death in 1687, ‘Ireland was the context for his greatest practical achievements: after the Cromwellian confiscations of land in the wake of the 1641 rebellion, Petty orchestrated the measuring and mapping of nearly 8,400,000 Irish acres... It was also the source of his fortune: in the course of official duties he was able to amass substantial properties of his own scattered in King’s County, and Counties Meath, Cork, Limerick, as well as in Kerry where he was to acquire a further 160,000 acres in 1668. (Fox, (no date), p. 2)

Petty's subsequent adventures with the Parliamentary army, and his lucrative land acquisition in Ireland must have gone some way to providing compensation for the loss of his radical educational proposals.

This protracted period of development – tentative and fragmentary though it was – marks some significant innovations that will go on to be of importance. Copper plate engraving in particular was to assume considerable significance, allowing for the propagation of illustrations in textbooks to bring the concept of *pictures* to enhance teaching. Indeed, Carline (1968) suggests that ‘this concept of a picture, as opposed to mere graphic exercises, obtained its only foothold in general education... through the increasing publication of illustrated books.’ (p. 32) Of major significance was the publication of *Orbis Pictus* by Comenius, in an English translation by Charles Hoole in 1658. *Orbis Pictus* contained one hundred and fifty-three engravings that were expressly intended to be ‘used and studied for their pictorial content.’ As Carline further states; ‘The *Orbis Pictus* constitutes one of the landmarks in art education,’ its significance lies with it being – in Carline’s view at least – as ‘the first attempt to encourage visual observation in centres of education generally and to provide the means for schoolboys and girls to practice drawing.’ (p. 32)

4.5 The schools of the most excellent artists often produce donkeys²⁶.

England was notable among the European nations by its absence of an Art Academy; English collectors were reliant on the outpouring of European art to satisfy their demands²⁷. In fact,

²⁶ As the Georgians began to collect Italian art, so Italian artists responded to the demand by setting up workshops to produce copies of originals that could be sold to an unwitting English clientele. The Court of Charles 1st appointed Anthony van Dyke as ‘Principal Painter to their Majesties in 1632’, and he managed the purchase of paintings for the Court. Having lived and worked in Italy for six years, he was aware that not only could art works be copies, but that they might also be products of workshops: ‘*Poichè ne escano dalle scuole di valentissimi maestri ben spesso anche delli asini.*’ (Since the schools of the most excellent artists often produce donkeys) Wood, J. (2018) *Artists and Agents. Connoisseurship at the Caroline Court*, in *Charles I: King and Collector* (exh. cat. Royal Academy of Arts, London, 2018), Royal Academy of Arts, London, 2018, pp. 30–35

²⁷ A number of sources suggest between five and ten million works of art were produced in the century-long Golden Age of Dutch Art. Whilst impossible to verify, the Dutch in the seventeenth century had both a voracious appetite for painting, and the production capacity to fulfil both the domestic appetite and that of foreign collectors. A concise overview can be read here: [A Brief Overview of the Dutch Art Market in the Seventeenth Century \(The Abundance of Paintings\)](#). The suggestion is that increasing embourgeoisement of contemporary Dutch society drove demand for fine art, more so than aristocratic collectors alone could; this would find a parallel in English society in the nineteenth century as Carline outlines in his discussion of Samuel Prout, a popular nineteenth century artist who produced romanticised landscapes; ‘His studies of picturesque streets, churches and bridges evoked dreams of foreign travel among the well-to-do merchants and professional men in Dulwich or Blackheath, and his unpretentious water-colours were thoroughly suited to their suburban dwelling. Prout’s work was not for the baronial hall either in scale or subject-matter, but for the modest breakfast parlour. It was these middle-class patrons who supported art teaching in the early years of the nineteenth century.’ (Carline, 1968, p72)

London did not gain an Academy until 1768, fully two centuries later than Florence, and a century later than most of its European capital rivals. From the beginning of the 18th century, there were repeated attempts to establish art schools along a variety of philosophical and pedagogic lines.

The earliest documented account of drawing classes being an intrinsic part of the school curriculum – and this was a period with little practical schooling, except for the small number of early Public Schools and certainly nothing for the general populace – dates to the early 1690s at Christ's Hospital School. These early drawing classes were not concerned with the appreciation of fine art, nor the expression of individual creativity.

At the instigation of Samuel Pepys, and Christopher Wren, who were on the Board of Governors at that time, these drawing classes were most concerned with evidencing 'technical ability, command of proportions, knowledge of perspective and neatness in execution' and 'were concerned with proof that the boys might, with tuition, make competent working drawings, while keeping their personal taste as much as possible in the background.' (Carline, 1968, pp. 35-6) Given that Wren was an architect – and at this time busy with drawing up plans for the reconstruction of London following the Great Fire – and Pepys was Chief Secretary to the Admiralty, and instrumental in the modernisation and reorganisation of the Royal Navy, it is reasonable to deduce that the young artists responsible for these 'competent working drawings' would later seek employment in the production of architectural drawings, and admiralty charts among other 'technical trades'.

Carline (1968) makes it clear that these drawing classes were not taught in order to produce fine artists. 'Real artistic expression was not expected from these children who belonged to the humbler walks of life,' they were instead 'not to create works of art but to carry out with perfection the requirements of their employers.' (p. 37) At this point in the development of English art education, the artist was regarded as a person of technical skill rather than a creative individual and their social status reflected that; artists were regarded as artisans, a legacy of the old craft guilds. (p. 49) There was no means for artists to gain recognised artistic qualification for employment as art teachers, no society to provide support, collective organisation, professional training or even the capacity to hold exhibitions of artists' work. Such a system did exist in principle European cities; the Accademia delle Arti del Disegno, Florence (1563); The Haarlem Academy, (1583); Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture, Paris (1648); Nuremberg, (1674); the Haagsche Teeken-Academie, Den Haag (1682); Poland (1694); Berlin

(1697); Vienna (1705); St Petersburg (1724); Stockholm (1735); Copenhagen (1738); Madrid (1752).

Pepys was instrumental in appointing Bernard Lens to teach at Christ's Hospital School, and Lens was one of a group of artists including Sir Godfrey Kneller²⁸ associated with the setting up of a private art school in Great Queen Street, London in 1711. Somewhat later, but clearly as a consequence of his experience in teaching, Lens also produced an educational text on how to draw for use in schools, entitled *For the curious Young Gentleman and Ladies that study the Noble and Commendable Art of Drawing* (1751)²⁹.

One of the directors of this early private art school was Sir James Thornhill, father-in-law of William Hogarth. Thornhill had, 'according to Walpole... proposed the formation of a National Academy, but failed to secure official support.' (Carline, 1968, p. 49) Instead, a more modest school proposed by Kneller was set up. In 1720, Thornhill, after a period of disagreement, closed Kneller's academy and set up a new one in his own house in James Street, Covent Garden. (Hanson, 2022, np) Further factionalism led Louis Charron and John Vanderbank to set up yet another fledgling academy, 'The Academy for the Improvement of Painters and Sculptors by drawing from the Naked' more usually known as the Vanderbank Academy, which was successful, attracting a subscription of many contemporary leading artists. One of the pupils there was Hogarth who received some formal art training at the Academy, where life drawing was encouraged and he gained further knowledge through association with his father-

²⁸ Carline also names Sir Godfrey Kneller as a lead proponent of the Great Queen Street school, with Lens. Kneller was born in Lubeck, studied in Leiden, became a pupil of Bol and Rembrandt in Amsterdam, travelled to Rome and Venice to paint historical subjects and portraits, and arrived in England in 1676. He knew all about the benefit of an Academy training.

²⁹ 'For the curious young gentlemen and ladies that study and practise the noble and commendable art of drawing, Colouring and Japanning, a new and compleat drawing-book; Consisting of Variety of Classes, viz. Whole Figures in divers Positions, and all the several Parts of the Human Body from Head to Foot; light, airy, loose Landskips; Perspective Views of Sea-Ports, Forts, Ruins, &c. Being the close study, for a Series of Years, of the late Mr. Lens, Miniature-Painter, and Drawing-Master to Christ's-Hospital. In Sixty-Two Copper-Plates, engraved by himself. Design'd chiefly for young Beginners, and now first published from the Author's Originals, very necessary and useful for all Drawing-Schools, Boarding-Schools, &c. &c. To which is prefixed, an introduction to drawing; Containing a Description of the Instruments and their respective Uses, and the Materials proper for Drawing; Rules for managing the Pencil, and the best Method for attaining Perfection in the Art; with Instructions by which a young Practitioner shall be enabled to form a Judgment as well of his own Performances as those of others; with easy, proper, and necessary Lessons for him at his first Entrance. Also, the Names of the Colours used, with Instructions to temper and mix them, and fit them for Painting. Likewise, Colours for washing Landskips, or Prints of any Kind; with plain and easy Rules for the Ladies Japanning. Translated from the French of Monsieur Gerrard de Lairese, and improved with extracts from C. A. Du Fresnoy.' <https://wellcomecollection.org/works/v2g5wt8t>

in-law, Sir James Thornhill. Vanderbank's Academy ultimately fell victim to his financial difficulties.³⁰

Hogarth, as well as being a prolific artist in his own right, was central to the establishment of another early academy founded in the winter of 1735, in Peter Court off St Martin's Lane. St Martin's Lane Academy, active from 1735-1767, 'was at the heart of London's rapidly changing art scene during the middle decades of the eighteenth century.' (Myrone, 2008, para. 1) As with the previous academies, the focal point of activity was the drawing of the human figure as a foundational basis for developing further skills as a painter or sculpture; significantly however, Hogarth was not temperamentally inclined to follow the hierarchical model of Academies based on the classical French model. Life drawing classes were open to all, allowing younger students to work alongside more established artists. Perhaps more significant than the nascent curriculum was that the academy 'played a singularly important role in connecting the different sectors of London's rapidly growing and diversifying art community.' (Myrone, 2008, para. 1) According to Carline (1968), Hogarth 'refused to have the election of any "presidents, directors, professors etc", as being "a ridiculous imitation of the foolish parade of the French Academy."³¹' (p. 50)

4.6 The Royal Society of Arts and The Royal Academy: Opportunity and Schism

The middle decades of the eighteenth century saw two significant developments in the continuing evolution of English art education. 1754 saw the founding of the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce, latterly known as Royal Society of Arts, and in 1768 a faction diverging from the RSA oversaw the foundation of the Royal Academy of Arts.

These two developments contain several elements that are key to understanding the subsequent evolution of art education in England; there is a growing discourse that builds upon two primary axes of value and doctrine; the artistic and the artisanal. These axes also cleave closely to class

³⁰ Vanderbank fled to France in 1724 to escape his creditors; a painter of considerable skill, he returned to London in 1729 and occupied a house in Holles Street, Cavendish Square, rent free thanks to the generous patronage of Lord Carteret. On Vanderbank's death in 1739, Carteret appropriated the contents of the painter's studio, the contents of which no doubt recouped the cost of supporting the painter in his latter years.

³¹ A friend of mine, having retired after thirty years teaching art, wanted to reconnect with his personal practice and to do so required a studio. In order to gain access to the only studios he could find, he was asked to provide two academic references, submit his work for scrutiny by the incumbent committee, undergo an interview and stage a presentation of his work to the existing members. All this simply to access space to paint; plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose. One wonders what Hogarth would have thought.

divisions in English society; the former grows from the existing notion – from Pliny onwards – of fine art as being an elite pursuit, with artists aspiring to high social status and the latter – with no obvious model to follow at this stage – tending towards a growing economic rationale for technical classes, unconcerned with individual creativity. Between these major axes, shifting constellations of influence suggest new possibilities for models of art; individual creativity and personal expression, romanticism, commercial imperatives, possibilities that always carry forward traces of previous incarnations.

This period, according to Carline (1963) sees ‘the artist’s status in England... beginning to rise. Preference was no longer given invariably to foreign artists or craftsmen.’ (p. 50) He also invokes one of the prevailing narrative strands for the subsequent expansion of English art schools; the notion that ‘special emphasis was placed in the problems of design, to enable British craftsmen to compete with continental products.’ (p. 50) This notion certainly suggests a rationale for the foundation of the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce, but it does not fully account for the continuing duality – artist or artisan, fine artist or commercial designer – which will bring about the Royal Academy, seen by its founders as a corrective to the emphasis on the commercialisation of art production and teaching.

The Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce

The Society was established with the express purpose of stimulating ‘arts, manufacture and commerce’ through the distribution of monetary prizes funded by public subscription.

The Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce, having been established on the most disinterested principles, and actuated by the most liberal motives (the benefit of mankind in general, and of their country in particular); it may be satisfactory to the publick, to take a general view of their transactions, and examine into some of the good effects produced by their laudable endeavours. (RSA, 1783, p. v)

Carline makes note that ‘one of the remarkable features of the Society of Arts was its democratic character, with all members entitled to participate and vote.’ (p. 51) This is of significance because it meant that, in theory at least, ‘any member... (could) take part in judging the competitions, irrespective of any capacity to judge.’ (p. 51) In fact, at the 1754 meeting to discuss the final arrangements for the first drawing competition, it was agreed ‘probably for the first time in England’ (p. 52) that the judgement of an artist in selecting prize-winners was at least desirable; the Society selected ‘...five of the most eminent masters of drawing... to assist in determining ye merit of the drawings’ recorded in the meeting minutes

as; ‘Messrs Dalton, Cheere, Strange, Bonneau, Vivarez...’³² In 1755 the Society added two judges of considerable import, William Hogarth and Francis Hayman, In 1756 they added two more; Joshua Reynolds and Joseph Highmore. Hogarth and Reynolds would come to embody fundamentally opposed views of the future direction of art education in England, and the significance of this dichotomy, profound in its impact on the English art school system, will be explored more fully in the following chapters.

Carline (1968) suggests that the Society competitions were, initially at least, ‘directed more towards the discovery of artistic talent than towards the promotion of education itself.’ (pp. 50-51) Nonetheless, in his view, the Society was the first *public* body to concern itself with art education. (p. 50) A significant outcome of the ‘discovery of artistic talent’ was the considerable number of young artists that would be brought to public attention, and who would subsequently seed nascent efforts in art education and in developing the expanding ecology of English art and design:

The first exhibition of contemporary art in 1760

Carline (1968) writes in detail of the early work of the society, and in particular highlights that ‘the success of these (drawing) competitions was proved by so many of the competitors having achieved subsequent renown in the world of art.’ (p. 56) The holding of the art competitions led to a further significant step towards popularising art in England; for the first time, the public would be able to view the work of the successful competitors in an exhibition at the Society’s new headquarters in The Strand in 1760. Later the same year, the professional artists also took the opportunity to display their work although, as Carline (1968) wryly suggests, they objected to having ‘their work intermixed with, and sometimes mistaken for, the children’s exhibits.’ (p. 56) Professional artistic dissatisfaction notwithstanding, this latter exhibition became an annual event. The Society of Arts found itself ‘involved in the controversies that now arose regarding how the artists were to display their work collectively, and establish an art school under their own control.’ (p. 56) Having discovered the potential for displaying their work to an appreciative and sometimes boisterous public³³, the artists involved in these early

³² Carline provides brief biographic notes for each of these; Richard Dalton later became Surveyor of the Royal Pictures; Robert Strange was noted for engravings after Vandyk and Titian; Vivarez was also an engraver of note; Jacob Bonneau, a water colourist, was also a drawing master at Christ’s Hospital; and Henry Cheere was the sculptor of the group – noted for his lead-cast figures ‘popular as garden ornaments’ (p. 52)

³³ Carline notes that the ‘undesirable persons, who were to be excluded from the exhibition were defined as “livery servants, foot soldiers, porters, and women with children.” Also noted, “Smoaking and drinking” were

exhibitions desired greater autonomy from the Society, and this coupled with the desire to introduce a formal education for professional artists – which was not part of the Society’s aims - paved the way for the formation of the Royal Academy.

The schism

Carline states; ‘The success of this exhibition, in which about seventy artists participated, prompted further overtures to the Society, but the artists demanded a greater degree of control.’ (p. 57) Allen (2011) goes further, and describes the situation between the Society committee and the artists:

The Society of Arts had been in the habit of exhibiting the prize- winning or 'premium' pictures in their Great Room but in the Spring of 1760 this clashed with the exhibition of the artists. The premium pictures were apparently scattered amongst the other exhibits with labels indicating the nature and degree of the awards gained and this led many visitors to believe that they had been judged the best pictures overall. This must have been intensely irritating to men as distinguished as Reynolds and Wilson and the artists therefore pleaded with the Society of Arts to make alternative arrangements for the premium pictures in 1761 - 'lest any man should a second time suffer the disgrace of having lost that which he never sought.' (p. 268)

According to Allen (2011), the premium pictures got most of the publicity, rather than the professional artists’ work. The artists also proposed that at the second exhibition no one should be admitted who had not purchased a catalogue, perhaps to dissuade the ‘intrusion of persons whose stations and education disqualified them for judging statuary and painting, and who were made idle and tumultuous by the opportunity of attending a show.’ (p. 266)

Not only did the Society of Arts reject both proposals but it gave additional powers to its committee which effectively put an end to further negotiations between the two bodies. (Allen, 2011, p. 268) Thus occurred the schism which deprived the Society of the leadership in the arts which its pioneer work had justified. (Carline, 1968, p. 57)

The Royal Academy³⁴

The schism directly led to the foundation of the Royal Academy, ‘born of rivalry and resentment, amid some confusion and much bickering’ (Mullan, 2013, para. 1). This was the

forbidden, but some visitors were, nevertheless, so boisterous or stimulated by the exhibits, that damage was caused and windows smashed.

³⁴ Pevsner refers to the Royal Academy as ‘the second of the “anomalous” academies, the others being St Petersburg in Russia, and the third, Madrid. They are anomalous by virtue of being founded and administered along different principles to the contemporary French, German and Italian academies of art. St Petersburg, Pevsner suggests, was anomalous by the degree of ‘state interference exercised’ and The Royal Academy by its almost total independence from the state. Madrid, took raising artists status to extremes, and conferred nobility

culmination of attempts by artists to gain more direct control over their affairs than was felt to be the case with their situation within the Society of Arts. In 1755 The Society had considered a draft application from Henry Cheere for a charter to found an Academy of Painting and Sculpture. This was not taken up, but the draft was almost identical to the 'Instrument' later granted by George III which founded the Royal Academy. (Sutton, 1967, p. 297) Cheere used his connection with the architect William Chambers to raise the request for patronage with the King; Chambers was head of the Office of Works, the official government architectural department and thus ideally placed to petition the King. Chambers informed King George III that he and a group of distinguished artists were keen to establish a society under his patronage that should "more effectually promote the arts of design than any yet established". (RAA/IF/1)

In its initial proposal, the aims of the proposed body were distinctly different from the Society of Arts. Instead of merely finding and rewarding talent, it was specifically to establish a 'well-regulated School or Academy of Design, for the use of students in the Arts' but with an additional remit to hold 'an Annual Exhibition, open to all artists of distinguished merit' (RAA/IF/1)³⁵. The Academy also sought to distance itself from a second faction that had split from the Society of Arts, the Free Society of Artists, 'set up by artists with a radical bent, with Hogarth as their secular saint.' (Mullan, 2013, para. 2) The Royal Academy, astutely aligning itself to George III's imperial aspirations, flourished; the Free Society did not. As Mullan suggests, 'the fledgling institution appealed strongly to (the King's) sense of national self-importance.' (Mullan, 2013, para. 3)

The founding of the Royal Academy was, according to Mullan, concerned with 'the many clauses and subclauses by which the enthusiastic would-be bureaucrats regulated their artistic activities' and 'the leading players such as Reynolds and Chambers professing grand ideals while driven by vanity and pique.' The imperialist nature of the project was buttressed by the direct evocation of the authority of classical antiquity as the well-spring from which the curriculum, the content and the artists themselves would seek guidance.

on all academicians, Successive attempts to bring the Royal Academy under state control foundered owing to the RA's total financial self-sufficiency. (Pevsner 1940, p. 183-187)

³⁵ The Instrument of Foundation, which can be viewed at the Royal Academy archive, suggests 'the belief that the profits arising from the exhibition would be sufficient to cover all the costs of the intended School and, in fact, would yield a surplus which could be distributed to charities.' One of the perplexing questions to consistently dog art education throughout its long history was how, and by whom, was it to be funded.

Mullan (2013) notes that the Royal Academy can be seen to mark the beginning of a public interest in *contemporary* art, as opposed to the ‘old masters’ that men and women of taste were meant to revere. Although ‘at the King’s command’, the starring work at the first exhibition was *The Departure of Regulus* by West, depicting ‘in a frigidly grand manner’ the departure of the Roman consul Regulus following his capture by Carthage in 255CE and is an example of Alberti’s *istoria* – fully three centuries after Alberti pronounced it ‘the greatest work of a painter’ and despite Reynolds’ passionate espousal of ‘his culture’s official faith in history painting’ it would be for the compellingly contemporary portraits of actors and aristocrats that Reynolds would be known. The public would seem to have little taste for the *istoria*, this ‘inert artefact.’ (Mullan, 2013, para. 6)

The classical principles on which the Academy was established were given annual public airings in Reynolds’ *The Discourses*, a series of lectures in which he advocated ‘the “grand style” which characterised the work of the academic artists of the latter part of the eighteenth century, as opposed to the ‘realists’ like Hogarth and Morland. The *Third Discourse* of 1770 defined its ‘great leading principles’ as ‘style, genius and taste’. (Hogarth, in Carline, 1968, p. 59)

As Carline describes it:

this doctrine contributed to the creation of a thoroughly artificial concept of art, far removed from the world of normal men and women, and steered art teaching, in so far as it was attempted at all in general education, along the pedantic course from which Ruskin tried to rescue it a century later.’ (p. 59)

In pursuit of the ‘grand style’, students sought to model their work directly on the great masters of the past and absorb the ideals of beauty enshrined in classical antiquity³⁶. In this, Reynolds

³⁶ As just one persistent example; one of the founding principles – the ideal of beauty which pertains to the elimination of individuality and flaws – is from the tale of the *Five Maidens of Croton*. Pliny wrote of it in his *Naturalis Historia*; Cicero included it in his *De Inventione*; Castiglioni had it in *Il Cortegiano*; and Hoby passed it on in his translation *The Courtier*. Quentin Bell writing in 1963 quotes it at length, Macdonald in 1970 mentions it more succinctly. By such baton passing, the accretion of centuries and the citing of an authentic Arcadian source, such tales became the theoretical framework and foundational in the development of the episteme, even if the tales themselves were no longer spoken of the lessons therein passed on. In Hoby’s version, the tale is rendered as:

‘Have you not read of the five daughters of Croton, which among the rest of the people, Zeisis the peincter chose to make of all five one figure that was most excellent in beawty, and wer renowmed of many Poets, as they that wer allowed for beawtifull of him that ought to have a most perfect judgment in beawty?’ (see Pliny, *Naturalis Historia*, Book XXXV, chapter 36, Cicero’s *De Inventione* Book II chapter 1; Hoby *The Courtier*, (p. 68); Bell *The Schools of Design*, (p. 5); Macdonald *The History and Philosophy of Art Education*, (p. 53) and doubtless others)

was able to draw on powerful philosophical and theoretical texts appearing in English translation. In addition to Alberti's *Della Pittura*; there was Vasari's *Le Vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori, ed architettori*; and Pliny's *Naturalis Historia*. There were also contemporary texts appearing, such as *Anecdotes of painting in England, with some account of the principal artists, and notes on other arts; collected by G. Vertue* of 1762, published by Walpole; the seminal *History of Ancient Art* 1764, by the German proto-Art Historian Johann Winckelmann; *Aretin: A Dialogue on Painting from the Italian of Lodovico Dolce* 1770; and Reynolds' own Discourses.

Together, these texts provided both a technical guide to the practice of painting and sculpture, and outlined a history of art that could inform the practice *and* exist as a discipline in its own right. Winckelmann's book, coming as it did from the Superintendent of Antiquities in Rome, was accepted as the voice of authority in the interpretation of classical art, although Haydon regarded Winckelmann as a 'useless, pedantic, ambiguous rhapsodist'. (Haydon, in Cunningham, p. 51)

Criticism and appreciation in art now became serious branches of study. As Carline (1968) says:

By the end of the century, we find the professors at the Royal Academy... concentrating their lectures almost exclusively on the work of the old masters and of classical antiquity, as the only models for the student to follow. Attention was directed away from the observation of real life in total absorption in the art of the past.' (pp. 59-60)

4.7 In summary

Even in this early stage, the development of art education began to show distinct values and doctrinal tendencies; firstly, the instruction of the artist; secondly, the production, collection and appreciation of 'fine art'; and thirdly, the acquisition and development of drawing as a technical skill to support cartography, industrial design and architecture. These tendencies, arising from the diverse historiographical origins of art education were distinct, contradictory, deeply held by their proponents and their resolution was to dog art education throughout its subsequent history.

From the disparate elements in play, a complex ecology begins to emerge; an inevitable gravitational influence from increasing public and state actors begins to coalesce these

elements into concrete forms which in themselves will allow further opportunities for control, oversight, power and policy to be brought to bear.

This period marks a graspable moment of disruption; the formation of new structures of public art education that broke with both the guild system, and with the recent era of the gentleman painter. The mid-eighteenth century sees the early emergence of professional, state sanctioned art education, with its attendant bodies, policies and apparatus. This is not to suggest that this led to a clean break with the past; in fact, subsequent art education continued to incorporate many elements from the past, often uncritically. These elements, hidden deep in the fundamental discourse, function like an unseen ocean reef, influencing the currents and the surface of the sea. Uncovering these elements and tracing their influences is, as Koopman (2013) suggests, the concern of genealogies. As he says:

The problems of genealogy are those problems found below the surfaces of our lives... these submerged problems are those that condition us without our ever fully understanding how or why... despite their depth, these problems are also right at the surface insofar as they condition us in our every action, our every quality, our every thought, our every sadness and smile. (p. 1)

The continuation of elements such as Pliny's lament for a lost classical past, the hierarchy of disciplines, and the growing schism between fine art and technical art, even as they became even more deeply buried, were to continue to exert an often-unacknowledged influence over the development of the English art school system, as will be apparent in subsequent chapters.

5 The State takes an interest: Late-Georgian radicals and Victorian Systemisation

This chapter considers a most significant period that can be considered as marking the beginning of almost a century and a half of direct government control of art education. The first intervention was a response to the perceived failure of the Royal Academy to facilitate the development of economically useful designers and a desire for art to make a contribution to the national economic situation, despite being in receipt of state funding.

A distinctively bureaucratic process was applied to the development of a national system of education; taking evidence, commissioning a report, examining existing systems of art education, and then initiating a national system based on rational deliberations. The resulting system that emerged from this technocratic process made concrete within the institutional apparatus a duality in art educational doctrine that remained unresolved even at the demise of the art schools 140 years later; what were the art schools for? Fine art or design?

In as much as the government drove the increase in scale of art education to a national level of provision, this doctrinal dualism was institutionalised from the start and is key to understanding much of what continually undermined the English art school system (for indeed, it was a national system from this point forward) as it was unable to resolve this issue. It needn't have been so difficult. The French and Germans had had art schools and design schools running in parallel (and occasionally in tandem) with great success for decades by this point, as the government knew from the evidence presented to the 1835 Select Committee. The lesson was not learned, and instead a single system was implemented that tried to resolve two doctrinally divergent systems of practice.

There were seven government interventions during this period, with the reports of 1836, 1842, 1849, 1853, 1854, 1864 and 1884³⁷ each one attempting to either problematize the provision of art education, or resolve problems arising from the implementation of previous policy. Additionally, and, not for the last time, charismatic individuals aligned themselves with

³⁷ 1836, Report of the Select Committee on Arts and Manufacture; 1842, First Report of the Royal Commissioners on the Fine Arts; 1849, Report of the Select Committee on the Government Schools of Design; 1853, First Report of the Department of Practical Art; 1854, First Report of the Department of Science and Art; 1864, Report of the Select Committee on the Schools of Art; 1884, Report of the Royal Commission on Technical Instruction.

specific doctrine, and arguments continued over which doctrine should direct the philosophy and curriculum of the system. As will be seen, these arguments centred around either the adoption of the French system, which centred on fine art practice as the basis for subsequent specialisation in either painting or design, or the German system which separated fine art and design teaching into separate institutions. Each position was taken up by influential individuals, and it is to be wondered to what extent these individuals were able to contort a national system to their own philosophical leanings. To complicate matters still further, there was a successful revival of classical practice with the setting up of the Slade School.

Finally, there was the opening of a large number of ‘Government Schools of Design’, around the country. This critical infrastructure, regardless of whichever doctrine held sway at the time or later, would come to form the nucleus of a national system of art school education that was fully dispersed across the regions until it was dismantled in the 1960s.

5.1 1835, the Select Committee

The setting up of the 1835 Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures is a clearly recognisable point of rupture in the trajectory of the English art school system; it marks a distinct bifurcation between the academic model that served the dilettante clientele of Georgian England and an attempt to find new models that might be better suited to meet the challenges brought about by the significant social and economic changes of the late Georgian period. As Ashwin (1975) noted, ‘The committee concerned itself with two major issues, the quality of British industrial design, and the provision of art and design education in the country.’ (p. 8) Pevsner (1940) suggested that:

Applied art³⁸ was in the most debased condition at that time. Academicians were too conceited to take an interest in it, trade schools too overburdened to give enough thought to its needs, and guilds were no longer in existence to uphold standards.’ (p. 246)

In large part, the 1835 Select Committee was brought about by dissatisfaction with the Royal Academy. The Royal Academy’s founding aims were twofold; ‘the establishment of a well-regulated school of design for the use of students, and an annual exhibition.’ (Macdonald, 2004, p. 62) In fact, as Macdonald concluded, in the early years of the nineteenth century the

³⁸ ‘Applied art’ was a contemporary term for what we would consider now the discipline of design.

Nomenclature can be distractingly confused throughout this period, not really settling into current forms until the reviews of art education in the 1960s.

Academicians interest in art education did not even extend as far as their own Schools. Instead, the professorships were regarded as sinecures for senior members, and:

there were many years in which the students in the schools received no lectures from a professor of a particular subject, although the Instrument³⁹ lays down that these salaried professors must annually give six lectures each.⁴⁰ (p. 62)

Again, Pevsner (1940) provides us with pithy insight:

the Royal Academy... remained virtually what it had always been. Distinguished Professors were not lacking... But that meant only lecturing a few times a year, or not even that. The social importance of the Royal Academy remained centred in its exhibitions and annual dinners. Educationally it was of little consequence.' (p. 221)

This state of affairs could not be allowed to continue, not only was the Academy failing in its stated mission of education, but it was viewed as a privileged, elitist monopoly that was enjoyed prestigious premises at the public expense. (Ashwin, 1975, p. 9) The Royal Academy founders had explicitly described as 'the two principal objects' of the future academy 'the establishing of a well-regulated School or Academy of Design, for the use of students in the Arts, and an Annual Exhibition, open to all artists of distinguished merit.' (Pevsner, 1940, p. 185) In the latter it met with great success, in the former it was seen to have failed. Pevsner again; 'the exhibitions grew fast in size and attendance. The school on the other hand remained small. On an average there were not more than thirty students enrolled each year.' (p. 186)

Not for the last time, it was felt that something must be done. Between the founding of the Royal Academy, and the establishment of the Government Schools of Design, England underwent significant economic, political and cultural changes. The Academy was established under royal patronage in a nation that was largely agricultural, the Schools of Design were to meet the needs of a rapidly industrialising nation, under the guidance of a parliamentary process. As Bell, looking back from 1963, wrote:

³⁹ The Instrument of Foundation is the original scheme for the establishment and government of the Royal Academy of Arts, presented to King George III on the 7th of December, 1768.

⁴⁰ Page 21 of the Instrument: *'There shall be a Professor of Painting, who shall read annually six lectures in the Royal Academy, calculated to instruct the Students in the principles of composition; to form their taste for design and colouring; to strengthen their judgement; to point out to them the beauties and imperfections of celebrated works of art, and the particular excellencies and defects of great masters; and finally, to lead them into the readiest and most efficacious paths of study: his salary shall be thirty pounds a year, and he shall continue in office during the King's pleasure.'* Six lectures a year. In 2022 I was delivering six, two days each week.

We had become a nation of shopkeepers, industrialists, landowners and landless peasants. The whole relationship between art and industry had been upset by the advent of steam power and a whole new clientele had come into existence which was increasingly far-removed from the spending habits and tastes of the eighteenth-century dilettante. (p. 34)

The Royal Academy was no longer seen as sufficient to meet either the needs of this new clientele, nor the changed economic circumstances of the nation. In the conventional historiography of art schools, much is made of the economic drivers behind these developments, Ashwin (1975) summarises it thusly:

During the early years of the industrial revolution Britain had depended on its considerable technical lead to monopolize world markets in manufactured goods. However, with the conclusion of the Napoleonic wars in 1815, the economic welfare of the country was increasingly threatened by foreign competition... Our biggest mechanized industry, textiles, was thrown into fierce competition with that of France, and the French were seen to excel with products which paid more attention to the quality of design than to quantity and economy, the prevalent British criteria. (p. 8)

More recent work, particularly that of Mervyn Romans, challenges the prevailing view that the subsequent development of the art school system was driven primarily by rational, political and economic drivers. As he puts it; ‘Making rather generalised references to the politics and politicians involved, historians have tended to skirt around an exploration of the early to mid-nineteenth-century political agenda in relation to art and design education.’ (Romans, 2007, p. 215) Malcolm Quinn (2011) argues ‘that in this instance, economic necessity should be defined according to the terms of political economic theories that offered ‘scientific’ reasons for the economic benefits of political change.’ (p. 63)

It is certainly the case that the establishment of the committee was a significant Parliamentary intervention into the art education of a nation. As Quinn (2011) states:

It is widely acknowledged that the origins of publicly funded art education in Britain lie in a belated political response to changes wrought by industrial capitalism, that precipitated the formation of the Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures of 1835/6 and the establishment of the School of Design in 1837.’ (p. 63)

Romans (2007) further suggests it is ‘generally acknowledged as being the key political event in the establishment of a system of public art and design education in Britain.’ (p. 215)

The origins of the committee are not necessarily as rational as the conventional historiography might suggest. Bell (1963) accounts for the setting up of the committee as an inevitable outcome of ‘the war between the Royal Academy and Haydon’s Parliamentary allies... the Committee resulted from the grievances and misgivings of many people’ (pp. 52-53) rather

than simply a matter of economic rationalism; Ashwin (1975) provides examples of the committee's interest in 'criticisms of the Royal Academy' (p. 21) and the 'detrimental effects of Academies' (p. 22) highlighting to some extent how the committee was, for Haydon at least, 'a theatre in which he could recite his grievances'; in many ways Carline (1963) tends to the less critical view that 'in the field of design that action was demanded. Foreign artisans had long been competing with British craftsmen... and the expansion of industry and manufacture made the training of designers... more than ever necessary.' (p. 75) Quinn goes so far as to say, 'the idea of the art school was developed by a core 'philosophic radical' and Benthamite group within the Select Committee of Arts and Manufactures, using political economic theories that linked the promotion of public enlightenment and national prosperity, to criticisms of the professions and institutions of art.' (p. 63)

What is less clear, as Quinn (2011) goes on to state, is 'exactly how capitalism determined, or ultimately failed to determine, the forms of art school pedagogy.' (p. 63) One problem with these various texts at this particular historical period – and one of the difficulties faced in interrogating them – is the interchangeability of the terms 'art' and 'design' and the varying nomenclature for both. As the primacy of fine art, in the academic, historical sense, faced competing modes of practice and pedagogy, there is a rise in the term 'design' to mean art practice that is not 'fine' but 'low', commercial. Both terms are far from neutral, and each can connote significant symbolic weight within a specific usage. Within this thesis, it would be useful to, broadly speaking, understand 'art' as the practice of fine art (painting, sculpture – architecture by this point having become its own discipline) and 'design' as the practice of applying aesthetic principles to manufactured artefacts. There are overlaps in some of the fundamental skills involved in developing the practice of each, but there are also significant differences – often bound up in the class system that underpins all English systems – the resolution of which would dog not only the outcomes of the 1835 Select Committee but much of the evolution of the art school system thereafter.

The Select Committee took statements from a variety of witnesses, undergoing questions from a number of committee members. Romans' 2007 paper *An Analysis of the Political Complexion of the 1835/6 Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures* analyses the composition of the committee from a political perspective, investigating more thoroughly than either Bell or MacDonald particularly in regard to the nature of the questions asked, and from whom they came. The result of this analysis suggests that the principal committee members, characterised

by Bell (1963) in particular as radicals representing Northern mercantile interests, were in many aspects a great deal less reform minded than has been previously accepted. Romans' analysis shows:

that there was an equal split between; 1– those who had a strong manufacturing connection, 2 – those who did not, but were in some degree liberal, laissez-faire, reforming etc. and, 3 – those who were Tories and potentially hostile to manufacturing interests.' (p. 220)

The physical limits of this thesis preclude a more extensive reiteration of the nuanced arguments put forward by Quinn (2011) and Romans (2007), but it is sufficient to record that together they advance the understanding from Ashwin (1975), Bell (1963), and Carline (1968) of the contested, contingent and multiple factors that were in play at the cessation of the Select Committee and that would attend its outcome; the Final Report and (in direct opposition to the perceived faults, biases and limitations of the Royal Academy) a proposal for a parliamentary vote on the foundation of a 'Normal School of Design' that would offer 'not mere theoretical instruction only, but the direct practical application of the Arts to Manufactures' (House of Commons, 1836, v).

5.2 The Government School of Design: Doctrine and Values

The significance of the first steps taken by the State to sponsor art education in a practical way cannot be overestimated; these initial attempts to address a desire to improve the training of artists in England illuminate the contradictory values underpinning the desire to increase the provision of art training, the political contexts, the passionate personalities, what and how art should be taught, who should pay, and to what ends art served the state. It is within these foundational debates that the animating philosophic impulses can be readily seen, and from them can be traced the tangled and contradictory influences that would underpin the distinctive art school system that emerged. Perhaps the clearest indication of the disruption that arose from the Select Committee's Final Report of 1836 is to state boldly; for the next 140 years, the Government would directly control the structure, content and direction of almost all art education in England, and that control was initially exerted not by a Board or Ministry of Education, nor even an Art Academy or Society, but by the Board of Trade.

The introduction of a state-sponsored system for art education, where previously there was only laissez-faire disinterest or aristocratic patronage, required practical examples to provide a guide. To this end, the Select Committee commissioned an investigation of the existing systems

in France and Germany. The Select Committee's final report of 1835, according to Ashwin (1975), 'reveal(ed) the prevalent conviction that the quality of French design could directly be related to the system of state-subsidised art education.' (p. 8) However, as he continues, a foundational paradox was then introduced by the committee:

whilst admit(ing) that German design was inferior in many respects to French, it was the Prussian witness Dr Gustave Waagen who seems to have made the greatest impact on the Committee.' (pp. 8-9)

Ashwin (1975) suggests that the Board of Trade – who would be responsible for the administration of the Schools of Design – were:

already committed to the German Gewerb-Institut system, under which design was closely wedded to science and technology, rather than the French system, in which fine art provided the foundation and rationale of all design activities.' (p. 9)

This confusion introduced an insoluble paradox into the nascent curricula and subsequent pedagogy that was to confound the art school system for the rest of its independent existence.

The establishment of the Main School in London, and the subsequent establishment (over a period of a decade) of the first twenty-one Branch Schools in the major provincial towns in England affords an opportunity to examine the conflicting passions, and philosophies that underpinned the subsequent development of the English art school system. This thesis has already recounted the slow ascent of Fine Art and the Academy as a distinct fracture from craft and the guilds. Much of this movement sought to systemise a practice that invoked antique notions of painting as an act of ennoblement and nobility, both in its practitioners and in its subjects; the aristocratic portrait, the history painting, the evocation of statesmanship, diplomacy, the national character, visible audits of wealth and power. This forms one doctrinal nexus around which ideas and practices of curricula would coalesce.

Conventional readings of this period would suggest that a second nexus forms around the economic, utilitarian justification for an expansion of art education; firstly, to address perceptions of commercial competition with European neighbour states; secondly to address perceived excesses and elitism of the Royal Academy and the sterility of its Academic teaching practice. According to Ashwin, 'much of the evidence expressed disquiet about the privileged position which the RA enjoyed.' (p. 9) The RA was able to 'occupy premises provided at the public expense whilst reserving the right to deny the public access and evading any kind of public scrutiny.' (p. 9) A closer reading of both Carline and, in particular, Bell, suggest that in

fact these competing foci for art education were more entangled and less clear cut than can be assumed from the later historiographical accounts.

Certainly, the establishment of the Schools of Design – the first State-supported art schools in England – was complex and problematic. As Bell (1963) put it:

their history is one of scandal, confusion and disaster; they were distracted by feuds, encumbered by debts and convulsed by mutinies. This unhappy state of affairs was in part due to circumstances of the age... and to the peculiarly difficult, incalculable or enigmatic character of such men as Haydon, Cole, Dyce, Heath Wilson, Kerr, Etty, and Gladstone. (pp. 1-2)

According to Bell, ‘the Report... undoubtedly created a great stir.’ It provided the first rude shock that persuaded the public to set about the business of creating art schools.’ (p. 60)

Strong States had made and developed the idea of the academy of art. Their legitimate reason had been to issue a certain quantity and a certain quality of art, useful to, and desired by court or government. Now art had emancipated itself since about 1800... after this the artist regarded himself as the bearer of a message superior to that of State and society. Independence was consequently his sacred privilege. To serve society would have been to degrade himself.’ (Pevsner 1940, p. 241)

Artists and academies, in the view of the Select Committee, having proven themselves ineffective at improving either the public taste, or the economy of the state, would not henceforth direct art education. Perhaps a revival of artisanal training under the guise of art education might be the way forwards? Significantly, for future developments:

there was at that time no Board or Ministry of Education and no Minister to whom the task of organizing schools would fall... The matter was therefore placed in the hands of the Board of Trade. (Bell 1963, p. 60)

5.3 Fumbling towards a national system: Values and Doctrine

The means by which the provincial Schools of Design – the Branch Schools – were brought about gives an insight into their contested origins, and their confused nature. The origins were by no means clear cut, and the outcomes by no means certain. But as Bell remarks:

... apart from the personal quarrels, the governmental fumbblings and tergiversations, the political chicanery and office-seeking... there was an important discussion of principle, a debate concerning the nature of art schools which turned upon the questions of whether they should be workshops or academies.’ (Bell, 1963, p. 1-2)

More pragmatically, where should schools be located, who should pay for them, and how exactly would they contribute to their specific local manufacturers? What, exactly, was to be taught, and to whom? There was no extant national exemplar to follow, only the Royal Academy that had been deemed an unsuitable model. Instead, the 1835 Select Committee had

to look elsewhere for a viable system; only France and Germany were seen to offer such examples at this time.

The Select Committee heard its witnesses, pondered awhile, and then produced a report largely agreeing with the proposals put forward by William Dyce, in preference to those of Benjamin Haydon. As will be seen, there were significant philosophical differences between the two that would have an impact on subsequent developments.

William Dyce ‘envisaged a strictly ordered Christian society in which every person should be trained only for that class of society in which he was predestined by God to serve’ (Macdonald, 1970, p. 77). Dyce had worked in Rome, but, far from succumbing to the ‘enchanted of Circes’, instead came under the ‘hard, precise German Nazarene painters who worked and lived together like a mediaeval guild in the Franciscan monastery of Sant’ Isidoro.’ (Macdonald, p. 77) Dyce was a narrow, High Church Nazarene, regarding art as ‘severe and precise craftsmanship, in fact a science.’ This rigid, hierarchical, overtly religious and Teutonic influence was to have profound consequences for the development of the Schools of Design.

Dyce visited France in September 1837, and found there a system that had been in operation for over a century and that had ‘some eighty recognised schools of art under the supervision of the Ministry of Public Instruction and Fine Arts.’ (p. 78) Macdonald (2004) further states; ‘Museums, galleries, palaces, and highly decorated churches of many periods were open for long hours with free admission, and the municipal buildings were furnished with works of art.’ England by contrast was a forlorn landscape utterly bereft of art in the provinces, and with precious little even in the capital. And access to what little art there was, whether for education, self-improvement, cultural capital or even simply for pleasure, was ruthlessly segregated on rigid class divisions.

Haydon was a passionate advocate of the French system, ‘an academic art training, which started with drawing each part of the body from models based on parts of Greek statuary, and ended with compositions of Classical epics’ organised under ‘an academy that was an efficient branch of the civil service.’ (Macdonald, 2004, p. 25) The school of the Academie, the *École des Beaux Arts*⁴¹, was highly regarded by British artists. Haydon was a ‘savage opponent of

⁴¹ The entrance exams not only included perspective, anatomy, design and life drawing, but were extended to include ‘history and other written subjects in French... aimed mainly at excluding the large number of British students, who were attracted by the superiority of the drawing there to that at the Royal Academy schools.’ (Macdonald, 2004, p. 27)

the Royal Academy... an artist who urged that copying works of art led to mere mannerism, whereas artists should follow the Greeks, not by imitating their works, but by studying the living nude as they did.’ (p. 58) Reynolds’ regime at the Royal Academy, implacably opposed by Haydon, was, according to Macdonald, ‘the nadir to which some academies sank... due to a faith in imitation and eclecticism.’ (p. 54) The beliefs of Reynolds, again according to Macdonald, ‘caused British students to copy historic art without any constructive teaching or method, in the vain hope that they would acquire the mysteries of ‘the great style, genius and taste.’⁴²’

This insistence on contemporary life drawing, not imitation of classical works of antiquity, was the animating force that motivated Haydon’s attempts to influence the direction of the Schools of Design. This was another element, this one based in doctrinal practice, of the competing philosophies of art education that confounded the early formation of the art school system, Haydon presented the committee with a simple binary choice:

the method employed by Mr Dyce, a follower of the dry, hard, Gothic German school, is based on the German *gewerbeschule*⁴³, whereas my proposals are based on the practice of the school at Lyons – and which do think is best, German design or French?

The route not taken then or later (for example, in the pondering of the NACAE in the 1960s) was that art *could* have had one system, and design another, just as was done in France and Germany⁴⁴. There was no necessity to select one and eliminate the other.

The original intention was that the regional schools would be closely aligned to the local manufactures, in the same manner as that in the *gewerbeschule* system: at Augsburg the emphasis was on the local calico printing industry; at Nuremberg on metal casting; and at Munich on stained glass, metalwork and wood-carving. That this intention was certainly not executed, in any meaningful sense, is in part due to the peculiarities of the industrialisation of English society. As Donald Horne (1969)⁴⁵ wrote, ‘somewhere in the nineteenth century

⁴² ‘Those who have talents will find methods for themselves’ (Reynolds, in Macdonald, p. 54) As a Course Leader for a decade and a half, I can bear witness to this attitude remaining entrenched in my practical experience; numerous staff I managed had no constructive teaching nor method to assist students and relied on pre-existing talent to get by. They were very quick to claim credit for the student’s successes as I recall.

⁴³ Literally, a trade school

⁴⁴ In the French system, all students underwent the same basic training then specialised in distinctly different institutions. In the German system students entered different specialist institutions from the start. Only the English tried to teach designers and artists in the same institution using the same instruction methods.

⁴⁵ ‘The Australian writer and academic Donald Horne is best remembered in Britain for his vivid summation of one of its largest divisions – that between the north and the south. Writing in 1969, Horne decided that the Britain of what he called the northern metaphor was “pragmatic, empirical, calculating, Puritan, bourgeois,

manufacturing became dirty... the more it succeeded, the dirtier it became.’ (p. 198). This can be seen to act as a brake on the desire to fully implement an effective industrial-educational ecology in the manner of, for example, Bavaria or Prussia. Horne (1969) again:

as new manufacturers established themselves in Britain, they showed a belief in the uselessness of education except as a means of achieving social advancement. They bought education for their own sons, but only to give them a lift in status. (p. 200)

More damningly, and this seems key to understanding the tensions built into the nascent art education system at this point, ‘a lack of interest in the value to business of an Oxford degree in classics or history was understandable enough; but this was accompanied by a contempt for thorough vocational training even for technologists and technicians. While the Americans, the Germans, and other(s)... were setting up whole complicated systems of training... the best the British usually did was to set up spare-time night schools.’ (p. 200)

The families of manufactures became respectable to the extent that they moved out of manufacturing or became so rich that they could buy themselves aristocratic virtue... by the end of the nineteenth century it was regular of the great manufacturing families to buy themselves landed estates and titles. (p. 198)

This unresolved tension, between contempt for vocational training and aristocratic virtue, underpins the debate between Haydon’s vision of a fine art Academy, and Dyce’s *gewerbeschule*; neither could achieve total domination over the other, and the resultant muddle plagued the subsequent development of the Schools of Design. Inevitably, the discourse was inflected by personal passions and enmity. Proponents of one system could see no merit in the other, and the government sat on the fence and procrastinated until Dyce’s arguments held sway.

Once the Report had been made, the first action was to form the Council that would govern the organisation, management and teaching within the Schools of Design. This Council, ‘charged with bringing the School into being, was composed of ‘Royal Academicians and gentlemen having an interest in arts and manufactures.’ It can be surmised that firstly the Academicians would have an active interest in preventing the Schools of Design from becoming *ersatz* Academies, and secondly, that the ‘gentlemen having an interest in arts and manufactures’

enterprising, adventurous, scientific, serious and believes in struggle”; while in the southern metaphor the same country was “romantic, illogical, muddled, divinely lucky, Anglican, aristocratic, traditional, frivolous, and believes in order and tradition”. The north’s great sin was “a ruthless avarice” rationalised in the belief that humanity’s prime impulse was “a calculating economic self-interest”; the south matched it with “a ruthless pride” that believed “men are born to serve”.

might not be particularly expert in either art, nor education. In some cases, they were not particularly expert in manufactures either, being of the clerical persuasion. The Council was to have a major impact on what – or more significantly, what would not – be taught in the Schools.

There were two distinct concepts of education in technical subjects at this time: the progressive concept of these modern subjects as a branch of liberal education as important as the classics and the fine arts, and the illiberal concept of these subjects as merely useful for a functional vocational training for the less intelligent classes to fit them for their occupations. (Macdonald, 2004, pp. 76-77)

On one point, however, the Council made up its mind. It was determined that in the School of Design the study of the human figure should *not* be taught. In order to enforce this prohibition, the policy of the Council, ‘to prescribe the subjects, course and method of teaching, and to select and appoint masters’ (Bell, 1963, p. 105) was enforced through financial means; for example, Birmingham Society of Arts originally proposed ‘a school that would give instruction in “the higher departments of art and in conjunction with trade and manufactures” but Somerset House would not support such an academy. It would provide funds only on the understanding that: ‘the Society of Arts is fully prepared to acquiesce in the proposed restriction of their institution to the province of ornamental art, as distinguished from that of Fine Art...’

The French system⁴⁶ did not distinguish between High and Low Art; students did not decide whether they would enter the fine arts department or the ornament (design) departments until they had completed a basic course of drawing and painting. (Macdonald, 2004, p. 79) Drawing from life was central to the course, and the life drawing class was open every evening. The French designers were acknowledged as the best in Europe. However, Dyce – so devious in his writings (Macdonald, 2004, p. 126) – constantly denigrated life drawing as a basis for design, and can be said to have misled the Select Committee in presenting the Prussian system as the correct model to follow for the Schools of Design.

Dyce was delighted by the Bavarian system; it concurred with his utilitarian view that ‘design is a science, and can be learned scientifically, starting from simple geometrical outlines and

⁴⁶ According to Pevsner; Colbert managed a ‘comprehensive academic system’ which transferred the idea of Royal Academies into other fields, such as music, and dance. The French state adopted a systematic approach to directing artistic activity towards nationalistic state ends.

ending with complicated technical facts...’ (Macdonald, 2004, p. 80) Dyce knew that the French system produced superior design, he also knew that France was the greater exporter of designs. However, he ended his Report to the Select Committee in ‘a typically devious manner by stating that the nations which did most for art education did not always earn the greatest profits from exports.’ (p. 80) As Bell has it, Dyce was ‘to a large extent, infected by the educational ideas of the Germans.’ (Bell, 1963, p, 79)

It is to be wondered what system might have evolved if, instead of Dyce’s partial take on the Bavarian system, a French system had been put in place from the start. Certainly, much time was wasted on tinkering with the flawed implementation of the system that was implemented. In fairness, it has to be said that neither the Bavarian nor the French system would have worked in the English context. The English had neither the educational thoroughness of the Bavarian school system to build on, nor the exemplary talent of the French for modern state bureaucracy. Instead, a mixture of English exceptionalism, laissez-faire capitalism, snobbery and rigid class apartheid warped misunderstandings of both systems into a peculiarly unsatisfactory ad-hoc English melange. As Carline asserts, ‘the wrong system was adopted.’ (p. 76)

For a full account of how wrong it was, Bell provides copious evidence. The scope and size of this thesis precludes a full survey here, but it is worth highlighting two specific problems.

Firstly, the Schools of Design were a state funded intervention in what had, up to that point, been a private, free enterprise endeavour. ‘The Schools of Design were brought into being by a Whig government acting upon the prompting of radicals, who in their turn were responsive to the demands of free enterprise.’ (Bell, 1963, p. 135) The schools conflicted both with private drawing masters and with industrialists; both wished the schools to do the opposite of what they currently monopolised. The private art masters wanted the schools to provide industrial training, and the industrialists wanted the schools to provide fine art training. As Bell says, ‘if the schools were to exist at all, and it appeared the economy of the country made them necessary, one set of vested interests was bound to suffer.’ (p. 135)

Secondly, ‘The invasion of the schools by the middle classes was one of the most disconcerting things that had to be considered by the authorities, and in the end, it was that invasion which, to a very large extent, determined their character.’ (Bell, 1963, pp.138-139) Bell provides a number of examples from the schools where, having been set up with state funding to provide

for region-specific artisanal training, the schools were being infiltrated by middle class students, predominantly women. As Bell suggests:

the council had, in fact, opened a door on the other side of which was a vast crowd of desperate young women. Just how vast a crowd it was, neither they nor anyone else could estimate, for here was a class which had no press, no representatives and no power, a class which was prevented by custom... from seeking employment in trade, industry, business or professions... Gentlewomen, who were allowed to do so little by the conventions of the age, might nevertheless find employment in the arts. Hence the rush to get in and the terribly long queue. (p. 137)

Partly, the problem was one of dealing with a rigid class structure; the schools offered strictly demarcated day and night classes, utilitarian and artisanal by day, middle class fine art by night. This was not just an example of class segregation; it was also an economic necessity. The schools were funded by the state to provide artisanal training, but this was not sufficient to fund the teaching and maintenance of the schools. State funding was expected to be matched by local subscription; this too was insufficient. The schools had to accommodate fee-paying middle-class students simply to provide additional income sufficient to operate, ‘the large number of fee-paying middle-class students enabled the schools to remain financially solvent.’ (Romans, 2005, p. 71)

The curriculum reflected these conflicting pressures and philosophies. Three strands were current; ‘the academy system, the scientific/design methods and the view that related figure to ornament.’ (Romans, 2005, p. 73) All three held that drawing was the common basis for all art and design, but each conflicted to the exact method that was best deployed to produce artists or artisans. The French made no distinction, the Bavarian’s preferred a scientific approach. The English system hedged its bets, and clung to notions of social class to provide a guide as to which curricula was most suited to which students. This epistemic hierarchy remained largely intact throughout the subsequent development of the art school system.

The system at this point consisted of the main school at Somerset House, London, and – over the decade 1842-1852 – a further twenty-one schools in provincial cities run either as auxiliaries of the main school, or as establishments in their own right.⁴⁷ Whatever shortcomings

⁴⁷ The initial schools were; Manchester, Spitalfields, The Royal Female School of Art (resulting from the segregation of male and female students at Somerset House), York, Birmingham, Sheffield, Newcastle, Glasgow, Nottingham, Coventry, Norwich, Leeds, Hanley, Stoke , Paisley, Cork, Dublin, Macclesfield, Belfast, Stourbridge, Worcester, St Martin’s (London) and Waterford.

there were in the founding and administration of these schools⁴⁸, they nonetheless formed the physical basis for the English art school system that would reach its apotheosis in the mid-late twentieth century, fully 150 further years later. It can be observed, that having accepted the need for a system of art education, the English were in no hurry to implement one and unsure what form it should take.

5.4 1849, Report of the Select Committee on the Government School of Design

According to Ashwin (1975), ‘12 years after its foundation, the Government School of Design seemed to be far from its declared objective of bringing about a significant improvement in the quality of British industrial goods.’ (p. 26) Consequently, it was subjected to review by a Select Committee (1849) appointed ‘to inquire into the Constitution and Management (of the School) and to Report their Opinion thereupon to The House.’ (p. 26)

As previously stated, the Schools of Design contained from their foundation two intrinsic flaws that were to directly contribute to demands for change; the unintended attendance of the middle classes (including women) or as Ashwin has it; ‘... students were attending the schools for the ‘wrong’ reasons, motivated by an interest in fine art or simply for recreation.’ (Ashwin, 1975, p. 26) and the parlous financial situation arising from iniquities in the original funding model, as detailed by Macdonald:

From the outset, the Board of Trade gave the administration of the whole annual grant of £10,000 for public art education to the Council of the Head School, and the Council gave its own school the lion’s share, with no conditions attached, while the provincial Schools were only allowed a sum equal to the local donations and subscriptions, up to a maximum of £600 a year.’ (Macdonald, 2004, p. 136)

Further development – or even managing reasonable ongoing and existing costs – was not possible under such a system; ‘The financial position of some of the branch schools was precarious, and the uncertainty of funds from year to year inhibited planned development.’ (Ashwin, 1975, p. 26)

Additionally, there was a growing concern that despite a considerable outlay of public funds:

The system of finance proved a failure. Most of the Schools of Design had fallen into debt and only seventeen had been established in the first ten years; in the words of the *Art Union*⁴⁹: ‘- ten years’ labour has scarcely produced a mouse, an expenditure of

⁴⁸ Bell writes at length, and often entertainingly, about the many such shortcomings.

⁴⁹ *The Art Union* was a monthly journal of the fine arts, founded in 1839 by Hodgson and Graves. Acquired in 1848 by George Virtue, became *The Art Journal* in 1849 and continued publication until 1912.

£100,000 has originated hardly an atom of benefit to the Manufacturers of Great Britain.’ (Macdonald, 2004, p. 136)

Staffing was also an issue; at this point ‘the Schools had found difficulty in appointing and keeping suitable staff, and those who were appointed often came into conflict with one another, or the administration, or both. There was no reservoir of capable designers from which staff could be drawn⁵⁰.’

The curriculum was also under attack on various fronts; ‘...because of a lack of elementary drawing in the public day schools much of the activity of the Schools of Design was confined to elementary art studies which, on the whole, were not followed up by more advanced work.’ (Ashwin, 1975, p. 26)

Into this uncertainty came one of art education’s periodic charismatic interventionists, Henry Cole. An opportunist of considerable capability, Cole⁵¹ was a Civil Servant in the Records Office. Possessed with an enthusiasm for art and a passion for administering artistic ventures, he was acquainted with many who could exert authority.’ (Carline, 1963, p. 80) Chief among these were Albert, Prince Consort, President of the Society of Arts, amateur artist and architect who was interested ‘to wed mechanical skill with High Art.’ (Macdonald, 2004, p. 129) and John Shaw Lefevre, Secretary of the Board of Trade and Thomas Milner Gibson, formerly Vice-President of the Board of trade and – home to a notably troublesome School of Design and with manufacturers interests – MP for Manchester. Having been introduced to Lefevre, as Macdonald suggests, Cole determined that:

there was a great possibility that art for manufactures might, under Albert’s influence, eventually form an important department of the Government.’ Further, ‘He intended to be the one permanent civil servant governing the Schools of Design.’ (Macdonald, 2004, pp. 129- 130)

Not for the last time, having impelled the introduction of a flawed system, the government was obliged through the mobilisation of popular agitation to correct its own errors by appointing a

⁵⁰ The situation hadn’t significantly improved in the 2000s when I tried to recruit staff to specialist design courses.

⁵¹ According to Macdonald, who devotes a chapter to Cole, the Civil Servant had become interested in art education while using his access to the Public Records to publish illustrated pamphlets on Westminster Abbey, Hampton Court and other medieval buildings; he also designed a silver tea-service for which he was awarded a silver medal by the Society of Arts. This attracted the attention of Prince Albert, President of the Society, and by such means Cole collected the men of influence who would advance his cause.

Select Committee, and commissioning a Report (*Report of the Select Committee on the Government School of Design*) in 1849.

In addition to Cole's efforts to forge networks of influence, he 'began to create a climate of opinion' (Bell 1963, p. 220) by launching a new periodical, *The Journal of Design*. It was an astute move, and a vehicle through which Cole was not only able to encourage manufacturers to his own views, but to act as a legitimizing platform for his attacks on the administration of the Schools of Design in the guise of objective editorial. *The Journal of Design* contained technical information that was pertinent to the manufacturers, it also contained physical samples of their textiles within its pages, examples of good and bad ornamental design, polemics, advertisements, scurrilous gossip and political grandstanding. It was 'Cole's main instrument for harrying the authorities at Somerset House' (Bell 1963, p. 220) and it was also a direct response to the *Art Union Journal*, which sought to thwart Cole's ambitions for reform.

Not coincidentally, on March 10th 1849, a motion was tabled in the House of Commons to call for a Select Committee to investigate the Schools of Design. Ashwin (1975) asserts that 'the driving force was ... Henry Cole.' (p. 27) Cole was to prove an energising force in the development of art education in Victorian England, mastering as he did the nuances of both the mechanics of government and the exercise of power through upper class, aristocratic and royal networks. Ashwin states that 'Cole... was destined shortly to reign as virtual dictator of art education in Britain.' (Ashwin, 1975, p. 27)

5.5 1853, First Report of the Department of Practical Art: policy as dispositif.

Bell (1963) covers this period in some detail, space precludes a more thorough overview here, but once the need for reformation was established – on economic, financial and administrative levels – there was a short pause while the various factions regrouped. The necessity for an improved organisation was acknowledged by the Board of Trade which, on February 16 1852, created the Department of Practical Art giving it full responsibility for the management of the 23 Schools of Design in existence at that point. Henry Cole was appointed as its General Superintendent, and as Ashwin (1975) states; 'set about his duties with gusto.' (p. 36) Cole appointed Richard Redgrave as the Art Superintendent. The significance of this event is that, According to Bell (1963), 'Cole... secured the complete reorganization of the administrative structure of the Schools; they would no longer be ruled by committees of artists or of civil servants.' (p. 249) This moment marks the point at which the provision of public art education passes out of the hands of artists, or art-inclined amateurs and becomes part of the apparatus of

government. For Bell (1963), the history of the Schools of Design ends with the formation of the Department of Practical Art (p. 253). For the longer historiography of art education in England, it marks the beginning of a different model of art administration, as a function of government with specific economic and cultural intentions, and the resulting administrative apparatus makes concrete the doctrinal distinction between fine art and practical art.

The First Report articulated three specific declarations; firstly, there should be elementary education in art; secondly, there should be provision for ‘Advanced Instruction in Art’; and finally, ‘Applications of the Principles of Technical Art to the improvement of manufactures.’ Ashwin (1975) notes that ‘this order of priorities represents an inversion of the original objectives for public art education.’ (p. 36) More significantly, the First Report was the *only* report produced by the Department for Practical Art; in 1854 it was ‘overtaken by the formation of the Department of Science and Art, of which it became a part.’ (p. 36) Thus, having achieved a measure of independence and administrative maturity, art education as a distinct entity was almost immediately subsumed into a larger organisation in which it would occupy a subservient role. This would not be the last time that government interaction with art education would develop; long struggles for independence, doctrinal skirmishes, internal struggles for dominance followed by autonomy won and immediately lost.

The twenty-year period, 1852-1873, ‘during which Henry Cole directed public art education, saw the most rapid increase of art institutions in British history’ (Macdonald, 2004, p. 57) But as Macdonald (1970) further suggests; ‘A national system of art education was set up of such thoroughness and rigidity that it truly merited the name ‘cast iron.’’ (p. 157) Foucault uses the term *dispositif* to fully describe the complexity of such systems, in particular how the ‘said, as much as the unsaid’ (Foucault, in Gordon, 1980, p. 194) shaped the discourse and generated the energy for future developments. It is not just what was taught, and not even what was prohibited from being taught, but it is also about the nebulous power exerted by what was not taught, and therefore what possibilities could not be thought of or articulated. This *dispositif* was manifested through the administration of a totalising system; in the training of art teachers, the imposition of exams and certification, the prohibition of all but the most mechanical copying in the teaching of drawing.

Although manifesting as a system of art education, in operation it was nothing of the kind. The academic model espoused by the Society of Arts, and the rigid, geometrical copying system in the Schools of Design were, at an aesthetic level, diametrically opposed. Each was to play a

fundamental part in shaping the future art education system, each would provoke a counter strike from artists and educators who felt unjustly constrained by the restrictions imposed within each system of thought.

Under Cole's utilitarian philosophy, the *dispositif* of the Practical Schools of Art brought into existence three interlinked apparatus that shaped the system and its evolution, including what could, and could not be seen to be legitimate. This was reinforced by a system of examinations and certification that rewarded exemplary behaviours in art practice, based on a rigorous technical system of accurate copying, outlined in painstaking detail by Redgrave. The significance lies in that this was a system and had been consciously designed as such, which differentiates it from previous more ad-hoc arrangements for art education.

5.6 Art education gets a new home: the Department of Science and Art

At the state opening of Parliament in 1852 the Queen made the following pronouncement: 'The advancement of the fine arts and of practical science will be readily recognized by you as worthy of the attention of a great and enlightened nation.' (Ashwin 1975. p. 39)

On the 16th of March 1853, officials of the Board of Trade wrote to the Treasury proposing the establishment of a united Department of Science and Art, one consequence of which was that:

for just under half a century, from 1853 to 1899, the Department of Science and Art controlled in effect the whole of public art education, including... what went on in the public elementary schools. Cole therefore became one of the most powerful civil servants of his day. (Ashwin 1975. p. 39)

In 1853 the Department of Practical Art, only a year old, was enlarged to embrace science in addition to art and the Department's title changed to reflect that larger responsibility.

This period is significant therefore as it not only firmly positions art education within a discourse of the Victorian English nation state, but also aligns it within an apparatus foregrounded by economic utilitarianism, notions of civic and cultural enlightenment, and also individual improvement; an apparatus designed to improve the character of the future working man and make him more efficient. 'Cole held evolutionary views and believed that, provided plenty of Schools of Art and school drawing classes existed... the meritorious would use these facilities to succeed.' (Macdonald, 2004, p. 177)

Sutton (1967) gives an account of Cole's views on the formation of the School of Design thus:

First teach the public to know what good art is, and the Schools of Design will soon learn how to provide it... The efforts of all who desire that the people of this country should acquire a power of perceiving and judging forms correctly should be directed in introducing drawing as a necessary part of instruction into *every* school in the kingdom. This power will also assist them to obtain increased accuracy in other ways and therefore become all the more truthful and sensible of God's wisdom. (Cole in Sutton, p. 59)

5.7 1864, Report of the Select Committee on the Schools of Art

Even at this early stage, the Government was concerned that the expenditure on education could be almost limitless. As Ashwin (1975) records, the first grant specifically committed to a named subject went to the founding of the Normal School of Design in 1836. (p. 50) He further recounts how 'expenditure on education continued to rise over the years, alarming those who thought of state grants as a form of charity necessary to stimulate educational activity but not intended to sustain and expand it in perpetuity.' (p. 50)

The Department of Art and Science found itself with 'the problems of a soaring budget and an expanding teaching force.' (Ashwin, 1975, p. 51) Accordingly, Cole 'no doubt encouraged by the Education Department' (p. 51) set about reducing this expenditure. The Committee of Council abolished the payment for certification, significantly reducing the income of the art masters in the elementary schools. As Ashwin (1975) records; 'the response of the art masters was immediate and indignant, and there can be no doubt that their representations were influential in bringing about the Select Committee of 1864.' (p. 51)

The Select Committee was appointed to:

inquire into the constitution and working, and into the success, of the Schools of Art wholly or partially supported by Government Grants, or otherwise assisted by the Government, and into the system upon which the sums granted by Parliament for the promotion of National Education in Art are distributed and administered.

It reviewed the history and success of the Government School of Design, accounting for the years 1837 to 1852 as 'a period of experiment.' It further considered and took evidence on substantive issues of self-support or state support; payment on results; improved taste of the country; the complication of the system; fees and salaries, and the employment of art masters.

The 1864 Report utilised selected excerpts from the information contained in the 10th (annual) Report of the Department of Science and Art, in particular referring to a number of appendices that reviewed aspects of the 1862 International Exhibition that had been held in South

Kensington. The Select Committee deemed, by reference to the evidence provided in the appendices of the 10th Report, that England had not advanced as far in regards to improving national tastes and achieving domination in the commercial arts as had been anticipated.

Firstly, the Report ‘perceptively criticised the rigidity of the ‘South Kensington’ Course as it had become known’ (Ashwin 1975, p. 52) There was a suggestion that Redgrave’s doctrine of accurate copying might not be as effective as had been supposed; the report comments that:

a strictly defined course of instruction, is open to the objection that, if too rigorously insisted upon, it cramps the energies of the master, and destroys the interest of the student.’ (Report of the Select Committee on the Schools of Art 1864, p. xvi)

It further suggests that this view was supported not only by the art masters themselves, but one of the Department’s own inspectors and, more damagingly, by the French. ‘That this is its tendency may be inferred not only from the complaints made by the masters,’ but also from such criticism as is contained in the following extract from the Report of M. Charles Robert, cited in the Appendix to the tenth Report of the Department of Science and Art. The President of the French Section of the International Exhibition, Michel Chevalier⁵², noted that the French exhibits in the Exhibition of 1862⁵³ demonstrated:

the artistic knowledge of French workmen has been represented at the London Exhibition only by the modest schools... we do not hesitate to declare the comparison, established between their efforts and those of the pupil-teachers and prize-students of the School of Design at South Kensington appears to us favourable to France.’ (Chevalier, 1864, 10th Report, Appendix FF p. 261)

His comments, incorporated into the Report of the Select Committee must have caused some discussion, noting as he did:

Previously to that date, it must be said, they were chiefly renowned for their bad taste, but they have felt the question to be one of education. They have therefore instituted, with great intelligence, and with that perseverance which is habitual to them, instruction in the Fine Arts, with a view to the advancement of their industry.’ (Chevalier 1864, 10th Report, Appendix FF p. 149)

⁵² Michel Chevalier, the President of the French Section of the international jury of the Universal Exhibition of London, 1862. Engineer, dedicated free-marketeer and early advocate of a Channel Tunnel. In his introduction to the general report on the 1862 Exhibition he advocated for the abolition of the system of patents for invention.

⁵³ There was a series of international exhibitions through the nineteenth century: London 1851; Paris 1855; London 1862; Paris 1867; Vienna 1873; Philadelphia 1876; Paris 1878; Melbourne 1880; Barcelona 1888 and on into the twentieth century.

The commentary, from a Frenchman no less, must have stung the chauvinistic impulses of the Select Committee. An exhibition staged to showcase the best of English design instead exposed the limitations and shortcomings of the national system. One of the French jurors for the exhibition, a Mr. Rapet, commented regarding the ‘State of Education among the various Nations represented at the Exhibition’:

It is well to note that England invariably employs the word *education* where we give preference to the word *instruction*. There is a whole system comprised in the choice of the one or the other of these two terms. The study of drawing in primary schools in England dates only from 10 years back. Till then it has remained a privileged study, reserved exclusively for the richer classes. But the Exhibition of 1851, which rendered distinctly visible the superiority of France in those products which demand taste, and whose value is based on a knowledge of design, revealed to England the cause of her inferiority. (Rapet 1863, Appendix FF, 10th Report p. 259)

Redgrave’s response was to dismiss the French observations entirely, stating to the Committee that he ‘cannot find out that they have any system whatever; every school seems to work according to its own will.’ (Department of Science and Art, 1864, p. xvi)

Secondly, again referencing the evidence of the 10th Report, the Select Committee submitted an analysis of the efficacy of the schools in relation to their intended outcome of improving manufacturing with particular focus on whether the Schools were, or would be, financially independent of the state; unfortunately, the evidence was inconclusive:

In endeavouring to form an opinion as to the probable future prospects of the Schools of Art, and their chances of receiving such an amount of local support as to render Government aid superfluous, Your Committee have been struck with the conflict of opinion which prevails respecting the proper function and the actual value of these institutions. (Department of Science and Art, 1864, p. xviii)

5.7 In summary: values and doctrine in conflict, alternative systems of art education

Macdonald (2004) is illuminating on the particular *dispositif* of the Department of Science and Art noting that the ‘rather cumbrous title of the Department of Science and Art was eschewed by the public, who preferred to refer to it as ‘South Kensington’ and to refer to the Department’s Course of Instruction as ‘the South Kensington System.’ (p. 226) He asserts that the whole system was directly driven by Cole and his Benthamite ‘single seated responsibility.’ (p. 226)

The key to understanding the philosophy, again in Macdonald’s view, is that firstly Cole ‘never endured working under or over any person he disagreed with,’ and secondly that his ‘more intellectual colleagues... all disliked the French methods of art education and preferred the

German, and tended to be more Utilitarians rather than Romantics.’ As Macdonald further points out:

whereas in general education the Utilitarians and philosophical radicals, such as Mill, Roebuck and Buller, were championing useful knowledge and attacking the traditional classical learning, in art education they championed useful ornamental and mechanical drawing, as opposed to an aesthetic atelier training in the French and Italian academic traditions. (p. 226)

The system thus made concrete and visible a doctrine of strictly utilitarian, functional values laced with class and religious views; Dyce’s particular deep religiosity, his preference for a hard, Germanic system of instruction, the long hangover of Protestant austerity, Cole’s opportunistic bureaucratic structuralism, Redgrave’s dogmatic Catholicism, government muddle and frugality and inevitably the English rigidly hierarchical class system.

During the latter quarter of the 1870s there was a shift in the schools as masters and students began to stray from the strict path laid down by Cole and Redgrave, and began to move towards fine art; a movement which, according to Macdonald:

caused Redgrave to accuse the masters of identifying their interest ‘less with the sound instruction encouraged by the Department, than with the capricious wishes of the middle class, who at present rather resist such sound instruction.’ (Macdonald 2004, p. 263)

Having allowed the middle classes access to the schools, for the financial bounty provided by the fees they brought in, the Department found them to be considerably less tractable than might be assumed. In essence, having constructed a system of control, the system’s authors encountered what Foucault termed ‘practical insubordination at the core of educational conduct.’ (Allen and Goddard, 2017, p. 9) The system was insufficiently flexible to deal with pressures brought by the subjects of the system desiring outcomes that the system did not offer.

Redgrave resigned as Inspector General for Art in September 1875, and was succeeded by Edward John Poynter. As Macdonald states, this was ‘bound to expedite the movement towards fine art already taking place in the Schools of Art.’ (p. 263) As he further states:

From the commencement of public art education the appointments of heads of the central institution had created the maximum swings of policy; firstly Dyce (Germanic and utilitarian), then Wilson (Italian and academic), next Cole and Redgrave (Germanic and utilitarian), and now Poynter (French and academic) (p. 265)

What there was not, was the appointment of anyone who might be considered from an ‘English School’, for the simple reason that there wasn’t one.

An alternative system 1: the Slade School

Against this febrile background, Felix Slade bequeathed in his will £35,000 to found chairs of Fine Art at the three most prestigious universities in England; Oxford, Cambridge and University College, London. John Ruskin was appointed to Oxford, Matthew Wyatt to Cambridge and Edward Poynter to UCL. The Oxford and Cambridge professors had only to give lectures to a general audience, but UCL set up the Slade School of Fine Art to teach the practical aspects of painting, sculpture, and the graphic arts.

The appointment of Edward Poynter as the first Slade Professor and the opening of the Slade School was to add another element to the already volatile combination of values and doctrines that were at work in the art education system. In particular, freed from the necessity to conform to governmental directive, the Slade set about applying an art doctrine that was wholly based on a rediscovery (although in fact they had not been lost, merely repressed) of classically based fine art practices that would have been wholly familiar to both quattrocento Italian artists, and to the students of the French Academies. In particular, the Slade overturned the state embargo on figure drawing, as Macdonald (2004) suggests, setting a new and refreshing standard of figure drawing for the British art schools:

From its opening, the Slade School in Gower Street had great social advantages over the contemporary art schools. It was free from the regulations and restrictions of Cole's state system, it was on a sounder footing than any private school, and it had the additional status of being part of a university college.' (p. 269)

This combination of freedom and status was advantageous; the Slade almost at once became the archetype that later modern art schools would aspire to become, regardless of their individual situation. In regards to enrolments, there was none of the fretting over the admission of the middle-classes, with their notions of becoming artists rather than honest artisans, to hinder the purity of Utilitarian spirit that animated the government Schools. Instead:

It was only to be expected that persons of the middle and upper classes, especially the ladies, would prefer to attend the Slade rather than the South Kensington schools, where the course was tedious and some of the pupils of rather humble origin. (Macdonald 2004, p. 269)

Macdonald (2004) suggests that:

The great contribution of the Slade concept of drawing formed by Tonks and his predecessors was 'intelligent' drawing. Drawing was given a positive intellectual direction towards a search for knowledge of form, and the slavish outlining, shading, plumbing and measuring of the South Kensington system was completely superseded. (p. 279)

There was a new emphasis, or perhaps it would be more accurate to say a rediscovery of, the concept of physical, sculptural form as the basis for drawing; an almost sculptural approach to drawing from the nude which would have form a legacy that lasted in English art education for a considerable period of time⁵⁴:

...because of the high quality of life drawing produced at the school, the Slade system became universal in British Schools of Art from the nineteen-twenties to the nineteen-fifties and ex-students were much sought after to take charge of life-classes. (p. 277)

The lineage of practice to classical art of the antique was made explicit; ‘Tonks drew the student’s attention to the drawings of Michelangelo, Rubens, Rembrandt and especially to Ingres...by reproductions of their work which were affixed to the walls’ (p. 277) This focus was on drawing to represent form, in the plastic, three-dimensional sense, and was in direct doctrinal contrast to the geometrical obsession of Redgrave. Such activity was overtly prohibited, as Macdonald makes clear:

The kind of drawing prevalent in the Government Schools of Art, a hard outline filled with dark hatching or stippling, was not permitted, and the concept of contour replaced that of outline. (p. 277)

What the Slade achieved, in brief, was to revitalise the academic approach to art education in contrast to the utilitarianism of the government Schools of Art, and by doing so (re)introducing a powerful tradition, with its roots reaching back deep into the classical age, into the dynamic mix of practices that would contribute to the later development of the English art school system as it entered the twentieth century. The Slade, as will be seen later, would come to have an unimagined impact on the whole system of art education in England, for it was the training ground for not only Sir William Coldstream, whose Council would shape the whole of art education as a system, but also Victor Pasmore, who would be equally influential in shaping the future direction of English art schools at a practice level. One would embrace the Slade concept of drawing; the other wholly reject it.

⁵⁴ The legacy persists to the present. Throughout my career in art education, I have frequently encountered a slavish devotion to and an uncritical assumption of drawing from the nude as the most important foundational element in any number of art disciplines, even when there was little or no justification for it. The arguments were well rehearsed, and drew on ancient roots. The practice of it was at best, questionable, and at worst damaging.

6. 'A Dog Chasing its own Tail', the Modern Age; 1900 – 1957

This chapter examines the development of the art school *dispositif* during a period of significant change; from the end of the Cole and Redgrave system, including the end of government examinations, towards an era that suggested a greater degree of autonomy. In some respects, this was a period of liberalisation within a wider scheme of general educational reform during the era.

From the Victorian age onwards, the art school system exists within a framework of governmentality. Foucault (2004) laid out his conception of governmentality in a lecture on the 1st February 1978, in which he stated:

by “governmentality” I understand the ensemble formed by institutions, procedures, analyses and reflections, calculations, and tactics that allow this very specific, albeit very complex, power that has the population as its target, political economy as its major form of knowledge, and apparatuses of security as its essential technical instrument...
(p. 108)

Foucault’s conception of governmentality supports an understanding of the art school system as part of a wider state concern with the population – improving its taste, enhancing its economic activity – that otherwise is obscured by the ongoing doctrinal debates over differing practice. With this in mind, an examination of this period suggests that there was a paradox: on the one hand there appeared to be a level of autonomy from direct government control (over doctrine, the curricula and examinations, for example); on the other an increasing level of governmentality becomes apparent at a system level (the overall aim of art education, the size and geographical spread of art schools, the administration, management and resources made available to it) It is important to recognise that, as Ball (2016b) suggests:

governmentality is not solely the ‘point of application’ of power, but also its ‘vehicle’.
The individual is the site of power, where it is enacted or resisted/refused; but never in an absolute sense, rather within multiple ‘strategic skirmishes’ (p. 1131)

For the government, the arts and art education were to continue to serve the interests of the state; to continue to improve the public appreciation of the arts, as well as continue to make a positive contribution to the economy – both aspects were inextricably interlinked. At the same time, developments in arts practice continued to bring challenges to the development of a coherent system; in particular, the influence of the Arts and Crafts movement which tried to regress art practice to a modern form of the medieval guild system; the desire of professional designers to establish design as a distinct discipline free from the domination of fine art; and

fine art itself which underwent internal challenges from radicals who sought to bring about an Anglicised (and some might argue, thoroughly misinterpreted) version of European modernism, and reactionary institutions such as the Euston Road School.

Although the Cole and Redgrave curriculum was thoroughly discredited, the physical infrastructure of their system remained in place; there were art schools of every size and shape in abundance, spread widely across the country (although not always where they were most needed). To some extent, the administrative infrastructure also remained in place, and this was subjected to continual scrutiny and adjustment. To better utilise and coordinate this system, and to more effectively direct the resources at its disposal, the Board of Education in 1933 issued Circulars 1431-2 which proposed a hierarchy of art classes, art schools, and art colleges, ‘an ordered system of art instruction leading up to a regional Art College’, the responsibility for organisation being left to local authorities. As Macdonald (2004) suggests:

The local School of Art, released from control of the Science and Art Department, municipalized, and now directed by the Technical Instruction Committee of the local council, changed its character completely between 1900 and 1914. (p. 299)

The schools at Leicester, Birmingham, Bradford and Leeds were recognised as Regional Colleges of Art by the Board of Education, before the outbreak of the second world war arrested developments. From a purely geographical perspective – with an art school of one kind or another in many towns across England, offering a varied ecology of education from evening classes to national qualification – this might be seen as the apogee of the system. As Banks and Oakley (2016) put it:

for most of the twentieth century many smaller UK towns and cities had their own independent art school, predominantly serving local working- and lower-middle class populations. As only a few universities offered fine art degrees and tended to recruit their students from more privileged social groups, the art school came widely to be known as an accessible alternative to university, offering the ‘masses’ the viable prospect of practically-oriented craft and aesthetic education. (para. 1)

6.1 Art education gets another new home: the Board of Education

Under the terms of the Board of Education Act (1899) the Education Department was merged with the Science and Art Department to form the Board of Education on 1st April 1900. This administrative development was to have a significant impact on the subsequent development of the evolving art school system. In the first instance, a Council of Advice for Art was set up consisting of four experts in different branches; Sir William Richardson (painting); Onslow

Ford (sculpture); T. Graham Jackson (architecture); and Walter Crane (design).’ (Ashwin 1975, p. 63)

The foundational hierarchy of Painting, Sculpture and Architecture – unchanged since being outlined by Pliny – was institutionalised in the structure of the Council, although the more recent preoccupation with design⁵⁵ was incorporated, not unproblematically as will be seen. Thus, doctrine and values became fully visible within the government policy apparatus, not just a matter of college level differentiation. This visibility gave the disciplines access to resources and recognition within the state system, but also rendered them subject to co-option by government policies for wider social, cultural and economic utility. The system was perhaps more liberal than previous regimes, but not as liberal as all that.

The new Board of Education published annual reports in which art education was subsumed into the wider education ecology; no longer would art have its own reporting system as it had under the Department of Science and Art, it would henceforth be one element of education competing for attention among many others.

6.2 General Reports on Higher Education for 1902

The first Board of Education General Report, published in 1903, ‘included a survey of national art provision by the Chief Inspector of Art, Mr S.J. Cartlidge.’ Ashwin (1975) notes that:

Although there was praise for many aspects of the system, his report prophetically high-lighted two issues which were to become key problems during the twentieth century. The first concerned the status of the art teacher’s authority in the absence of a firm art educational dogma such as that propagated by the Science and Art Department, and the second the relation of art education to the institutional structure at large. (p. 63)

The first issue will be explored more fully in chapter 7, suffice to say at this point that once the art school system had lost its autonomous status within the wider educational ecology manifested by the Board of Education (and later, as it was absorbed into the polytechnic system) Cartlidge identified that there was likely to be:

instances of difficulties arising from the want of appreciation by those in authority of the means of keeping the machinery of Art instruction up to date. Occasional friction arises in large instructions from the drafting of Art students into other subjects of study, and the placing outside of the Art Master’s authority over the Art students. (p. 64)

⁵⁵ design at this point was still largely what now would be described as industrial or product design; graphic design as a specific discipline would not be added until 1946.

There was also the matter of art school staff salaries. As will be seen later, a significant driving force for the adoption of a new national qualification of equal status to a university first degree was that without that status, art school staff were paid at a lower rate than their colleagues working in a university.

The second issue is fundamental to the development of art education in England through the twentieth-century, and will be central to the following chapters. Increasing governmentality would drive art schools into new administrative structures, further reducing their autonomy and status and contorting their sense of identity.

A third issue, not apparent from the Report, but visible through a number of polemical texts of the period, sought to influence the contemporary development of art education during the period under review. It would be an over-simplification to align this debate along class divisions or art-practice, but as part of a wider development in English society there continued to be passionate debate as to the purpose of art, and therefore how it should be taught and, to a great extent, to whom. The tentative liberalisation (of the curricula at least, if not entry to the system, or its social inclusivity) that arose with the dismantling of the rigid system under Cole and Redgrave and the expansion of industry into the administration of the art school system under the Technical Instruction Act of 1899 re-energised the dynamic tensions between the differing doctrinal interpretations of the purpose of art education; fine art for the upper classes; design for commerce and industry; art for the middle classes; art for women; the arts and crafts movement; the influence of the German Werkbund. These doctrinal debates, containing within them passionately held values, would emerge, become visible, assume concrete form in policy, texts, curricula and institutions of the first third of the twentieth century, before a considerable degree of retrenchment and standardisation was imposed after the second world war.

Disciplines such as fine art, or architecture, gained the status of schools within a larger, overarching college structure; within the schools' discipline-specific crafts could be taught. It was a significant administrative development that allowed for an explicit line of power to be followed, all the way from government policy (the Board of Education) into a college and onwards down through the schools and all the way into individual classes. In addition to this thoroughly modern administrative apparatus, as Macdonald says; 'the convergence of art schools with local industry concerns (lead to) craft education for the artisan at last.' (p. 298)

6.3 Should we stop teaching art? The Arts and Crafts Movement

The arts and crafts movement reignited the debate that craft should be the primary occupation of the art schools.

Two specific cases serve to illustrate this development. In 1897 the School of Practical Art at South Kensington became the Royal College of Art. The appointment of Walter Crane as the new director of the RCA brought a change in direction; Crane implemented design education, decorative art and craftwork in South Kensington before moving to implement the same policy in Manchester as the Director of Design at the Municipal School of Art. His teaching was distilled into three influential texts; *The Claims of Decorative Art* (1892); *The Bases of Design* (1898); and *Line and Form* (1900) establishing Crane ‘as the most influential art teacher⁵⁶ in Britain, especially in the manufacturing areas.’ (Macdonald, 2004, p. 296, Carline, 1968, p. 137)

The reorganisation of the RCA away from a focus on training fine art teachers took administrative form in the establishment of four discipline-based schools; Architecture, Painting, Sculpture and Design. In addition, specific craft classes were run; stained glass, pottery, metalwork, etching, engraving and lithography, illuminating and calligraphy⁵⁷, embroidery and tapestry, wood carving and gesso. These classes could be run in conjunction with local industry needs for specific skills, and added or dropped without affecting the larger matrix of relationships in the college bureaucracy. In many respects, the English art school emerged in its modern guise at this point.

At the same moment, the London County Council established the Central School of Arts and Crafts in Upper Regent Street. The first principal was W R Lethaby, formerly Professor of Design at the newly revitalised RCA, At the Central School, according to Macdonald:

the architect gathered about himself a group of expert craftsmen-teachers, and thus founded a school which quickly became the largest centre for craft education in Britain.’ (p. 297)

⁵⁶ A comprehensive review of Crane’s teaching, with fascinating examples of contemporary practical exercises, can be found in Sutton 1967, p. 199-219.

⁵⁷ Later to evolve into Graphic Design (1946) which would assume the dimensions of a separate discipline, see Chapter 7

Pevsner, in *Academies of Art Past and Present*, cites Hermann Muthesuis, the founder of the German *Werkbunds* as stating that the Central School was ‘probably the best organised contemporary art school.’ (1940, p. 265)

However, as Pevsner (1940) further states:

Once a certain amount of craft instruction had penetrated into some art schools and had become amalgamated with what already existed of trade courses, Britain did not go further. A movement in which the English had been leading... now “hesitated, halted and broke down” (Ashbee). The transformation of architecture... was achieved outside Britain, and so was the reform of art education. (p. 265)

Pevsner suggests that not only reform in art education was achieved outside Britain (specifically Germany before the second world war) but that superiority in crafts and artisan workmanship was predicated on a wholly superior general education system in which drawing had featured as a compulsory subject since 1860.

What caused this hesitation and retreat?

Macdonald (1970) suggests that the emergence of the Arts and Crafts movement contained ‘(a) paradox which caused the Arts and Crafts Movement to check progress in design education in Britain’ and that the heart of the matter was:

the snobbery of deeming handcrafts superior to machine products. Morris, Crane and their associates, in claiming this superiority, were guilty of the very sin they, as art-socialists, attributed to the High Art protagonists – the separation of artefacts into grades of merit. The snobbery of classicism was replaced by the snobbery of medievalism. (p. 313)

As Macdonald further asserts:

Such snobbery produced a generation of ‘hermit-craftsmen’, doomed to live precariously on wealthy patrons, for none of the workmen Morris loved could afford their products; in addition, it produced an unsuitable art training and a hostile attitude to industrial and commercial art lasting up to the forties.⁵⁸ (p. 313)

The impact of this on the England of the 1910s was to deny England a significant role in the development of industrial design. Macdonald, again; ‘Herbert Read, writing of the period,

⁵⁸ Arguably the snobbery lasted far longer than that. The organising principles and hierarchical arrangements of art school management throughout the discussions evident in the Coldstream Committee archive suggest that Fine Art continued to dominate until the end of the Art Schools in the 1970s, after which the doctrinal factions within the arts were of no interest to the senior management of Polytechnics or New Universities. Doctrinal factionalism continued within the middle tiers of administration, at faculty, school, department and course level, with dominant factions able to command resources and drive local policy.

described an art school as a place where industrial design is not merely segregated, but barely tolerated.’ (p. 314)

Governmentality: doctrine aligned along class lines

The paradox was that although some elements within government wanted society to be culturally improved, and wanted British goods to be more competitive in relation to European manufactures, a significant number of parliamentarians did not; they were adamantly opposed to establishing parity between universities and art schools, between academic subjects and the arts, between fine art and crafts or the trades. The Board of Education enacted these strategies, and managed the resulting paradoxes by implementing tiers of syllabi arranged around class lines. The government directed the management of the curricula along specific, well established, class lines and the art schools obliged. There was no question that art schools were at all liberal or liberalising at this point, the art schools were part of a broader projection of governmentality that built on social stratification within the wider educational ecology.

Within the art schools themselves, the doctrinal debate concretised along class lines, differentiating design from art, and further segmenting design towards industrial manufacturing or artisanal craft. The debates would not be resolved, and their pernicious influence will be seen throughout the period under review as factions aligned to specific doctrinal traits sought to dominate institutions and policy. As Macdonald outlines clearly, the stratification of the syllabus along class lines was rigid and driven by specific cultural imperatives along governmental lines as overtly stated in school documentation of the period:

The sociological structure of the student body at Schools of Art is clearly given in the annual syllabuses of the Leicester School during this period: “The school gives tuition to three classes of students – Craftsmen: to make workmen better workmen. General Students: for the cultivation of observation, appreciation and knowledge of art. Teachers: to qualify those who are, or intend to become, teachers to give instruction in art.” (pp. 299-300)

Design⁵⁹ (in any of its guises) struggled to achieve parity of esteem with the other disciplines within the institutions of this period, fine art had a long-established historical ascendancy based

⁵⁹ I realise, somewhat belatedly, that I have not attempted any definition of ‘design’ as a distinct set of practices that are wholly different from fine art. Therefore, I offer up the thoughts of the designer, Norman Potter (2002). ‘It is convenient to group the work into three simple categories... product design (things), environmental design (places) and communication design (messages). In the field of product design, the professional extremes might be said to range from studio pottery and textile design at one end of the spectrum to engineering design and computer programming at the other... Obviously, the more aesthetic and sensory latitude available within a particular range of design opportunities, the closer they resemble those offered by the practice of ‘fine-art’. The less latitude, the closer design becomes to the sciences, and to fields in which the scope of aesthetic ‘choice’ is

partly on its ability to evoke classical antiquity as the basis for its disciplinary status and its historical proximity to power, as it was manifested in institutions resonant with cultural status, such as the Royal Academy, with its explicit statement of monarchical patronage.

Design, by contrast, had failed to achieve a similar status, although, as will be seen later, Architecture did acquire high status and a degree of independence from the general art school – in particular the length of study before being able to practice as an accredited professional – through extensive and ultimately successful parliamentary lobbying in the 1930s. By contrast, design continued to struggle for parity of esteem and recognition. Unlike France and Germany, where art (specifically drawing) was a compulsory part of general education and where fine art and design had been separated into two distinct forms of educational institution, with a commensurate capacity for professional status, the English system continued for the most part to regard design as an inferior activity for which fine art practice would provide an adequate training.

This was compounded still further by a further difference between England and its neighbours as Pevsner (1940) highlighted:

Whereas in England most of the eighteenth-century crafts had been destroyed by the industrial revolution, and the Arts and Crafts Movement had therefore of necessity taken the shape of a gentlemen's enterprise to revive the profession of the artist-craftsman, in Germany, as in many other Continental countries, cabinet-makers, metal-workers, etc. were still in existence in big and small towns who could turn out excellent handwork. (p. 269)

Among the texts produced by the Arts and Crafts Movement that sought to influence art education policy, there was the publication in 1906 of *The Restoration of the Guild System*, by Arthur J. Penty, and *Should We Stop Teaching Art* (1911) by C. R. Ashbee⁶⁰, 'a blistering attack on schools' (Macdonald, 2004, p. 311) by the renowned arts and crafts artist. In this short book (it was prefaced as part of a much larger work that remained unpublished), Ashbee presented a critique of the contemporary art education system, and the conflicted role of art and design

truly marginal. The design of a traffic light system has an aesthetic component, but it would need a very special definition of aesthetics to embrace the many determining factors that must finally settle the design outcome.' (p. 11)

⁶⁰ 'Although Ashbee was regarded as an established Arts & Crafts artist... Pevsner claimed that he was not so much a romantic artist symbolizing an era as a rebel, an exception in his time. Pevsner based his argument on the first axiom of Ashbee's much-disputed book, *Should We Stop Teaching Art?* (1911), which states: 'Modern Civilisation rests on machinery, and no system for the endowment, or the encouragement, or the teaching of art can be sound that does not recognise this' (N. Hysler-Rubin 2006, p. 23)

in the machine age. In particular he was scathing of the inability of the art school system as it was to produce employable arts and craftsmen, stating:

in a period of ten years 459 students have been trained at the Royal College of Art; out of those only 32 have made the practice of Art in any form their livelihood, while 126 earn their living as teachers⁶¹. (p. 16)

Ashbee's polemic can be considered as 'characteristic of a pedagogue whose critique is the outgrowth of disappointment; whose outlook... is the product of "simple, romantic men"' (Allen, 2018, p. 48). In this, he reproduces a spirit of loss, a regret for a preceding age, that echoes Pliny and others through the long history of art education.

Ashbee was concerned that the teaching of art was fundamentally unable to deliver good designers for the modern, machine age. It would be better, he suggested, 'if public money wasted on art schools... should rather be spent on setting up numerous craft workshops.' (Macdonald 2004, p. 311) Ashbee's work was overtaken by later events – in particular, the second world war brought most art education philosophical experimentation to a temporary halt until it revived in the 1960s – but certainly Pevsner acknowledged the significance of his thinking, and assured Ashbee of a degree of significance as an educational thinker perhaps greater than his actual accomplishments.

Ashbee set out six axioms⁶², each expanded into a chapter, the most radical of which suggest that art teaching should be removed from art schools entirely, and instead be conducted in numerous, local settings where local craftsmen and artists would give practical instruction in local workshops. It may not have been as extreme as Penty's desire for a complete return to

⁶¹ Ashbee is quoting from Appendix IV of the Report of the Departmental Committee on the Royal College, 1911.

⁶² The axioms were;

Axiom I— modern civilization rests on machinery, and no system for the endowment, or the encouragement, or the teaching of art can be sound that does not recognize this.

Axiom II — the craft cannot be learned in the school; the craft can only be learned in the life of the workman and in the workshop

Axiom III — the purpose of the "arts and crafts" is to set a standard of excellence in all commodities in which the element of beauty enters. the tendency of machine industry is to "standardize," that is to say, to create as many pieces of any commodity to a given type as is economically possible.

Axiom IV — standard of excellence in the industrial arts acts in competitive industry as Gresham's law acts in coinage. the bad coin tends to drive out the good. So the bad product tends to drive out the good product, the unskilled workman and the machine tend to drive out the skilled craftsman.

Axiom V — Machinery is neither all good nor all bad. an intelligent community will distinguish which is which, and the aesthetic education of the community in our day should be directed towards this distinction between the bad and the good.

Axiom VI — the experience of the last twenty-five years has shown that in many trades and crafts the distinction between what should and what should not be produced by machinery has already been made.

the Medieval Guild system, but in practice it would have been very close to it. In fact, the Board of Education's 1933 scheme for dispersed, local and regional art education in 'an ordered system of art instruction leading up to a regional Art College' would come closest to this (entirely unintentionally) with its inherited dispersed art school system. Penty's and Ashbee's schemes would have required a return to something approaching the Medieval Guild system, complete with Masters and Apprentices, something that was not achievable in post-industrial revolution England.

Nonetheless, as will be seen later, Ashbee's critique and other similar dissenting viewpoints would continue to be aired in the discussions of the National Advisory Council on Art Education under the chair of Sir William Coldstream, where designers, artists, theoreticians and historians proposed and counter proposed different models of art education, suggestions for alternative curricula and even alternate qualifications from within their doctrinal camps.

These struggles can be considered as part of the centuries long struggle for recognition and dominance. It can be useful to consider this constant struggle, from a Foucauldian perspective at least, as a civil war between the various doctrinal camps; civil in both the sense of a war fought politely, with decorum and within accepted realms of conflict (committees, pamphlets, texts, policies, institutions) but also quietly vicious as any war fought between citizens of the same realm would be. In early 1976, Foucault gave a series of lectures in which he sought to develop both the representation of power, and the functioning of power by using a model that made the relation of forces intelligible through the use of war as an analytical device:

(S)hould one, or not, analyse these "struggles" as the vicissitudes of a war, should one decipher them according to a grid which would be one of strategy and tactics? Is the relation of forces in the order of politics a relation of war? (1997, pp. xvii-xviii)

The war metaphor might be considered overly dramatic:

(o)ne difficulty with war as a cipher for power is that it threatens to polarise discussion. We are tempted to think in terms of victors and vanquished, oppressors and oppressed in a way that purges analysis of any subtlety and useful insight.' (Allen & Goddard 2014, p. 19)

But it gives an indication of the degree of passion each camp felt for their respective doctrine, and the degree to which their values could be strategized, and tactics deployed to counter attacks from opposing forces. It is also useful to consider that the war metaphor also opens up the possibility to invoke conceptions of strategy, and tactics of power. As Foucault suggested, inverting Clausewitz's conception of war as the continuation of politics and instead considering

‘politics (to be) the continuation of war by other means’ (Foucault 1997 p. 15) gives a powerful perspective; the seemingly benign debates as being more akin to a ‘permanent war’ where the ‘basis of the power relationship’ is ‘a warlike clash between forces.’ (Foucault, 1997, p. 16).

This period also saw changes to the funding and support for the art schools. Operating along another axis of power, local councils received powers under the Technical Instruction Act of 1899 to levy a penny rate for ‘a more perfect system of science and art teaching more especially for the artisan classes.’ (Macdonald 1970, p. 298) This shifted responsibility for funding from local subscribers to local government, with the ‘beneficial result that municipalities began to take entire responsibility’ (p. 298) The significance cannot be overstated; another element of control and power over the development of art education was realigned towards the nation state. The concerns of the nation – economic, utilitarian – could now begin to be addressed more effectively with a greater degree of direct state involvement than was possible under the previous system of fragmented private patronage.

Having organised art education along neatly doctrinal lines (neat at least from an administrative perspective) the Board next decided to tackle the examinations system, which had grown piecemeal to encompass an enormous range of possibilities all of which, ultimately, were the Board’s responsibility. This work was to see the final dismantling of the last vestiges of the National System of Instruction with the result that, as Macdonald (1970) suggests, ‘During the first world war Cole and Redgrave’s system was finally eradicated.’ (p. 304)

6.4 The Board of Education: Circular 775, 1911

The Board outlined its intentions in the preface to Circular 775:

The Board of Education have for some time past had under their very careful consideration the Examinations in Art now conducted by them... The Board have, therefore, come to the conclusion that such stimulus and control as may be properly applied to the teaching of art by a central authority can best be exercised through the medium of visits of inspection, and that the duty of applying such examination tests as are suitable to the more elementary students should be undertaken by the teachers of the Schools themselves rather than by external examiners. (Board of Education Circular 775 1911, in Ashwin (1975) p. 82)

As Ashwin (1975) states:

The examination system was accordingly revised in 1913, the Board shedding the responsibility for examining the numerous elementary stages... and concentrating its attention on advanced studies and the art schools.’ (p. 83)

Thus, the Board reduced, but did not relinquish fully, control over the examination of art students. Perhaps more significantly for the future development of the art school system, the Board initiated the principle of government level inspection of art schools.

The Board of Education examinations system: 1913-1946

In 1913 the Board of Education revised the advanced level examination system for art schools. This saw the introduction of a first stage exam – the Drawing Certificate – which was followed by a second stage of specialist Certificates in Painting, Modelling, Pictorial Design (latterly known as Illustration) and Industrial Design. This scheme lasted from 1914 to 1946, representing one of the more stable periods of art education. Ashwin (1975) outlines the curriculum that students followed for the examinations:

...full-time art studies normally began at the age of 16. After two years students could enter for the so-called Drawing Examination⁶³. Having completed (this), the full-time student normally studied for a further year before entering for one of the four advanced examinations known as the Examinations in Industrial Design, in Illustration, in Painting, and in Modelling, each of which had its own examining panel. Both the Drawing Examination and the four advanced examinations were set and examined centrally.’ (Ashwin, p. 83)

Although the degree of standardization and centralisation within government control was somewhat radical, the syllabus was completely conventional, relying on deeply embedded traditional practices within a modern, governmental administrative apparatus with the consequence, as Strand (1987) suggests, that most notable of ‘much of the students’ work resulting from the system as it operated... is its essentially derivative nature, based on the copying of conventional styles; and together with this lack of originality, its very high technical competence.’ (p. 4)

Although the rigidly stratified National System of Instruction of Cole and Redgrave had been vanquished, the new system operating under the careful control of the Board resulted in a similar ossification of student work. The immediate post-second world war period was, however, to introduce an increasing and accelerating degree of change and instability into the system, beginning in 1946 with the replacement of the existing system of the first stage Certificate of Drawing with new Intermediate Certificate in Arts and Crafts, and the multitude of second stage specialist Certificates with the National Diploma in Design. This was, in

⁶³ The Drawing Examination consisted of tests in following subjects: Drawing from Life; Drawing and Painting from Memory and Knowledge; Anatomy; Architecture; Drawing from the Cast and Perspective.

Strand's view at least, designed 'no doubt to raise the status of the examinations, and, as the title of the new Diploma implied, to direct more attention to the teaching of design.'

Art and industry in the 1930s

On 13 July 1931 the Board of Trade, dismayed by the recent slump in demand for British products, appointed a committee under the chairmanship of Lord Gorell⁶⁴ on the *Production and Exhibition of Articles of Good Design and Everyday Use*. (Macdonald, 2004, p. 302) The Gorell Report stated; 'It is common knowledge, we believe, that cooperation between Industry and Art Schools is not always so close as it should be.' (p. 302) Almost a century after the initial government directed intervention into art education – to improve trade through better design – the government once again determined that an improved relationship between art schools and industry would solve an economic problem.

As a consequence of the Report, the Board of Trade immediately appointed a Council of Art and Industry in January 1934, to investigate the practicalities of bringing art and industry closer together for economic purposes. Under the chairmanship of Frank Pick⁶⁵, this Council 'thought of art and industry as separate.' (p. 302) Art Schools would be solely responsible for 'impart(ing) improved taste and a wider understanding of art to the part-time pupils who come to them from factory design rooms...' whilst 'it is for the factory and not for the art school to impart to these part-time pupils the necessary experience of the methods and processes of manufacture...' (p. 302)

There were other currents of design thinking in Britain at the time; The Design and Industries Association had taken modest steps towards a modern continental approach to design, particularly that of the *Deutscher Werkbund*; there was an emerging design profession committed to the needs of industry and the idea of essential design rather than applied art; and 1930 Milner Gray had founded the Society of Industrial Artists in 1930. But those currents were not represented on the Council, and so an opportunity was lost. Germany had developed

⁶⁴ Ronald Gorell Barnes; Winchester College, Harrow School, Balliol College Oxford. Barrister, Journalist, decorated for service in WW1, crime fiction writer.

⁶⁵ Frank Pick, remembered largely for his management of the London Passenger Transport Board 193-1940 and as an early advocate for the use of design in public life. He trained as a solicitor, and practised as an administrator. He was involved in the founding of the Design and Industries Association. It is possible to deduce that his Council's dismissal of the role of art schools was premised on a practical experience for the separation of art and design as distinct practices; art schools – as has been seen many times in this thesis – for the most part simply did not provide adequate training for professional designers.

the arts and crafts into modernism under state sponsorship of the *Werkbund*, while in Britain as Saler (1999) suggests:

from its inception, the arts and crafts movement was complex, consisting of both antiquarians and progressives; it continued to adapt and thrive in the interwar period as mediaeval modernism.' (p. VIII)

Herbert Read was critical of the Gorell Report at the time, but Nikolaus Pevsner described it as:

the first official document to emphasise the vital importance of improvements in British industrial art and to confirm the urgent necessity of immediate action. (Colman, 2020, para. 8)

As measured by those arguing for a radical overhaul of the system, it was a century of, in essence, no progress whatsoever.

An alternative system 2: the Euston Road School

The constant agitation from government to harness design to statist economic imperatives was met with a counter argument from three established, traditional figurative artists; Victor Pasmore, a graduate of the Central School of Art, William Coldstream and Claude Rogers, both graduates of the Slade. Together, the three founded a school of Drawing and Painting, the Euston Road School, in 1937. According to Hunt (2017):

Given the prevalence of publicly funded art and design schools its appearance was as much ideological as market driven. The school was established in reaction to the predominance of applied arts and industrial and commercial design throughout the public sector. (para. 6)

It concentrated solely on drawing and painting in an entirely traditional manner, emphasising realism rather than abstraction, and promoting technical skills that were seen as being at risk of neglect or even repudiation. Vasari and Cennini would have recognised it in its academic intent, its devotion to classical figuration and technical skill and in its physical form; it was nothing less than a 20th century manifestation of a 16th century academy, or a 19th century atelier.

The Euston Road School may have been relatively short-lived⁶⁶, but it exerted a powerful influence that outlasted its physical manifestation as an art school; its practice and values would form one of the doctrinal camps that would influence post-war developments.

⁶⁶ The Euston Road School may indeed have been short lived, but demand for this specific form of a traditional figurative painting school remains undiminished. There are a small number extant today in 21st Century

Paradoxically, two of its formative members, Victor Pasmore and Kenneth Clark, would later switch sides in the civil war. Pasmore disavowed traditional figurative art, and (as will be seen later) pursued a vision for art education that ran contrary to that of Coldstream; Clark supported the Euston Road School and its traditional, figurative artists, later he became enamoured of abstraction and personally funded a great deal of English abstract art. (Lee, 2016, para. 92) In view of what was to come later, the presence of both Pasmore and Coldstream within the school can have given little indication of the collision of competing doctrine and values that would profoundly impact the development of the English art school *dispositif* through the 1960s and into the 1970s.

The school closed with the advent of the Second World War; by the War's conclusion the staff would all relocate to the public sector, with significant (and often contradictory) influence over subsequent developments.

6.5 The Ministry of Education: *Education After the War*

It is beyond the scope of this thesis to fully consider the impact of the second world war and the post-war reconfiguration of the wider educational system. It is pertinent to mention, even briefly, that the impact on art education was to be profound, but in relation to art at least, was to take place over a peculiarly attenuated timescale. The urgency attached to national reconstruction, particularly that of health and education, did not attach to the matter of art education. There was a good deal of policy debate, and committees and reports, but the pace of developments proceeded at the same pace that had attached to developments in art education from the Victorian period onwards.

Some of this lack of urgency might be attached to snobbery, as indicated by Macdonald (1970) It might also be attributed to a more general sense of what Correlli Barnett (1995) calls 'romantic idealism.' (p. xiii) To this he ascribes:

the anti-technical bias of general education in Britain and the neglect of vocational training from the mid-Victorian age up to the outbreak of the Second World War. (p. xiii)

Although Barnett was not concerned with art education specifically, his observation nonetheless gives an insight into the prevailing malaise that permeated the development of art

England; a greater number of art students who desire this particular form of training attend classical academies in France and Italy. 'In 2016, out of 53 works exhibited in that year's BP Portrait Award, 31 of the artists were trained in academies abroad.' (Lee, 2016, para 46)

education in the post second world war period. As will be seen in more detail in the sections covering the Coldstream decade, there was an almost leisurely Victorianism at work in the committees, sub-committees, working parties, calls for evidence and so on that signified a great deal of diligence from the participants, but negligible progress towards a system of art education that could reasonably expect to accommodate the changes of the mid-twentieth century.

Education After the War, also known as The Green Book⁶⁷, a confidential memorandum compiled by members of the Board of Education, sought to stimulate debate about the future structure of education in England. It touched briefly on art education:

It is unnecessary to deal separately with provision for art education... The two main points which require to be pursued are the provision of better accommodation and the development of art instruction for industrial purposes in closer association both with industry and technical education. The brevity of this reference to art education must not be taken as representing the weight that should be attached to the importance of its further development. Quite apart from any questions of cultural values, there is no doubt that much remains to be done to secure that the Art Schools shall make their due contribution to production in the sphere of design. (Board of Education 1941, para. 45)

The Green Book informed the 1943 White paper, *Educational Reconstruction*, which made only passing reference to the art schools:

Plans were in hand immediately before the war to increase the provision of technical, commercial and art colleges and to expand and bring up to date, where necessary, those already in existence. (Board of Education 1943, para. 80)

In the final draft of the 1944 Education Act art education did not receive any mention at all, but the English art education sector found itself with yet another variation in government bureaucracy that would shape its onward development. The 1944 Act recast the Board of Education as the Ministry of Education. The Ministry was functionally distinct from the Board by virtue of being a *corporation sole* whereby ultimate responsibility and power resides within a single holder of office (The Minister) rather than the Board's councils or committees. From

⁶⁷ Robert Wood, Deputy Secretary of the Board of Education, who first suggested that the Board should respond to the views being expressed on post-war reconstruction. Sir Maurice Holmes, the Board's Permanent Secretary, agreed. 'It is clear from references in the press', he noted, 'that other persons and bodies have ideas on post-war educational reconstruction and I think this is a matter in which the Board should lead rather than follow' (Gillard, 2017, np, Simon 1991:57) The Green Book itself may be of slight significance for art education, but the manner of its coming into being, its distribution, and its intent to circumvent resistance to educational reform (from, among others, the then Prime Minister Churchill) is an interesting example of radicalism within a bureaucratic apparatus. It is worthy of study, and such study should start with Gillard, (2017) who outlines the careful circumvention of the reactionary elements in government who were opposed to reform.

this point on, advocates for development, sustenance or reform of art education would have to directly appeal to, or answer, to a Minister of State.

6.6 Post war developments

The post war period also brought new pressures to bear on art education. In addition to the ongoing conflict between fine art and design, still cleaving to state sanctioned class divisions, there was an entirely new cohort with an interest in the future of art education who would bring new ideas and make new demands on the system. Lee (2016) highlights that:

only after the Second World War, when a young generation of eagerly anti-establishment British artists many of them returning from military service... were alternative teaching methods adopted that were deliberately calculated to prepare students for a future in advanced Modernist experiment. (para. 63)

Within this expanded field of conflicting doctrine and values, the newly formed Ministry set out its view on art education.

Ministry of Education Pamphlet No. 6: Art Education 1946

The pamphlet states the prevailing state conception of the role of art education:

our task is twofold. It is first to raise the level of public taste and appreciation, both by cultivating discrimination and by encouraging art and craft activities as leisure-time pursuits, and secondly to provide the training required for those who may take up artistic careers, more especially in industries which depend on good design and craftsmanship. (Ministry of Education 1946, p. 5)

This position has not significantly altered from the very first Select Committee of 1835. Art education is an instrument of governmentality; art serves both as a civilising agent for wider society, (whatever, or whomever that may be) and has a utilitarian function for the individual to contribute useful to the nation state, in return for their educational opportunities. To return to Foucault's conception of civil war as a suitable rhetorical device for understanding networks of power, the resulting tensions continually arose at the institutional intersection between founding principles – utilitarianism, economic and a civilising rationale – and the individual's values or institutional doctrine. The *practice* of the art school is constantly revolving around a set of competing influences arising from the changing *idea* of the art school at an institutional and a personal level. The battle ground is both at policy level, and within the art schools themselves. Skirmishes would become more frequent as the different doctrinal camps, the combatants, saw the ongoing policy debates as productive spaces and opportunities to advance their individual causes.

Ashwin (1975) suggests that the 1946 Pamphlet identifies several key issues for discussion; art schools and their locality; art schools links with industry; art schools within technical institutions (a foretaste of what was to become, perhaps); the selection of art students; curriculum for designers; forms of instruction and the importance of fine art and drawing. Each issue would be a rallying point for different doctrines to coalesce around. The Ministry had very specific aims, firstly;

The art schools should be the centres of art inspiration and artistic activities in the areas they serve. Their influence in these directions may be expected to extend considerably in the future. (Ministry of Education 1946, p. 6)

and secondly;

Every art school must be adapted to the needs of the area it serves. For example, the school which provides for a thickly populated manufacturing area with staple industries dependent upon good design and craftsmanship, while not neglecting the cultural side of its work, should concentrate on the special requirements of local industry. (Ministry of Education 1946, p. 24)

The civil servants within the Ministry were not unaware of the historical legacy that they had inherited:

The outbreak of the War roughly coincided with the centenary of the state-aided art school as we know it to-day in this country, and it is interesting to reflect that a hundred years ago committees were recommending the setting up of schools of art which should be something more than academies of fine art and should render real service to industry. (Ministry of Education 1946, p. 24)

The pamphlet continues, with perhaps a nod to Penty, Ashbee and the Arts and Crafts Movement:

... while the advocates of the "industrial" art school in those earlier days felt that the schools should make a contribution to the improvement of design for manufactured goods, they do not all seem to have realised that to teach design on paper alone was of little use. (Ministry of Education 1946 p. 26)

and further:

The old "National Competition", which included an exhibition of designs done by art students, did nothing to change this attitude except in so far as it drew attention to the inadequacy of an easel and drawing-board training for the designer for manufacture; and it was left to a few far-seeing people in the schools themselves⁶⁸ to realise that the proof of the success of a design lay in the making, and that it was through practical

⁶⁸ This method was adopted by pioneering schools such as the Colleges of Art at Birmingham and Leicester and the London Central School of Art and Crafts.

work in the material that the designer should be educated. (Ministry of Education 1946, p.26)

It would seem, from these statements that the Ministry was sympathetically inclined towards design and that subsequent developments would be designed with the twin aims (cultural improvement and enhanced economic activity) as the principal focus.

The first practical policy action resulting from these philosophical statements would be to review and reform the examination system. This constructive alignment, in both policy and action to align art education towards specific rational state goals, would begin to unleash forces within the art school system. As the Ministry divested itself of the direct administration of art education, the art schools themselves took on this responsibility (often misconceiving it as autonomy) with unintended outcomes.

The Committee on Art Examinations, 1947

The system of examinations set out in 1913 (The Drawing Examination) remained in place until 1946 when it was replaced by the Intermediate Examination and the National Diploma in Design⁶⁹. The four previous Examinations in Industrial Design, Illustration, Painting and Modelling were replaced by a single examined qualification, to be set and examined centrally. (Strand 1987, Ashwin 1975) The change may appear modest, but as Strand suggests:

the new scheme was a first, if somewhat hesitant, move towards the devolution of central Government control over art and design further education and a partial shift of responsibility to the colleges of art themselves.' (p. 5)

In March 1947 the Committee on Art Examinations was appointed with the following terms of reference:

To examine the present system of Art Examinations for the Award of the Intermediate Certificate in Art and Crafts and the National Diploma in Design of the Ministry and to consider the possibility of replacing them by a system of internal examinations and external assessment. (Ashwin 1975 p. 87)

Report of the Committee on Art Examinations, 1948; The Bray Report

The Committee produced the Bray Report, named for the Chair of the Committee Mr F Bray, published in 1948 which began by noting the pressures for changes in art examinations. As Ashwin notes:

⁶⁹ This comprised eight tests, namely Drawing from Life, Drawing and Painting from Memory and Knowledge, Anatomy, Architecture, Drawing the figure in costume, Creative Design for Craft, Modelling and General Knowledge.

the recently formed Council of Industrial Design wanted art examinations to be brought into line with the National Certificate system for technological subjects; a need for better regional coordination between art, technical and commercial education and industry, and the Ministry was looking for a way of granting art colleges greater autonomy. The existing system of art examinations was seen as militating against all of these objectives and tending to isolate art education in a world of its own. (p. 87)

The Report was instrumental in shifting attention from art examinations to art courses and the quality of education provided by the colleges. Its Appendix II provides a brief summary of the suggested rules for operating the Intermediate Examination and the National Diploma in Design under a scheme which entailed procedures for the approval of courses, internal examination and external assessment. (Ashwin 1975, p. 89)

The Report made a number of recommendations that can be considered as indicative of the constant tension within the art education *dispositif*; the administration of the system created a burden for the Ministry which it was ill-prepared to meet and wished to discontinue; equally there was a desire to retain control in order to maintain standards, manage resources and costs efficiently, and to ensure that the art education system played its designated role in the wider national education system.

Firstly, it recommended that the Intermediate Examination and the National Diploma Examination should continue to be held annually. Entry to the examinations would ‘only be open to students who complete satisfactorily approved courses of study.’ (Ministry of Education 1948, in Ashwin 1975 p. 88) Further, ‘Schools desiring to enter candidates should be required to submit schemes of study for approval.’ (Ministry of Education 1948, in Ashwin 1975, p. 88) Thus access to qualifications in art, and the content that was deemed to be appropriate for qualification remained a practical concern of the government, not the art colleges.

Secondly, full-time students would normally be required to pass the Intermediate before being admitted to courses leading to the National Diploma. This requirement could be waived for part time students who could demonstrate ‘experience of design in industry’ and who ‘have reached satisfactory standards in art education...’ (Ministry of Education 1948, in Ashwin, p. 88) These two recommendations can be seen as normalising the progression through the system. Art schools had previously (and would continue to) regard entry requirements, and the ladder approach to educational progress as irrelevant or even antithetical to the development of the artist. The conflict between what art schools thought was their role – to bring about artists

– and what the government thought art schools role was – to bring about cultural improvement in the population, and to improve economic performance – would increasingly be fought on the field of administration.

The Report recommendations continued with, thirdly, that art school teachers themselves should participate directly in the assessment of their students.

Fourthly, marks should be awarded in respect of the student’s performance during the course as well as in the final examinations.

Lastly, the Report recommended that ‘there should be a National Committee to deal with the approval of courses, examinations and assessment’ and so the Minister appointed in 1949 the National Advisory Committee on Art Examinations, the terms of reference of which were to advise on the administration, content and conduct of the Ministry’s examinations courses and assessment.

The National Advisory Council on Art Examinations: The Freeman Report

The National Advisory Committee on Art Examinations published its first report in 1952, (the *Freeman Report*) and a second in 1957, the *Report on Proposed Changes in the Art Examinations and in the Length of the Diploma Course*. The National Advisory Committee carried forward the work of its predecessors and the 1952 Report, according to Strand:

contained a statement presaging more radical future developments: “Art education is the only form of education for which the Ministry of Education assumes full responsibility as an examining body, and the national Advisory Committee cannot, therefore, lose sight of the possibility that the responsibility for the examinations might, at some stage, be transferred to another body or bodies.” (1987, p. 7)

And further, according to Strand (1987):

The courses leading to the examinations were criticised as leading to neither good industrial designers nor satisfactory art teachers. The art examinations were the only ones still conducted by the Ministry, which now wished to be relieved of them. (p. 6)

Some indication of the degree to which drawing was integrated into contemporary life outside of the art schools can be gained from James (2016) *Art Schools in England 1945 to 1970: An anecdotal history*.

Neal French recalls that as late as 1953, when he was undertaking National Service, the Royal Army Service Corps maintained a role of “Tactical Sketcher” where a recruit judged to possess an ability to draw accurately and rapidly was employed to record the

details of military positions of various kinds. He also remembers that the title was generally corrupted by the uncouth soldiery into “testicle scratcher.”

Thus, drawing as it had been practised since the 1690s under the direction of Pepys as Chief Secretary to the Admiralty, was still in use by the military in the age of atomic weapons and satellites.

The National Advisory Council on Art Examinations: Second Freeman Report

The 1957 Report proposed ‘a radical move towards college autonomy’ (Ashwin, 1975) stating:

a number of art schools are, in our view, well able to bear responsibility for planning courses and examining students with a minimum of outside control. We believe that, with greater freedom, these schools would increasingly develop their own characteristics and make a more distinctive contribution to art education. (p. 90)

Strand (1987) suggests that this ‘report was timely.’ On administrative and logistical grounds alone, there was ‘a need for rationalisation; there were by this time no fewer than 190 schools, colleges and departments of art in the public sector entering students for the Intermediate examination and the National Diploma. Strand again:

From both educational and economic standpoints it seemed that there were too many courses for the total number of students. But more importantly, perhaps, in the colleges themselves there was a general groundswell of dissatisfaction with the existing system. The staff could see change on all sides: in the arts generally, in the social and economic structure of the country and an accelerating expansion of higher education. (p. 7)

The 1957 Report further suggested ‘a gradual winding up of the external assessment system.’ (Ashwin 1975 p. 91):

We have decided that this objective of discontinuing central assessment altogether could be reached only by stages, and that it would be unjustifiable to delay any change until all schools were ready for it. We recommend instead that the schools which are ready for this change should be given greater freedom, and that further progress should be made in this direction as more schools become ready to take over the responsibility. (Ministry of Education, 1957)

The Minister of Education⁷⁰ accepted the broad terms of the Report with ‘one important reservation, he did not favour *any* continuation of the Ministry’s traditional role as examiner in the field of art and design.’ (Ashwin 1975, p. 91, my emphasis) The close involvement of the

⁷⁰ Quintin McGarel Hogg, Baron Hailsham of St Marylebone, KG, CH, PC, FRS, known as the 2nd Viscount Hailsham between 1950 and 1963, at which point he disclaimed his hereditary peerage. A barrister and Conservative Party politician educated at Sunningdale School and then Eton College, he entered Christ Church, Oxford as a Scholar and was President of the Oxford University Conservative Association and of the Oxford Union. Hailsham became Minister of Education in 1957 under Macmillan, holding the office for eight months.

state with the administration, content and examination of art that had begun with Cole and Redgrave, and the desire of the state in the form of the Ministry, to directly engage with art education was to be reversed in series of governmental disengagements.

6.7 In summary

This period saw the first steps towards liberating art education from the iron grip of the Ministry of Education and finally banishing Cole's ghostly presence. Within a larger *dispositif* that contained the widely dispersed physical institutions of 'an ordered system of art instruction leading up to a regional Art College', there were attempts to achieve reform through tinkering with the regulation of courses and the examinations system.

These hardly yet constituted either a radical overhaul nor a return to the system that had pertained prior to the first world war. A radical shift in the wider educational system was under way, and it seemed something similar was inevitable, primarily driven by the desire of the Ministry to free itself from the burden of managing examinations and assessment, and in recognition that the art colleges might, at long last, be reaching a level of development that would allow for full autonomy within the wider national system of education, and parity to some degree with qualifications within that system.

As the period under review progressed, encompassing two world wars and significant social change, the state's involvement in, and desires for, art education also evolved, albeit slowly. Despite the reorganisations, restatements of policy, and the continual internecine struggles between the doctrinal factions, art education as a system had neither achieved the aspirations of those arguing for a radical overhaul of the system, nor the governmental aims as set out in the Ministry of Education Pamphlet No. 6 of 1946.

At an experiential level, art education continued to manifest an extraordinary degree of standardisation, whilst still not yet satisfying the need for designers to undergo a specific, professional form of training relevant to their discipline. The degree to which the Board of Education had exerted a significant degree of control through its examination system, where the prevailing fine art doctrine and the administration were in complete concert, interlocked content and output into rigid, standardised forms; as Strand recalls:

an enduring memory remains of the internal assessment of dozens of almost identical figure drawings in pencil, varying only with each student's position before the model; of the strict invigilation of most examinations, and a general plethora of rules and restrictions totally inimical to the creative process; of a visit paid to the South

Kensington headquarters of the Ministry's examiners, and the sight there of hundreds of plaster cast figures of the nude models, like the drawings, identical in size and frequently in style and treatment. (Strand, 1987, p. 6)

None of this was of any use to industrial designers, nor it could be argued, was it of much use to fine artists of that era. Despite the many reforms and reports, policies and polemics, nothing had really changed at a curricular level since Redgrave had assumed the role of Inspector-General of Art in 1857. It is sobering to contemplate that such a lack of momentum could persist at the same time (the middle half of the twentieth century) that America was ascending to a position of dominance in industrial design and then, too, in fine art. (Lee, 2016, para. 63)

It is reasonable to suggest that art education policy of the period, as Carline (1968) insightfully describes it, was 'a dog chasing its own tail.' (p. 151)

7 Beware the Stork King

These next chapters examine the continuing development of the art school *dispositif* during the post second world war period. This can be seen as a period of increasing governmentality, with an accelerating tempo of direct government involvement in the systemisation and administration of art education, part of a larger programme of educational reforms.

This increasing activity can be traced through Appendix 1 which shows that the pace of art school openings slows significantly, the production of art education treatises is reduced, but the rate of government policy interventions increased significantly; two reports between 1900 and 1945, then twelve between 1946 and 1970. It also encompasses the significant decade 1960-1970, bookended as it is by the publication of two significant reports; the '*First Report of the National Advisory Council on Art Education*' (NACAE) of 1960 and '*The Structure of Art and Design Education in the Further Education Sector*' (NACAE/NCDAD) of 1970. This decade sees the 'final' emergence of an autonomous English art school system; the setting up a government-adjacent advisory council that reported directly to the Minister of State for Education (the National Advisory Council for Art Education or NACAE) which in turn developed its own university first-degree equivalent qualification and its own administration council (the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design or NCDAD).

It also encompasses the sudden and rapid end of this system from 1970 with the onset of polytechnisation as a consequence of the implementation of Department of Education and Science 1966 white paper, *The Future Pattern of Higher Education within the F.E. System*. The period is significant in that it can be seen as the point in which the modern art school as a distinctive discursive formation reaches its most complete form. This is the form that Patrick Heron lamented the disappearance of in his polemic, *The Murder of the Art Schools* (1970) From this point forward, it undergoes a series of diminishments and retreats, firstly into polytechnics, then latterly into the expanded university sector post-1992. These developments will be explored in Chapter 9-10.

7.1 The Coldstream era: 1958 – 1970

The Second Report of The National Advisory Council on Art Examinations, April 1957, had made a number of significant recommendations to the Ministry of Education, including the observation that 'a number of art schools... are well able to bear responsibility for planning

courses and examining students with a minimum of control.’ (Ashwin, 1975, p. 90) In response to the Report, the Ministry issued Circular 340 on the 14th of July 1958. The delay in the response was as a consequence of the Report raising issues beyond a restructuring the art examination system. As the Circular stated:

The Report is concerned mainly with the future of the Ministry’s art examinations, but it gives rise to a number of fundamental questions affecting the art schools as a whole. The complexity and importance of the issues involved precluded any very early announcement of the Minister's policy; he has, however, now reached the following general conclusions, and in doing so has taken into account the many broadly favourable comments on the Report which he has received from those concerned with art education. (Ministry of Education, 1958, para. 1)

7.2 Ministry of Education: Circular 340, July 1958

This modest document, 3 pages of only 1500 words, set out the Ministry's views on; the purpose of artists and designer; their role within society; the importance of art education; the overall nature of that education; art education’s future association with industry and commerce; new advanced level courses and a new qualification; the size of the art education sector (henceforth, it would be smaller); art teacher’s qualifications; and organisational principles for the art education system. As such, it is an important indicator of the extent to which art education became increasingly the focus of governmentality.

Although the document was modest in size, it laid out parameters for the future development of the art school system that were to have radical implications. These implications were not immediately apparent from within the text, but would become abundantly clear in the ensuing implementation of the Circular’s recommendations through the work of yet another government appointed council. Paragraph 5 states:

As recommended the Minister will set up forthwith a National Advisory Council on Art Education whose terms of reference will cover all aspects of art in Further Education, except architectural education on which he will continue to look for advice to the R.I.B.A. Board of Architectural Education. (Ministry of Education, 1958, para. 5)

The NACAE was mandated to take over the functions of the National Advisory Committee on Art Examinations, and to liaise with the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers and the National Advisory Council for Education in Industry and Commerce. (para. 5) This effectively brought the future development of art education into closer harmony with other aspects of the government administrative apparatus as within the wider educational ecology. To continue to utilise Foucault’s conception of governmentality, the Ministry had

established a strategic advantage over the art educationalists crating a bureaucratic zone of conflict. The art educationalists would henceforth have to engage battle on the Ministry's terms.

As will be seen, the entire activity of the NACAE, including the Coldstream Reports and other related Reports and policy documents from the various sub-committees and working parties, would be framed by the Ministry's conceptualisation of art education. In particular, the Circular set out fundamental assumptions which would shape future developments. Firstly;

(t)his Circular... deals principally with the development of advanced art education for full-time students. But the numbers in this sphere are bound to be relatively small and the main volume of work for the great majority of art schools has consisted, and will continue to consist, of work of other kinds. This is no less important, whether it takes the form of full-time work at a lower level, or courses for part-time students vocational or non-vocational. (Ministry of Education, 1958, para. 3)

and secondly;

Art schools have much to contribute to the raising of standards of artistic performance and to a growing appreciation of art throughout the country. The Minister's general policy in this field will be designed to further both these processes. (Ministry of Education, 1958, para. 3)

Both assumptions would present difficulties in the implementation process. The differentiation between advanced courses and vocational would continue the historical class division between disciplines that had been constructed on an assumption that there was an intrinsic difference between the fine arts and the commercial arts when in fact, these were constructs with long historical roots. This time, the division would be formalised and reinforced by the adoption of a new qualification that concretised this differentiation. This was a view not necessarily shared by either art educators or art students, and would become one of several axes along which battles would be fought. And, once again, the art schools would be responsible, somehow, for 'raising standards of artistic performance' (whatever that was) and for 'a growing appreciation of art throughout the country.' (Ministry of Education, 1958, para. 3) These Ministerial directions would constrain and contort the activity of its appointed agent, the National Advisory Council for Art Education.

The most radical reformation of the art education system, therefore, did not arise through concerns of administration, doctrine or values, as had many of its predecessor interventions; rather, it began simply as an attempt to relieve the Ministry of Education of the burden of responsibility for the logistical effort required in managing the centralised art examinations.

7.3 The National Advisory Council on Art Education

The first administrative outcome of Circular 340 was the setting up of an advisory body to undertake the review and make recommendations for the new art qualification to replace the Intermediate Examination and the National Diploma Examination. The Minister appointed Sir William Coldstream to chair this council; subsequently the reports and the council itself came to bear his name.

The NACAE produced its First Report in 1960, a Second Report (*Vocational Courses in Colleges and Schools*) in 1962, an addendum to the First Report in 1965 (incorporating experience gained from the operationalisation of the First Report's recommendations) and a final Joint Report (*The Structure of Art and Design Education in the Further Education Sector*) in 1970. The NACAE had an advisory role; responsibility for the administration of the new qualification and the reformed art school system was held by the NCDAD.

The First Report of the NACAE

The NACAE produced its First Report in 1960. The Report's Foreword sets out the Council's remit and the scope of the Report; all that subsequently did or did not happen – and the Report alarmed some and disappointed others, and its implementation was problematic, as will be seen later – should be viewed through the lens of the Council's interpretation of the Ministerial brief; improve standards; improve public taste; reduce the size of the art school system.

Coldstream answered directly to the Minister, had been appointed by him personally, and perhaps this explains what can appear to be a level of intransigence in using the Report to affect a more radical reshaping of art education. The minutes of the meetings (and the NACAE met frequently, and deliberated at great length) in the National Archive give some indication of Coldstream's firm hold over the proceedings and the eventual direction of the Report itself. Thus, governmentality had a greater influence over the future shape of art education than any doctrinal concerns or personally-held values. These elements would, however, constantly resurface and disrupt the implementation of the system as envisaged by the Ministry.

To restate the remit:

The Minister's intentions, set out in Circular 340, were that the new diploma was to be of a higher standard than the NDD which it would supersede; that the normal age of entry to the course was to be not less than eighteen; that entrants must have produced evidence of ability in art and have reached a satisfactory standard in general education before being admitted; and that the diploma course itself should last three years. (Strand, 1987, p. 9)

These very specific intentions frame all that the Council did. If there were any radical intentions from the Council for a thorough reformation of art education (and scrutiny of the archive suggests not, at least not that are recorded in the minutes of the many meetings) they did not in the end manifest within the Report. As will be seen, however, even if the Report was not, in itself, especially radical, the *operationalisation* of it released dynamic and unpredictable forces along numerous axes, where at the intersections between values, doctrine and administration, conflict arose and where considerable difficulty was later encountered.

The concern of the Ministry of Education was that the NDD was producing too many specialists who could not find employment, since their trades were being mechanised; the concerns of the Coldstream committee seem more to have been that the NDD did not offer a sufficiently intellectual grounding deemed essential not only in order to demonstrate parity with university first degrees, but also for those students who might hope eventually to engage with Modern Art. Negotiating between these concerns would not be simple.

The problems arising from defining, let alone achieving, the 'higher standard than the NDD' within a timeframe that was a quarter less than previously available, and from an early starting age; the age restrictions and the desire for all entrants to demonstrate not only an existing ability in their field of study (and this would lead to fierce doctrinal conflict subsequently), and perhaps most contentiously (initially at least) the stated intention that entrants demonstrated 'a satisfactory standard in general education' would lead to significant difficulties that would give rise to dissent, conflict and even calls for revolution, as will be seen later.

As Dr Barnett Stross⁷¹ remarked in his address to the House of Commons Debate in November 1961:

Perhaps, in days gone by, although Leonardo da Vinci could well have said, "I can offer you seven A level passes, if you want them, at a moment's notice," others like Van Gogh and Rembrandt would have felt a little embarrassed and unwilling to sit down and study to the same extent. (HC Deb, 28 November 1961, vol 650)

The implications of a reduced number of art colleges also caused concern; James Boyden, MP for Bishop Auckland, in the Further Education debate of 28th November 1961 led by Stross,

⁷¹ Barnett Stross, (1899-1967) Labour MP for Soke on Trent. Dr Stross practiced in the Potteries and was an active campaigner on behalf of the pottery workers. His passion was the arts; he co-founded the Arts and Amenities Group of the Parliamentary Labour Party, collected and donated art works to North Staffordshire (collection now held by Keele University) and was instrumental in founding the Lidice Shall Live campaign, (the Nazi eradication of the village in Czechoslovakia) including the setting up of the Lidice Museum of Art, and the Mitchell Arts Centre.

indicated difficulties in his constituency regarding access to a diminished range of opportunities:

(o)ne of the regulations will shut down a considerable number of courses and the recommendation of the First Report of the National Advisory Council on Art Education is that if the numbers attending a course are less than twelve the course should be shut down. I ask the Parliamentary Secretary whether he will be very lenient for a time in the rural and scattered areas where it is difficult for students to travel and they are more likely to go into residence. (HC Deb, 28 November 1961, vol. 650)

Boyden's area was one of those impacted by the Beeching railways act that eliminated railway services which, in the age before widespread car-ownership, rendered access to further education opportunities almost impossibly difficult:

One of the difficulties of this age is the concentration on big towns. I represent a scattered area where education is extraordinarily difficult for young people living in the Dales. A train has ceased to run and students have been deprived of evening classes because they cannot get home. I ask that special attention should be given for the time being at any rate to the rural areas. (HC Deb, 28 November 1961, vol. 650)

The implementation of the Coldstream Report was not the only government policy of the time that would concentrate resources towards major cities and away from marginal towns and the provinces, in a reversal of the expansive network of both railway stations and local Schools of Art established a hundred years previously.

The First Report: Raising Standards

The first Ministerial directive was for art schools to contribute to 'the raising of standards of artistic performance.' (para. 3) This was nothing new; art schools had been asked to constantly raise standards since their earliest origins. No Minister or educationalist ever asked for standards to be lowered. In some respects, the constant demand for raising standards acts as a pedagogic Shepard Tone⁷², giving the illusion of seeming to constantly rise but in fact not doing so. (The Shepard Tone can - and is - used to generate anxiety or dread in, for example film audiences. The raising standard tone has the same effect on many educationalists.)

The scheme that the council devised was straightforward, and could be enacted reasonably quickly. Firstly, the existing Intermediate and Advanced qualifications leading to the National Diploma in Design was to be abolished and replaced by a new qualification that, crucially,

⁷² Hans Zimmer uses the effect in his soundtrack for Dunkirk. Like all great illusions, the explanation is straightforward but the experience is intense. See <https://splice.com/blog/how-shepard-tone-works/> for a full explanation.

imposed more stringent academic entry requirements than were required by the NDD. Secondly, the institutions that offered courses for the new qualification would be vetted and approved by the NCDAD and this would result in substantially fewer institutions able to offer the new qualification than offered the NDD. At a fundamental level, the First Report and the DipAD, as its administrative instrument, changed the discursive formation of the artist; as Aspinall (2012) says:

To be an artist before the Report, was technically a profession in contrast to amateurs, but it was also commonly associated with a vocational rather than a professional calling, which was decided more by the chance of natural talent than by conscious choice. In recreating the image of the artist, a newform of design education was defined that involved art history, contextual studies and fine art as integral components. (no pagination)

The First Report: Matters of Administration

The report is model of efficient administrative concision, and is organised into short paragraphs. The first 26 concern the description of the New Diploma, including 3 outlining the pre-diploma courses, 4 on the prior educational requirements and 10 concerning the construction of the courses. These 26 paragraphs can be seen as a distillation of the preceding decades of intersection between the state administration and organisation of art education, and the sometimes-contradictory energies of art educators and artists. The report devotes paragraphs 29-51 to the ‘Administration of the New Award’, and one further paragraph to the ‘Training of Teachers of Art’. It devotes rather more space to the categorisation of art practice into subjects and mapping these onto the administrative project⁷³. In this, there was a

⁷³ When we came to name the broad areas of specialisation, we were able readily to agree on two: Fine Art and Graphic Design. We also agreed fairly easily on the main subjects not covered by these two categories which could properly be studied at the diploma level. These are, in alphabetical order:

Ceramics
Fashion
Furniture
Glass
Interior Design
Product Design
Silversmithing and other Metalwork
Textiles—Printed and Woven

We found it less easy to agree about the areas into which these subjects should be grouped and we considered and examined the implications of a number of possible groupings none of which was wholly satisfactory. We were trying to name areas not merely as covering titles for lists of separate more or less closely connected subjects but as descriptions of fields of study and practice each of which must have some sort of coherence and unity and we

continuation of prior historical hierarchies and established principles, once again privileging fine art (and especially a form of academic drawing) above other activities.

The Report then stated:

We have therefore agreed on the following broad areas of specialisation as:

- I. Fine Art
 - II. Graphic Design
 - III. Three-Dimensional Design
 - IV. Textiles/Fashion
- (Ministry of Education, 1960, para. 17)

Having determined the subjects that would constitute the new award, the report then articulated the means by which it would be operationalised and administered. Making specific reference to the Ministry Circular 340⁷⁴, the report determined that the award would be administered by an executive body that was fully independent from both the Advisory Council and the Minister of Education and that this body should have ‘final responsibility for all matters within its purview.’ And additionally, ‘There should be no appeal from its decisions to any other body.’ (Ministry of Education 1960, para. 30)

The implementation of these two observations alone gave the proposed administrative executive body extraordinary power to shape the new award, its content, size and constituent institutions. This was to cause problems later. Art education may have seemed to have slipped from the restrictive grasp of central government, but in fact for all practical purposes the Ministry retained a degree of control over the art education in regards to the number of

had a purely practical object in view, namely to be able to give a good deal of freedom to art schools within the limits of a simple framework.’ (Ministry of Education, 1960, para. 16)

⁷⁴ Specifically paragraphs 11: “The Council will be asked to consider the form of external assessment which will be needed and to recommend how the new system should be administered, whether, that is to say, by some new organisation created for the purpose, or directly by the Council itself. The Minister would expect that whatever body administers the examination system will also be responsible for laying down the academic conditions which courses designed to lead to the new diploma must satisfy, for approving syllabuses and for awarding the diplomas.” and 13: “The breadth and standard of the advanced courses envisaged in this Circular will have repercussions on the organisation of advanced art education and it is not to be expected that all the schools which now run approved courses for the National Diploma in Design will be able to provide diploma courses of the new type. It will be for the body responsible for administering the examinations leading to the new diploma to consider the capacity of individual schools to satisfy that body’s academic requirements. At the same time, it will be necessary to establish a procedure for the approval by the Minister of advanced art courses for grant purposes. The Minister proposes to invite the new National Advisory Council to recommend to him an appropriate procedure, including any consultation with Regional Advisory Councils which it considers desirable. The Council will also be asked to consider the relationship between the schools which will provide advanced courses and conduct examinations and those which will not. This will include consideration of the proposal for a federal system put forward in the Report of the National Advisory Committee.” (First Report 1960, p. 9)

institutions that would be supported. In fact, in relation to the number of colleges granted the authority to offer the new award, and the much-reduced number of students able to then undertake it, the initial outcome of the First Report at least was a draconian reduction in access to art education at a higher level. Autonomy, such as it was, came at a price.

The new executive body was to be independent of the Advisory Committee and the Ministry, but its constitution was to be highly dependent on both:

Although we do not as a Council wish to take part in the administration of the new award, we feel that there would be obvious advantages to be gained from close liaison between the Council and the awarding body, and that this could most readily be achieved by some degree of common membership. We recommend that: the Minister should appoint all the members of the new executive body after consultation with the National Advisory Council on Art Education. (Ministry of Education, 1960, para. 31)

Further, the advisory committee ‘consider(ed) it vital that the awarding body should be of the highest standing in the field of art education.’ Additionally, ‘Its status should be assured not only by its membership, but also by adequate material and financial provision for its work.’ (Ministry of Education 1960, para. 32) It is questionable to what degree the awarding body could be considered independent, as its functioning would be reliant on state funding. Equally, the art schools themselves although to be given a degree of autonomy, it could be suggested that this was to varying degrees illusory; the choice of colleges eligible to award the new DipAD was within the Ministry’s administrative instrument, the NCDAD, and the funding of the colleges themselves was within the remit of the Local Education Authority. These two factors would play an important role in the dissatisfactions that would precipitate a degree of unrest, for which the Council would somewhat unjustly be held largely to blame.

The First Report: Matters of Doctrine

The First Report continues the doctrine of ‘fine art training as the basis for any later specialisation’ and then seeks to identify ‘discrete but by no means watertight areas of study; Fine Art, Graphic Design, Three-Dimensional Design, Textiles and Fashion.’ (Strand, 1987, p. 11) Although the report is at pains to ‘to give a good deal of freedom to art schools within the limits of a simple framework’⁷⁵ (*First Report* 1960, p. 5) the doctrine of fine art, with its long

⁷⁵ ‘We were trying to name areas not merely as covering titles for lists of separate more or less closely connected subjects but as descriptions of fields of study and practice each of which must have some sort of coherence and unity and we had a purely practical object in view, namely to be able to give a good deal of freedom to art schools within the limits of a simple framework.’ (*First Report of the National Advisory Council on Art Education 1960* HMSO, London, 1960 p. 5) This statement also suggested the title to Strand’s 1987 book.

history stretching back to classical antiquity, remains dominant. Where the report deviated from this practice-centric doctrine was to be found in two further recommendations, these ‘seemingly unexceptional statements’ as Strand puts it, that were later to be the cause of much controversy: ‘that the history of art should be studied throughout the course and be examined for the diploma; and that about 15 per cent of the total course should be devoted to the history of art and complementary studies.’ (Strand 1987, p. 12; Ministry of Education, 1960, para. 1, 3, 8, 17)

Although the attempt to establish equivalence to a university first degree was radical in intent, the ensuing recommendations did not stray far from the historically dominant doctrine of art education in England. Nowhere in the report was to be found any reference to modernist art educational practice such as the Bauhaus, nor a practical design orientation such as the Werkbund. In many ways, the report can be seen as parochial and conservative. For example, traditional fine art practice was privileged as foundational to all the disciplines:

As we have stated, the area of fine art has a role of special importance to play in the plan which we propose. The fine art teaching must serve not only those who intend to become painters and sculptors, but all other students whatever their eventual aim, for, as we have indicated in paragraph 12, it is through this teaching. (Ministry of Education 1960, para. 20)

That said, it was articulated with enough latitude in its recommendations as to ensure dynamic and unstable interpretations from individual institutional responses, particularly in regard to the pre-diploma courses. Inherently though, as Tickner (2008) states:

the development of the DipAD as a degree level course thus conjured in the same move a second-class field of vocational students, courses and institutions. This echoed an old distinction, already evident from the nineteenth-century Schools of Design, between ‘trade’ students developing a career in art, design or teaching, and those who found in art colleges a liberal education in arts and crafts. Many of these were women, and most of them were middle class. (p. 17)

The First Report; Matters of Value

At this point, it would be prudent to consider the committee that produced the report, and the reaction to the report itself. The Chair, Sir William Coldstream, as outlined earlier, can be seen as the embodiment of traditional fine artist and educator. The council members included several from the previous National Advisory Committee on Art Examinations, including Freeman (Vice-Chair under Coldstream), Robin Drew, rector of the Royal College of Art, Edward Pullee, principal of Leeds and later Leicester College of Art, Neville Ward, architect and designer, William Stone, director of education for Brighton, and Elizabeth Wray, fashion

designer. New members included Misha Black, designer and Professor of Industrial Design at the Royal College of Art, James Fitton, a leading examiner for the Ministry of Education, Stuart Mason, the pioneering director of education for Leicestershire, Victor Pasmore, influential abstract painter and educator, and Professor Nikolaus Pevsner, art historian. As Strand (1987) states:

the council as a whole reflected a range of interests: local education authorities, educational and teachers' organisations, the Arts Council, the Council of Industrial Design, the Royal Institute of British Architects, the Society of Industrial Artists, the Royal Academy, the Royal Society of Arts and the university sector. (pp. 8-9)

Misha Black was, according to Tickner (2008), 'a hard-nosed protagonist of the view that art and design education should be separated.' (p. 44) Coldstream, the distinguished establishment painter, desired 'a liberal education in the arts' in which traditional drawing and painting were foundational to all art and design, Pasmore, the charismatic evangelist for modernism, desired a radical reformation, and Pevsner the historian was concerned that art education had little intellectual activity compared to existing university first degrees and that contemporary artists had lost any meaningful connection with society.

The intersection between the composition of the committee, the recommendations within the report and the reactions to it can be seen as 'a graspable moment of displacement in the British art world.' (Aspinall, 2014, no pagination) As Aspinall further reflects:

It represents a shift between an educational system based on disciplined studies of techniques and crafts to one based on conceptual thinking and design. Its legacy is marked by trauma and confusion that deepened as the decade matured, spilling over into creative outbursts and political revolt. It has become a symbol of oppressive, narrowly defined rigour and prejudiced artistic values. (no pagination.)

The report reiterated the principles on which the Minister had considered the new award should be constructed. Entry should be not only on the basis of proven achievement in the practice of art (from pre-diploma courses or, rarely, direct from school) *but also on the basis of general educational attainment.* As the report states:

Entrants to the diploma courses should have reached a satisfactory standard in general education. The only practical way of prescribing a general educational standard in this kind of context is in terms of the General Certificate of Education... as a general rule, students entering diploma courses should have five "O" level passes in G.C.E. (or the equivalent in terms of combined "O" level and "A" level passes) before they start the course. (Ministry of Education 1960, para. 4)

The intention was to ensure that courses were demonstrably approximate in quality and standard of achievement to a university first-degree; indeed, the Report specifically states that:

Unless the entry to the new course is conditional upon this minimum standard of general education as well as the pre-diploma requirements in art already described, the Burnham Committee⁷⁶ are unlikely to accept the diploma for “graduate equivalent”. (Ministry of Education 1960, para. 4)

The report states that these requirements are ‘the Minister’s policy’ (Ministry of Education 1960, para. 1) but inevitably, the blame for the consequent restrictions, disruptions and disputed outcomes would be borne by the Coldstream Council (NACAE) and the Summerson Council (NCDAD).

The NACAE was attempting to weld together competing and conflicting elements, comprising (and compromising) the views of many of the Council members who held divergent views to the Ministry’s aims; that of improving standards, regulating access and dictating the size of the sector. It is no surprise that some viewed the result as a tremendous mess:

The committee sat for about two years without coming to any decision until someone in the Government became restless. Further discussions resulted in the Coldstream Report which, in my view, was destined for the biggest muddle that had ever been known in art education. The previous committee might have been stupid, and others even more stupid right back to Victorian times, but the one under Coldstream was the worst of all. (Johnstone in Llewellyn, 2015, pp. 32-33)

The Council also intended that the DipAD should be a four-year course of study, as it was in Scotland. The Ministry regarded three years as the usual length of a university first-degree, and did not accept that the DipAD should be different. As Strand (1987) says:

There is little doubt that the National Council tried very hard to make the case for a four-year diploma course. There is equally little doubt that the Minister regarded three years as being the traditional and therefore the accepted length of a degree or a degree-equivalent course...and that to make provision for a longer course in art would create a dangerous and costly precedent. How was this impasse to be resolved? (p. 9)

⁷⁶The Burnham Committee originated in 1919 by H A L Fisher, the President of the Board of Education in the 1916-22 Coalition Government to oversee teacher’s salaries. After the 1944 Education review, the committee had two constituents; one (the Main Committee) to deal with the salaries of teachers in Primary and Secondary Schools and County Colleges, the other . . . with the salaries of teachers in Technical, including Commercial and Art, Colleges and Schools." (Spectator, 15th December 1950) A direct link was made between salary scales, and quality of educational provision. Thus, the salary for the DipAD graduate art teachers would be on a level commensurate with that of university graduate teachers from academic disciplines, if the courses were seen to be educationally equivalent ie, as classified award. As it transpired, the Burnham (FE) Committee obdurately refused to acknowledge the classified status equivalency of the DipAD, with university degrees. This discrimination against art and design rankled with many graduate art teachers and was only remedied, and then not retrospectively, when the NCDAD merged with the CNAA and the DipAD was converted into an honours degree. (Strand 1987, p. 41-42)

The solution lay in an administrative sleight of hand; the one-year pre-Diploma course⁷⁷. The pre-diploma courses were envisaged as an area of initial training in order to better enculturate entrants to the DipAD. The Report was quite carefully worded to indicate a preference for existing traditions of art education to be maintained within the pre-diplomas; ‘all students should receive some fine art training as the basis of any later specialisation.’ However, the pre-diploma was still to be based on the assumption:

that there are fundamental skills and disciplines which underlie and sustain any form of specialisation in art or design and which should be learned and practised by all students throughout the course *as an extension of the work already done in the pre-diploma course. We think that individual art schools should be free to evolve their own ideas in this context.* (Ministry of Education, 1960, para.12, my emphasis)

Although the suggestion was that ‘schools should be free to evolve their own ideas’, the context was the specific invocation of a range of traditional (and by this time, long standing) ‘fundamental skills and disciplines.’ No-one at the time would have been under any illusion that this did not specifically invoke observational drawing from life or, as the report stated:

The general aim of all these courses should be to train students in observation, analysis, creative work and technical control through the study of line, form, colour and space relationships in two and three dimensions. A sound training in drawing is implicit in these studies. A sound training in drawing is implicit in these studies. (Ministry of Education, 1960, para. 3)

Although the idea was practical – and in fact, it was the only means available by which to achieve the Council’s desired four-year course of study - the subsequent implementation of the pre-diploma courses would be prove to be problematic, particularly as they were entirely unregulated. Perhaps the most significant element of the First Report was in what it did not state, more than what it did. As Strand notes, ‘Coldstream did not prescribe any syllabus or seek to determine the form that pre-diploma courses should take, although broad outlines were suggested. This freedom, coming as it did after so long a tradition of centrally determined course content, was a heady draught, and from it sprang both the strengths and weaknesses of the (pre-diploma) courses.’ (Strand 1987, p. 10)

⁷⁷ The pre-diploma courses were later retitled Foundation Courses and are still, just, in operation 60 years later. As Ashwin (1972) states: The contemporary conception of a 'Foundation' course as a prelude to higher art studies is based in principle on the curriculum of the Bauhaus design school, founded in Weimar by Walter Gropius in 1919 and closed by the Nazis in 1933'. (p. 43) They were a site of experimentation in the immediate post-Coldstream era, as various modernists used them to explore novel modes of educational practice.

7.4 Sowing Dragon's Teeth: The National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design

The National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design was appointed by the Minister of Education in May 1961, in accordance with the recommendations of the NACAE. It was the administrative body charged with operationalising the recommendations of the NACAE, firstly to review submissions for new Diploma in Art and Design courses (Dip AD) and secondly to validate courses it deemed suitable to warrant the Dip AD status:

The Minister will proceed forthwith to appoint a body to be known as the National Council for Awards in Art and Design with responsibility for approving the academic standards of courses to be followed by candidates and for examination arrangements. (Ministry of Education, 1960, Administrative Memorandum 16/60, para. 4. LCC/EO/HFE/01/323)

Administrative Memorandum 13/61 outlined the timetable for the suspension of the Intermediate Certificate and the National Diploma, superseded by the DipAD and set out the procedure for the Minister's approval of courses leading to the Diploma in Art and Design. (Ministry of Education, 1961, para. 2, LCC/EO/HFE/01/323) The NCDAD was charged with the responsibility for operationalising the NACAE's recommendations as set out in the First Report, in particular the administration of the new Diploma in Art and Design qualification, and the approval of courses leading to the award of DipAD submitted by colleges, schools and departments of art and design. Although the NCDAD was given responsibility for selecting courses for DipAD status, final approval (and the ultimate size of the art education system) was the personal remit of the Minister of Education.

As such the NCDAD can be considered as a consummate instrument of governmentality; it was empowered to dictate curricula, syllabus, standards of admission and subsequent academic performance, college governance, quality and standing of teachers, adequacy of accommodation and equipment, the maintenance of libraries, the provision of suitable communal amenities and conduct of examinations. One of its main responsibilities was to safeguard standards and levels of attainment among all schools of art where diploma courses were approved.

The initial Chair was Sir John Summerson, 'a historian of distinction, curator of Sir John Soane's Museum in London., Urbane, scholarly, liberal-minded but with a sharp eye for detail

and a respect for precision of thought and expression.’ (Strand, 1987, p. 15) The vice-chair was Stuart Mason⁷⁸, who would succeed Summerson in 1970.

Governmentality in operation: the Values of the NCDAD, Memorandum No.1

Memorandum No. 1, published July 1961, was a model of bureaucratic simplicity; in only 5 pages the NCDAD set out guidance for the colleges who wished to gain DipAD status. Memorandum No. 1 reiterated the foundational values that were at the heart of the NACAE’s conception of the English art education system in the form of 33 compact statements within 8 administrative categories:

- 1) The Award
- 2) Character of Courses
- 3) Admission to Courses
- 4) Content of Courses
- 5) Examinations
- 6) The College
- 7) Teaching Staff
- 8) Approval of Courses

The Memorandum detailed the fundamental values that underpinned the DipAD, compliance with which was a condition of a college being granted DipAD awarding status. Thus, by means of a compact administrative document, the Ministry was able to exert a powerful influence over the future development of the art school system, whilst maintaining the notion that the system was autonomous and self-regulating.

Five specialist panels were constituted to facilitate the reviewing of the first group of applications for approval. These comprised one for each area of study; Fine Art; Graphic Design; Three-Dimensional Design; Textiles/Fashion and one in History of Art and Complementary Studies. The function of the panels was:

- (i) to advise the NCDAD on all matters relating specifically to their respective areas of study; and
- (ii) to constitute from among their members the visiting teams whose function was to make direct contact with principals and staffs and to visit schools as part of the process of assessing the courses submitted for inspection.

⁷⁸ Mason was the former Director of Education in Leicestershire. During his tenure he enacted several radical reforms of the post-war education system in Leicestershire including; becoming one of the first counties to abolish the 11-plus, introducing fully comprehensive education, making use of new ideas in architecture such as open plan schools, building larger schools which could justify purchasing specialist equipment and resources, emphasising child-centred learning, particularly in the infant school, and developing community colleges inspired by Henry Morris’s village colleges in Cambridgeshire to foster learning for all ages and all of the community. His booklet *The Leicestershire Experiment and Plan (1964)* makes for an interesting read.

Each panel was headed by a chair who was also a member of the council. Each member of the council, except the chair of the council, served on one of the panels.

It is worth elucidating the respective roles of the Council and the Ministry in regards to the applications to run DipAD courses, and their subsequent management and oversight. The Coldstream Report laid out the terms of reference for the NCDAD; essentially to oversee academic matters and determine the suitability of college applications to run DipAD courses solely on academic grounds. As Strand (1987) states; ‘It had no standing in administrative matters or the deployment of resources nationally.’ (p. 16)

The twofold approval system, with the Ministry making decisions on resourcing and administrative grounds, and the NCDAD making choices on academic terms meant that, in practical terms, the administrative outweighed the academic in setting the size, accessibility and terms of the new college system, although Strand (1987) suggests that the opposite was the case:

Although academic quality was the dominant criterion for granting recognition, we shall see that the Department of Education and Science (as the Ministry soon became) later felt obliged to exercise a more stringent control over approvals on administrative grounds. (p.17)

The initial prosperity enjoyed by art education was short-lived, as the Ministry reined in the expenditure inherent in developing a national system as envisaged by the NCACE.

Governmentality in operation: Fast and draconian, the process of validation

The NCDAD’s Memorandum No. 1 was issued in 1961, and gave general guidance on the submission and conduct of the new diploma courses. The submissions were reviewed, visits to art schools undertaken and the initial course validation process completed in just 15 months. Once the initial courses were validated, there were to be no more under the terms set out by the Administrative Memorandum 4/65.

Strand highlights one of the features of the NCDAD, the visits to colleges from the Validation Panels. This was, he suggests, ‘a novel experience for most colleges.’ (1987, p. 18) Having previously been subject to infrequent visits from Her Majesty’s Inspectors from the Ministry, the new regime required visits that were possibly seen as being less ‘in the guise of officials’ and more as ‘active practitioners... comprised largely of people who were active and successful in some field of art or design’ (p. 18). College staff may have anticipated that the Council’s visits may have been more sympathetic than those of the Ministry; in fact, as Strand identifies,

‘professional artists and designers are capable of ruthless judgements; some were decidedly hawkish, while undoubtedly a few were so idiosyncratic as to be intolerant of any attitude or approach that differed from their own’ (p. 18). Tickner (2008) concurs, stating, ‘The process was fast and draconian. One panel member referred to his colleagues as the ‘Dr Beechings’⁷⁹ of the art-school system’ (p. 19).

As well as being ‘fast and draconian,’ the selection process was shrouded in secrecy. James (2016) highlights:

The feelings of unease felt by the teachers in some colleges were heightened by the fact that while the formal outcome of a visit was conveyed in a letter from the NCDAD, the reports of visiting panels were confidential to Summerson and never shown to the institutions themselves. The best colleges could hope to receive by way of an account of the visit was a trip to London to be given an oral summary of “highlights” by a senior officer of the main findings which had led to the decision to approve a course or not. (chap. 7, para. 5)

The immediate effect was that only a small number of colleges had their courses approved, and that ‘it left a trail of unsuccessful colleges whose staff and governing bodies experienced a shattering of complacency, deflated reputations and bitter disappointment.’ (Strand, 1987, pp. 18-19) ‘The effect was traumatic for the majority of colleges, left without any nationally recognised courses in any area and obliged to diversify with part-time and lower-level vocational work.’ (Tickner, 2008, p. 19)

As Tickner (2008) correctly states; ‘The introduction of the DipAD reduced the number of diploma courses and students and was, indeed, designed to do so.’ (p. 17) Out of the 201 courses, submitted by the 72 colleges which had been visited throughout the country in the first round, only 61 courses were approved to run the DipAD in 29 colleges. (Strand 1987, p. 18. Tickner, 2008, p. 19) This left swathes of the country including East Anglia and much of Wales with no diploma places at all, but ten... in and around London.’ (Tickner, 2008, p. 19) There were only 18 educational establishments in England and Wales that were selected to run DipAD courses in Graphic Design. (Lord, in Lyon 2008, no pagination)

⁷⁹ Richard Beeching achieved lasting recognition for his report ‘*The Reshaping of British Railways*’ which, although it contained undeniably pragmatic recommendations regarding the modernisation of a largely Victorian undertaking (this was in 1963...) is remembered chiefly for eliminating nearly 1/3rd of all Britain’s railway stations, and eliminating the majority of the local and branch lines. This incurred the wrath of, among many others, that arch-Victorian Sir John Betjeman. The cuts to the railway network were also ‘fast and draconian’, and the parallels with the similar speed and scale of reduction imposed on the Victorian art school system were obvious.

It would seem that the art education system suffered its greatest depredation at the hands of its own practitioners. The former diffuse, dispersed, locally situated system in which institutions large and small could offer anything from a national qualification to evening classes was wholly eradicated and replaced by a centralised, state-controlled system with an immediate reduction in access to art education for vast swathes of the country and its populace.

It can be argued that a 'purer' implementation of the Coldstream recommendations would have resulted in an even smaller system. Thompson (2005) suggests that:

... because of pressure from the local education authorities, the Summerson Council, set up to implement the Coldstream recommendations, approved far too many colleges, thereby threatening the whole 'specialist' enterprise – a blatant piece of sabotage that even the usually reticent Coldstream felt driven to publicly disassociate himself from, declaring that there were not enough high-level artist-teachers available to staff the number of schools approved. (p. 220)

Students, staff and colleges that had been on the previous NDD route now found themselves utterly disenfranchised, shut out from any form of continuation studies leading to a qualification. As can be imagined, this caused a great deal of consternation, and questions were raised in Parliament addressing these concerns directly.

'The Council's decisions resulted in many protests at national level; questions were even raised in Parliament.' (Strand, 1987, p. 19) For example, on the 28th November 1961, Dr Barnett Stross asked:

There will not be so many of these institutions. Inevitably, they will not all be able to be brought up within the foreseeable future to the standard to which the best must be brought up. I believe that there are 120 to 130 schools of art in Britain. How many does the Parliamentary Secretary think will be able, with all the help that it is proposed to give them, to qualify to afford in full the facilities for training for an advanced diploma of this type? Will it be thirty or forty? What will happen to the other schools that cannot satisfy the Minister of the required standard? What is proposed to be done for them? (Hansard HC Deb., 28 November 1961)

Stross refers to Circular 340 in order to highlight what the intention seemed to be for the many colleges that would not be 'brought up within the foreseeable future to the standard' and the place of the art school within a community and continues:

the emphasis which the Council puts on the development of part-time vocational and non-vocational work; he believes that this is a field of work in which all schools of art and art departments of colleges of further education have a useful part to play. If that means anything, it should mean that the Minister will accept every art school, including those schools which cannot qualify or may not qualify for many years as being instruments of culture and of real use to the community, giving inspiration and

fulfilment to people of all ages, probably mostly part-time, as a true instrument of education and not ignore or neglect these schools. (Hansard HC Deb., 28 November 1961)

It would seem then that the colleges that were not successful in being appointed suitable to award the DipAD (and there would be a lot of them, according to Stross's prediction) would be expected to provide some form of vocational, part-time, community-based cultural role. This would be a significant loss of status, a double blow in fact; not only not being able to award the DipAD, but also no longer able to continue with the Intermediate and National Diploma. As referred to earlier, the lower status of the qualification would also have a direct negative impact on staff salaries.

7.5 The NACAE: Matters of Values

The First Coldstream Report laid down some broad principles; there was no prescribed syllabus; the colleges were not told what kind of course they could propose, beyond general guidelines laid down by Coldstream. The guidelines laid down by Coldstream, of course, took their lead from the committee's interpretations of the Ministry's circular 340. The First Report is quite explicit on this point; 'In considering the principles on which the new diploma courses should be constructed, we took as our starting point the decisions taken by the Minister and announced in Circular 340.' (Ministry of Education 1960, para. 9) Further, it states; 'The aim of the courses 'was to give an opportunity of a liberal education in art to the most promising artists and designers.' (para. 13)

Lee (2016) highlights a possible reason for the Report's broad principles and lack of a structured curriculum:

(t)he presence on the committee of Victor Pasmore, who had previously disagreed with Coldstream over future art school policy, and who had already spent over ten years re-configuring art courses with which he had been associated, may have been significant. He was in a position to ensure the sort of ambiguous final wording allowing the revolution in art education he had helped kickstart to continue unimpeded. (para. 71)

Coldstream himself suggested:

It should have been called the Pasmore Report, then people would have understood what was happening⁸⁰. (Coldstream, in Tickner, 2008, p. 171)

⁸⁰ One of the unanticipated outcomes of the implementation of the First Report was a significant reduction in traditional life drawing across the sector. As Coldstream stated:

It also has to be recalled that the rigidity of the National System of Instruction was not a distant memory for many of the Committee members; this and the adoption of radical attitudes by some of the members would tend to drive the Report towards an accommodating compromise:

The Report was an attempt to give the impression that changes in art education were under official control whereas, in truth, they were anything but. It was in the interests of those who were already way in advance of any principles in Coldstream to leave the Report's conclusions as open as possible to interpretation to enable those of a progressive bent, of whom Pasmore was one, to proceed much as they had before without hindrance. (Lee, 2016, para. 72)

Additionally, the theoreticians and historians on the Committee sought recognition for their values to be validated as an academic principle within the Report. The guidelines that the First Report laid were liberal, both in the sense of being generously broad, but also in the sense of being part of the long historical trend for art practice to desire to become a *Liberal Art*, with a concomitant increase in intellectual and cultural status. This was, in part, to provide energy to the theoreticians and historians who were to seize upon Coldstream's instruction that all courses should contain an element of art history and complementary studies, which previously had played no part in the teaching of art on the NDD. This aspect was to be one of Strand's Dragon's Teeth.

At another level, the guidelines were also pragmatic and dogmatic. Of particular import were: courses would approximate the quality (of teaching) and standard of achievement of a university first degree; courses would be of three years duration; satisfactory prior educational attainment was a requirement of entry; entrants must have produced evidence of ability in art; all students should receive some fine art training as the basis for any later specialisation; students should not specialise too narrowly. The implementation of these would effectively impose greater restriction on the courses than might be presupposed from the 'broad principles' laid down in the First Report. The dominance of fine art practice remained somewhat

While the committee was sitting Victor Pasmore organised the Developing Process exhibition with Harry Thubron, Richard Hamilton and Tom Hudson at the ICA. They were very successful with the Bauhaus idea and there was little I could do against the tide of opinion... it should have been called the Pasmore Report, then people would have understood what was happening.

Of all the clashes in the art education civil war, the battle for dominance between the figurative, traditional artists and the modernists influenced by an English Marxist interpretation of the Bauhaus was the most bitter, and the most damaging in relation to art school curriculum. Its impact continues to the present, with writers such as Lee (2016) and Willer (2018) and others lamenting, as they see it, the gutting of skill and technique from the curriculum.

unchallenged at this point although they would come under vigorous attack over the next decade from Pasmore and others, particularly within the pre-diploma courses. In addition, an increasingly engaged student body desired greater influence within their educational establishments. Art students were not uniquely disposed towards direct action, but as will be seen later, they did act and their actions attracted a disproportionate response from some quarters. As Lee (2016) says:

Coldstream and Summerson, Edwardians both, could not have suspected the rebellious new mood among recently liberated young people. Thus far students had passively done as they were told, but from the mid-1960s the student body became vocal and confident, indeed uncompromisingly dictatorial about what it required from its own education. (para. 76)

The conflict in values, which then bled into the doctrinal clashes afflicting every aspect of the NACAE and the NCDAD was driven by personalities rooted in their particular, localised historical contexts:

Coldstream steered an unwieldy committee of thirty members with different agendas and egos - a task no less daunting than that of his colleague Sir John Summerson, who had to administer the new award with a committee of strong personalities, all of whom were invested in the future of art education. (Westley, in Llewellyn, 2014, p. 58)

Coldstream and Summerson were both Edwardians and figurative painters. The period immediately following the First Report saw new directions in art and design; 'shifting the emphasis from mere technical proficiency and copying to self-expression', 'the growing influence of non-figurative painters,' and finally 'how the Bauhaus basic design in the hands of less able teachers came to be misunderstood.' (Strand, 1987, p. 30) These new directions introduced disruptive elements into the operationalising of the First Report, bringing instability and a dynamic interplay of tensions as the NCDAD under Summerson attempted to enact the recommendations of the First Report into a new qualification system, and operationalise a new art education architecture within a system that itself – both art practice and wider educational practice – was under increasing pressure from rapid modernising tendencies.

Among the value conflicts that would play a part in destabilising the art school system as it transitioned from a Victorian to a Modern system, was the growing movement away from long-established traditional norms of art practice as exemplified by Coldstream and Summerson; instead, a newly energised concentration on the abstract, non-figurative and the diminution of the importance accorded to objective drawing despite Coldstream's explicit encouragement of

‘a sound training in drawing.’ (Ministry of Education 1960, para. 4; Strand 1987, p. 31) Pevsner was sufficiently concerned to write a letter articulating his concern that:

...50% of these students will ultimately teach school children... Surely, part of the teaching of school children is the teaching of accurate drawing and precise painting. They are not going to be artists, they may benefit much by free expression, but they will also benefit by the ability to show precisely in terms of drawing what they may want to record. (in Strand 1987, p.31)

It is a notable point of difference in values expressed as educational doctrine that a traditionalist (and non-practitioner) such as Pevsner was able to contemplate an education that encompassed both figurative *and* abstract, whereas apparent modernisers such as Pasmore flatly refused to engage with the figurative⁸¹ and thus actively prevented generations of future artists from experiencing both, from which they could then choose their own future path.⁸² Pevsner concluded his observations with:

Personally, I would feel happier if we could insist on this aspect of the teaching (accurate drawing and precise painting) in art colleges to be become a matter of course. (in Strand 1987, p.31)

Rather than develop an awareness of the changing educational landscape around them, with the imminent threats to autonomy clearly visible to those who chose to look, the art education world during this time turned inwards and fought battles over arcane differences in approach and practice, one aspect of art education’s tendency to be prone to the whims of charismatic individuals and their latest passions. Pivotal among these, a group that originated within the Euston Road School and the Slade would come to exert an influence that would shape the late-modern art school, provoking criticisms – including from council member and panel expert, Pevsner.

Victor Pasmore would go on to the Central School of Arts and Crafts, under William Johnstone, and lead one of the few BA art courses in the university sector prior to 1992, when he became Head of the Department of Painting at King's College, Durham/ Newcastle University (1954

⁸¹ The irony was that despite having had an almost identical art education to Coldstream, Pasmore would come to reject his own education and practice and seek to eliminate it from art education henceforth. Indeed, all the early abstract artists in Britain at this time would have had a similarly traditional instruction into painting and drawing; it was only later, under their influence, that such regressive skills-based instruction would be eliminated. Having benefited from a plurality of approach, the English abstract artists become almost messianic in their desire to prevent young artists gaining a similar breadth of skill and experience. See David Lee (2016) for more on this.

⁸² Institutions could be identified as belonging to one or other particular doctrine, and students moving from the pre-diploma would choose (and be chosen by) institutions that reflected their own current interests.

to 1961). His tenure, along with that of Richard Hamilton saw the introduction of elements of the ‘basic design movement’⁸³ into British art education. (Yeomans, 1987, p. 2) The basic design approach was not then, nor more recently, without criticism:

The work of Victor Pasmore, Richard Hamilton, Tom Hudson and Harry Thurbron has been criticised as pseudo-scientific, politically naïve, authoritarian, and insensitive to the commercial and industrial needs of the country...they have been accused of breaking down previous training in art skills and techniques that a generation of visually and technically incompetent art graduates has been inflicted on English society. (Forrest, 1985, p. 147)

Some measure of the degree to which these charismatic individuals distorted the direction of art education can be determined by reference to a comment from Coldstream himself. In response to a question as to why he had rejected the pro-polytechnic arguments of such prominent figures as Victor Pasmore and Harry Thubron, Coldstream responded; ‘What would have been the point in replacing one tyranny with another?’ (Thompson, 2005, p. 220)

7.6 Unintended consequences; the intersection of Doctrine and Administration

The Ministry of Education (soon to be the Department for Education and Science⁸⁴) controlled the administration of the whole system through funding, within a national framework of general education. A rapid increase in the scale of art education, with a commensurate rise in the costs to be met, was clear to foresee. Quite apart from larger changes in the Higher Education ecology to come, this would not be permitted. The Summerson Council minutes of a meeting held on 23rd of November 1964 are the first specific record of the intended DES moratorium on new

⁸³ A Bauhaus concept, first propagated in Britain by Johnstone at the Central School, students acquired basic principles of painting or design from direct analysis of their own experiences with materials, rather than learn a series of received ideas (Thistlewood, 1992; Yeomans, 1987, p. 2). Walker (1981) stated: Basic Design was intended to destroy an orthodoxy but... once it was taken up by the Coldstream Committee working to reorganize art education in the early 1960s, it rapidly became an orthodoxy in its own right. Pasmore, newly converted to Modernism and abstraction, insisted on a complete break with the past. Hamilton, on the other hand, valued the traditional training he had received as a student and thought more in terms of a continuous development. In fact, an assimilation of recent history was in progress: the British artists were somewhat belatedly attempting to come to terms with Continental Modernism of the period 1900-1939: Cubism, Constructivism, De Stijl, and above all the various Basic courses taught at the Bauhaus. What was not sufficiently taken into account was that these Continental ideas were to be applied in a different social context, in a different period. Also, the British art institutions lacked the social vision and industrial/architectural emphasis one associates with the Bauhaus. (p. 3)

⁸⁴ The Ministry of Education became the Department for Education and Science in 1964. The change of title is perhaps more significant than might be assumed, reflecting perhaps, a change in State emphasis to more overtly include science and technology. This same move would underpin the development of the Polytechnics, which gave technology a much more significant role in the broader higher education ecology, with a commensurate reduction in capacity to support the arts as an autonomous sector within HE.

courses; the DES asked for the Council's views on a number of issues, including the further development of new DipAD centres:

Certain suggestions had been discussed in the Department as to how some form of administrative control over the development of DipAD courses could be put into operation. It was suggested that a moratorium should be put into effect whereby no new DipAD centres should be agreed during the next two or three years. (Strand, 1987, p. 44)

The DES published an Administrative Memorandum on April 2nd 1965 on *The Approval of Courses leading to the Diploma in Art and Design*. It outlined the DES' concerns: a serious shortage in staff at all levels in the colleges; competition for staff and new buildings; a small increase in the number of students eligible for the DipAD. It concluded:

The Secretary of State has therefore reached the conclusion that consideration of the applications for the approval of new courses to start in or after September 1966, should be limited to those colleges which have already received approval for courses in another area of study.

As Strand observes:

...after only three DipAD intakes to the courses first approved in 1963, the brakes were applied. The established DipAD centres were to be consolidated, and most of the other colleges steered... towards *different objectives*. (p. 46, my emphasis)

The Summerson Council's operationalisation of the Coldstream Report brought about a change in the fundamental nature of art education from this point forwards. If the Intermediate and NDD system could be seen to have embodied and encouraged a primarily craft-based approach, the DipAD turned the emphasis towards the cerebral and the intellectual. (Aspinall, 2014, no pagination) Additionally, the implementation of the Coldstream reforms in the form of the DipAD and the DES intervention limiting the number of DipAD centres represented a significant reduction in the number of qualification opportunities from the previous NDD.

7.7 In Summary

The immediate outcome of the First Report, the intersection of governmentality and doctrine, was that art education reversed the direction of travel it had followed during the half-century after the first World War; in freeing itself from the utilitarian restrictions of the Cole-Redgrave-Ministry doctrine, art education – under the influence and domination of fine art practitioners and theorists – resumed its exclusionary elitist trajectory. The number of art was reduced by almost two-thirds, and the number of students studying art for a national qualification was consequently equally reduced. As Rebecca Kill (2006) states:

The two Coldstream reports frame a decade long period in the development of higher education in Art and Design where art education achieved academic integrity; it became recognised, and funded, as an academic subject but this transformation occurred subject to certain specific indicators of authority. (p. 2)

Students in the system who did not meet the new entry requirements were then denied continuation of their studies, as were many students who did meet the criteria; the reduction in available places on the new DipAD met they too were denied further progress, even though this had been implied when adopting the pre-diploma courses as a means to gain access to the Diploma.

Within the new DipAD curriculum, design, previously of central concern as the Ministry of Education tried to enlist art education in the unending project to improve the England's economic position, was also diminished; henceforth, fine art practice was deemed to be a suitable grounding for all subsequent professions and pursuits, and craft skills were even further diminished in the hierarchy to the level of non-qualification vocational courses only. Even fine art itself, under the influence of the modernisers such as Pasmore and Thubron, was to be stripped of traditional skills, rendering its suitability as a foundation for design even more tenuous than before.

In enacting the Coldstream Report, the NCDAD validated relatively few of the existing art schools, despite the Ministry of Education's rigorous inspection policy having recently approved them. The actions of the committee, the 'fast and draconian' implementation of the validation process in particular, gutted England's art school system. The committee members were all artists; but driven by their individual zeal for doctrinal purity, and to eliminate competing notions of what art education could be, the art school system was smashed by its own children. As Beck and Cornford (2012) commented in *The Art School in Ruins*:

The failure of art schools to create relevant and innovative programmes driven by local contingencies was caused... by a combination of the influence of... the 'commercial avant-garde' and the woeful implementation of the Coldstream proposals.

More trouble was to come, as will be seen in the next chapter. As Lee (2016) put it; 'the ham-fisted imposition of the controversial DipAD... lit the touchpaper.' (para. 76)

In stark contrast to the diminishment of art education brought about by the NACAE recommendations and their operationalisation by the NCDAD, Macdonald (2004) relates how the architect, Sir Hugh Casson, was of the opinion that, in his experience, 'councillors can be far more liberal and understanding than artists and experts.'

In fact, as Casson suggested:

...practising artists and art educationists have always been more ruthless and domineering than councillors or general educationists: artists tend to be single-minded. It was Redgrave who imposed the awful *National System of Instruction* with such fanatical zeal, it was Poynter who introduced a two years course of drawing exclusively from the cast, it was Millais who considered art schools unnecessary, it was Ashbee who suggested their abolition, it was the practising artists of the Summerson Council area panels who ruthlessly pruned the art schools. In the past it was local councillors who donated funds to build art schools and art galleries, precious little ever being given by senior wealthy professional artists, who mostly seem to have the attitude that only the very best should pursue art. The frogs may eventually get rid of their councillor governors and acquire a stork king, or a few water serpents. (Macdonald, 2004, p. 362)

The art critic David Lee (2016) noted:

The... Coldstream Report, a brief document of only twenty pages published in October 1960, and its fine-tuning supplementary addenda... (and) the final Coldstream report in 1970, are frequently and flippantly claimed to have laid the groundwork for the destruction of art teaching.’ (para. 67)

and further noted:

It has become customary to blame Coldstream and Summerson, both of them political and artistic conformists, for everything that has subsequently gone wrong. It is certainly true that the reports changed art’s organisation and certification, but in truth there is little in the wording of the main original report to suggest a path was being embarked upon leading to the state reached today... The Report encouraged liberalising tendencies and experiment, but always with the longstop of a necessary foundation of skill, an awareness of art history and a complementary general knowledge. (para. 67)

In fact, the removal of centralised control over content did not initially stimulate a radical departure from the accepted norms of art doctrine; the long tradition of particular practices remained in place, often with a sheen of radical modernity applied, but demonstrating remarkable resilience throughout the twentieth century. Indeed, in my own professional experience⁸⁵, many of these doctrines linger in the values and practices of even newly hired staff who would have had little to no exposure to what might be termed a traditional art education.

Whatever the intentions had been, the operationalisation of the report was to have immediately disruptive consequences and latterly, as Strand (1987) suggests, ‘sowed some dragon’s teeth.’ (p. 28)

⁸⁵ Academic staff were still referring to a ‘sound training in drawing’ or similar in both learning outcomes and applicant requirements in my most recent design degree course validations during May 2022.

8 Second Class Citizens, a Policy for the Arts, and the Looming Threat.

This chapter examines the immediate consequences of the implementation of the DipAD by the NCDAD, and the implementation of Crosland's polytechnisation policy.

The NACAE, perhaps belatedly recognising the damage wrought by the rapid implementation of the DipAD which rendered the non DipAD courses (the majority of art courses in fact) without a formal qualification, sought to mitigate the worst effects by looking at the non-DipAD provision in its Second Report, *Vocational Courses in Colleges and Schools*.

The NCDAD produced Memorandum Number 1 and its First Report, *The Summerson Report*, which looked at the process of validation of colleges and courses for the new DipAD and a range of related administrative issues. The period covered here also includes contemporary governmental visions for the arts, specifically Jennie Lee's *A Policy for the Arts*, and ongoing doctrinal conflicts and divisions within the NACAE. The archive of the proceedings of the NACAE throughout this period record regular attempts by the designers to include the needs of industry, professional practice, alternative curricula and even entirely separate (but equivalent) qualifications.

The historians and theoreticians also actively lobbied for a more significant role in art education, and fine art came under increasing pressure from doctrinal schisms around historical and contemporary practice. Art students in a number of schools (a minority) became radicalised around the teaching of art, and the popular image of the art student and art school as radical, creative and anti-establishment begins to emerge as the various factions engage the press as a strategy for recognition and influence over policy.

The period paradoxically sees the full emergence of the English art school system as a distinct entity (albeit one that is predicated on a notional autonomy within a national conformity) with the simultaneous emergence of forces that would bring about its disappearance. The civil war raged on, the traces are visible through the steady accretion of meetings and minutes, policies and reports, curriculum proposals and counter proposals. Focussed on their own narrow doctrinal disputes, the combatants were initially unaware not only of the threat from changing government focus but also of the rapid technological developments that would suggest a different form of training from that available under the DipAD. Neither the NACAE nor the NCDAD seemed to be aware that their historical preference for fine art – and a long-standing

antipathy to design – had been overtaken by social, cultural and technological events. Sir Robin Darwin⁸⁶, a member of both Councils from the beginning, outlined the extent of the disconnect in the ‘Annual Oration’ to the Society of Industrial Artists and Designers on the 25th February 1969:

Someone or other in this educational world has got to wake up to the fact that there is breaking upon us a tremendous technical revolution which is not only going to affect the way we design but likewise the number of people we need to design, and thus of course the type of training provided for designers. Unless we realise the dimensions if not the exact nature of this great wave of innovation, we who are training designers for the modern world will suddenly wake up to find that we have been only training, as it were, embroideresses and illuminators. Yet in the corridors of the Coldstream and Summerson Councils I have not so far met the smallest appreciation of what is happening nor of its possible effects. (TNA, ED206/17, NACAE (SC) (69) 3)

The student-staff rebels involved in the Hornsey occupation identified the same problem. As Lee (2016) highlighted, the rebels noted that:

Precisely at the period when the new diploma courses were being conceived, the historical conditions they reflected were disappearing for good. (para. 73)

Not only was the practice of art and design changing fundamentally, so was the wider educational ecology within which it was located. The *Woolwich Polytechnic Speech* of 1965 – midway through the ‘Coldstream Decade’ – and the subsequent implementation of the recommendations of the ensuing White Paper *Future Pattern of Higher Education within the F.E. system* would bring the English art school system’s brief period of autonomy to an end commensurate with the publication of the NACAE/NCDAD Joint Report of 1970.

8.1 Second class citizens: the Second Report of the NACAE, *Vocational Courses in Colleges and School*.

The significant reduction in the number of places available to study the DipAD, in relation to the previous NDD, and the lack of a DipAD equivalent qualification route for students who wished to pursue art and design for commercial reasons cause forced the NACAE to consider the consequences of the ‘fast and draconian’ implementation of its Report. This had decimated the capacity for what might usefully be termed non-fine art practice; the many designers, printers, ceramicists, and so on who were now to be denied access to a qualification that

⁸⁶ Sir Robert Vere Darwin, (1910-1974). Darwin, a landscape and portrait painter, studied at the Slade School of Fine Art. His most significant legacy was the administrative reconfiguration of the Royal College of Art turning it from a rather outmoded art school to ‘what had become by general consent the foremost institution of its kind in the world... its influence spread through the whole edifice of art education in Britain. Its academic stature was recognized by the grant of a university charter in 1967...’ (Gooden, 2014)

required them to have ‘reached a satisfactory standard in general education’ (Department of Education and Science, 1960, para. 4) which specifically entailed five O levels, or a diminishing number of O levels and a commensurately rising number of A levels, and ‘which at a stroke divided vocational from diploma students and rendered them second-class citizens.’ (Tickner, 2008, p. 17) In consequence, the NACAE proposed to develop vocational courses in colleges of art and this formed the subject for the NACAE’s Second Report, published in 1962.

Within the same period, significant developments in the wider sphere of education were underway, which were to have a profound impact on the future development of art education in the higher education sector. Most notably, in 1963 came the publication of The Report of the Committee on Higher Education (The Robbins Report) which recommended a massive increase in the HE sector, including new forms of qualification, greater access, and increased student numbers. Less radically, perhaps, but with, as will be seen later in this section, significant implications for the administration of art education and qualifications, it also recommended the replacement of the National Council for Technological Awards (at that point only able to award Diplomas) with a degree-awarding council, the Council for National Academic Awards. Most significantly, this enabled the Colleges of Technology to devise and validate their own degree courses with the oversight of the CNAA rather than requiring the Universities to accredit courses.

8.2 Values as policy: ‘A Policy for the Arts: the first steps’, Jennie Lee⁸⁷

The 1965 White Paper ‘*A Policy for the Arts: the first steps*’ was the first expression of a national cultural policy, distinctly more over-arching than previous interventions which had acted in a more limited sphere. Lee, ‘a potent Labour icon,’ (Black, 2006, p. 325) wished to make the arts – in the broadest sense – accessible to as many as possible, and to be dispersed around the country, not just corralled within extant dominant metropolitan centres. ‘...if a high level of artistic achievement is to be sustained and the best of the arts made more widely available, more generous and discriminating help is urgently needed, locally, regionally, and nationally.’ (Department of Education and Science, 1965, para. 2) Lee considered it to be the state’s duty to support artists directly; ‘In any civilised community the arts and associated amenities, serious or comic, light or demanding, must occupy a central place. Their enjoyment

⁸⁷ Janet Lee, Baroness Lee of Asheridge, Minister for the Arts 1964-1970. The role was established by Harold Wilson, having not previously existed as a separate post. In addition to the White Paper for which she is (within the Arts at least) well known, she was instrumental in the formation of the Open University.

should not be regarded as remote from everyday life.’ (DES 1965, para. 14) Equally, she was explicit that state should not direct or constrain artistic endeavour; ‘The relationship between the artist and State in a modern democratic community is not easily defined. No one would wish State patronage to dictate taste or in any way restrict the liberty of even the most unorthodox and experimental of artists.’ (DES 1965, para. 1) In counterpoint to the rigid doctrine under the Ministry’s legacy of Cole and Redgrave’s National System of Instruction, and to some extent the doctrinaire conflicts of Coldstream and Pasmore, she articulated an intention ‘into making Britain a gayer and more cultivated country.’ (DES 1965, para. 100):

The main educational functions are carried out in England... under the aegis of the Department of Education and Science. In partnership with the local education authorities and voluntary bodies they are concerned with the arts in schools, colleges of further education, including colleges of art, adult education and community centres. (DES 1965, para. 17)

The place that the arts occupy in the life of the nation is largely a reflection of the time and effort devoted to them in schools and colleges. (DES 1965, para. 58)

It is beyond the scope of this thesis to fully explore the 1965 White Paper. However, in the context of this thesis it is worth considering that – although outwardly appearing to be a positive, supportive framework for all the arts (and by extension, *all the artists*) – Lee took an essentially instrumentalist approach to the arts; new funding was to be channelled through the existing hegemonic infrastructure of culture; the national education system; the Museums and Galleries and the Arts Council. ‘The support that the Government can give to the arts can be grouped under three heads – education, preservation and patronage.’ (DES 1965, para. 16)

The NACAE considered the policy at its fifth meeting in 1967:

The main objective of the White Paper “A Policy for the Arts” published in February 1965 is to bring the best of the Arts within reach of a wider public... It emphasises, in some detail, the influence education might have in enlarging the appreciation of the Arts. (TNA, ED 206/4 NACAE (67) 5)

The spectres of hierarchy, paternalism, bureaucracy, technocracy, homogeneity loom behind a thin veil of democratizing rhetoric. As with all state-imposed actions, it ignored the more radical ideology of cultural democracy in favour of attempts to get more people involved in existing arts and cultural provision – official culture – and did not accommodate or legislate for other, more diverse, dispersed, authentic or local forms of cultural activities. Lee’s white paper was a blueprint for the development of an official state cultural industry based upon the

ideology of the democratisation of culture. Despite a patina of liberal rhetoric, the White Paper firmly entrenched orthodox views of the societal value of the arts.

Lee's defence for public spending on minority, elite pastimes (was) that improving access to them might have a cultivating trickle-down effect or therapeutic value... Increased spending was induced by the belief the Arts were a remedy for social problems. (Black, 2006, p. 330)

The theme/value of what might usefully be termed the communal cultural value of art recurs frequently in debates surrounding art education. A state system had evolved in which the rationale for the support of the arts – within education primarily – flip flopped between the contrasting but equally limited notions of therapeutic value for social ills and economic utilitarianism; both sharing the conceit that both ends could be best served by raising standards of public taste.

8.3 Retrospective policy formation: the 1965 Addendum to the First Report of the NACAE

The NCDAD's operationalisation of the First Report gave rise to a number of specific problems which were addressed by a thirteen-point addendum to the First Report. As the addendum states:

It has been represented to us by the Summerson Council and others that the operation of those sections of our report dealing with pre-diploma courses is giving cause for concern. (DES 1965, para. 2)

Specifically, it states:

That Council drew particular attention to the lack of precise definition as to what a pre-diploma course should contain and to a lack of understanding on the part of many students and of some colleges of the aims and function of the courses. It felt also that many students were under the impression that, having completed a pre-diploma course, they were assured of a place on a diploma course. (DES 1965, para. 2)

The issues arose at the intersection between the limited number of approved DipAD courses (and there were to be no more, according to the DES' Administrative Memorandum of 1965) and the much larger number of pre-diploma courses, compounded by an expectation on the part of students that the pre-diploma was a guarantee of access to the DipAD. As a consequence, demand for places on the DipAD far outstripped availability. This served the DipAD courses well; they were able to hand-pick students from a plentiful over-supply. It ill served students, who were not able to progress their studies, having expected to be able to do so, and also the

non-DipAD approved courses. The administrative intent collided with the lived experience, and pressure would be brought to bear on both.

As Ashwin (1975) notes, there had ‘at no time been a deliberate numerical balance established between pre-Diploma and Diploma courses.’ (p. 102) For the duration of the DipAD, the pre-diploma courses turned out far more students than could be accommodated by the Diploma courses. Further, in response to the NCDAD’s request for a more precise definition of the role of the pre-diploma course, the Addendum merely restated its earlier position of rejecting a national system ‘on the principle that such a system would inhibit college’s freedom to devise and direct their own courses.’ (p. 102) The solitary concrete proposal arising from the Addendum was the restatement that ‘the pre-diploma courses should be seen as having a generally diagnostic function’ and, in an attempt to counter the assumption that pre-diploma would automatically lead to a place on a Diploma course, the pre-diploma courses should henceforth ‘be renamed ‘foundation’ courses, a change to indicate the function they have in practice assumed.’ As Ashwin suggests, this was ‘a delightfully English example of retrospective policy formation.’ (p. 102)

Several major issues raised their heads between 1963 and 1968: the establishment of postgraduate studies leading to NCDAD awards; a Department of Education and Science Administrative Memorandum 4/65 which restricted new DipAD courses to colleges that had already been approved by the NCDAD which effectively halted new developments except in the existing limited monopoly of approved DipAD institutions; the first intimations of a merger with the Council for National Academic Awards; the Government’s White Paper, ‘A Plan for Polytechnics’; and the Pilkington Report on the subject of student numbers. (Strand, 1987, p. 44)

Meanwhile, the art colleges found themselves facing a hazard of a quite different kind. Anthony Crosland... the Secretary of State for the Labour Government at the time, had master-minded sweeping changes in public sector higher education which he had outlined in a celebrated speech at Woolwich Polytechnic in 1965 and which were embodied in a White Paper published in May 1966 under the title ‘A Plan for Polytechnics and Other Colleges: higher education in the further education system. (Strand, 1987, p. 54)

8.4 Crosland and the Woolwich Polytechnic Speech

Crosland’s (1965) speech outlined the higher education policy landscape for the next decade at least. In agreeing with the Robbins Report that ‘it would be a misnomer to speak of a system of higher education in this country... the needs of the present and still more of the future

demand that there should be a system.’ (para. 2) Crosland laid out a plan that concretised the dual system of higher education, in which the Colleges of Technology would be significantly uplifted, positioning them as having parity with what he referred to as ‘the autonomous sector, represented by the universities, in whose ranks... I now include the Colleges of Advanced Technology.’ (para. 3)

He also referenced ‘the public sector, represented by the leading technical colleges and the colleges of education’ (para. 3) but of the public funded art colleges – and there were around 180 of them, covering all levels from the DipAD downwards to part-time and non-qualification courses at this point – there was no mention at all. Even in its early speech form, the new higher education policy was not going to recognise the previously maintained distinction of art education as part of the ‘diversity in higher education which contemporary society needs.’ (para. 4) Coming only a year after Jennie Lee’s white paper ‘A Policy for the Arts’, which suggested that the arts were an integral part of society, as significant as health and education, (‘All new social services have to fight long and hard before they establish themselves. Only yesterday it was the fight for a free health service. The day before it was the struggle to win education for all.’ (para. 98)) it is significant that art education was not mentioned, nor was it to be considered as an autonomous sector when the speech was formalised as policy.

Instead, an increasingly technocratic strand of government ideology took hold and directed higher education policy, combined with a desire to reduce the size (and, one assumes, cost) of the FE sector under the technocratic guise of ‘the most effective use of resources.’ (DES 1966, para 21) Cole and Redgrave had massively expanded art education along strictly utilitarian lines to meet a governmental desire for expanding the manufacturing success of England, Coldstream’s council tried to redirect art education away from this narrow strategy – increasing mechanisation had rendered much of its utilitarian outcomes obsolete by this point – and towards a more liberal, intellectual activity. They were probably fifty years too late, and arguably, in comparison with France, a hundred and fifty years too late. The 1960s were not a fruitful decade to launch an educational model based on classical doctrine and traditional values, within a technocratic administration. The entirely foreseen outcome of polytechnisation, the tensions in art education (still, after all this time undecided as to what should be taught, how it should be taught and to whom) unresolved by the NACAE and the impact of the implementation of the First Report would cause unrest, disruptions and discontinuity. ‘The bubble burst,’ as Strand suggests. (p. 82)

8.5 Polytechnisation; the looming threat

Most leading artists and educationalists were against the incorporation of art colleges into polytechnics and both Coldstream and Summerson verged on public opposition to government policy in 1966-67. (Tickner, 2008, p. 22-23)

Those in favour agreed, perhaps naïvely, that art students would somehow benefit from amalgamation by gaining access to the wider range of facilities of a polytechnic. This misunderstands the nature of resourcing and disciplinary domination of institutional politics. Those against amalgamation suggested – correctly as it was to turn out – that art education would be of secondary concern within institutions that had been created to serve primarily technical and technological needs, and the needs of government policy concerned with challenging the traditional universities monopoly on higher education. As Tom Nairn⁸⁸ put it; ‘Polytechnisation will be lengthy, stingy and compromised in a hundred different ways. No less favourable conditions for art education can be imagined⁸⁹.’ (Nairn, 1970, in Tickner, 2008, p. 25) More specifically, as Thompson (2005) highlighted, The Coldstream council indicated that the forced amalgamation would have lasting consequences. He states:

Andrew Forge, the public voice of the Coldstream Committee, declared very forcefully that the polytechnisation threatened the art and design schools’ historic spirit of intelligent independence. It would destroy the community of art and design interests, and once this was lost, it would be lost for ever. Prophetically, he saw no benefits at all for fine art education and predicted short-term gains and long-term losses for the design subjects. (p. 221)

Tickner, in her examination of the art student unrest of 1968, refers specifically to the situation at Hornsey College of Art, but the reaction must have been broadly similar at every other art college that had so recently gained a measure of autonomy:

The position of staff, students and governors was almost unanimous: amalgamation would mean loss of autonomy, name and reputation; the colleges of technology – ignorant of the work of artists and designers and outnumbering them – would dominate resources and academic politics. (p. 23)

⁸⁸ Tom Nairn was a lecturer at Hornsey and a supporter of the student protests. After the college authorities regained control of the college, he was dismissed from his post and did not work in secure university posts for the next thirty years. ‘He paid for his iconoclasm and intellectual independence. He was denied the academic posts he richly deserved and so led a peripatetic life lecturing where he could. He eventually found a permanent teaching post in Australia, an exile from his homeland.’ (<https://www.thenational.scot/politics/23268432.tom-nairn-appreciation-intellectual-giant/>) He was an exemplary critic of British nationalist nostalgia, certainly one of the prevailing trends visible within the development of the English Art School system. He was born in Fife in 1932 and died as I was writing this chapter.

⁸⁹ Unfortunately, much worse *could* be imagined and such imaginings were to inform future art education policy, see chapter 10.

8.6 The End of the Art School: *The Future Pattern of Higher Education within the F.E. System* White Paper and the implementation of ‘polytechnisation’

Crosland’s speech was rendered as official government policy with considerable rapidity. Almost as soon as the implications of the speech had begun to penetrate the slow-moving ruminations of the NACAE and NCDAD committee meetings, they were presented with the proposal document – marked ‘In Confidence’ – prefaced with a brief note from a DES civil servant, R. Howlett, dated 4th of January 1966 ‘with a request for comments by the end of January’ (TNA ED206/3 NACAE (66) 2)

The letter suggests awareness that there would be concerns raised by the NACAE and the art schools with regard to their future autonomy, as it states:

As you will see, the memorandum is concerned with the organisation of further education in general. Most art colleges will probably be more appropriately treated as specialist institutions (paragraph 12) than as part of a polytechnic institute. (TNA ED206/3 NACAE (66) 2)

The NACAE held its first scheduled meeting in the final week of January, 1966 and Coldstream responded to the request for comments on the 14th of February.

The response from the NACAE is unequivocal. Firstly, Coldstream expressed unease with the limited time that the Council had been given to discuss what was clearly going to be a major policy shift:

My council would have liked to have been able to consider the proposals in some detail. The limited amount of time available for discussing the paper meant that we were able to deal with no more than the general outline of the scheme.

Secondly, he listed further comments and issues of concern from the Council meeting. These were;

for there to be no pressure on LEAs to integrate art colleges with other FE establishments and for art colleges to continue as specialist centres outside the (polytechnic) institutes;

that independent art schools provide a better ‘professional art education’ than those within an FE college;

that art schools should be able to remain small in size;

students on ‘below degree level’ courses should be safe guarded;

that the NCDAD (on the basis of ‘very considerable of the work of major art establishments’) ‘could be consulted when proposal effecting colleges of art are being considered’;

and finally ending with a request that '(the Council) would like to be consulted further on any matters of principle as they arise.' (TNA ED206/3 NACAE (66) 3a)

The DES memorandum outlines the current system with regard to student size and dispositions; 39,558 students of whom 6,722 were art students in '40 colleges of art engaged in advanced work' (DES, 1966, paras. 3-4)

A careful reading of paragraph 12, mentioned in the covering letter, can scarcely have reassured the NACAE committee about the future of art school autonomy and self-determination. It states:

The Secretary of State believes that the best results will be achieved by developing higher education on polytechnic lines wherever practicable. By this means staff and students will be able to enjoy the advantages of belonging to institutions offering a variety of disciplines and of the wider range of facilities which larger size makes possible without a proportionate increase in resources. (para. 12)

The clear indication here is not so much the implication within the covering letter, that '(m)ost art colleges will probably be more appropriately treated as specialist institutions (paragraph 12) than as part of a polytechnic institute' but that the DES was overtly looking to link colleges 'in the same or neighbouring areas' ostensibly to enable 'staff and students... to enjoy the advantages of belonging to institutions offering a variety of disciplines and of the wider range of facilities which larger size makes possible', although what such advantages might be are never articulated. The real driver behind the Polytechnisation proposal is to enable these mythic advantages 'without a proportionate increase in resources.'

To this end, paragraph 17 tried to outline the likely size of the future system, but is at once vague and yet oddly precise; 'it (is not) possible at this stage to estimate precisely how many major centres will be designated in either polytechnic or the specialist category' it says, going on to further state. 'as far as can be judged at present the number of polytechnic centres is likely to be if the order of thirty, and including the colleges of art which do not form part of polytechnic centres, there might be some 50 specialist centres.' (para 17)

This would seem to suggest that there might be 20 Art Colleges outside the main Polytechnic system. Even if this was to become the case, it would still represent a reduction of around 50% of the then total number of art colleges offering the DipAD which in itself was a significant reduction from the number of art colleges that had previously offered the NDD.

To add further confusion, paragraph 18 deals with what the various centres might be called, and does it in such an off-hand manner as was likely to cause considerable offence to the existing institutions under threat of assimilation. It states:

Considerable importance attaches to nomenclature. There is no reason why the specialist centres should not continue to be spoken of as “colleges of art”, “agricultural colleges”, or whatever they may be, but it is necessary to have a new omnibus term which can be used to describe the major centres of a polytechnic character. (para 18)

This would suggest that although ‘colleges of art’, ‘agricultural colleges’ or ‘whatever they may be’ could retain the title – perhaps for the purposes of a letterhead – in reality they would be assimilated within ‘major centres of a polytechnic character.’

The significance of this is contained within paragraph 19:

Colleges designated as Polytechnic Institutes or specialist centres will have the advantage that it will be publicly known that they have been selected as major centres and that they will be given priority in the allocation of resources for the development of full-time higher education within the Further Education system. (DES 1966)

This thesis has previously identified that although the NCDAD ostensibly had autonomy to manage the affairs of an independent art college system, in fact the then Ministry of Education (soon to be Department of Education and Science) had full authority over the size of the system and the resources allocated to it. It was clear from the DES 1966 White Paper that this degree of control over the art colleges future existence within a consolidated FE system was to be greatly increased, with a commensurate loss of autonomy for the art colleges. (And, one supposes, the agricultural colleges and other specialist institutions, ‘whatever they may be.’)

Across the entirety of the White Paper, art schools merit only 3 brief mentions, around two dozen words, from a total of 12 pages, 23 paragraphs and 3428 words. This represented a significant reduction in the importance that Government attached to art colleges; from the Victorian era expansion, through the early 20th century peregrinations regarding curricula and status, to the post-world war 2 desire for academic parity with the Universities, it would seem clear that the DES had scant interest in continuing to indulge the notion of art school autonomy, and would prefer them to be administered as schools, departments or faculties within larger and more resource-efficient institutions. As the DES clearly stated; ‘The object will be to reduce very substantially the number of colleges engaged in full-time higher education.’ (DES 1966, para 23 (iv))

8.7 ‘Manifestations of unrest’: student response to changes in the art school system

At the same time that the state was about to enact a policy that would largely eliminate the autonomous art school system, the restructuring resulting from implementing the Coldstream Report recommendations was exacerbating tensions that were present within the system. As Lee (2016) suggests, ‘it was the ham-fisted imposition of the controversial DipAD which lit the touchpaper and propelled students to action’ (para. 76). Some of these tensions were localised, some were a harmonic to wider societal tensions across Europe; the student activism of 1968 lent an energy to the dissatisfaction with the new art school system, and suggested means by which action could be taken. As John Lord, fine artist and teaching at Brighton Art College at the time summarises:

Students had little formal opportunity to give voice to their concerns about courses or air their views generally. They were not represented on any committees. There were some heads who thought that students had nothing to contribute. There was trouble brewing among the students regarding the art history/complementary studies element of the courses. There was a view that the 20 per cent element of the course was wagging the tail of the 80 per cent ‘main studies’. Some believed that theory and practice should be integrated more, rather than seen as separate entities. (Lord, in Lyon, 2008)

A number of art colleges experienced a range of disruptions by students (and some staff) in response to the profound changes they perceived to be underway in the art education system; changes in which they had had no say. These included Guildford, Brighton, Goldsmiths, Camberwell, St Martin’s and Hornsey. Other art colleges – but only a small minority even at the time – were caught up in student protests that were at once parochial and universal. Hornsey was, as a consequence of the eloquence of its principal actors, the production of accessible texts at the time and the subsequent existence of an archive, perhaps the most well-known of the art college occupations⁹⁰. ‘The debates led to the production of over 70 documents during the six weeks the occupation lasted, principally concerned with a critique of art education.’ (Hunt, 2018, para. 18)

Among the documents produced, Document 11 included a list of the protesters’ grievances and demands. In particular, the academic entrance requirements for the DipAD, and the distinction

⁹⁰ The events at Hornsey were recorded in *The Hornsey Affair*, published in 1969, and written by the students and staff involved in the occupation. A documentary for Granada TV, *Our Live Experiment is Worth More Than 3,000 Textbooks*, was broadcast in 1969. The *Hornsey Film*, directed by Pat Holland, appeared in 1970, and can be watched courtesy of the BFI. More recently in 2008 Lisa Tickner published a detailed account in *Hornsey 1968: The art school revolution*. There are also several blogs concerning Hornsey 1968 written by those involved available online. (Hunt, 2018) Tom Nairn, the Scottish Political Philosopher, then a lecturer at Hornsey, wrote a piece on the Hornsey student activism which can be accessed from the *New Left Review*.

between DipAD and vocational distinction between colleges were both targeted for abolition. Objections were raised against compulsory status of the academic elements of the curriculum – art history and complementary studies. (Strand, 1987, Tickner, 2008). The students also wanted ‘to democratise art education, dissolving its hierarchical structure to the point where students and lecturers form a partnership engaged in the same task.’ (Hunt, 2018, para. 25)

As Tickner (2008) states; ‘the sit-in needs to be understood in terms of the interaction between local conditions (factors and forces peculiar to Hornsey) and sweeping changes in national art education (initiated in 1957 and established in 1961).’ (p. 14) Local conditions certainly one of the factors in the student unrest of 1968 was precipitated by the woeful facilities at Hornsey, as described by Wendy Smith (2016):

Hornsey was, I confess, a disappointment. Haringey, inconvenient for the main building in Hornsey, near enough to Bowes Road, the graphic design outpost in the North Circular wastelands. Unprepossessing does not adequately express this old fire station's lack of aesthetic charms. The studios are dark and pokey. Outside, there is nowhere to escape. The cobbled yard is only good for smokers and bringing out tea from the too small canteen. ‘Tiny,’ a wee thing with roller curls and larky demeanour runs this, dishing out beans on toast and Mars bars. There are no printmaking facilities, except silkscreen. Brenda, a caricature of a woman with power, chaperones the teensy library. Mr Straw (thin, white haired) and ‘Hank’ (red-faced, portly) stand sentinel each evening to herd us out of the building. I can't remember which of them held the clipboard or the stopwatch, but the litany on a Wednesday was the same. ‘And where do you think you are going?’ ‘To the main building’. ‘You can't, it's only ten to six!’ I catch the bus just in time. (Smith, in James, chap. 12, para. 41)

In contrast, Chelsea enjoyed a purpose-built art school in modern style as recalled by former student Tony Colley:

(I) found myself in the heart of SW3, in Manresa Road, just off the King's Road, with Sloane Square and its ‘Rangers’ in one direction, and World's End and Fulham in the other. It had opened in 1964 and was purpose-built. It provided suitably-equipped studios and workshops, a well-stocked library and a state-of-the-art, ramped lecture theatre. The style of the building was Modernist in the Bauhaus tradition; no frills and successfully utilitarian. It looked and felt as though some care had gone into designing it and had a distinct sense of quality. It was set back from the road and was entered via a courtyard adorned with a large catalpa tree, and a two-piece sculpture by Henry Moore, a patron and governor of the school. (Colley, in James, 2016, chap 12, para. 42)

It is perhaps not so surprising then that Hornsey students felt compelled to rebel against their locally dire provincial situation, whereas students comfortably located in the urban, cosmopolitan and purpose-built Chelsea, did not. Peter Jones (1975), suggests the degree to which - even at the time - the art school unrest was detached from any practical considerations:

... despite appearances – the philosophical window dressing, utopian sociological speculation and simplistic discussions on creativity – the impulse for the symposia was primarily political. They were part of a protest movement by people who felt that art and design education was threatened by government policies of which they disapproved. In particular, many were unhappy about plans to replace the old autonomous Diploma in Art and Design by a Bachelor's Degree from the Council for National Academic Awards, a move felt to hold dangers over over-emphasizing 'learned' attitudes and values as against the 'individualistic', 'experimental' values of the avant-garde art school. Absorption of many art schools into Polytechnics reinforced these fears. (p. 266)

According to Strand (1987), 'the Hornsey flare-up and its sequels elsewhere took the authorities by surprise. There was no blue-print for dealing with occurrences of that kind in the hitherto untroubled waters of art and design' (p. 86).

8.8 Matters of doctrine: modernists, theorists, designers and historians

Tickner (2008) suggests the student unrest was driven more by concerns for the future direction of art education than for more general political motives:

A general critique of the structure and ambition of the DipAD was driven by objections in particular areas: to the introduction of GCE entrance qualifications, which at a stroke divided vocational from diploma students and rendered them second-class citizens: to art history and complementary studies – the price of academic respectability – as obligatory and examinable components of the course⁹¹; to the role of 'foundation', an introductory and diagnostic year from which many would fail to secure a diploma place; and to what was perceived as a linear, over specialised curriculum by advocates for a 'network system' of maximum flexibility. (pp. 41-42)

The unrest, then, was over matters of doctrine, which set of values would be dominant in art direction, the degree to which historical, didactic teaching methods would continue, and the degree of self-determination and representation that the students desired. One doctrinal clash came to the fore; that of the imposition of academic practice which was seen to be anomalous to studio practice. As Strand (1987) put it:

To state an extreme position, the art historians saw the study of their subject as a worthy end in itself; the students saw it as best as a means to an end, informing and assisting their own imaginative work in the studios; the more arrogant among them regarded it

⁹¹ Coldstream, whilst not seeking to direct the artistic content of the DipAD courses, nonetheless felt able to direct that 15% of time spent on and 20% of the total marks awarded (from examination) for the DipAD should be given over to obligatory art history and complementary studies in order to achieve parity with contemporary university first degrees. (Strand, p. 85) Not only did this significantly reduce time available for practice, it introduced an entirely different academic to the art college. Neither practitioners nor theorist/historians were able to completely accommodate the other; they did not agree on what art was, what should be taught, how it should be taught nor for whom. Inevitably, this led to further instability in the administration of art schools, and attempts to accommodate both elements were to cause disruption to the operationalisation of Coldstream's recommendations for the DipAD.

as an irrelevance. Small wonder, then, that this topic was one factor in the general climate of unrest, (p. 91)

Misha Black, Head of the School of Industrial Design at the Royal College of Art, and a member of both the NACAE and NCDAD, suggested that there were:

three major changes in the sixties which broke up the old assumptions about art education: the first that the aristocratic concept of the fine arts had been disturbed by the emergence of the art forms described as “popular”; second that industries like textiles and ceramics which had been based on craft techniques had been progressively automated, requiring technical knowledge and skills of their designers; third, that instruction in industrial design (engineering) had become a new element in design education. (Black, in Bourne, 1971, p. 45)

The DipAD, based as it was on long established traditions and brought into being by Edwardians such as Coldstream and Summerson was being outpaced by changes in society and in the arts. The students desired greater reform than the DipAD brought about.

In replacing the NDD, increasingly moribund and impossible to administer, Coldstream had arrived at a liberal education in the arts. The argument now was not that the NDD was better, but that the reform fell short. (Tickner, 2008, p. 42)

Art education could have been mirroring the contemporary democratisation of education. Instead, it appeared to be becoming more elitist, as the imposition of academic qualifications as a mandatory entry requirement seemed to suggest. The GCE entry requirement brought about a disenfranchising of art students from non-academic backgrounds, generally assumed to be those of the working classes, or more vocationally oriented students. As Tickner (2008) points out, ‘the argument against GCE selection was conducted with fluency and verve by those who had had no trouble meeting it’ (p. 45). There was an optional route into art education, as Strand (1987) indicated:

A sympathetic operation of the ‘exceptional entry’ arrangements would take care (as Coldstream had recommended) of those ‘gifted students who either are temperamentally allergic to conventional education or have, for one cause or another, been denied opportunities to obtain the... minimum qualifications. (p. 90)

However, it was almost never used, and in fact a great deal of students who previously would have gained a qualification from the Intermediate/NDD route, now found themselves outside that system, unable to gain entry.

Tickner (2008) records that:

More than 90% of all art and students were on other kinds of courses (vocational, foundation, part-time or day-release). The First Coldstream Report of 1960, in

establishing the terms of the DipAD, created at a stroke a two-tier system: a liberal arts education of diploma students and vocational training for the rest.’ (p. 45)

In order to achieve parity of esteem with the university first-degree ward, the First Report incorporated elements that resulted in an act of national disenfranchisement on a grand scale. It is of little surprise then that there was a revolt against it from within the art school system.

8.9 The official response to the student unrest: The Select Committee on Education and Science (Student relations)

The student unrest of 1968 created a measure of public interest. As Ashwin (1975) stated:

Art students, although statistically a small proportion of the student body, attracted a disproportionately large amount of attention, featuring regularly in national news coverage of student troubles in the press, and on radio and television. (p. 114)

So much so that in 1969 the Government set up a Select Committee to consider the student’s views. ‘Four art colleges were investigated by the committee, Hornsey, Guildford and Brighton – in all of which there had been breakdowns in staff/student relations in 1968 – and Manchester, which had remained free from serious unrest.’ (Ashwin, 1975, p. 114)

A fuller examination of the resulting Select Committee Report is beyond the scope of this thesis, but it is interesting in that it captures the essential characteristics of the art school system of the time, and in doing so highlights the prevailing values, doctrines and administrative processes in play. It took an interested, but doctrinally-neutral group to examine art education and to account for some of its particular qualities, qualities that might have seemed a matter of common-sense or had gone unexamined for considerable time among art educationalists.

The Select Committee Report commented on some peculiar features of art and design education, including the apparent absence of agreed principles of teaching, the subjectivity of assessment procedures, and the uncertainty surrounding career prospects. There had been an atmosphere of distrust and suspicion evident during the process of taking evidence. In some cases, the internal problems of institutions had been aggravated by prolonged negotiations over polytechnic mergers. (Ashwin, 1975, p. 115)

The appointment of the Select Committee seemed to suggest that the government was more concerned with the student unrest than the NACAE. Coldstream wrote to the members of the NACAE on the 19th June 1968 suggesting that:

The issues involved are in many cases of purely domestic relevance which will need to be resolved by local settlement. There does, however, seem to be some dissatisfaction with certain aspects of art and design courses on which I think that it is

important that we as a Council should have a view. (TNA ED206/11 NACAE (SC)(68) 3)

8.10 Select Committee; observations from the Report

Although a full examination of the report is beyond the scope of this thesis, it is worth mentioning specific conclusions it reached that accurately reflected the art schools in a way that art schools themselves seemed unable to manage. The three initial observations alone might have suggested that art education, despite its lengthy genesis, had still not satisfactorily addressed fundamental issues:

The nature of Art Colleges

By considering the Colleges of Art it is essential to realise that the title is misleading. Contrary to what may be the general impression, the majority of students at Colleges of Art are not studying painting and sculpture – Fine Arts – which traditionally constitute “Art” studies. While almost every College of Art has a Fine Art Department, the majority of students are studying a variety of subjects, from industrial design, to ceramics, photography and decoration. Many students are therefore following courses with a considerable vocational bias.

The basic qualification for an artist

... while the traditional view of “artists” may only be applied inappropriately to art students today, it was rightly pointed out to us that the basic qualification for an artist must remain artistic ability, a talent much less likely to be measured effectively by conventional GCE passes, than those talents necessary for a student to embark on a more strictly academic or technological course.

Intrinsic problems with the DipAD – the academicization of art

The characteristic feature of student unrest in Colleges of Art was the debate on the content and purpose of art education. The Diploma of Art was subject to serious criticism. In retrospect it seems that too little consideration was given to the effect that the introduction of the Diploma courses would have in the Colleges of Art. With their high academic educational standards, they radically changed the character of the student population in the colleges concerned: the introduction of complementary studies brought a different kind of staff into the colleges: the recommendations that history of art should be studied throughout the course, together with ancillary subjects that formed part of some Diploma courses, introduced, indeed, “a new educational approach to art and design.”

(Department of Education and Science, 1967, paras. 219-223)

Despite over one hundred years of continual tinkering, art education was still ill-defined as to what it taught, to whom, and to what ends. The collision of doctrines – the traditional aristocratic notion of fine art, the more modern conception of fine art being of ‘an adventurous or random character’ (Ashwin, 1975, p. 124), the desire for the development of a professional designer, the introduction of the theorist and the historian, all of these elements were in play and competing for equality within the system, or supremacy over it. Additionally, there was the difficulty of accommodating these dynamic forces within a system that sought parity of status with the academic university first-degree.

As will be seen, these issues would remain unresolved throughout the relative autonomy of the state-sponsored art school period. They would continue to remain unresolved beyond that period, but would no longer be a matter of state concern, receding from view and diminishing in importance as the art schools themselves receded from view following their absorption within the Polytechnic system. From that point, doctrinal matters would be firmly localised, and no longer a matter for national concern.

8.11 Problems of administration

The report identified that the colleges of art suffered not only from a ‘division of responsibility nationally and locally, but often a further disintegration of control at local level.’ And further, that ‘this ponderous chain of administration... may have been tolerable when the colleges were smaller but is ill adapted to present conditions.’ (Department of Education and Science, 1967, para. 226) This was a response to the particular situation at Guildford and Hornsey where the difficulties arising from the operationalisation of the Coldstream Report recommendations were compounded by labyrinthine administration and ‘where the lines of demarcation are unclear between one group and another.’ The report was clear that much of the difficulty could be attributed to ‘little attention (being) paid to the indirect but consequential effects of policy changes.’ (para. 228) The report also highlighted the art colleges as having a ‘special position... within Higher Education’ and that ‘course content, teaching, examinations and career prospects are matters of particular concern to students of Art.’ Where matters of administration, doctrine and values collided was in the particularly subjective aspect of art education. In comparison with students of more academic or technical course, art students were ‘specially vulnerable’ and continued:

... there is no general agreement either about course content or the best way of teaching art; assessment is necessarily more subjective than in many other subjects; there is no guarantee that art studies will lead to a satisfying and rewarding career; the role of Colleges of Art is perhaps not well understood by the community at large. In these circumstances, the importance of communications and of staff/student relations becomes even greater than in other institutions of Higher Education. (para. 476)

8.12 Doctrinal divisions

The recommendation that 15% of the DipAD should be awarded to academic – in other words, non-practical – studies introduced a destabilising element. The report noted that ‘in all four Colleges of Art the introduction, following the establishment of the Diploma in Art and Design, of courses variously called “general”, “complementary” or “liberal” studies gave rise to uncertainty among students.’ (para. 484) The intent of the Coldstream Report’s determination

not to direct course content cannot be known, but its consequences were to plague the brief period of autonomy that the art schools had before being fully absorbed into the polytechnic system.⁹² In addition to the trauma of the imposition of the DipAD, the disruptive influence of theorists and historians seizing elements of the curriculum⁹³, the Colleges of Art were to lose their individual, localised identities that had been established in many cases for more than a century by this point.

8.13 In summary

At this juncture, the art schools had – in various forms – been extant for over a century as a state concern, and a century before that as a matter of nationalistic cultural enterprise. The prevailing nationalist exceptionalism would suggest that the English art schools were world-leading. Partisan interests would suggest that the art schools believed themselves to be separate from the rest of higher education. In fact, they resided firmly within a wider ecology of higher education and were entirely conceived of and administered within the prevailing ideological orthodoxies of the age. Perhaps the most special aspect of them was the failure over centuries to define what art education was for, what and how it was to be taught, and to cohere into an academic discipline that could stand alongside the other arts in universities. Doctrinal in-fighting caused great disruption, and lasting harm to many of those involved⁹⁴.

The Select Report is unusual in that, instead of acceding to solely doctrinal or administrative concerns – Cole and Redgrave’s Victorian utilitarianism, Coldstream’s liberal traditionalism or any of the many dissenting views to either approach – it regarded the student view as an appropriate lens through which to view the art schools. In this aspect alone, it is of significant interest. Indeed, the report records that; ‘However they may have started, the discussions at Guildford and, in particular, at Hornsey developed into a serious review of the purpose and place of art education.’ (para. 485)

⁹² Of the four Colleges of Art that the Select Committee investigated, three (Brighton, Hornsey and Manchester) were to be merged into Polytechnics, and the fourth, (Guildford) was to be amalgamated with Farnham College of Art.

⁹³ ‘At Guildford, the history of the complementary studies department was closely bound up with the discontent of the School and differences between it and other departments had a disruptive effect on the whole of the School. At Hornsey, evidence was given that staff of the general studies department were associated with the sit-in... The introduction of these courses of study has caused difficulties and the consequences of their introduction were not sufficiently anticipated and appreciated.’ (para. 484)

⁹⁴ ‘It is noteworthy that... departments were reorganised and that some members of staff did not have their contracts renewed.’ (para. 484) In conflicts between doctrine and administration, administration generally prevails.

However effective or ineffective the student action was, and Tickner states ‘the sit-in was, and was not, defeated’ (p. 100), and however much art schools reorganised and shifted doctrinal allegiances, or tinkered with the curriculum, the art school system was shortly to face a much larger policy shift, one that was significant enough to bring about the end – after only a decade – of art school autonomy. This autonomy, compromised though it was through reliance on an unstable and unequal power relationship between funding and administration bodies, would nonetheless come to be seen as a high-water mark in the existence of the English art school system. The English art school of nostalgic ideal belongs to this brief period; brief but with a lasting impact on those who encountered it at the time, and those (myself included) who lived in the shadow of its passing.

From this point forward, art schools would be wholly absorbed into and constrained within large institutions for whom art education was not a primary concern. Although the autonomous art school ceased to exist, art education as a distinct activity within higher education continued.

Strand (1987) suggests that in fact:

What emerges clearly from the ups and downs of art education during the decade from 1960 to 1970 is that despite the anxieties, fears, and gloomy prognostications of many, despite the 1968 unrest, despite Pilkington, the Pooling Committee’s guidelines on student/staff ratios, the coming of the polytechnics, the uncertain status and future of the foundation courses, the early skirmishing between the Summerson Council and the CNAAs; despite all these things there is little evidence that art and design education had been actually weakened... The system, and the colleges operating within it, had proved adaptable and resilient. (pp. 108-9)

9. The Joint Report of the NACAE and the NCDAD: The Structure of Art and Design Education in the Further Education Sector 1970

In 1968, against the imminent assimilation of the autonomous art schools into the polytechnic system, the NCDAD established a working party 'to make recommendations on points needing consideration as matters of policy as well as to offer general observations which might be relevant to a reappraisal of the first report of the NACAE.' (Department of Education and Science, 1970, para. 5) From this, it was subsequently decided to form a joint committee of members from the NCDAD and the NACAE to review the whole situation of art education in HE in light of 'a number of expressions of opinion suggesting the need for a general review of art and design education.' (para. 5)

The resulting report, *The Structure of Art and Design Education in the Further Education Sector*, published in 1970, was, as Ashwin notes, 'twice as long as the NCDAD (1964) and three times as long as the NACAE (1960) and the 'early timing of this major review, coming only eight years after the policy blueprint of The First Coldstream Report and after only two generations of Dip. AD graduates was' in Ashwin's view, 'largely attributable to the disturbances at many art colleges during 1968.' (p. 123) although the report itself only mentioned them in passing as 'manifestations of unrest in some colleges of art', (para. 5) downplaying the fact that the student action had attracted a disproportionate degree of public and press attention. The Joint Council, according to Bourne (1971):

comprised the establishment of art education, with a strong prior commitment to the structure launched by Sir William Coldstream's first report in 1960. Its report, daintily called "The structure of art and design education in the Further Education sector", was bound to cause a row. (p. 44)

Ashwin (1975) states that 'the Joint Committee's declared purpose was to extend and reinforce the existing structure rather than abandon what had already been achieved.' (p. 123) To this end, the Report advanced a number of alterations in the system that were, regardless of intent, to introduce a further dimension of instability and dissent into a system already facing an existential threat from the prevailing Government policy winds.

The Joint Report was published in 1970. The Committee first met in October 1968, and over the following eighteen months 'met on 48 occasions, including one weekend session' (Ashwin, 1975, p. 123). The meetings considered written evidence from 141 submissions (Department of Education and Science, 1970, para. 7) in its deliberations. Initially meetings were held every

month through 1966-68 and then weekly during 1969 as the Committee slogged back and forth through every page, paragraph, line and word. The minutes of the NACAE held at The National Archive⁹⁵ in Kew charts in detail the monumental labour that went into producing the Report. Coldstream and the Committee members worked assiduously towards an acceptable compromise, to account for the activity of the NACAE over the previous decade, to summarise the situation of art education at that time, to restate art education's autonomous status as of central importance and to map the system going forwards into an increasingly technological (and perhaps indifferent) future in the wonder educational ecology of the time.

In the Foreword, Coldstream states:

In this report we have tried to see the art education system as a whole and to relate the different parts so that they complement each other.

We make recommendations concerning the various bodies which advise on or control art education so that their activities may be better co-ordinated and so that art and design education may preserve its identity while being more effectively related to the education system as a whole. (Department of Education and Science, 1970, p. VI)

The Report was submitted to the Minister for Education, Margaret Thatcher. At the time it was submitted, '26 of the 30 newly created polytechnics had swallowed local art schools whole... By the end of the 1960s a majority of art schools were being 'run' by polytechnics.' (Lee, 2016, para. 81)

9.1 Matters of Value

In the Foreword, Coldstream clearly articulates the value system that underlay the work of the NACAE and in particular the Joint Report and its attempts to ameliorate problems arising from the First Report, and the operationalisation of the First Report by the NCDAD. It is clear from the minutes of the 48 meetings held by the NACAE that a great deal of attention was paid to the careful wording, directed by Coldstream's close control over the Council's output. The text in the final version has been poured over, page by page, line by line, word by word. (TNA ED206/22, ED206/16) The latter meetings of the NACAE through 1968 and 1969 must have been excruciating for some of the members. Rather than the free ranging discussions of earlier years, the last were devoted to grinding though administrative detail.

In making our recommendations we have been influenced by our belief that it is in the interests of many young people that they should not commit themselves too early to a

⁹⁵ NACAE papers are catalogued under ED46/843-ED46/854 covering 1958-66 and ED206/1-ED206/24 covering 1964-71

career in art and design and that they should be able to continue their general education, without undue specialisation, up to the age of eighteen.

At the same time we recognise the continuing need to provide a range of vocational courses for those leaving school at sixteen or seventeen who wish to enter them and have suitable abilities. We see a need for a national body to review and validate these courses.

We believe that further education after leaving school should be available to as many people as possible and that for some young people leaving school early who have a special interest in art and design but who are not suited or attracted to vocational courses, art colleges can play a part in offering general education with a significant art content. Suitable courses might be conducted in colleges of art or in conjunction with other colleges of further education. Students on these courses while having an experience of art college education could keep the options open as to a future career. At the same time we are aware that the opportunities for fuller studies of art and design in secondary schools are rapidly increasing and this must be taken into account. (Department of Education and Science, 1970, p. vii)

The Report is around twice the size of the First Report; 47 pages, 6 further pages summarising the previous 47, and 11 pages of appendices.

It also includes a 'Note of Dissent' from Sir Nicholas Pevsner, which states his disagreement with paragraphs 34-41 in Chapter 3. In a divergence from the general thrust of the Report, Pevsner articulated his view that the Report, and therefore the future direction of art education, had taken a significant move away from both fundamental skills in representational art, and intellectual rigour. He specifically attacks the Report for what calls an unpalatable truth; 'There is a general tendency in education at present to make tasks easy or to make them appear easy. But education is not easy and cannot be.'

He continues:

... the college of art poses a problem which does not arise in other schools... the college of art according to our programme reserves only 15 per cent of the available time for strictly intellectual or, we might say academic pursuits. I don't want them to reserve more, but I regard the fifteen per cent as a dire necessity... It is clarity of thought and expression, it is unbiased recognition of problems, it is the capacity for discussion and it is ultimately understanding they must achieve. But to understand one must know the facts; to know the facts one must learn the facts, and to choose relevant facts one must command a surplus of facts. That is the unpalatable truth. (Department of Education and Science, 1970, p. 49)

Pevsner's view of Chapter 3 could usefully be extended to critique the Report as a whole; in trying to satisfy the contradictory, deeply held values and the conflicting doctrinal divisions of the various Committee members representing a variety of disciplinary positions, the Joint Report 'provides generalities and leaves their interpretation too wide open.' (p. 48) He

concludes; ‘My dissent then is caused by the Chapter’s preference for the general at the expense of the specific, and by any avoidance of any emphasis on the required discipline of learning. (p. 49)

It is worth contrasting the rather vague values contained within Coldstream’s foreword with what might have been; as will be seen later in this chapter, at least one member of the Council, David J Warren Piper, had actively campaigned for a more overt statement of values, and a more robust defence of art education based on a rational system of evaluation, rather than the woolly phrasing of the published Report.

9.2 Matters of Administration

In preparing the Report, the NACAE had sought for a wide range of input from anyone with an interest in art education; ‘Views on Art Education Invited’.

The National Advisory Council on Art Education (Coldstream Council) met yesterday and decided to invite views on any matters relating to the general structure of art and design education in colleges and schools of art.

It was following the Council’s First Report in 1960 that the award of the Diploma in Art and Design was established. This is administered by the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design (Summerson Council). The second Coldstream Report issued in 1962 was concerned with vocational courses.

Both Councils are naturally aware of views being currently expressed and they feel that there should be an opportunity for the present structure to be looked at and, if necessary, re-assessed. (TNA ED206/11 (3) appendix B)

The Council received a considerable volume of responses; 23 from Associations and other bodies, 32 from groups or working parties, 24 from groups of members of staff, 1 from a group of students, 4 from groups of staff and students collectively; 86 submissions from individuals of which 32 were from principals or heads of colleges or schools or departments of art and 34 from other teaching staff. (Department of Education and Science, 1970, Appendix I(a))

They range from the thoughtful to the outlandish; from ‘the system is basically fine’, to ‘the system needs to be completely rebuilt’. It is an invaluable repository of opinions and ideas pertaining to art education at the time, and warrants a fuller exploration. The constraints on this thesis preclude such an exploration; suffice to say that the Council absorbed it all, digested it, ruminated for a considerable period of time, and essentially stayed on its original path, with minor administrative tweaks. The ‘present structure was looked at’, (para. 6) but there was not to be a significant restructuring.

In the views submitted to us there were many references to Dip AD courses. These were mainly concerned with particular points of course content or administration. The general weight of the evidence submitted to us did not seriously challenge the fundamental concept of the Dip AD as outlined in the First Report. (para. 21)

In fairness, given the prevailing polytechnisation, there must have been an awareness that no such restructuring would now be possible; it was already too late. Further developments would take place within the polytechnic system that had already absorbed almost all of the advanced level art education institutions, and the NACAE was at this point fighting a rear-guard action to try and ensure a role within the new system.

The most significant administrative development was the affirmation that the vocational courses, for so long the route of the second-class citizens, warranted a more nuanced approach to the award of DipAD to encompass - after considerable lobbying from the professionally minded designers (ably represented by Misha Black and the Society of Industrial Artists and Designers on Committee meetings) - that a professional design route should be available within the DipAD scheme.

The Report rather cagily suggested that:

We are equally sure from the evidence of submissions received and from discussions amongst ourselves that some important features of the system require reappraisal and modification if they are to meet to the fullest possible extent the educational needs of future students and if a sensible relationship was to be achieved with the developing prospects of employment in a changing society. (para. 20)

It continued:

There were, however, complaints of a too rigid approach in some DipAD courses and that these were not reviewed to meet changing needs. We therefore considered whether in general terms modifications were desirable to the course pattern as it has evolved under the auspices of the NCDAD since the inception of the DipAD on the basis of the First Report of the NACAE. (para. 22)

The Council then committed itself to a two-path system:

We concluded that in its next phase of development the Diploma course system should allow for two distinct course structures. The first of these would be provided by the continued operation of courses similar in form to the present DipAD courses but modified to provide a greater flexibility of approach. These are referred to as Group A courses. The second would find embodiment in a range of courses directed more specifically towards certain categories of industrial and professional design practice. These are referred to as Group B courses. (para. 23)

9.3 Matters of doctrine

In practice, Group A were the existing three-year DipAD courses (of course, if a pre-diploma or foundation course had been undertaken these became de facto four-year courses, even allowing for the questionable value of the Foundation courses). The Group B courses were to be 'professional' four-year sandwich courses which would allow for a placement of between three months and a year to be taken before the final year of study. As Strand says; '(s)andwich courses of four years' duration, including a year spent in industry, were already a common feature of the CNAAs degree structure in other disciplines.' (Strand, 1987, p. 102) It was unclear why the Council felt it necessary to codify courses as A or B, as this must have, in some instances, been assumed to convey some hierarchical relativity. Nonetheless, the acceptance in principle of a need for a path more suited towards professional designers was also a visible step towards parity with the wider education system, and a tacit acknowledgement of the CNAAs and its distinct qualifications. A tri-partite system would not prevail in a system where the government direction was towards rationalisation, and the smaller party would be likely to be the loser. As the government pivoted its economic strategy towards technology it was clear that the technical institutions and their administration would gain an upper hand. No longer would the State look to art and design to deliver on improving economic performance, as had been the case from the Victorian era until the late 1940s. Too late, perhaps, the combatants in English art education's civil war woke up to the fact that they had been outflanked by a previously unconsidered threat.

9.4 The role of fine art in Diploma Courses

We cannot conclude this chapter without referring briefly to an aspect which has provoked controversy from time to time. The First Report envisaged that students in Diploma courses would all continue to have some kind of fine art training. This fine art teaching was to serve not only those who intended to become painters and sculptors but all other students whatever their eventual aim. In the meanwhile we believe that art and design education has evolved in such a way as to make the concept not universally appropriate. We now would not regard the study of fine art as necessarily central to all studies in the design field. (Department of Education and Science, 1970, para. 42)

Fine art's foundational claim in relation to the wider art and design educational system had been undermined significantly since the First report, as fine art (in its traditional form, underpinned by drawing based on figurative realism and the slow mastery of technical skills)

had come under increasing attack from radical influences, such as that from Pasmore, who sought to eliminate the historical basis for fine art in favour of modern, conceptual practice. As Strand (1987) suggests:

This brief pronouncement was the result of long and intense discussion in the Joint Committee. It was a belated recognition, proclaimed for a long time by some design members of the Summerson Council, that certain parts of the design field were very different in character, values and modes of thought from fine art. (p. 102)

None of this intense debate surfaced in the wording of the Joint Report; simply a short statement to the effect that fine art was no longer regarded a 'fundamental premise' (para, 42, Ashwin, 1975, p, 124). As Ashwin (1975) noted:

A number of reasons suggest themselves for this important change of policy: fine art interests were thinly represented on the Joint Committee; moreover, much fine art activity under the Dip AD system had developed an adventurous or random character which was incompatible with the inherently pragmatic nature of design disciplines. (p. 124)

Although the designers on the Council had succeeded in removing fine art as a fundamental principle, they failed in their attempts to have design recognised as a distinctive discipline warranting its own curriculum and qualification that had parity with the Dip AD. The NACAE archive contains at least two, fully worked out proposals for alternative curricula, that focussed on the needs for professional designers. Even those efforts represented a step back from the original aspiration in which design should become a professional practice, with commensurate protected educational characteristics, as Architecture had managed to do in the 1930s.

9.5 Future Developments; Warren Piper and section 10 of the Joint Report

Section 10 'Future Developments' hints at the dynamic and unstable position of the art school system at this juncture. On the one hand, it implies that the art schools will, somehow, remain a semi-autonomous and distinctive sector within higher education; on the other it suggests that there is a need to 'foster a satisfactory relationship' with the rest of the educational system:

The evolution of art and design education has in many ways followed a separate path from other sectors of further and higher education. Its emphasis of educational values differs from that of the main stream of academic institutions, and has in the past put it into partial isolation. The central problem facing us now is one of fostering a satisfactory relationship between art and design and the rest of the educational system while protecting those unique features which are essential to the character and quality of art and design education. (para. 137)

It also contains, perhaps for the first time, an attempt to evaluate art and design education in terms other than doctrinal. This element is based on the work of David Warren Piper, a ‘Hornsey Rebel’, who was - albeit briefly⁹⁶ - a member of the Council.

It would seem that the Coldstream and Summerson Councils were still hoping that the art schools might survive as specialist institutions as per paragraph 12 of *The Future Pattern of Higher Education within the F.E. System* White Paper, and were in denial that the polytechnics were going to absorb them entirely. In fact, by the time the Joint Report was published (and certainly by the time that Thatcher finally responded in circular 7/71), almost all of the art schools had already been, or were imminently to be, absorbed into polytechnics. Instead, the Joint Report, paragraph 148 states; ‘In the sphere of further and higher education there is considerable diversity in the type and character of institutions within which art education is offered; the newly formed Polytechnics have added to this diversity.’ That diversity was shortly to be greatly reduced, as the art schools wholly lost their privileged position as educational outliers.

Warren Piper was perhaps the first person to try to devise a systematic approach to evaluating the effectiveness of art education *as an educational system* based on three principles, independent of doctrinal or practice-based bias. These were the result of his contributions to the work of the Council, among which were two papers that set out a systematic approach to supporting and evaluating further development of the art education system. This approach outlined three principles; meeting the demand for places (para. 139 - 141), the need for qualified people (para. 142 - 148), and intrinsic values (para. 149 - 150).

His first significant contribution to the Council was to prepare a paper ‘*Educational Planning at a National Level*’ in which he stated:

The task must be approached as one of planning a system. Unless this is done the plan will be piecemeal and consequently may contain gaps and anomalies. A way of representing the system was described in NACAE(SC)(69)1. Any plan must embody value judgements, beliefs, philosophies or political convictions. (TNA, ED206/17 NACAE (SC)(69)3.)

⁹⁶ David Warren Piper, ‘a young, able sociologist who had been much involved in the ‘Hornsey Affair’ and whom the Secretary of State had appointed to the NCDAD.’ (Strand, 1987, p 122) As Strand further noted, Piper’s rationalist approach to evaluating art education (and by inference, the NCDAD) met with considerable resistance in the Council itself. By the start of the 1971 triennium regarding membership, Warren Piper was no longer a member. ‘an irresistible force had met an immovable object.’ (p. 127)

His second was to provide a most erudite critique of art education at this point in his paper to the Council, *'The Value of an Educational System'*. In it, Warren Piper examined the art education system by deploying three standpoints that are free from the usual doctrinal obsessions or factional biases that dogged discussions of the system to this point. Rather than accept as a given that traditional fine art should remain unchallenged, or focusing on professional design, or that national economic progress should be subservient in the art school to unfettered individual creativity, debates that had circled each other for a generation or more, Warren Piper looked instead at how;

...the value of an educational system can be judged from three standpoints:-

the standard of the discipline and the culture it nurtures;

the quality of education that it offers to students;

the value to society of its alumni and staff.

He then went on to discuss how:

...if an educational system is not to neglect one of these sources of its objectives, it must contain institutions, or courses, which give preference to one of these three over the other two, because at a course planning level these three are to an extent mutually exclusive. (TNA, ED206/17 NACAE (SC)(69)3.)

In the papers presented to the Council, Warren Piper set out a means to justify both the continued existence of art education, and a means to effectively deploy resources which took 'into account the likelihood that money will become progressively harder to obtain' (TNA, ED206/17 NACAE (SC)(69)3.)

Firstly, he set out a rational explanation on the nature of discipline (surely what Foucault would have termed *dispositif*) and its influence on the educational experience that would support it, including deploying student selection as 'a means of protecting standards by admitting those most able to embrace the subject as it has been conceived and most likely to succeed in the course as it run'.

Secondly, from the point of view of the student, he identified that:

fundamentally an education system can be one of two kinds: one which attempts to provide education for all who wish to pursue it, and is thus concerned with realising as much of a person's potential as possible, the other which will give preference to some applicants over others. This last is an elitist system, however inclusive it may seek to be.

This was the discipline approach; it shaped my experience of art education as a student, and it continues in my current professional experience. Courses try to be selective on the basis of ‘protecting standards’ within their disciplinary camp. Prior experience, interviews and portfolios as part of the student recruitment process are deployed as active agents in this defensive strategy, despite rhetoric that might suggest otherwise. Warren Piper explores at some length the operationalisation of this schema and the outcomes of various application processes in privileging or denying different potential students - those ‘nearest the final grade’ at the point of entry, or ‘those who would benefit most.’

Finally, from the point of view of society, he sought to examine art education as ‘an instrument for national development.’ At its simplest, Warren Piper was suggesting that art education had values at its heart, and should be honest and open about them. It was expensive, and likely to become even more so, and therefore it was reasonable to expect that the nation should gain some benefit from supporting it, and that those experiencing it should also gain some measurable benefit from the experience.

Education in this country is currently moving away from being the activities of a number of institutions which seek to preserve and pass on a discipline or certain aspects of our culture to a select minority of the population to being a system which is an important instrument in national economic development, and which at the same time seeks to offer opportunity for self-improvement to the majority (if not all) of the population. These two aims can be to an extent mutually exclusive so the special provision must be made in order to accommodate both objectives within the same system. (TNA, ED206/17 NACAE (SC)(69)3.)

Although his tenure on the Council was short, Warren Piper was one of the relatively few to consider art education a part of the border educational ecology, one that should be planned accordingly and to be free from doctrinal obsessions. Ploughing through the archives, his work immediately stands out as modern, thoughtful, bracing. It asked difficult questions of art education, and accepted no special pleading on its behalf. His work shaped Section 10 the Joint Report, and in most respects, the questions raised within it remained unanswered.

The Joint Report covered 47 pages with 166 paragraphs. After concluding with thanks to the joint secretaries, Gibbs, Pullee and Boulton, the final word was left to Nikolaus Pevsner, and his Note of Dissent. ‘As one college lecturer drily earmarked on reading the Joint Report, the plainest piece of English in the whole document had been written by one for whom it was not his mother tongue.’ (anon, in Strand 1987, p. 104)

On the 1st of September 1974, the NCDAD merged with the Council for National Academic Awards becoming the CNAA's Committee for Art and Design. The NACAE had dissolved itself four years earlier on completion of the Joint Report. Under the terms of the merger, the Dip AD became a BA with Honours with the option of retrospective conversion for past diplomates. (Ashwin, 1975, Strand 1987)

9.6 The Government response to the Joint Report; Department of Education and Science Circular 7/71

The official DES response was published almost a year after the Joint Report had been initially published. In Circular 7/71, the DES reported that:

The Secretary of State for Education received, and published last autumn, the "Report of the Joint Committee formed from the National Advisory Council on Art Education and the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design. She has since received and considered a wide range of helpful views which bear witness to the interest the Report aroused. (Department of Education and Science, 1971, para. 1)

Circular 7/71 acknowledged and endorsed the recommendation for Group A and Group B courses, with the proviso that '(s)he will not, for instance, expect to approve sandwich courses unless they present evidence of a firm commitment by employers to take on all the students concerned, on acceptable terms, for the periods of practical experience specified.' (para. 4)

The Secretary of State will not necessarily rule out proposals from institutions not already running a Dip AD course, but these will be regarded as exceptional and in accordance with the general policy for the development of higher education in the FE sector will normally be confined to polytechnics. In considering new proposals she will need to be satisfied that the commitment of additional resources can be justified: other things being equal, a valid reason for preferring one proposal to another will be that it can meet demand more economically. (para. 5)

On the question of entry to Diploma courses and the preparation of students for these, the Report recommended that the three-year Dip AD courses should normally be preceded by a one-year Foundation course, though it recognised that there could on occasion be entry direct from sixth form study; it suggested that four-year sandwich Diploma courses might be preceded by a Foundation course but it was expected that they would frequently be entered direct from the sixth form or the equivalent. The Report recommended that the normal age of entry to a Foundation course should be 18 and that some form of central control of Foundation courses should be introduced; these would be new features. (para. 9)

Entry to Dip AD *normally* only from Foundation, entry to Foundation only at 18. The majority of students would not have gained entry to the A levels that covered the 16-18 ages, and so access to the art education system - the qualification bearing part at least - was increasingly inaccessible to a majority of students who would have left school at 16.

McLoughlin (2019) suggests that, even though the report was the result of a wide-ranging consultation:

Days before it was published the government changed. The new Minister for Education, Margaret Thatcher, effectively 'buried' it. (p. 170)

9.7 In Summary

This section reviewed the period during which the English art school system achieved a level of autonomy within a larger educational ecology in which, already, it was clear to see the emergence of forces that would bring about its disappearance.

The interaction between administration, doctrine and values in art education during this period is best understood not as a linear progression. Art education cannot be said to have reached its zenith, nor indeed any kind of peak from which it has since descended, despite what writers such as Bell, Carline, Strand, Tickner and Lee might suggest. Still less can it be said to have been murdered, as Heron would have it; if anything, it took rather too long to contemplate itself whilst becoming ever more irrelevant in the eyes of all but its practitioners and supporters. As early as the 1940s, Pevsner had highlighted that the artist had achieved emancipation from social responsibility. Having emancipated the artist, art was now free to be whatever it wanted to be, and to continue its circular, doctrinal arguments that it had done since the nineteenth century, and arguably earlier.

Rather than a linear progression, the endless Councils, committees, working parties, reports, the evidence gathered and the papers presented can be understood as a constantly shifting cyclical dynamic, a matrix of interdependencies where the intersections are so smooth and featureless as to be almost invisible; perhaps not even as definite as a matrix, or a set of networks, but more akin to the surface of a soap bubble, as described earlier, constantly shifting and adjusting to accommodate the inherent instability in the system whilst trying to maintain order, to retain its shape.

Despite a considerable expenditure of human effort, as Strand says 'During its thirteen years of existence the NCDAD met, as a council, eighty-four times in all (not including the brief winding-up meeting in November 1974). In that period, the total number of meetings of all its five specialist panels was one hundred and two.' (p. 186) art education in England under the advice of the NACAE and the instruction of the NCDAD hardly advanced at all; in the end, both disappeared from the stage leaving art education, such as it was, to flounder on within the

polytechnics. The only person to attempt to relate art education to the wider field of education in the social and cultural context of the time was the sociologist, Warren Piper. For his efforts, his membership of the Joint Council was not renewed.

In the end, as the art critic David Lee wrote in 2016:

Whatever the Coldstream reports may have stated as their intentions it is hard to find evidence of anyone anywhere who appears to have taken the slightest notice of what was contained in them. Those already eagerly re-inventing art teaching appear to have continued as they had before, except that now the end certificate awarded bore a different name. (para. 69)

Sir John Summerson retired from the NCDAD on the 31st July 1970. According to Strand (1987), 'he had presided... over what had become by 1970 one of the best art and design education systems of its kind in the world and one which, despite economic and political vicissitudes and what must often have seemed the obstructiveness of officialdom, has remained a resilient and durable creation.' (p. 125) This statement has to be considered in light of its caveats; 'one of the best' and 'of its kind', since it could be argued that not only was it not one of the best art education systems in the world, it was not necessarily the best system for the English situation.

10. The polytechnics and beyond: art and the massification of HE

This section considers the art school system as it was firstly integrated into the polytechnics, and then subsequently into the expanded university sector after 1992. This was a period characterised by two major shifts; firstly, a rapid and significant increase in student numbers as the university sector underwent a process of ‘massification’ (Trow, 2006) and secondly as funding regimes shifted from a grant system to one of student fees, after the Teaching and Higher Education Act of 1998. Arguably, a third factor can be seen in a doctrinal shift in university ethos towards a more overtly ‘business’ orientation, although this is somewhat obscured by, as Addison et al (2018) suggest; ‘a rhetoric of ‘empowerment’... (using) such terms as ‘collaboration’, ‘equity’, ‘evidence’, ‘potential’, ‘transformation’ and ‘transparency’... to fix educational discourse within a benign web of progressive action.’ (p. 14)

This latter shift effectively removed most post-school art education from public access and instead located it behind the not insignificant barrier of student fees. This period is also the one in which the author is situated and brought into being as an academic. I completed a Foundation in Art and Design in 1982, at a small former art school. I completed a first degree at a polytechnic, 1984-1987, a Master’s Degree in Design at a new university in 1994 - 1997 and have taught in a post-massification, post-fee-paying university since 1999. I have, therefore, experienced first-hand the many doctrinal shifts, diminishments, and contortions that art education has undergone as it transitioned from the polytechnic system to the present situation. It is the desire to understand this experience that has in large part driven the thesis.

10.1 More students, more courses, fewer colleges, new disciplines

Walk the corridors of art schools up and down the Kingdom and you see one shiny Mac suite after another, distinguishable from each other only by their differing appeals to weary blandness... In this way, art schools have increasing needs for huge portico lettering, because once inside you can’t tell them from the business and enterprise academy. (Mitchell, 2015, para. 21)

The immediate aftermath of the Coldstream era reforms had resulted in a significantly reduced art education ecology, in physical size and geographical spread, and initially at least, the variety of provision on offer. This was then compounded by the implementation of Crosland’s polytechnisation policy, which eradicated art school autonomy and eliminated the art education’s specialist degree level qualification. From this point forwards, the art *school* no longer existed, but art *courses* continued, within the much larger polytechnic institutions.

Within the polytechnic system, however, there was greater scope for introducing new courses, particularly those which combined elements of art and design with technology. This had been suggested as one of the positive benefits of polytechnisation as a policy, and despite the misgivings of many within the Coldstream and Summerson councils, new art and design courses were introduced in the later 1970s and 1980s.⁹⁷

This had not been the case previously. Strand (1987) covers in some detail the attempts during the latter years of the Coldstream era to combine art and design with communication technology, specifically to enhance education, and to develop a DipAD in Educational Media. Despite considerable effort, and a clear need for such a course, it did not gain approval. As Strand says:

The Educational Media debate... provides an instructive insight into the way in which a good and innovatory idea... could be allowed to run into the sand... there was simply not enough force available to overcome the sheer inertia of the system, or the firm control of the Department of Education and Science over an 'independent' validating body such as the NCDAD. (p. 124)

Additionally, despite the efforts of the designers on the Councils, and the work of Professor Black and the Society of Industrial Artists and Designers, attempts to expand design within the DipAD framework and to more effectively support the design industry came to almost nothing. To the end, the DipAD over represented fine art (in its many guises) within the art education ecology. As Strand, again, says:

...by 1981 there were twenty-one sandwich courses (those with an industry placement) in design subjects as against 175 full-time three-year courses in art and design as a whole... Indeed, it is arguable that if a far higher proportion of degree courses in design were in that mode, and if industry could have afforded or been encouraged to accept the sandwich placement concept as an almost obligatory feature, British industry as a whole would have been in a much healthier state. (p. 199)

To the very end of the DipAD system, fine art exerted an altogether sclerotic influence over the art education system. It would only be within the polytechnics, and with the demise of the DipAD qualification, that design as a distinct set of disciplinary practices would begin to make some headway in the art education ecology. Generally, though, as Ashwin (1984) suggests:

...art and design continue to occupy a relatively marginal place in advanced education. They are rarely represented in the universities except as history of art (not, usually,

⁹⁷ My first degree was Photography, introduced as a degree course within art and design in 1973. Later, I undertook a Masters in Multimedia Design (introduced in 1992) and worked with Design Management (1976). I developed new courses myself; Interaction Design, Animation, and Game Art (2005) and Concept and Comic Arts (2020)

history of design) and one or two cognate areas such as architecture. We continue to suffer from the cultural legacy of the Romantic Movement which often represented the arts... as a matter of intuition and inspiration somehow above and beyond the access of rational inquiry and understanding. (p. 42)

While the number of colleges declined up to and after 1970, student numbers grew in line with the increase in the types of courses offered, especially those in the many emergent branches of design, including film and photography, and in fashion and textiles. Moreover, the success of the art and design industries in Britain and their reputation abroad during the 1960s and 1970s attracted a growing number of young people to apply for places at art school, and the availability of grants which continued throughout these decades supported this growth in the student population, not least from among those social groups for whom the expense of going to college for three or four years is likely to have acted as a deterrent.

The trend towards a diversification in courses and especially in the titles given to art and design courses, gained ground with the absorption of courses in the performing arts from the former teacher training colleges and their successors, which had been incorporated into many polytechnics and larger colleges from 1978 onwards. It was also boosted significantly by rapid developments in computing and communication technology during the 1980s and 1990. James (2016) highlights that:

following the decision of the John Major Government in 1993 to terminate the major validating body in the field, the CNA, which had frowned on the use of idiosyncratic course titles believing them to be potentially misleading both to students and employers, institutions became free to adopt more precisely descriptive titles for their courses, partly to draw attention to their particular character and partly as a marketing device to attract student enrolments. (no pagination)

The formidable growth in the numbers of diversified courses and of students was, however, concentrated in far fewer schools. In 1968 there were fewer than 3,000 students on three-year, full-time courses leading to the DipAD at art colleges in London and the whole of south-east England. In 1970 there were 26,500 students enrolled nationally on courses leading to the DipAD. Forty years later, in 2010, there were 174,000 students on creative arts and design degree and postgraduate courses in UK universities. The institutions which remained had, during these years, increased greatly in size, partly in response to Government pressure to increase participation levels in higher education, and to economise on the provision of expensive resources, especially staffing.

In 1959 114 art schools submitted candidates in all of the subjects forming the curriculum of the National Design Diploma. The output of fine art graduates stood at 1,085. By 1981 there were 45 institutions offering fine art courses at degree level, with a total enrolment of 4,900. The number of higher education institutions teaching fine art practices rose sharply through the 1990s to more than 75 and the number of undergraduate students of fine art to more than 14,000 in 2000-2001. (Cornock, 2003, para. 6)

Staff-student ratios, the measure of the number of students in a group to each teacher, greatly widened after the end of the 1970s. Classes of five, eight or twelve students to one teacher were common in the 1940s and 1950s, and, in fact, twelve would have been considered a crowd throughout the period 1945 to 1970. On my first degree, the staff student ratio was around one to twelve. It is also worth highlighting that student attrition was considerable. On my course, of the 36 that began the first year in 1984, only around 25 graduated in 1987. In my current situation, staff student ratios are in excess of one to thirty-five - and it only achieves that ratio through covert manipulation by faculty management by, for example, calculating the staff student ratio as an average across the faculty, including Professors with limited teaching in the overall total. To give one direct comparison, life drawing classes on my course are attended by up to 35 students at a time, and run for only two hours three times in a day. Coldstream's famed life drawing classes at the Slade in the 40s and 50s would have engaged fewer than a dozen students for several days at a time.

10.2 Descent: from government support to government attack

As art education emerged in the post DipAD era, it underwent several transformations. Firstly it was merged with the polytechnics, secondly the polytechnics themselves were merged into the university sector, resulting in a single higher education system, of which art education formed one small part. This latter transformation also took place during a period in which, arguably, prevailing political orthodoxy required education to reconceive itself along a business axis. This introduced pressures on art and design courses to increase enrolments, whilst at the same time putting them under increasing pressure to reduce costs. Art and design - with the exception of the 'mac suites' referred to at the start of the chapter - often requires prodigious amounts of space, and specialist equipment, which do not lend themselves to flexible use. They also require prodigious amounts of 'time on task'; mastering any art and design discipline is a matter of doing rather than thinking, and since the days of the guilds, apprenticeships and ateliers, this time has been consistently and considerably reduced.

The foregrounding of the business doctrine also increasingly led to a shift in management. In my career, I have seen my 'location' within an institution change; from art and design, to art design and humanities (an amalgamation that was undertaken to protect Humanities from the consequences of falling enrolments, as much as for any shared culture) and latterly to computing, engineering and media. Ironically, this last amalgamation was also to address falling enrolments in engineering courses. At each stage, artists or designers were increasingly remote from managerial positions. None of the senior management or administration within my current faculty are from an art and design background. What this means, in effect, is that the most recent lived experience feels to be one of constant attrition and neglect, a constant struggle for recognition and for resources simply to do the job that one is expected to do. The level of friction and inertia in the system is often overwhelming, and the sense of being on the losing side in a decades long civil war is hard to escape.

Since the elimination of the art school as an autonomous entity, it has been vanishingly rare for anyone to achieve a senior position from an art and design background. The barrier to seniority remains accomplishment in textual formats, a PhD is an entry requirement for senior academic positions, and generally art and design staff are inclined more to a career of practical, visual outputs than academic textual outputs. This is changing; certainly, part of the rationale behind my attempting an EdD was a deliberate effort to engage with what I considered to be a traditional academic higher degree, having already undertaken two practice-based degrees.

My own institution can historically claim to have been one of the few to appoint a senior leader from a practice-base; David Bethell (1923-2005), who had studied at the West of England College of Art, in Bristol, chiefly as a typographer. He became principal of Coventry College of Art in 1965, only the second such appointment anywhere from a design background. Bethell moved to Leicester in 1969 as deputy director of what was about to become a new polytechnic and, in 1973, he was appointed its director. As James (2016) highlights:

That an individual from an art and design background, without a degree, let alone a doctorate, should have been appointed to head a large multidisciplinary higher education institution, not an "arts" university, was unique and, at the time of writing, has remained so. (no pagination)

It is perhaps not a surprise then to find that under Bethell's guidance, Leicester Polytechnic awarded the first PhD in Fine Art, in the specialist area of sculpture, in 1978. (Cornock, 2003, np)

James also highlights the career of Bill Brooker, principal of Wimbledon School of Art in 1969:

Brooker's career as a painter, a teacher and, finally, a college principal, shows that it was possible, between 1945 and 1970, to combine successfully work as an artist of considerable merit and remain an effective teacher. More significantly in this context, however, it was possible to combine being an artist of some distinction with a professional reputation and remain a successful boss of a good art school. (no pagination)

That this was so was largely due to the small scale of such institutions during those years. In the introduction to a catalogue for a retrospective exhibition of Brooker's work in 1987, the art historian, Nick Wadley, stated that Brooker was one of the last of a long tradition of principals who were also significantly active as artists. While it is true that today "research" is seen as an equivalent to professional practice in this regard, and the expression "curating" appears on the curricula vitae of some staff in the arts universities indicating that they have brought work together or documented a topic, few senior managers are able to maintain a place of real consequence professionally as artists or designers, such are the demands of running large institutions. (James, 2016, chap. 14, para. 16)

What this brought about was an increasingly bland, homogenisation of the higher education institution. The prevailing doctrine has rendered all current institutions largely similar, in outlook, in curriculum, in management style, and in the experience they offer. Even the 'specialist art universities' are universities first, and art schools only in name.

As Addison; Georgakia; Nirta (2016) identified:

the 'official' pedagogies within UK universities had become an aggregate of practices predicated on liberal values underpinned by academic criteria; in this respect the arts university was no different. These pedagogies had been formalised and applied across the sector in response to the Dearing Report (1997) and its vision of a 'learning society', in which higher education (HE) was critiqued for its obduracy and arrogance when confronted by social justice forces at home, competition internationally and a converging, cross-party, aspirational agenda for education. (p. 13-14)

This suggests that, although art education itself was no longer a concern of the state, as it had been prior to and during the Coldstream era (and earlier, as far back as the nineteenth century) education per se was increasingly an area of government concern and scrutiny. Addison (2016) et al further usefully articulate the prevailing political orthodoxy and how it impacted on art education specifically. As they state, the government determined that:

The purposes of HE are also social, cultural and personal. In particular, a new principle of social justice, and equal opportunities, could be added. HE should enhance access, widen life chances, and be socially inclusive' (Bill 1998: 282 in Addison et al, p. 13)

As has been shown earlier, art education before the Coldstream era had to a great extent achieved exactly this. It was the subsequent reimposition of an elite system that had severely reduced the size, the geographical diffusion, and the access to a diversity of educational experience. It was the Coldstream council's determination to achieve parity with the university *of that age* that eliminated a more accessible art education system.

Increasingly, during the late 1990s, art education once again, as it had more than a century before, found itself co-opted as the solution to a national concern. In 1998 the Culture Secretary Chris Smith questioned assumptions about the need to devote attention to halting the long decline in agriculture and manufacturing and instead drew attention to a group of 'creative industries' that had been booming in contrast to the decimation of other industries at the time. They had, he suggested, generated 50,000 jobs and £60bn in revenues during 1997-98. (Cornock, 2003, np)

This economic imperative was then further confounded by a doctrinal shift in the wider higher education ecology. Addison (2016) et al further describe the contradictions that contorted education discourse during this period:

A liberatory discourse was propagated using a rhetoric of 'empowerment'. Such terms as 'collaboration', 'equity', 'evidence', 'potential', 'transformation' and 'transparency' were deployed as 'point de capiton' (master signifiers) to fix educational discourse within a benign web of progressive action; few but the most reactionary or radical could object. Despite emancipatory aims, this 'liberal' tendency has coincided with, or as some would say been complicit with, neo-liberal economic policies (Lynch 2006; Giroux 2014). These policies are characterised by marketisation, globalisation, individualism and competition, an assemblage that has shaped education into a 'service industry' (Ball 2007), developments that have proved somewhat at odds with the former emancipatory aims. (p. 14)

Art education in the new universities, then, found itself having to address not only the elimination of traditional smokestack industries in favour of the (as an *industry*, almost certainly mythical, and certainly in terms of employment numbers, tiny) creative industries, but also in shouldering a majority of responsibility for increasing participation and social mobility. Addison (2016) et al contrast this resulting contortion with the notion of 'a sense of loss, the loss of a 'golden age', the 1960s and early 70s, a time when art colleges were

supposedly spaces of freedom (Llewelyn, 2015), polymorphous generation and (political) resistance. (p. 15)

Other commentators on this period include Jon Thompson who, on the occasion of his retirement from the Research Professorship of Fine Art at Middlesex in 2004⁹⁸, described not only his experience in and art school during the Coldstream era, but also a return to the contemporary English art education within the new university era after a lengthy period spent teaching in the European art education system:

My first teaching job was at Lancaster College of Art, where I was plunged immediately into the preparation for a validation visit from the Summerson Council. It ended at Middlesex University, in the financially starved and academically alienated environment of the fine art department. The commercial, market-led model of higher education, as dreamed up by the second Thatcher government, had become even more entrenched under New Labour. Students were now quite openly referred to by the new administrative class as ‘clients’ and ‘consumers’ and teachers were ‘service providers’ working in ‘educational services. (Thompson, 2005, p. 215)

Thompson continues, describing an experience very similar to my own during this period, in particular the twin impositions of ‘modularisation and quality assurance’, the *idées populaires du jour* at that time:

I discovered that ‘quality control’ was the managerial term on everyone's lips. The main issue was how to guarantee standards that would meet the demands of the newly established array of government agencies of surveillance and control from within a reducing, per capita, resource base... modular structures are more about accountancy functions than the realisation of academic objectives. They are of more use to managers than to academics. (p. 217)

Thompson was particularly critical of ‘a serious loss of academic coherence,’ highlighting:

within the institutions, the dissolution of subject-based, academic authority and the historic scholarly values this represents; for students, at the receiving end, the fragmentation of their learning experience; for the collective body of university teachers, a dispersal of their academic responsibilities and the steady erosion of scholarly authority within their universities. (p. 218)

and this was entirely because, as he saw it, no longer were ‘the majority of fine art departments... situated either in polytechnics or in the rump of independent art and design colleges’ but instead:

⁹⁸ This talk was given in September 2004 at Tate Britain at a conference on art education and later published as *Art Education from Coldstream to QAA* in *Critical Quarterly*, Vol. 47. Nos. 1-2, (2005) pp. 215-225

most of them had been bundled unceremoniously into an extended and unified university system where they found themselves subject to the same kind of generalising academic and professional pressures that have always been applied in the governance of university subjects. Fine art has been reduced, in short, to being a study area amongst other study areas – in the old terminology, an academic subject amongst other academic subjects. (p. 218)

Towards the middle of the second decade of the twenty-first century, there was a discernible reaction against both the contemporary university's diminished vision of art practice, and against the worst excesses of the art-as-concept theorists. This could be seen in the number of private art schools or academies that sought to position themselves as providing traditional drawing and painting skills. This phenomenon, 'a broad but concerted endeavour to revive "traditional" painting' as Jacob Willer termed it in 2020 is examined in Willer's (2018) *What Happened to the Art Schools*, commissioned by the Charles Douglas-Home Memorial Trust. In the preface, Noel Malcolm⁹⁹ identifies a similar doctrinal position to Chris Smith in 1998 but suggests a particular problem is in play:

The creative arts – including visual arts of all kinds – are, we are told, flourishing in Britain. But the traditional skills of drawing and painting, which for hundreds of years formed the substance and the purpose of all serious artistic training, have been downgraded to such an extent that few students are enabled to acquire them. (preface, para. 1)

So at this late point in the history of art education, once again traditional figurative practices have undergone a revival in interest. As Malcolm says, '... to react against a negative change is not to be a 'reactionary' ... there is no good reason to think that art, to be fully modern, must be radically cut off from its past.' (in Willer, 2016, preface) Lee (2016) reinforces this view of the contemporary, national university's operationalisation of art education:

An art college is not a place you now attend to learn techniques, and neither is it a place whose staff are capable of showing you by encouragement or example how to acquire them. (para. 3)

This view lends energy to the revival of technique and training outlined by Willar. It is a reaction against the perceived loss of a traditional, historically proven, system of training that requires revival. This revival is so thoroughly embedded in historical practice that it seeks to reverse any of the progressive elements that infiltrated art education from Read onwards, stating:

⁹⁹ Sir Noel Malcolm, Eton College, Peterhouse Cambridge, Trinity College Cambridge, All Souls College, Oxford.

It has often been said that art cannot be taught. True enough; but the traditional crafts of drawing and painting, from which art has bloomed in such splendid variety, can be taught, and always were taught by the same exercises. (Willer, 2016, p. 2)

Art education as of the time of writing then, can be seen to be simultaneously in retreat, thoroughly enmeshed in contemporary abstraction and conceptualisation, or equally undergoing another ‘renaissance.’ It has to be said however, that the dichotomy of the two fine art practices outlined here are enacted on a small scale compared to the general situation in the pre-Coldstream era of re-elitism. The general trend for art education, and in particular for its situation within the ‘new universities’ as distinct from the specialist private institutions and elite national universities, remains in a state of impoverishment.

The doctrinal axis

The thesis examined the doctrinal axis as it connected art education to temporally specific apparatus or manifestations, which evolved over time, for example; art for moral purpose; art for economic purpose; art as part of a project of national identity. As Wallis (2016) described the situation at that moment; ‘there have been endless convulsions over many years over the relative merits of intrinsic, ‘art for art’s sake’ arguments against more instrumental public value arguments: crudely, ‘excellence’ versus ‘usefulness’. The argument, he contends, splits along two oppositional conceptions; ‘art’s value exists in its creation and quality, and attempts to quantify or measure its importance mistake its fundamental purpose’ or that art does not exist ‘for its own sake’ but that ‘the artistic community must prove their worth to Treasury bean-counters by linking “citizen contact with a vibrant arts system to overall quality of life, so the health of our cultural, transportation, and health care systems are one day considered to be of equal value by policy leaders.”’ He further states that:

On this reckoning, the sector must prove increased quality of life of those who engage with culture, making art a highly valued public good, comparable to healthcare and education. In recent times, much of the advocacy for the arts has focused on its economic value. Many have pointed out that the high economic returns on funding in the arts make a strong case for continued government investment. (p. 9)

In support of this financial benefit-public good conception, art is once again co-opted to the notion of ‘the creative industries’, just as it was by Chris Smith in 1996, to justify support for the arts, and by extension, art education. Wallis highlights that:

in the discussions that followed the financial crisis about the UK’s potential to shift to a high wage, high skill economy, the creative industries were recognised to be a sector where the UK has a natural competitive advantage, and one where the winds of globalisation are likely to blow in its favour. (p. 9)

That was the perception in 2016; subsequent events have shown that not to be the case. Rather than more investment to support the creative industries, there have been repeated cuts to art education funding, and increasingly rhetorical attacks on the validity of undertaking any form of creative degree. (O'Brien et al 2019; Williamson, 2021; Boehm 2022). Wallis (2016) suggests that, in part, this has happened because:

The case for the arts over many years has been unfocused and confused. What's more, the nature of the campaign against the cuts often seemed remote and exclusive. Led by high-profile artists and arts leaders, the focus has been on lobbying government at a national level in terms which are often abstract and technocratic – gross national product and social return on investment. The arts have become detached from the day-to-day drama of people's lives and are in danger of becoming 'othered': something happening somewhere else, for someone else. (pp. 9-10)

The administrative axis

The administrative axis sought to cover the multitude of manifestations of apparatus that sought to control art education, the committees, reports, policies, government statements, the schools and the state interpretations of curricula and examinations, and the prohibitions on what can be taught, to whom, and to what purpose. There has been no policy statement regarding art in seven years, since *The Culture White Paper* of 2016. This was the first in fifty years, since Jennie Lee's '*A Policy for the Arts first Steps*' in 1965, but as Ed Wallis (2016) suggested:

it was deemed an "unworthy successor". While many welcomed the fact that the government was making a statement of intent, the paper contained no new initiatives, no new core funding, no connection with the work of other government departments, and no broader sense of mission. There remains an abiding feeling across the political spectrum that arts and culture are something that's nice to have, but an expendable luxury in tough times and not high on the list of what voters care about. It doesn't even warrant a mention on YouGov's political issues tracker. (p. 21)

Political parties of all persuasion have deserted the cause of art education. Art education is currently only made visible when it is required to be set up as an easy target for attack under the guise of 'value for money' of all.

The value axis

The thesis shows that art education was often divided along class lines, and in many respects, continues to be so. Best and Andrew (1972) characterise 19th-century education policy as deliberately patterned to perpetuate class differences, magnifying 'its structure in detail'. Recent revivals in traditional figurative training overtly manifests an elitist, aristocratic set of values that have remained in place since the Renaissance era, and that were initially set out in foundational texts from the Roman era.

As recently as May 2013, a conference entitled *What's the point of art school?* was held at Central Saint Martins¹⁰⁰ to address some of the questions raised by the conference title. As Mitchell (2015) records:

In the panel discussion at the end of the day, Professor Ute Meta Bauer, Dean of Fine Art at the Royal College of Art, answered the question by suggesting that if you don't need a degree then don't spend the money on one. Go to free lectures, club together with like-minded people and spend the tuition fee renting a studio instead. She talked about the critical importance of art education as a space for free thinking, for learning how to fail, how to 'not-know', where outcomes are not predetermined before you even begin. And how a culture of targets and recruitment drives and crippling tuition fees is killing this. A senior figure from the most prestigious art school in the country was advocating not going to art school. (para. 5)

As the twenty-first century progressed, art education once again became a subject of antagonistic discussion. As this thesis has shown, art has been assigned multiple and often contradictory purposes at each stage of its development. In the modern age, once art and artists were emancipated from social responsibility (in that they no longer were anticipated to contribute to either national economic improvement or improve the public taste) art education increasingly found itself under pressure from governments and institutions that saw it as an unjustifiable expense. The Royal Academy (Philips, 2019) published *Art under threat: the growing crisis in higher education* an article highlighting newspaper headlines such as:

Creative arts courses are 'not economically worthwhile.

One in four students is on a 'Mickey Mouse' course that won't lead to a well-paid job... leaving taxpayers to foot the cost of their unpaid loans.

Bar students from 'poor value' university courses that offer little economic benefit.

The headlines were a response to a report (O'Brien et al, 2019) by a conservative think-tank, UKOnward, that had used Department for Education estimates of graduate earnings to suggest that 'university is simply not going to be worth it economically – either for students saddled with debt they cannot pay off, or taxpayers who end up paying it instead.' The report also recommended 'divert(ing) students into either higher value university courses or graduate level technical education' and 're-investing the savings made from reducing low value university courses to support one-for-one investment in higher and graduate-level apprenticeships.' It also

¹⁰⁰ But not the *real* St Martins, of course; the current *ersatz* version is just one of several iterations of the University of the Arts London.

states ‘The current political debate is mainly about shifting the economic cost of higher education between the general taxpayer and the individual graduate.’

Explicit in this, and to a degree implicit in Willer’s (2018) conception of art education, is a sense that art education should not be supported by anyone other than the individual who can independently support their educational choice and not burden the taxpayer with unpayable debt to be written off after a lengthy period of low earnings. At the same time, Mitchell (2015) reports, art is being systematically downgraded in schools, (and fewer students then are able to or capable of successfully undertaking an art degree at university) and art education risks becoming (once again) an elitist activity:

The Warwick Commission report year revealed a 50% drop in GCSE numbers for Design and Technology and 25% in arts-related subjects since 2003) and tuition fees further narrow the field of opportunity, Smith argues, the art school runs the risk of becoming so elitist it loses its point. (para. 6)

10.3 In summary

This chapter surveyed the condition of art education as the last visible remnants disappeared from view, absorbed firstly into the polytechnics, where they enjoyed a brief resurgence with new disciplines and degree courses, and then latterly into the increasing homogeneity of the corporatized universities of the UK.

During this same period, art educators in senior management roles became increasingly rare, as the universities repositioned themselves along a more business-oriented axis. In absolute terms, in order to survive, universities can be seen to have little to no choice in this reorientation. Patrick Heron alleged that the government of the day (1971) had murdered the art schools; in fact, the art system run by artists killed far more schools, colleges, courses and non-conformist staff than the government managed. Instead, the government withdrew any interest it may have had in art education either for the cultural benefit of the public, or for the national economic interest. The art schools that survived the Coldstream era in the end faded from public view, only latterly reappearing as an easy target for government intent on reducing state funding still further.

11. Last thoughts

The majority of writers and artists up to the 2000s cited in this thesis cannot have foreseen how diminished art education would become, both in institutional practice and in national esteem. Pevsner (1940); Bell (1963); Carline (1968); Ashwin (1975); even Strand (1987) wrote in a spirit of optimism that art education had earned parity with and its place alongside the universities. Later writers chart the difficult passage from the post-Coldstream era through the polytechnisation era and into the age of the new universities. But even then, there is a sense that things are not irrecoverable. A golden age, if there can be thought to have been one, may be receding into the past but the sense of the centrality of art to the human experience, and the necessity therefore to teach it, remains a constant. This would seem to be borne out by the desire for a traditionalist revival as outlined by Lee (2016); Willer (2018) and Philips (2019). The economic case for a revival in art education is made by Boehm (2022) who writes:

- In 2018 the BEIS report for the Creative Industry Sector Deal listed 3.04m jobs in the UK Creative Economy.
- With a Gross Value Added (GVA) of £111.7bn per year and it had an annual growth five times faster than the UK average.
- From 2016, this had grown by 60%, compared to the UK average of 33%.
- In terms of exports, the Creative Industries made up 12% of the total UK services export sector, and annual growth in exports of 9%, three times faster than the rest of the service exports.
- Between 2011 and 2017, Creative Economy jobs grew by 28.6, whereas the total UK job sector grew only by 9.3% in the same time.
- One in eight businesses in the UK is a creative business. (BEIS, 2018)

These figures are impressive, and I still feel the need to make sure I mention them to students, to parents of students or to anyone who might not understand how vital and important the creative sectors are. (p. 152)

Boehm (2022) cautions however:

art subject areas are also inherently one of the most vulnerable disciplinary areas in the higher education system as their highly fragmented impacts on the economy and society are less quantifiable in monetary terms and thus less understood. (p. 18)

Until relatively recently, as this thesis has shown, although doctrinal arguments raged across what should be taught, who should be taught and to what purpose, art education was seen as an essential component within the wider educational ecology. My experience, first as a

student of, and then as an academic within art education means that I am no longer sure that this is the case.

This thesis contends that the art schools had, despite centuries of development and state support, simply failed in their primary stated aims; ‘... first to raise the level of public taste and appreciation, both by cultivating discrimination and by encouraging art and craft activities as leisure-time pursuits, and secondly to provide the training required for those who may take up artistic careers, more especially in industries which depend on good design and craftsmanship.’ (Ministry of Education 1946)

Having failed to achieve these under their own, independent direction, the English art schools simply became irrelevant to national concerns; consequently, the state washed its hand of the whole business, and folded the art schools into the polytechnics where they would either survive or decline but they would no longer be of any concern of government.

This thesis further contends that far from being the radical, creative centres of their own imagining, the art schools were often regressive, hierarchical, solipsistic, prone to the whims of charismatic individuals, and in thrall to their own historical origins. They scarcely advanced in their own terms in any meaningful sense over several centuries. Their ultimate achievement was the emancipation of the individual artist from social obligations (Pevsner, 1940)

By failing to achieve national or governmental aims, either for the improvement of the public taste, (Select Committee 1836; Select Committee 1864; Board of Trade 1931; Pevsner, 1940; Ministry of Education, 1946; Ministry of Education 1960; Ministry of Education 1965) or the enhancement of national economic activity (The Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufacturers and Commerce 1754; Select Committee 1835; Select Committee 1836; Department of Practical Art 1853; Board of Education 1900; Board of Trade 1931; Ministry of Education 1960; Piper 1967; Addison 2016; Wallis 2016; Philips 2019; O’Brien et al 2019; Boehm 2022) the art schools lost their claim to independent status, were absorbed into the wider higher education ecology. This loss of independence (illusory though this thesis has shown it to be) and the resulting loss of status and self-esteem cast a long shadow over those who experienced it first-hand.

Rather than being murdered, as dramatically suggested by Heron (1971), ultimately, the English art school system firstly was ruthlessly culled by a council of artists, and then, as

outlined above, became both irrelevant as a direct concern of the government, and largely obsolete in relation to the changes in society that required new forms of design-oriented educations to be rapidly developed.

As stated at the beginning, this thesis arose from a personal and professional crisis that was centred on a condition of increasing disillusionment, a sense that something had been lost in the transition from art school to polytechnic, and that even more had been lost in the transition from polytechnic to the contemporary ‘neo-liberal’ liberal university. This amorphous sense of loss was paralleled with the physical imposition of degraded conditions, diminishing resources, increasing levels of stress and anxiety, and a feeling that an improvement in any of these was not imminently forthcoming. As far back as Pliny, as outlined in chapter 3, art education was premised on a sense of loss and, more importantly for the formation of practice, with a notion that art as a system of knowledge must be recovered from a situation of debasement, and raised from low to high status.

As mentioned in the introduction, it often seems that my colleagues suffer equally, but collectively we do not seem to have either the historical knowledge, a critical vocabulary or an analytical framework through which we can begin to understand and articulate how we have arrived at the current situation. We are isolated from our peers by a management regime that sets us to bickering and squabbling among ourselves in constant competition for attention and scarce resources, in which acknowledgement of a job well done is constantly deferred. As Thompson (2005) stated:

It is certainly the case... that the community of art and design interests was largely dismantled by the polytechnics and is being further eroded in the new generation of universities. The principle of divide and rule has come to prevail almost everywhere, turning the house against itself. Where once an atmosphere of mutual support held sway, we now have a dog-eat-dog situation, with the old Art and Design subjects scrapping endlessly amongst themselves over diminishing territories and steadily reduced resources. (p. 221)

Having endured this condition for a significant period of time, the thesis arose in part as a desire to examine how this had come about, what, if anything, had *actually* been lost, and to re-conceptualise my own position within this system. The thesis sought to articulate the conditions described by deploying a Foucauldian genealogy to examine art education along three axes of power/force; doctrine, administration and values. In doing so, I was mindful of, as Koopman (2013) says:

Foucault can be profitably read as equipping us with resources we can use to perform our own critical inquiries of our own present. Foucault helps us see our way to a practice of philosophy as a critical inquiry into the complex and contingent formation of the present in which we find ourselves. (p. 12)

In conducting this enquiry, I sought also to balance the genealogical with the historiographic; as Koopman (2013) says, '(g)enealogy tracks complex histories of alliances, support, and reinforcement that facilitate the production of spaces of practical possibility' but more importantly for this enquiry, he continues, 'The point is not to discern how the intentions of those in the past effectively gave rise to the present, but rather to understand how various independently existing vectors of practice managed to contingently intersect in the past so as to give rise to the present' (p. 107). The genealogy, in fact, functions as a critical analytic framework, as Foucault (1984) suggests:

...criticism is no longer going to be practiced in the search for formal structures with universal value but, rather as a historical investigation into the events that led us to constitute ourselves and to recognise ourselves as subjects of what we are doing, thinking, saying. (in Rabinow, 1991, pp. 45-46)

11.1 Contributions

This genealogy of the English art school system contributes to the educational discourse in several ways. Firstly, it adds to recent literature that examines the art school education specifically in the English post-Coldstream era; Miller (1985); Candlin (2001); Elkins (2001); Cornock (1983, 2003); Walker (2003); Romans (2005); Thompson (2005); Tickner (2008); Nicolson (2010); Aspinall (2012); Beck and Cornford (2012); Williamson (2013); Dennis (2014); Llewellyn (2015); Mitchell (2015); Addison, Georgakia, Nirta (2016); Houghton (2016); Lee (2016); Hunt (2018); Willer (2018); McLoughlin (2019); Secondly it does so from a particular genealogical approach, which makes it individually significant. It thereby also contributes to a large and growing literature that critiques education by utilising Foucauldian analytics.

The originality of the thesis resides within its localised and specific temporal situation. It is conducted by, and on, a subject currently working within the art education system, and whose values have, at the same time, been shaped by the very discursive formation under examination. Thirdly, it rises to the challenge laid down by Llewellyn (2015) in *The London Art Schools: Reforming the Art World, 1960 to Now* where he suggests that; 'At present, the bookshelf marked 'Art School History' is understocked and this is something that future scholarship

needs to challenge.’ (p. 153) Finally, it also sets out to, as Ball (2019) suggested, use Foucault’s later work to ‘think differently’ (*penser autrement*) about teaching and learning.’

For the stated reasons, this thesis represents a significantly original contribution to the educational discourse in general, and to that of art education specifically.

This thesis set out to deploy a Foucauldian analytic to the historical account of a specific, localised, system of education, the English art school. In doing so, it cannot sit above, or outside, the subject of its scrutiny. I am the author of the thesis, but also a subjective formation of the system I have sought to critique, and in doing so find that I cannot be extricated from this situation. Instead, I sought to destabilise it, to think differently of and about it, and consequently to reconsider my situation within the discursive formation of my own lived experience. The thesis, then, does not seek to provide an objective overview, but to destabilise the history that art school might tell of itself. As set out in chapter 2, genealogy offered an analytical technique which both described the English art school as a system in which repeatedly ‘problematization function(s) to render problematic certain old practices at the same time that they establish a basis for the elaboration of certain new practices’ (Koopman, 2013, p. 101) and the phenomenon of its emergence as a system. As Hacking (2006) said, ‘I never called it history.’

For this reason, the thesis does not discuss art, or artists, art movements except where they manifest visible traces of the system as it wills itself into being. It is also not a history of art, and it certainly does not attempt to narrate a smooth evolutionary path from classical antiquity to the modern age by means of ascending virtues. Rather, it hopes to suggest that the emergence of the English art school system was a long, bloody battle – at times akin to a civil war, in which artists themselves often fought over different but equally passionately held values and doctrines, whilst also struggling to accommodate contradictory national and governmental desires for art to contribute to the national character or economy.

This thesis does not suggest better ways to do art education, it refuses to find solace in any of the history it uncovers. All is suspect. It is also paradoxical, having stated that it did not desire to produce more knowledge, (rather, it claimed to want to think differently about existing knowledge and its origins), it did exactly that.

Finally, in part because of limitations in the thesis size, and the specific contextual subjectivity of the author, this thesis does not begin to deal with the full range of other voices that deserve to be heard in the art education debate; it agrees with Stothard (2019) in that:

this thesis does not have the remit to discuss other subjugated discourses regarding how the race, gender or ability or disability of affects their subject position... Indeed, it would be valuable to the field of genealogy and education to consider other 'noisy silences' which may challenge dominant discourses... (p. 170)

11.2 Further research

In meeting the challenge of Llewellyn (2015), whereby future scholarship should address the understocked bookshelf marked 'art school history', this research carried out for this thesis has in turn suggested a number of areas that might fruitfully be further explored. So far, this thesis seems to be the sole attempt to apply genealogical analytics to art school history, as a specific educational phenomenon. As identified throughout the thesis, art educational pedagogy is distinctive and has a long history; far longer than other elements of the current educational ecology. This history is worthy of further genealogical study, as is the contemporary situation which has only briefly been examined in this thesis.

One of the earlier conceptions of this thesis was interested in recording the views, thoughts and memories of active participants in the more recent history of the English art school. I still feel that this is an important piece of research that needs to be done, while it is still able to be done. During the time in which this thesis was being written, a number of my colleagues passed away, and their first-hand experiences of being art students in the 70s and 80s, and of working through the transitional period from polytechnics to new universities are now beyond recovery. For this reason, at least, I feel there is a degree of imperative to extend the oral history of Hywel James'. *Art Schools in England 1945 to 1970: An anecdotal history* to cover two further 25-year periods; 1970 - 1995 and 1995 - 2020.

As this thesis evolved, my own understanding of my position as a subject of the apparatus under examination herein grew, and on that basis, I feel there is scope for a more searching critique of art education specifically and the formation of the self as subject, based on Foucault's later work, and extending that of Allen, (2017, 2018) and Ball (2019) into this specific paradigm.

Generally, the art school-oriented theses that have been reviewed as part of this thesis tended to focus on art practice, for example Yeomans (1987); Thurlow (2019) or artists (Foss (1991)

or historiographical accounts such as by Butterworth (1968); Cunningham (1979); Kusamitsu (1982); Sloan (1986); Webb (2003); Gooding (2012); Martin (2013); McLoughlin (2019) or art movements, such as Dennis (2016), and there is scope for further genealogical studies of art education.

The ‘fast and draconian’ implementation of the NACAE’s First Report were enabled firstly by inspection visits to the applicant institutions. Given that they had all been previously inspected and found acceptable by the Ministry of Education’s own Inspectors, on what grounds were so many applicant courses refused? The decisions of the Summerson Council were not made available to the courses that failed to gain Dip AD status. How, then, were the decisions made? What preconditions, preconceptions and prejudices were in play?

This thesis also encountered the work of the young sociologist Warren Piper, who was briefly co-opted to the NCDAD (from Hornsey School of Art, no less) and who attempted to approach the problematization of art school by applying a systematic approach to the evaluation of art education, (rather than the value-laden doctrinal prejudices displayed by the NACAE) to art education policy formation and to the administrative processes for art education. His contribution to the art education debate has been overlooked, and is ripe for reappraisal in light of current difficulties art education is experiencing in the contemporary policy realm.

The NACAE/NCDAD archive, held at the National Archive, also contains a wealth of evidence gathered by the Coldstream’s 1968 request for ‘Comments on the Structure of Art and Design Education’ and is worth examination for what they can reveal about the situation of art and art education at that pivotal moment. Equally, the archive contains examples of alternative curricula and qualification proposals, particularly coming from the work of the various designers and representatives of the design profession who were members of the NACAE. Ultimately, these were suppressed and design would have to wait for a decade more before beginning to make headway under the CNAA within the polytechnic system. For the British design industry of the time, this represents a lost opportunity and arguably reduced British capability in areas of design that were annexed by the United States and a resurgent post-war western Europe. This aspect of design history is certainly under-researched and would warrant a close examination.

11.3 Personal reflection

This research project began with the intention of researching student experience on a contemporary university art degree. It evolved instead into a larger, genealogical exploration of the English art school system as the location in which I was formed as a student and educator, and traced the often-unremarked historical forces that shaped my lived experience. I was also mindful that Foucault (1982) had stated:

I don't feel it is necessary to know exactly what I am. The main interest in life and work is to become someone else you were not in the beginning. If you knew when you began a book what you would say at the end, do you think you would have the courage to write it? (in Ball, 1990, p. 1)

The research process was messy, evolutionary, and incomplete. The emergence of the thesis as an object itself shaped the research process, and this in turn shaped my conceptualisation of art school, whilst at the same time undermining my previously held views and assumptions. In this aspect, the thesis is also an attempt, as Ball (2019) suggests, 'to enabl(e) the development of an awareness of one's current condition as defined and constructed by the given culture and historical moment.' (p. 132) My innate scepticism regarding the common-sensical view of knowledge production in art education, and its doctrinal, administrative and value systems developed a theoretical and analytical framework by engaging with Michel Foucault's work. This was extraordinarily challenging. Having no previous disciplinary basis on which to build, this felt like deciding to learn to swim at the very moment the boat sank. This produced two significant effects, both unintended; it succeeded in disconcerting me, it also refused to offer any solace for that disconcertion.

As Foucault said, 'we cannot conceive of alternatives within the discursive possibilities we currently inhabit.' (Foucault, in Ball 2019, p. 134)

12 Bibliography

Addison, N; Georgaki, M; Nirta, C. (2018) *Lost and Found: Historical Account 1975-2015*.

UAL Teaching Unit. Available at:

https://www.academia.edu/74141346/Lost_and_Found_Historical_Account_1975_2015

(Accessed: 09/04/22)

Allen, A. (2014). *Benign violence: education in and beyond the age of reason*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Allen, A. (2015) *Forcing a Smile: the Plight of Today's Educator*. Discover Society,

Available at: <https://archive.discoversociety.org/2015/02/01/forcing-a-smile-the-plight-of-todays-educator/> (Accessed: 10/04/23)

Allen, A. (2018) 'The End of Education: Nietzsche, Foucault, Genealogy'. *Philosophical Inquiry in Education*, Volume 25, No. 1, pp. 47–65. Available at:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/130097/14/1029-2975-1-PB.pdf> (Accessed: 12/04/22)

Allen, A. and Goddard, R. (2014) 'The domestication of Foucault: Government, critique, war'. *History of the Human Sciences*, 27 (5). 26 - 53. Available at:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/83269/5/Allen%20Goddard%20The%20domestication%20of%20Foucault.pdf> (Accessed 16/02/23)

Allen, F. (2011) *Education: Documents of Contemporary Art*, Whitechapel Press/MIT, London. Available at:

https://www.academia.edu/1297603/Education_Documents_of_Contemporary_Art

(Accessed 11/0/22)

Anon. (1969) 'On the Reasons for a Revolution: A Study Paper by the Association of

Members of Hornsey College of Art, England'. *Leonardo*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Apr., 1969), pp.

193-198, The MIT Press. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2307/1572029> (Accessed 14/04/21)

Ashbee, C. R. (1911) *Should We Stop Teaching Art?* Batsford, London. Available at:

<https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=SV8GAAAAMAAJ&dq=editions:UOM39015027317992> (Accessed 24/03/23)

Ashwin (1972) 'DipAD Students and Their Foundation Courses', *Educational Research*, 15:1, 43-47. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0013188720150107> (Accessed 23/03/23)

Ashwin, C. (1975) *Art Education documents and policies 1768 – 1975*. SRHE, London

Ashwin, C. (1984) 'Drawing, Design and Semiotics', *Design Issues*, Autumn, 1984, Vol. 1, No. 2 (Autumn, 1984), pp. 42-52. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1511498> (Accessed: 23/03/23)

Aspinall, K. (2012) 'Vocation or Profession? the Character of the Artist and the 1960 'Coldstream Report'', *Art as a Mode of Enquiry*, University of Oxford, 16 - 17 June 2012. Available at:

https://www.academia.edu/8524291/Vocation_or_Profession_the_Character_of_the_Artist_and_the_1960_Coldstream_Report (Accessed: 24/03/23)

Aspinall, K. (2014) 'The 'Pasmore Report'?: Reflections on the 1960 'Coldstream Report' and its legacy'. *Art School Educated Conference*, Tate Britain, 11- 12 September 2014. Available at:

https://www.academia.edu/8524265/The_Pasmore_Report_Reflections_on_the_1960_Coldstream_Report_and_its_Legacy (Accessed: 22/03/23)

Ball, S. J. (1990) *Introducing Monsieur Foucault*, Taylor and Francis, e-book. Available at: <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9780203092781-1/introducing-monsieur-foucault-stephen-ball> (Accessed: 22/03/23)

Ball, S. J. (2013) *Foucault, Power and Education*, 2nd edition, Routledge, London

Ball, S. J. (2016a) *Is Education Impossible? Foucault as Educator*. Available at: <http://www.susees.eu/lecture-1-is-education-impossible-foucault-as-educator/> (Accessed: 10/02/23)

Ball, S. J. (2016b) 'Subjectivity as a site of struggle: refusing neoliberalism?' *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 37:8, 1129-1146. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2015.1044072> (Accessed: 22/03/23)

Ball, S. J. (2018) ‘The tragedy of state education in England: Reluctance, compromise and muddle—a system in disarray’. *Journal of the British Academy*, 6, 207–238. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.5871/jba/006.207> (Accessed: 10/04/23)

Ball, S. J. (2019) ‘A horizon of freedom: Using Foucault to think differently about education and learning’, *Power and Education*, 2019, Vol. 11(2) 132–144. Available at: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/219541928.pdf> (Accessed: 24/03/23)

Banks, M. Oakley, K. (2016) ‘The Dance Goes on Forever? Art schools, class and UK higher education’, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 22:1, 41-57. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2015.1101082> (Accessed: 23/03/23)

Barnett, C. (2001) *The Lost Victory*. 2nd Edition, Pan Books, London

Beck, J. Cornford, M. (2012) ‘The Art School in Ruins’, *Journal of Visual Culture*, Vol 11(1): 58–83. Available at: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1470412911430467> (Accessed: 23/03/23)

Bell, Q. (1963) *The Schools of Design*. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London

Black, L. (2006) ‘Making Britain a Gay and More Cultivated Country: Wilson, Lee and the Creative Industries in the 1960s’. *Contemporary British History*, 20(3), pp. 323-342. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13619460500407012> (Accessed: 06/04/23)

Bevir, M. (2008) ‘What is Genealogy?’ *Journal of the Philosophy of History* 2 (2008) 263–275 Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1163/187226308X335958> (Accessed: 23/03/23)

Boehm, C. (2022) *Arts and Academia: The Role of the Arts in Civic Universities*. Great Debates in Higher Education. Emerald Publishing Limited, Bingley. Available at: <https://eprints.staffs.ac.uk/7301/> (Accessed: 12/04/23)

Bostock, J. (1855) Pliny the Elder, (77CE) *The Natural History, Book 35: An Account of Paintings and Colours*. Taylor and Francis, London. Available at: <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/57493/57493-h/57493-h.htm> (Accessed: 24/03/23)

- Bourne, R. (1971) 'Still at Square One', *Design Journal* 265, 1971, pp. 44-46 Available at: <https://www.vads.ac.uk/digital/collection/DIAD/id/8487/> (Accessed: 06/04/23)
- Burns, T. (2011) *Cennino Cennini's Il Libro dell'Arte: A Historiographical Review*. *Studies in Conservation*, Vol. 56, No. 1, pp. 1-13. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42751734> (Accessed: 24/03/23)
- Carline, R. (1968) *Draw They Must*. Edward Arnold, London
- Caston, G. (1979) Planning, Government, and Administration in Two University Systems: California and the United Kingdom, *Oxford Review of Education*, 1979, Vol. 5, No. 2, Policy Issues for the Eighties and After. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1050396> (Accessed: 13/04/23)
- Cornock, S. (2003) *Celebrating the Achievement of The Art Schools: A New Resource*. Available at: <http://fineart.vads.ahds.ac.uk/collection/html/stroud.html> (Accessed: 24/04/22)
- Cust, R. (2014) Charles I's Noble Academy, *The Seventeenth Century*, 2014, Vol. 29, No. 4, 337–356. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0268117X.2014.955046> (Accessed: 02/04/23)
- Deacon, R. (2002) 'An analytics of power relations: Foucault on the history of discipline', *History of the Human Sciences* Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 89–117. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2002.tb00518.x> (Accessed: 23/03/23)
- Dean, M. (2015) 'Foucault Must Not be Defended', *History and Theory*, October 2015, Vol. 54, No. 3, pp. 389-403. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2002.tb00518.x> (Accessed: 23/03/23)
- Dennis, M. (2014) 'The Ascent from the Maelstrom: Art Students Observed and its descriptive resonance 40 years on', *Journal of Visual Art Practice*, 13:1, 17-29. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14702029.2014.933019> (Accessed: 23/03/23)
- Deleuze, G. (2006) *Foucault*. 7th printing, translated from the French by S, Hand. University of Minnesota Press. Available at: <https://altexploit.files.wordpress.com/2017/05/gilles-deleuze-sean-hand-foucault-university-of-minnesota-press-1988.pdf> (Accessed: 13/04/23)

- Devine-Eller, A. (2004) *Applying Foucault to Education*. Available at: <http://www.audreydevineeller.com/Devine-Eller,%20Applying%20Foucault%20to%20Education.pdf> (Accessed: 23/03/23)
- Dohmen, R. (2020) 'Art, industry and the laws of nature: the South Kensington method revisited'. *Open Arts Journal* (9) pp. 23–42. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346677393_Art_industry_and_the_laws_of_nature_the_South_Kensington_method_revisited (Accessed: 24/03/23)
- Dreyfus, H. and Rabinow, P. (1982) *Michel Foucault: beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, University of Chicago Press. Available at: <https://doctoradohumanidades.files.wordpress.com/2015/04/dreyfus-michel-foucault-beyond-structuralism-and-hermeneutics.pdf> (Accessed: 12/03/23)
- Dunn, D. (2021) *The Strange Death of the Art School*, Engelsberg Ideas, Available at: <https://engelsbergideas.com/notebook/the-strange-death-of-the-art-school/> (Accessed: 10/04/23)
- Fleming, M. (2010) 'Arts in education and creativity: a literature review'. *Creativity, Culture and Education* 2nd Edition. Available at: <http://old.creativitycultureeducation.org/wp-content/uploads/arts-in-education-and-creativity-2nd-edition-91.pdf> (Accessed: 20/02/22)
- Forrest, E. (1985) 'Harry Thubron at Leeds, and Views on the Value of his Ideas for Art Education Today', *Journal of Art and Design Education*, Vol 4, No. 2, 1985. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1476-8070.1985.tb00155.x> (Accessed: 12/04/23)
- Foucault, M. (1977a) *Discipline and Punish*. Available at: https://monoskop.org/images/4/43/Foucault_Michel_Discipline_and_Punish_The_Birth_of_the_Prison_1977_1995.pdf (Accessed 23/03/23)
- Foucault, M. (1977b) *Nietzsche Genealogy and History*. Available at: <https://nohernandezcortez.files.wordpress.com/2011/04/nietzsche-genealogy-history.pdf> (Accessed: 24/03/23)

Foucault, M. (1980) *Power/Knowledge Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, Pantheon Press, New York. Available at: https://monoskop.org/images/5/5d/Foucault_Michel_Power_Knowledge_Selected_Interviews_and_Other_Writings_1972-1977.pdf (Accessed 24/03/23)

Foucault, M. (1988) *Politics, philosophy, culture: interviews and other writings of Michel Foucault, 1977-1984*. Routledge, London. Available at: https://monoskop.org/images/9/96/Foucault_Michel_Politics_Philosophy_Culture_Interviews_and_Other_Writings_1977_1984.pdf (Accessed: 12/03/23)

Foucault, M. (1997) *Society Must Be Defended. Lectures at the Collège de France 1975-1976*, Picador, New York. Available at: <http://s3.amazonaws.com/arena-attachments/2288168/a517f6153600c84ff334b416cf460745.pdf?1528579703> (Accessed: 24/03/23)

Fox, A. (no date) *Sir William Petty, Ireland, and the Making of a Political Economist, 1653-1687*. Available at: https://www.shca.ed.ac.uk/staff/supporting_files/apfox/fox-publ.pdf (Accessed: 01/04/23)

Garland, D. (2014) ‘What is a “history of the present”?’ On Foucault’s genealogies and their critical preconditions’, *Punishment & Society 2014*, Vol. 16(4) 365–384. Available at: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1462474514541711> (Accessed: 23/03/23)

Hacking, I. (2006) *The Emergence of Probability, a Philosophical Study of Early Ideas About Probability, Induction and Statistical Inference*, Second Edition, Cambridge University Press, Available at: http://www.andreasaltelli.eu/file/repository/Jan_Hacking_Emergence_Probability.pdf (Accessed: 07/04/23)

Hanson, M. (2022) *The Royal Academy of Arts*. Available at: <https://englishhistory.net/the-royal-academy-of-arts/> (Accessed: 01/04/23)

Heron, P. (1971) *Murder of the Art Schools*, editorial, *The Guardian*, October 12th 1971. Available at: <https://www.proquest.com/docview/185478376/3BE7835FF0CC43E1PQ/81?accountid=13828> (Accessed: 10/04/23)

- Herringham, C. (1899) *The Book of the Art of Cennino Cennini: A Contemporary Practical Treatise on Quattrocento Painting*. George Allen, London. Available at: [https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781315123844/book-art-cennino-cennino-cennino-christiana-herringham](https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781315123844/book-art-cennino-cennini-cennino-cennini-christiana-herringham) (Accessed: 24/03/23)
- Hoag, J. D. (1970) 'The Antiquity of the Art of Painting, by Felix da Costa', *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 23, No. 2 (Summer, 1970), pp. 176-177. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/i333795> (Accessed: 24/03/23)
- Horne, D. (1969) *God is an Englishman*. Penguin Books, London
- Horne, D. (1986) *The Public Culture, the Triumph of Industrialism*. Pluto Press, London
- Hook, D. (2005) 'Genealogy, discourse, 'effective history': Foucault and the work of critique', *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 2:1, 3-31. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088705qp025oa> (Accessed: 23/03/23)
- Hunt, S. (2017) *The CNAA art collection: Victor Pasmore, Britain's art schools and higher education*. Available at: <https://cnaa.senatehouselibrary.ac.uk/blog/cnaa-art-collection-victor-pasmore-britains-art-schools-and-higher-education> (Accessed: 06/04/22)
- Hunt, S. (2018) '50 years ago: May 1968 and the British art school uprising', *Centre for Global Higher Education*. Available at: <https://www.researchcghe.org/blog/2018-05-04-50-years-ago-may-1968-and-the-british-art-school-uprising/> (Accessed: 07/10/22)
- Hurtado, S. H. (1993) 'The Promotion of the Visual Arts in Britain, 1835-1860'. *Canadian Journal of History* XXVIII, pp. 59-80. Available at: <https://go.gale.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA13718974&sid=googleScholar&v=2.1&it=r&linkaccess=abs&issn=00084107&p=AONE&sw=w&userGroupName=anon%7E17bfc71c> (Accessed 23/03/23)
- James, H. (2016) *Art Schools in England 1945 - 1970: An anecdotal history*. [Kindle e-book] Spencer House Press
- Jones, P. L. (1975) 'Readings in Art and Design Education by David Warren Piper', Review, *Leonardo*, Vol. 8, No. 3 (Summer, 1975), p. 266. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1573278> (Accessed 24/03/23)

- Kill, R. (2006) 'Coming in From the Cold: Imperialist Legacies and Tactical Criticalities'. *Journal of Art and Design*, Vol. 25, No. 3, pp. 308-317. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/970983/Coming_in_From_the_Cold_Imperialist_Legacies_and_Tactical_Criticalities (Accessed: 24/03/23)
- Koopman, C. (2013) *Genealogy as Critique: Foucault and the Problems of Modernity* Bloomington: Indiana University Press. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt16gzmqf> (Accessed: 23/03/23)
- Koopman, C. Matza, T. (2013) 'Putting Foucault to Work: Analytic and Concept in Foucaultian Inquiry', *Critical Inquiry* 39 (Summer 2013), The University of Chicago. Available at: https://pages.uoregon.edu/koopman/pub/2013ci_koopman_matza_foucault-analytic-concept.pdf (Accessed: 24/03/23)
- Koopman, C. (2017) *Ways of Doing Genealogy: Inquiry after Foucault*. A Group Interview with Verena Erlenbusch, Simon Ganahl, Robert W. Gehl, Thomas Nail, and Perry Zurn, in: *Le foucauldien*, 3/1. Available at: <https://www.genealogy-critique.net/article/id/7050/> (Accessed: 24/03/23)
- Kritzman, L. (1988) Power and sex: An interview with Michel Foucault. In: Kritzman (ed.) *Michel Foucault: Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977–1984*. New York: Routledge. Available at: https://monoskop.org/images/9/96/Foucault_Michel_Politics_Philosophy_Culture_Interviews_and_Other_Writings_1977_1984.pdf (Accessed: 16/04/23)
- Lee, D. (2016) 'What Happened to Art Education?' *The Jackdaw*, York. Available at: <http://www.thejackdaw.co.uk/?p=1824> (Accessed: 14/04/21)
- Llewellyn, N. (Ed) (2015) *The London Art Schools: Reforming the Art World, 1960 to Now*. Tate, London.
- Lord, J. V. (2008) *Post-war curriculum and assessment: Coldstream, Summerson, art history and complementary studies*. University of Brighton. Available at: <http://arts.brighton.ac.uk/arts/alumni-and-associates/the-history-of-arts-education-in-brighton> (Accessed: 09/04/22)

- Lyon, P. (2008) *1968: the student revolution*. University of Brighton Available at: <http://arts.brighton.ac.uk/arts/alumni-and-associates/the-history-of-arts-education-in-brighton> (Accessed: 09/04/22)
- Macdonald (2004) *The History and Philosophy of Art Education*, 2nd Edition, Lutterworth press, Cambridge.
- Madge, C. and Weinberger, B. (1973) *Art Students Observed*. Faber and Faber, London
- McLoughlin, M. (2019) 'The textile student needs little Giotto, (or a little will go a long way) The 1970 Coldstream Report in response to the art school unrest of 1968', *Journal of Design History* Vol 32 No 2. Available at: <https://academic.oup.com/jdh/article-abstract/32/2/170/5273587> (Accessed: 12/08/22)
- McNay, M. (1999) 'Patrick Heron obituary', *The Guardian*, 22 March 1999, Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/news/1999/mar/22/guardianobituaries.michaelmcnay> (Accessed: 10/04/23)
- Megill, A. (1987) 'The Reception of Foucault by Historians', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Jan. - Mar., 1987, Vol. 48, No. 1 (Jan. - Mar., 1987), pp. 117-141. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2709615> (Accessed: 12/03/23)
- Miller, R. (1985) 'The Fate of the Art Schools'. *Education Supplement* Part 2, Nov. – Dec. 1985, pp. 22-29. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2307/25557028> (Accessed: 09/04/22)
- Mitchell, L. (2015) 'What is Art School For' *The Double Negative*. Available at: <http://www.thedoublenegative.co.uk/2015/09/what-is-art-school-for/> (Accessed: 12/04/23)
- Mullan, J. (2013) *The Royal Academy: a history of sulks and squabbles*. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2013/jan/04/royal-academy-sulks-and-squabbles> (Accessed: 01/04/23)
- Myrone, M. (2008)-*St Martin's Lane Academy*. Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/96317> (Accessed: 01/04/23)
- Nairn, T. (1968) 'Hornsey', *New Left Review*, 1 50, August 1968, pp. 65-70. Available at: <https://newleftreview.org/issues/i50/articles/tom-nairn-hornsey> (Accessed: 24/03/23)

- Noriel, G. (1994) 'Foucault and History: The Lessons of a Disillusion', *The Journal of Modern History*, Sep., 1994, Vol. 66, No. 3 (Sep., 1994), pp. 547-568. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2124485> (Accessed: 22/03/23)
- O'Brien, N. Tanner, W. Miscampbell, G. (2019) *A Question of Degree*, UKOnward. Available at: <https://www.ukonward.com/reports/question-of-degree/> (Accessed: 06/04/23)
- Panofsky, E. (1972) *Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art*. Icon Editions, Harper and Row, London
- Penty, A. J. (1906) *The Restoration of the Guild System*. Swan Sonnenschein, London. Available at: <https://archive.org/details/restorationofgil00pentrich> (Accessed: 24/03/23)
- Pevsner, N. (1940) *Academies of Art Past and Present*, Cambridge University Press.
- Philips, S. (2019) *Art under threat: the growing crisis in higher education*. Royal Academy. Available at: <https://www.royalacademy.org.uk/article/art-under-threat-crisis-britain-higher-education> (Accessed: 12/03/23)
- Poster, M. (1982) 'Foucault and History', *Social Research*, Spring 1982, Vol. 49, No. 1, Modern Masters pp. 116-142. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40970855> (Accessed: 22/03/23)
- Potter, N. (1969) *What is a Designer?* (4th Edition, 2002) Hyphen Press, London. Available at: <https://advdesign2017.files.wordpress.com/2017/07/what-is-a-designer-potter.pdf> (Accessed: 24/03/23)
- Prado, C. G. (2000) *Starting with Foucault*, 2nd Edition, Westview Press, Boulder, Co.
- Quinn, M. (2011) 'The Political Economic Necessity of the Art School 1835–52'. *International Journal of Art and Design*, Vol. 30, No1, pp. 270-277. Pp. 62-70. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1476-8070.2011.01660.x> (Accessed: 24/03/23)
- Rabinow, P. (1991) *The Foucault Reader*, Penguin, London
- Romans, M. (2004) 'Living in the Past: Some Revisionist Thoughts on the Historiography of Art and Design Education'. *Journal of Art and Design*, Vol. 23, No3, pp. 270-277. Available at: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Living-in-the-Past%3A-Some-Revisionist->

[Thoughts-on-of-Romans/54302a11b1cd32eeb2b33de9ea20a172f9337431](#) (Accessed: 24/03/23)

Romans, M. (2005) 'Histories of Art and Design Education: Collected Essays', *NSEAD, Intellect*, Bristol UK. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25475855> (Accessed: 24/03/23)

Romans, M. (2007) 'An Analysis of the Political Complexion of the 1835/6 Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures'. *Journal of Art and Design*, Vol. 26, No2, pp. 215-224. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1476-8070.2007.00531.x> (Accessed: 24/03/23)

Roth, M. (1981) 'Foucault's "History of the Present"', *History and Theory*, Feb., 1981, Vol. 20, No. 1 (Feb., 1981), pp. 32-46. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2504643> (Accessed: 22/03/23)

Royal Society of Arts. (1783) INTRODUCTION. *Transactions of the Society, Instituted at London, for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures, and Commerce, 1*, v–viii. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41321871> (Accessed: 02/04/23)

Saler, M. (1999) *The Avant-Garde in Interwar England: Medieval Modernism and the London Underground*, Oxford University Press, Oxford. Available at: https://monoskop.org/images/7/73/Saler_Michael_T_The_Avant-Garde_in_Interwar_England_Medieval_Modernism_and_the_London_Underground.pdf (Accessed: 24/03/23)

Spencer, J. R. (1970) Battista Alberti, L. (1435) *On Painting*. Yale University Press, New Haven. Available at: <http://www.noteaccess.com/Texts/Alberti/Intro1.htm> (Accessed: 24/03/23)

Sproll, P. A. C. (1994) 'Matters of Taste and Matters of Commerce: British Government Intervention in Art Education in 1835'. *Studies in Art Education*, Vol. 35, No. 2 (Winter, 1994) pp. 105-113, Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1320824> (Accessed: 24/03/23)

Strand, R. (1987) *A good deal of freedom. Art and Design in the public sector of higher education, 1960-1982*. CNA, London.

Sutton, G. (1967) *Artisan or Artist? A History of the teaching of Art and Crafts in English Schools*. Pergamon Press, London.

Tamboukou, M. (1999) 'Writing Genealogies: an exploration of Foucault's strategies for doing research', *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education*, Vol. 20, No. 2, 19, pp. 201-217. Available at:

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epdf/10.1080/0159630990200202?needAccess=true>

(Accessed: 23/03/23)

Tamboukou, M. Ball, S. J. (2003) *Genealogy and Ethnography: Fruitful Encounters or Dangerous Liaisons?* Available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/274832211>

(Accessed: 23/03/23)

Thompson, J. (2005) 'Art Education from Coldstream to QAA'. *Critical Quarterly*, Vol. 47. Nos. 1-2, pp. 215-225. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.0011-1562.2005.00641.x> (Accessed: 24/03/23)

Tickner, L (2008) *Hornsey 1968 The Art School Revolution* Frances Lincoln Ltd, London

Veyne, P. (2010) *Foucault, his Thought, His Character*. Polity Press, Cambridge.

Wallis, E. (2016) *Civic Socialism, a New Agenda for Arts and Culture*, Fabian Society.

Available at: [https://www.fabians.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Civic-](https://www.fabians.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Civic-Socialism_final.pdf)

[Socialism_final.pdf](https://www.fabians.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Civic-Socialism_final.pdf) (Accessed: 24/03/23)

Walker, J. A. (1981) 'The Basic Faults of The Basic Design Courses', *Art Monthly*, (46) pp. 27-28. Available at: [https://uploads-](https://uploads-ssl.webflow.com/5fc0b81148a1f1349080387b/5fc0b81148a1f11698039e3_Basic%20faults%20of%20Basic%20Design.pdf)

[ssl.webflow.com/5fc0b81148a1f1349080387b/5fc0b81148a1f11698039e3_Basic%20faults%20of%20Basic%20Design.pdf](https://uploads-ssl.webflow.com/5fc0b81148a1f1349080387b/5fc0b81148a1f11698039e3_Basic%20faults%20of%20Basic%20Design.pdf) (Accessed: 24/03/23)

Walker, J. A. (2003) *Learning to Paint: A British Art Student and Art School 1956-61*, Institute of Artology, London. Available at:

<https://www.vads.ac.003uk/customizations/collection/FA/pages/pdf/walker.pdf> (Accessed:

11/03/23)

Warren Piper, D. J. (1969) *Educational Planning at a National Level*. TNA, ED206/17 NACAE (SC) (69)3.

Westley, H. R. (2014) *The Many Lives of the Life Room*, in Llewellyn (Ed) *The London Art Schools*, Tate, London

Willer, J. (2018) *What Happened to the Art Schools?* Politea, London. Available at: <https://www.politeia.co.uk/wp-content/Politeia%20Documents/2018/Willer/Willer%20text%2019.10.18.pdf> (Accessed: 24/04/23)

Wood, J. (2018) Artists and Agents. Connoisseurship at the Caroline Court, in *Charles I: King and Collector* (exh. cat. Royal Academy of Arts, London, 2018), Royal Academy of Arts, London, 2018, pp. 30–35. Available at: <https://nottingham.academia.edu/JeremyWood> (accessed: 31/03/23)

Woodham, J. M. (2008) *Brighton School of Art - the Victorian age to the twentieth century*. Available at: <http://arts.brighton.ac.uk/arts/alumni-and-associates/the-history-of-arts-education-in-brighton> (Accessed: 09/04/22)

Yeomans, R. R. (1987). The foundation course of Victor Pasmore and Richard Hamilton, 1954-1966. PhD thesis, Institute of Education, University of London. Available at: <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10007507/> (Accessed: 12/04/23)

Foundational Texts

The texts that describe, contain and convey key philosophies, historical practices and techniques that underpin the evolution of the English Art School system; specifically codified and enacted as curricula, values, doctrine, or administrative instruments.

Abstract of the Instrument of Instruction and Laws of the Royal Academy of Arts, London (1768) Royal Academy of Arts. Available at:

https://gale.com/apps/doc/CW0105961613/ECCO?u=su_uk&sid=gale_marc&xid=a4c42644&pg=7 (Accessed: 28/03/22)

Alberti, L. B. *Della Pittura*. Translated and with notes by Spencer, R. (1970) Yale University Press. Available at: <http://www.noteaccess.com/Texts/Alberti/Intro1.htm> (Accessed: 25/03/23)

Alberti, L. B. *On Painting*. Edited, translated and with Critical Notes by Sinisgalli, R. (2011) Cambridge University Press. Available at: <https://dokumen.pub/qdownload/leon-battista-alberti-on-painting-new-translation-and-critical-ed-9781107000629-1107000629.html> (Accessed: 31/03/23)

Armenini, G. B. *Dei Veri Precetti della Pittura*. Translated and edited by Olszewski, E.J. (1977) Burt Franklin, New York. Available at: https://ia600204.us.archive.org/14/items/bub_gb_DBmF83Vrqr4C/bub_gb_DBmF83Vrqr4C.pdf (Accessed: 25/03/23)

Cennini, C. *Il Libro dell'Arte*, translated and notes by Herringham, C. J. (1899) Boston, Harvard University. Available at: <https://ia800300.us.archive.org/23/items/bookofartofcenni00cennuoft/bookofartofcenni00cennuoft.pdf> (Accessed: 25/03/23)

Elyot, T. *Boke named the Govenour*, transcribed by Schneider, B. R. (1998) Lawrence University, Wisconsin. Available at: <https://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~rbear/gov/gov1.htm> (Accessed: 25/03/23)

Hoby, T. *The Courtier*, transcribed by Bear, R. S. (1997) University of Oregon. Available at: <https://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~rbear/courtier/courtier.html> (Accessed: 25/03/23)

Mulcaster, R. *Elementarie* transcribed by North American reading Program (1994) Available at: https://revistaliterariakatharsis.org/Richard_Mulcaster.pdf (Accessed: 25/03/23)

Peacham, H. *The Art of Drawing with the Pen*. Facsimile (1970) Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, University of California. Available at: <https://tile.loc.gov/storage-services/service/rbc/rbc0001/2021/2021rosen1465/2021rosen1465.pdf> (Accessed: 25/03/23)

Pliny the Elder, *The Natural History, Book 35: An Account of Paintings and Colours*. Translated and notes by Bostock, J. (1855) Taylor and Francis, London. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/41346835/The_natural_history_of_Pliny (Accessed: 25/03/23)

Ruskin, J. (1857) *The Elements of Drawing in Three Letters to Beginners*. Available at: <https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/30325> (Accessed: 25/03/23)

Ruskin, J. (1902) *Fors Clavigera*. Collected, edited and with notes by Cook, E.T. and Wedderburn, A. George Allen, London. Available at: <https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/media/lancaster-university/content-assets/documents/ruskin/27-29ForsClavigera.pdf> (Accessed: 25/03/23)

Van Der Doort, A. *Catalogue of the Collections of Charles I*. Edited and with an introduction by Millar, O. (1960) The Walpole Society, The University Press, Glasgow. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41829344> (Accessed: 25/03/23)

Vasari, G. (1550) *Lives of the Most Eminent Painters Sculptors and Architects*. Project Gutenberg. Available at: <https://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/25326/pg25326-images.html> (Accessed: 25/03/23)

Vertue, G. *The Notebooks of George Vertue Relating to Artists and Collections in England*, collected and edited with notes by The Walpole Society (1951) In 3 Volumes. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41830860> (Accessed: 25/03/23)

Policy Documents

Department of Science and Art (1849) *Report of the Select Committee on the Government School of Design*. Available at: [https://parlipapers.proquest.com/parlipapers/result/pqpresultpage.gispdfhitspanel.pdflink/\\$2fa\\$2fb\\$2fd\\$2fa\\$2f3\\$2f1849-025826_complete.pdf/1849+report+of+the+select+committee+on+the+government+school+](https://parlipapers.proquest.com/parlipapers/result/pqpresultpage.gispdfhitspanel.pdflink/$2fa$2fb$2fd$2fa$2f3$2f1849-025826_complete.pdf/1849+report+of+the+select+committee+on+the+government+school+)

[of+design\\$40\\$2fapp-gis\\$2fparliamentary-paper\\$2f1849-025826\\$40Parliamentary+Paper\\$40null\\$40January+01,+1849?pgId=d504f262-5b68-4afe-95c7-c650d77c6d1b&rsId=1867DE53B0C](https://parlipapers.proquest.com/parlipapers/result/pqpresultpage.gispdfhitspanel.pdflink/$2fapp-gis$2fparliamentary-paper$2f1849-025826$40Parliamentary+Paper$40null$40January+01,+1849?pgId=d504f262-5b68-4afe-95c7-c650d77c6d1b&rsId=1867DE53B0C) (Accessed: 25/03/23)

Department of Science and Art (1852) *First Report of the Department of Practical Art.*

Available at:

[https://parlipapers.proquest.com/parlipapers/result/pqpresultpage.gispdfhitspanel.pdflink/\\$2fapp-bin\\$2fparliamentary-paper\\$2f6\\$2fb\\$2ff\\$2fa\\$2f1852-029195_complete.pdf/1852+department+of+practical+art\\$40\\$2fapp-gis\\$2fparliamentary-paper\\$2f1852-029195\\$40Parliamentary+Paper\\$40null\\$40January+01,+1853?pgId=720cccc0-83e0-4500-8a14-1e86fd1dca70&rsId=1867B2E19D8](https://parlipapers.proquest.com/parlipapers/result/pqpresultpage.gispdfhitspanel.pdflink/$2fapp-bin$2fparliamentary-paper$2f6$2fb$2ff$2fa$2f1852-029195_complete.pdf/1852+department+of+practical+art$40$2fapp-gis$2fparliamentary-paper$2f1852-029195$40Parliamentary+Paper$40null$40January+01,+1853?pgId=720cccc0-83e0-4500-8a14-1e86fd1dca70&rsId=1867B2E19D8) (Accessed: 24/03/23)

Department of Science and Art (1863) *Tenth Report of the Science and Art Department.*

Available at:

[https://parlipapers.proquest.com/parlipapers/result/pqpresultpage.gispdfhitspanel.pdflink/\\$2fapp-bin\\$2fparliamentary-paper\\$2fe\\$2f6\\$2ff\\$2f6\\$2f1863-039134_complete.pdf/1863+tenth+report+of+the+science+and+art+department\\$40\\$2fapp-gis\\$2fparliamentary-paper\\$2f1863-039134\\$40Parliamentary+Paper\\$40null\\$40January+01,+1863?pgId=42e79071-a86d-44af-aaf3-d920827956b4&rsId=1867DEC6955](https://parlipapers.proquest.com/parlipapers/result/pqpresultpage.gispdfhitspanel.pdflink/$2fapp-bin$2fparliamentary-paper$2fe$2f6$2ff$2f6$2f1863-039134_complete.pdf/1863+tenth+report+of+the+science+and+art+department$40$2fapp-gis$2fparliamentary-paper$2f1863-039134$40Parliamentary+Paper$40null$40January+01,+1863?pgId=42e79071-a86d-44af-aaf3-d920827956b4&rsId=1867DEC6955) (Accessed: 25/03/23)

Department of Science and Art (1864) *Report of the Select Committee on Schools of Art; together with the proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index.*

Available at:

[https://parlipapers.proquest.com/parlipapers/result/pqpresultpage.gispdfhitspanel.pdflink/\\$2fapp-bin\\$2fparliamentary-paper\\$2f2\\$2ff\\$2f1\\$2ff\\$2f1864-040109_complete.pdf/1864+report+of+the+select+committee+on+schools+of+art\\$40\\$2fapp-gis\\$2fparliamentary-paper\\$2f1864-040109\\$40Parliamentary+Paper\\$40null\\$40January+01,+1864?pgId=9e6195b5-67e4-4175-9f8a-b985fe8eee7e&rsId=1867DF6574A](https://parlipapers.proquest.com/parlipapers/result/pqpresultpage.gispdfhitspanel.pdflink/$2fapp-bin$2fparliamentary-paper$2f2$2ff$2f1$2ff$2f1864-040109_complete.pdf/1864+report+of+the+select+committee+on+schools+of+art$40$2fapp-gis$2fparliamentary-paper$2f1864-040109$40Parliamentary+Paper$40null$40January+01,+1864?pgId=9e6195b5-67e4-4175-9f8a-b985fe8eee7e&rsId=1867DF6574A) (Accessed: 25/03/23)

Department of Science and Art (1865) *Art Schools, &C. Minute of The Committee of Council on Education on Art-Schools and Art-Instruction.* Available at:

[https://parlipapers.proquest.com/parlipapers/result/pqpresultpage.gispdfhitspanel.pdflink/\\$2fa](https://parlipapers.proquest.com/parlipapers/result/pqpresultpage.gispdfhitspanel.pdflink/$2fa)

[https://parlipapers.proquest.com/parlipapers/result/pqpresultpage.gispdfhitspanel.pdflink/\\$2fa-pp-bin\\$2fparliamentary-paper\\$2f2\\$2f9\\$2fb\\$2ff\\$2f1865-041468_complete.pdf/1865+art+schools+minute+of+the+committee+of+council+on+education+on+art+schools+and+art+instruction\\$40\\$2fapp-gis\\$2fparliamentary-paper\\$2f1865-041468\\$40Parliamentary+Paper\\$40null\\$40January+01,+1865?pgId=90dfc39b-bb76-413d-b5aa-2e6a880d71dc&rsId=1867DFBC272](https://parlipapers.proquest.com/parlipapers/result/pqpresultpage.gispdfhitspanel.pdflink/$2fa-pp-bin$2fparliamentary-paper$2f2$2f9$2fb$2ff$2f1865-041468_complete.pdf/1865+art+schools+minute+of+the+committee+of+council+on+education+on+art+schools+and+art+instruction$40$2fapp-gis$2fparliamentary-paper$2f1865-041468$40Parliamentary+Paper$40null$40January+01,+1865?pgId=90dfc39b-bb76-413d-b5aa-2e6a880d71dc&rsId=1867DFBC272) (Accessed: 25/03/23)

Department of Science and Art (1884) *Second Report of The Royal Commissioners On Technical Instruction*. Available at:

[https://parlipapers.proquest.com/parlipapers/result/pqpresultpage.gispdfhitspanel.pdflink/\\$2fa-pp-bin\\$2fparliamentary-paper\\$2f7\\$2f3\\$2f5\\$2f1\\$2f1884-060422_complete.pdf/1884+Second+Report+of+The+Royal+Commissioners+On+Technical+Instruction\\$40\\$2fapp-gis\\$2fparliamentary-paper\\$2f1884-060422\\$40Parliamentary+Paper\\$40null\\$40January+01,+1884?pgId=a7078c32-9941-4861-8860-642edac4f47a&rsId=1867E1758B1](https://parlipapers.proquest.com/parlipapers/result/pqpresultpage.gispdfhitspanel.pdflink/$2fa-pp-bin$2fparliamentary-paper$2f7$2f3$2f5$2f1$2f1884-060422_complete.pdf/1884+Second+Report+of+The+Royal+Commissioners+On+Technical+Instruction$40$2fapp-gis$2fparliamentary-paper$2f1884-060422$40Parliamentary+Paper$40null$40January+01,+1884?pgId=a7078c32-9941-4861-8860-642edac4f47a&rsId=1867E1758B1) (Accessed: 25/03/23)

Ministry of Education (1943) *Report of the Art Education Committee*. Journal of the Royal Society of Arts, May 28th, 1943, Vol. 91, No. 4640, pp. 331-342. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41361852> (Accessed: 24/03/23)

Ministry of Education (1946) *Pamphlet No. 6*. Available at: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/minofed/pamphlet-06.html> (Accessed: 25/03/23)

Ministry of Education (1958) *Circular 340 Art Education, Report of the National Advisory Committee on Art Examinations on Proposed Changes in the Art Examinations and in the Length of the Diploma Course Introduction*. (TNA ED 46/843: NACAE (WP)(68) 1)

Ministry of Education (1960) *First Report of the National Advisory Council on Art Education 1960*.

Ministry of Education (1965) *First Report of the National Advisory Council on Art Education Addendum*

Department of Education and Science (1965) *A Policy for The Art, The First Steps*. Available at: <https://collective-encounters.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/A-Policy-for-the-Arts-Jennie-Lee.pdf> <https://collective-encounters.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/A-Policy-for-the-Arts-Jennie-Lee.pdf> (Accessed: 25/03/23)

Crosland, A. (1965) *Woolwich Polytechnic Speech*. Higher Education Policy Institute. Available at: <https://www.hepi.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Scan-158.pdf> (Accessed: 25/03/23)

Department of Education and Science (1966a) *A Plan for Polytechnics and Other Colleges-Higher Education in the Further Education System*. Available at: <http://filestore.nationalarchives.gov.uk/pdfs/small/cab-129-125-c-70.pdf> (Accessed: 25/03/23)

Department of Education and Science (1966b) *Future Pattern of Higher Education within the F.E. System*

Department of Education and Science (1967) *Administrative Memorandum No. 8/67: Polytechnics*. (TNA ED206/4 NACAE (67) 4)

Department of Education and Science (1970) *Circular 7/70 Government and Conduct of Establishments of Further Education*.

Department of Education and Science (1970) *The Structure of Art and Design Education in The Further Education Sector*. Available at: https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/13935/1/Structure_of_art_and_design_education.pdf (Accessed: 25/03/23)

Department of Education and Science (1971) *Circular 7/71 The Structure of Art and Design Education in The Further Education Sector: Report of The Joint Committee of The NACAE and the NCDAD*.

Williamson, G. (2021). Notification to the Office for Students (OfS) by the Secretary of State for Education to set terms and conditions for the allocation by OfS of Strategic Priorities grant funding for the 2021/22 Academic Year. Available at: [Notification to the Office for Students \(OfS\) by the Secretary of State for Education to set terms and conditions for the allocation by OfS of Strategic Priorities Grant funding for the 2021/22 Academic Year](#) (Accessed: 13/04/23)

13 Appendix 1: Timeline

Publications

Policies

Curricula/exams

Colleges/Schools

Academies/Societies/Administrative Bodies

AD77-79	<i>Naturalis Historia</i>	Pliny the Elder
~ 790CE	<i>Libri Carolina</i>	Bishop Theodulf of Orleans
~ 1437	<i>Il Libro dell'Arte</i>	Cennino Cennini
1435 (1450)	<i>De Pictura (On Painting)</i>	Leon Battista Alberti
1469	<i>Naturalis Historia</i> printed	Johann and Wendelin of Speyer (Venice)
1508-28	<i>Il Cortegiano</i>	Baldassare Castiglioni
1531	<i>Boke named the Governor</i>	Sir Thomas Elyot
1550	<i>Le Vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori, ed architettori</i>	Giorgio Vasari
1561	<i>The Courtier</i>	Sir Thomas Hoby
1563	Accademia delle Arti del Disegno	Cosimo I de' Medici
1572	Academy for the Education of the Sons of Noblemen	Sir Humphrey Gilbert
1581	<i>Positions</i>	Richard Mulcaster
1582	<i>Elementarie</i>	Richard Mulcaster
1586	<i>De Veri Precetti della Pittura</i>	Giovan Battista Armenini
1601	<i>The Historie of the World (Naturalis Historia)¹⁰¹</i>	Philemon Holland
1606	<i>Art of Drawing</i>	Henry Peacham
1622	<i>The Compleat Gentleman</i>	Henry Peacham
1630	Rubens visits Charles I in London	
1635	<i>Divine Emblemes</i>	Francis Quarle
1648	Petty's College (not established)	Sir William Petty
1657	<i>Orbis Pictus</i>	John Amos Komensky (Comenius)
1690 – 1750	Christ's Hospital School, drawing classes	

¹⁰¹ First English translation

1711	Great Queen Street	Godfrey Kneller/Bernard Lens
1720	St Martin's Lane	Louis Charron and Vanderbank
1724	Covent Garden	Sir James Thornhill
1726	<i>Of Painting</i> ¹⁰²	James Leoni
1735	St Martin's Lane	William Hogarth
1751	<i>For the curious Young Gentleman and Ladies that study the Noble and Commendable Art of Drawing</i>	Bernard Lens (CHS)
1753	first recorded evidence of external examinations in drawing	
1754	Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce later; Royal Society of Arts	
1762	<i>Anecdotes of painting in England, with some account of the principal artists, and notes on other arts; collected by G. Vertue</i>	Horace Walpole
1762	<i>Émile</i> ¹⁰³	Jean Jacques Rousseau
1764	<i>History of Ancient Art</i>	Johann Winckelmann
1768	Royal Academy of Arts	
1769-90	<i>The Discourses</i>	Joshua Reynolds
1770	<i>Arcton: A Dialogue on Painting from the Italian of Lodovico Dolce</i> trans W Brown	
c1784	<i>A new method of assisting the invention in Drawing Original Compositions of Landscape</i>	Alexander Cozens (CHS)
1813	<i>Rudiments of landscape with progressive studies</i>	Samuel Prout
1833	<i>Sketches in Flanders and Germany</i> ¹⁰⁴	Samuel Prout
1835	Select Committee on Arts and Manufacture	
1836	Report of the Select Committee on Arts and Manufacture	
1837	The Government School of Design later; Royal College of Art	
1838	Manchester School of Design Newcastle School of Art	
1842	Royal Commissioners on the Fine Arts, First Report, HMSO, London	
1842	Royal Female School of Art later absorbed into Central School of Art	
1843	<i>Modern Painters</i> Birmingham School of Design Coventry College of Design	John Ruskin

¹⁰² First English translation of Alberti's *Della Pittura*

¹⁰³ English translation appeared 1763 – according to Carline, its influence on art teaching was only indirect.

¹⁰⁴ The system of copying became entrenched in teaching as a result of lithography at the beginning of the century.

	Guilford School of Art
	Nottingham School of Art
	Sheffield School of Design
1845	Norwich School of Design
	Royal West of England Academy
1846	Leeds School of Art
1849	Report of the Select Committee on the Government School of Design
1851	Herefordshire College of Art & Design
	Wolverhampton School of Art
	17 Branch Schools of Design
1852	Bath School of Art
	Cheltenham School of Art
1853	First Report of the Department of Practical Art
	Bristol School of Practical Art (attached to RWEA)
	Burslem School of Art
	Derby School of Art
	Stoke School of Art
1854	First Report of the Department of Science and Art
	Crystal Palace Company's School of Art*
	Exeter School of Art
	Lambeth School of Art
	Saint Martin's School of Art
1856	Liverpool Institute and School of Arts
	Southampton College of Art
1858	Brighton School of Art
	Cambridge School of Art
1859	Ipswich School of Art
1863	Lincoln School of Art
1864	Report of the Select Committee on the Schools of Art
1865	Oxford School of Art
1866	Farnham School of Art
1867	Maidstone College of Art
1868	Canterbury Sidney Cooper School of Art

	Croydon School of Art	
1868-71	<i>The Slade Letters</i> ¹⁰⁵	
1870	Leicester School of Art	
	Middlesbrough School of Art	
1871	The Slade School of Art	
	Ruskin School of Drawing	
1874	Hartlepool Government School of Art	
1878	Bromley School of Art (later Ravensbourne)	
1880	Hornsey School of Arts	
	Bournemouth Government School of Art	
1881	Keswick School of Industrial Art	
1883	Liverpool School of Arts	
	Walthamstow School of Art*	
1884	Report of the Royal Commission on Technical Instruction: The Samuelson Report	
1886	Rochester College of Art	
1890	Wimbledon College of Arts	
1891	Goldsmiths' Technical and Recreative Institute	
1894	<i>How Gertrude teaches her Children</i> ¹⁰⁶	J H Pestalozzi
	London College of Printing	
1895	Chelsea School of Art	
	Putney School of Art*	
1896	Central School of Art and Design	
1897	Bilston School of Art	
1898	Camberwell School of Arts and Crafts	
1901	Sunderland School of Art	
1902	General Reports on Higher Education for 1902 (Board of Education)	
	Bournville College of Art	
	Falmouth School of Art	
1906	<i>The Restoration of the Guild System</i>	Arthur J. Penty
1910	Byam Shaw School of Art	

¹⁰⁵ fifty-nine letters by Victorian artists and academics relating to the foundation of the Slade School of Art at University College London in 1871.

¹⁰⁶ First English translation, originally published in 1801

1911	<i>Should We Stop Teaching Art</i>	C. R. Ashbee
1911	<i>The Training of the Memory in Art and the Education of the Artist, translated from the French by L D Luard</i> ¹⁰⁷	Lecoq de Boisbaudran
1911	Board of Education Circular 775	
1913	The Drawing Examination and the Advanced Examination	
1925	Grosvenor School of Modern Art*	
1932	Courtauld Institute	
1934	<i>Art and Industry: The Principles of Industrial Design</i>	Herbert Read
1936	Report of the Committee on Advanced Art Education in London: the Hambledon Report	
1937	East Anglian School of Painting and Drawing	
	Euston Road School (the School of Drawing and Painting)	
1943	<i>Plan for a School of Technological Design</i>	Norbert Dutton
1943	<i>Education through Art</i>	Herbert Read
1946	Ministry of Education Pamphlet No. 6: Art Education	
1946	The Intermediate Exam/National Diploma in Design	
1947	<i>Art Now</i> ¹⁰⁸	Herbert Read
1948	Bray Report (Ministry of Education: <i>Report of the Committee on Art Examinations</i>)	
1952	Freeman Report (National Advisory Committee on Art Examinations)	
1957	Freeman Report (<i>Report on Proposed Changes in the Art Examinations and in the Length of the Diploma Course</i>)	
	Ealing Art College	
1958	Ministry of Education Circular 340	
1958	The National Advisory Council for Art Education	
1960	First Report of the National Advisory Council on Art Education: <i>First Coldstream Report</i> (NACAE)	
1960	A Proposed Course in Basic Design	Norbert Dutton
1960	The Diploma in Art and Design (Dip. AD)	
1961	The National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design	

¹⁰⁷ The book was a compilation of three shorter pamphlets; *L'Éducation de la mémoire pittoresque*, 1847; *Un Coup d'œil sur l'enseignement des beaux-arts*, 1872; and *Lettres à un jeune professeur - sommaire d'une méthode pour l'enseignement du dessin et de la peinture*, 1877. As remarked in the thesis, the English were far behind the French in art education.

¹⁰⁸ The 1947 edition of *Art Now* (originally published in 1933) contains the statement "France, in spite of wars and economic catastrophes, still retains the undisputed leadership in modern art." Also "In America all modern styles flourish, in fabulous amity." Read's provocations would find a receptive response from art students in the 1960s, tired of the structures of figuration and the vernacular English styles.

1962	Second Report of the National Advisory Council on Art Education: <i>Vocational Courses in Colleges and School</i> (Second Coldstream Report) (NACAE)	
1964	First Report of the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design: <i>The Summerson Report</i> (NCDAD)	
1965	A Policy for the Arts: the first steps	Jenny Lee
1965	National Advisory Council on Art Education: <i>Addendum to First Coldstream Report</i> (NACAE)	
1965	Woolwich Polytechnic Speech	Antony Crosland
1966	A Policy for Design Education (SIAD)	
1966	Future Pattern of Higher Education within the F.E. system	
1966	Government and Academic Organisation of Polytechnics	
1967	SIAD proposal for separate vocational and advanced level Design courses	
1970	Joint Report of the National Advisory Council on Art Education (NACAE) and the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design (NCDAD): <i>The Structure of Art and Design Education in the Further Education Sector</i> (chair: Coldstream)	
1970	Second Report of the National Council for Diplomas in Art and Design	
1971	Circular 7/71, Department of Education and Science	
1974	Vocational Courses in Art and Design: The Gann Report	
1974	Diploma in Art and Design (Dip. AD) become BA (Hons)	
1974	NCDAD merged into the CNAAB	
1988	Education Reform Act (removed Polytechnics from Local Authority control)	
1992	The Further and Higher Education Act of 1992 (polytechnics became universities)	