



England Expects  
Every Man  
To Do  
His Duty

Megaron

COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL

# Chapter I

## Being British and Going ... Somewhere

*Lisa Tickner and David Peters Corbett*

Paul Nash, in his article on 'Going Modern and Being British' in 1932, famously sought to reconcile these two disparate and puzzling qualities.<sup>1</sup> He saw, and marvelled at, incompatibilities such as 'internationalism versus the pastoral; the functional versus the futile': Britishness was a ragbag of ancient quiddities and modernity something thrust upon it. Perhaps an appeal to the continuous and fluctuating nature of the present would provide the answer as a new 'being' emerged out of the old. Or perhaps Britishness and modernity were always somewhere at odds. But the attempt to reconcile them seemed important in 1932, and since Nash's puzzled but game effort there have been many attempts to forge a settlement.<sup>2</sup>

The Festival of Britain in 1951 sought to make a stirring statement about modernity and national identity to those who would soon become 'new Elizabethans'. But the contrived hopefulness of the early 1950s could not outweigh the effects of post-war austerity, decolonization, and a loss of standing on the international stage. 'Britishness' was advanced in other terms. Britain was the 'island nation' that withstood invasion, the home of Shakespeare and tradition or – as 'the modern' was invoked in the 1960s – of Quant and the Beatles rather than heavy engineering and nuclear power. An increasingly global economy of transport, finance and culture is evident in the shuttling of Kurt Schwitters, exiled by the War, between Norway, the Lake District and London, Peter Lanyon between St Ives and the US, or Frank Bowling between London, the Caribbean and New York; and institutionally in the rise of international exhibitions, the impact of American painting in Britain from the late 1950s, and the promotion of artists from Henry Moore to the pop generation by the British Council abroad. British art belongs in these increasingly transnational histories and geographies – before, during and after the disputed moment at which the 'modern' becomes 'late-' or 'post' – and the aim of this collection is to situate it in this broader and more comprehensive narrative context.

### The Conference

The collection derives from a conference held at the Courtauld Institute of Art in June 2010. The title we chose was 'New Approaches to British Art, 1939–1969', and the responses to it prompt us now to some observations on periodization, on approaches and on Britishness. In soliciting papers we suggested that British art had benefited from an extraordinary growth in scholarly studies over the last decade but that the rich history of the years between 1939 and 1969 remained relatively under-explored. Despite the buoyancy of the market, the large audiences for modern art

**Detail from Derek Boshier, *England's Glory*, 1962. Oil on canvas, 126 × 101 cm. Łódź: Muzeum Sztuki. © Derek Boshier.**

*British Art in the Cultural Field, 1939–69* Edited by Lisa Tickner and David Peters Corbett © 2012 Association of Art Historians.

internationally, and the significance of monographic exhibitions devoted to familiar names (Nicholson, Caro, Bacon, Freud), our impression was that there was still a dearth of younger scholars working in this period and little thematic and analytic study in comparison with scholarship on the nineteenth century or the early decades of the twentieth. The aim of the conference was to stimulate further study in the period and provide a forum in which new approaches and new material could be discussed and developed.

Some delegates took issue with our reading, either on the grounds that it underrated the significance of monographic studies, particularly major exhibition catalogues, for a developed account of post-war British art, or that it overlooked valuable contributions to the field from established authors – such as Margaret Garlake, James Hyman and Chris Stephens – that had indeed been more wide-ranging, analytic or thematic. These were certainly among our honourable exceptions, but we stand in broad terms by the assertion that fewer younger scholars have been working in this period, that monographic titles – see the lists of Ashgate and Lund Humphries, for example – have found readier markets, and that the history of a complex period has yet to be fully explored.

We were largely successful in soliciting proposals that dealt with the historiography of British art; with art, architecture and photography; with transnationalism and immigration; with austerity and Americanization; and with aspects of the institutional field including cultural policy, exhibitions, criticism and the market. There were certainly more interesting proposals than would fit into a two-day conference and more stimulating papers delivered at it than could, in the end, be squeezed into a single set of covers (even a specially extended issue of *Art History*). We were less successful in attracting essays that proposed new theoretical or methodological approaches, or which suggested fundamental shifts in the assessment of the period, perhaps because this is a moment of consolidation in the discipline and close focus in the analysis of twentieth-century British art.

### **Periodization**

Periodization is always a matter of artifice, of cutting a slice of time with loose threads hanging. Our opening bracket is one kind of marker: the outbreak of war. This, with the rise of fascism in the 1930s, led to a series of painful displacements with enormous consequences for British cultural life. Ernst Gombrich, Isaiah Berlin, Nikolaus Pevsner, Karl Popper, Melanie Klein, Kurt Schwitters, Piet Mondrian and Naum Gabo, along with Bela Horowitz (who founded the Phaidon Press), Walter Neurath (founder of Thames and Hudson) and George Weidenfeld (of Weidenfeld and Nicolson) were among those émigrés whose presence left a decisive imprint on post-war Britain.<sup>3</sup> There were fruitful exchanges, as Megan Luke discusses in relation to Schwitters and Herbert Read, and Chris Stephens in relation to the importance of Gabo's example for Lanyon in St Ives. Our closing bracket is another kind of marker. By the late 1960s, avant-garde activities had been reconfigured by the emergence of conceptual, process-oriented, installation and land art, and this 'dematerialization of the art object' was confirmed with the opening of Charles Harrison's version of *When Attitudes Become Form* at the ICA in London in 1969.<sup>4</sup>

Periodization is of course about synchrony as well as diachrony, about connections between unevenly stranded political, economic, social and cultural developments as well as about a sequence of events unfolding in linear time. In Ludmilla Jordanova's words, 'If you believe in the significance of basic economic, political and social structures, or that the look of different things is linked, then it

behoves you to keep working on how to understand those connections in a satisfying way.<sup>5</sup> This can't be a matter of glib connections, of the 'micro' as the 'macro' in miniature. The cultural field has its own internal dynamics – its own developing histories – but its 'relative autonomy' from other activities and spheres of influence is partial and contingent.

### Approaches

'New approaches' here are less a matter of a particular model, or set of analytic concepts, imported from elsewhere (Marxism, feminism, psychoanalysis, varieties of structuralism and post-structuralism in relatively pure or hybrid doses), and more a question of unfamiliar framings, close readings, or neglected archives. New material rather than new methods. This has nothing to do with post-war British art *per se* and everything to do with the state of the disciplinary field. The social history of art was transformed in the 1970s and 1980s by the challenge of theories addressed in the first instance to questions of economics, ideology, subjectivity and power. There is now a degree of consensus that these are, or can be, integrated with an expanded model of the social history of art capable of absorbing the insights they offered. Art-historical analysis may be more open-ended now, more rooted in the object, more sensitive to reception, and more catholic and pragmatic in its theoretical interests. As James Meyer remarks, formal or structuralist and socio-historical approaches, once at loggerheads, have drawn closer together: 'Increasingly, the most nuanced social readings attend closely to the work's structure and, conversely, some of our most innovative formal accounts have benefited from an integration of economic and social detail. The critic ... may arrive at a syncretic approach suited to the task at hand.'<sup>6</sup>

The task may involve a double focus, as the work itself is understood to open onto the relations that made it possible, to which it contributes, and within which it is (or perhaps fails to be) understood. In 'prosopography', the history of science has provided a sophisticated account of the ways in which institutional structures and individual and group biographies interact to bring about cultural change through complex social systems (rather than unfettered individual endeavour). A more comprehensive and nuanced model for art history, however, might be found in the sociology of Pierre Bourdieu.

Our title alludes to Bourdieu's concept of 'the autonomous cultural field', which is understood as embracing the works themselves (within a historically developing space of possibilities), their producers (whose strategies and trajectories derive from their positions and dispositions as agents), and all those instances of legitimation by which cultural products are recognized and ranked (by audiences, publishers, curators, academies and critics) in public and personal economies of meaning and value. This has the advantage of recognizing the shifting dynamics and productive effects of a field of active relations, structured by individuals and institutions with different levels of economic or cultural capital, and of understanding agents – again, not as unfettered individuals – but as simultaneously 'shaped' (in their dispositions and by their positions in the field) and 'shaping' (through their active contributions to it).

There are drawbacks to Bourdieu's scheme for art historians, but it has the merit of a conceptual framework generous enough to absorb insights from elsewhere (from Marxism, feminism or psychoanalysis, for example), and at the same time to situate local contributions (monographs, group or institutional studies, close readings) in relation to each other and to the overall space of a structured but dynamic cultural field. Many art-historical projects have operated in effect with just

such a set of implicit or explicit assumptions, and there is of course no final 'theory of everything' – as opposed to an ongoing conversation about the meanings and value of cultural works.<sup>7</sup>

We should like to claim, however, that collectively these papers represent a series of boreholes into the dense structure of the field of British art in this period. Or perhaps the metaphor is closer to illumination: to a torch shone into dusty corners, or the flashes of brilliance from a prism passed over familiar ground. In some cases the focus is tight but suggestive (as in Megan Luke's account of Herbert Read in Schwitters' studio); in others it pulls back to a wider view (as in Leon Wainwright's discussion of Frank Bowling's transatlantic identities). In either case the yield can be unexpected moments of magnification and pleasure.

### **Britishness**

The greatly increased art-historical attention paid to British art over the past two decades has not been motivated by any desire to discover an essential national identity in the art produced and consumed in this country. It seemed necessary to assert and defend a focus on British art as a hitherto neglected topic with serious significance for any ambitious account of modern art and culture. Tactically, it made sense to avoid deconstructing the idea of 'Britishness' until the idea that British art, from periods not previously much thought of, had taken root and become at least tolerably convincing. At the same time, there was from the first an acknowledgement that the historical conditions and circumstances of Britain were particular to a local history that needed to be traced and integrated into the histories of art, and that the art made, bought and understood in Britain was part of broader currents of production and consumption, comprehension and affiliation that extended across the globe. Art in Britain cannot now be thought apart from these, and with a rigorous scepticism towards arbitrary and clichéd attributions of national identity. It is notable that scholars from outside Britain writing on British topics (such as Claire Zimmerman or Anne Wagner) regularly place the work in a broad field of reference and debate and do so without apology.

The essays in this collection neither under- nor over-state the 'Britishness' of their subject matter. Where they consider it, they see Britishness – like sociologists and other historians – largely as a collection of attributes that have their being chiefly as tropes within traditions of representation.<sup>8</sup> A major narrative that features in many of these essays (those of Luke, Wainwright, Catherine Jolivette, Alex Potts, Chris Stephens, Andrew Stephenson and Lisa Tickner in particular) concerns the working through of a sense of Britain's diminished place in the post-war world, a sense exacerbated by the loss of an imperial role, the disruption to established systems of British society and the increasing political, economic and cultural power and influence of the USA. 'British' was now acquiring meaning in reference (and deference) to 'Americanness', a meaning both indebted and opposed, suggesting both the promise of increased consumer affluence on the American model and the threat to British cultural identity of 'Americanization'.

All of this meant that the neat but precarious balance of Nash's 'Modern' and 'British' had largely collapsed. Both terms were under question and both revealed – as, indeed, had always been the case – a plurality of diverse and even contradictory meanings. In the 1950s this diversity was partly concealed by the enviable sense that other countries had achieved the ideal position of a modern, national, cultural expression rather better, the School of Paris and then the influence of the New York art world dominating the cultural landscape. Britain seemed to lag behind. In the

1960s, however, the emergence of a glamorous and exportable version of modernity that was British-led, and acknowledged by Americans, for whom 'swinging London' held an appeal compounded of that sly sibling mixture of admiration and contempt that a common language allows, made it possible for British art to flourish without the sting of anxiety that was present twenty years earlier for Nash. Realism (see here Andrew Lee and Alex Potts), diversity and 'belatedness' (Wainwright), and the mutation of local cultures under the pressure of a new internationalism and nascent globalism (Stephenson, Wainwright), joined the propulsion of change and representation in British pop and its avatars (Potts, Tickner) to reflect new circumstances and fresh potential.

### The Essays

In his essay on Francis Bacon, Martin Hammer explores the idea that for Bacon photographs were a stimulus to what could only be accomplished in paint, something to trigger an image that would strike 'immediately onto the nervous system'. He turns to Roland Barthes's description of the 'punctum' in *Camera Lucida* – that element in a photograph that 'pricks' or 'wounds' a particular viewer who is 'animated' by it – as something close to Bacon's almost visceral response to a stimulus that might 'animate' his painting. In this scenario the photograph sparks off, or chimes with, existing elements in what Bacon described as the 'haze of sensations and feelings and ideas' in which he worked. On the other hand, there are indications that he sometimes had an idea in mind and was able to extract, from the rich mulch of images in his studio, a particular photograph or fragment to serve the purpose at hand.

Catherine Jolivette takes up a topic that has been widely recognized but left almost entirely undiscussed in relation to the visual arts. The splitting of the atom, and the subsequent development of the atomic bomb with its unprecedented destructive power, produced in the years following the conclusion of the Second World War a grim consciousness of both the capacities of modern science and the intimate presence of oblivion. The emergence of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament and the march on Aldermaston towards the end of the 1950s offset the upbeat molecular design language of the Festival of Britain at the start of the decade. Jolivette sees the mood of unease that has been attributed to the post-war decade as governed in significant ways by the threat of nuclear destruction. She reads images such as Peter Lanyon's *St Just* (1953) as expressive of contemporary anxieties and blends the productions of fine artists and sculptors like Henry Moore into the themes that were being explored and promulgated in popular culture such as the television series *Quatermass* (1953). In Jolivette's account, central questions which preoccupied society in the post-war years are given as widespread and mordant expression in the fine arts as elsewhere in culture. If these responses might seem on the ideological level to divide too neatly into the positive and the downbeat, in practice the range of responses and the diversity of forms and subjects into which the emotional load was distilled makes for a complex field of response.

Andrew Lee concentrates on the 'battle for realism' in post-war British art, arguing that it is possible to trace the pressures of debate around the role and valency of abstraction and figuration in the contested figures that Francis Bacon and other artists produced in their work. For Lee the body and its representation as figure are highly invested social distillates, the grounds of not only aesthetic but also social debate. The complex realities of post-war British life and the fraught debates about the ability of abstraction and figuration to assess and diagnose them are given expression through Bacon's handling of the figure, so that *Study for Portrait of van Gogh VI* (1957)

which is formed as a void 'emptying into its surroundings' thereby conjures up a version of the body as 'informe', 'low', and problematic in relation to established norms and structures. Whereas the refusal of the body in abstraction preserves these norms by default, the figuration deployed by Bacon and contemporaries such as De Kooning probes and upsets stabilizing social norms.

Megan Luke's paper on Herbert Read in the studio of Kurt Schwitters offers a reminder of the always contingent and international relations shaping a 'British' cultural field (here in the context of an émigré artist and his local reception in the 1940s). The War had largely severed Schwitters' relations with a cohort of international artists and architects, and he wrote to a correspondent in 1946 that England was 'artistically at a standpoint from before 1914'. Luke is attentive to Schwitters' isolation, to the archive and the historical moment, but also to what can be understood from a close formal analysis of the work. She looks at the conversations between artist and critic and traces the qualified impact of Schwitters' work on Read's understanding of sculptural form. But Read 'sacrifices the truly radical proposition' inherent in his essay on Schwitters' work, and despite his enthusiasm for its 'roughness' – what he called its 'deep protest against the chromium-plated conception of modernism' – he could only respond in part to objects that were highly tactile, polychrome, 'skinned' with plaster, obdurately unnatural and complete in themselves (unlike Henry Moore's contemporary pebbles and flints).

Alex Potts' essay explores how the concerns that brought together artists, architects and cultural commentators and critics in the loosely constituted Independent Group in the early and mid-1950s were manifested in two key artistic practices that are usually opposed in their cultural and political resonance. Richard Hamilton and Eduardo Paolozzi shared interests with a great deal of experimental art of the 1950s and early 1960s that was anxious to produce an engagement between art and life felt to be lacking in the self-consciously abstract work that dominated the post-war art scene. Such experimental art, sometimes dubbed 'new realist', strove for a vividness and range of reference to the realities of the contemporary world. Highly catholic and hybrid in its use of heterogeneous materials and imagery, it worked from and through the materials of everyday modern experience and sought to cast them into meaningful forms that would speak to the denizens of this life. Although opposed to the formalist, self-referential tendencies of post-war modernism, Potts shows that artists such as Hamilton and Paolozzi and cultural commentators, notably Reyner Banham, 'were nevertheless in their own way fascinated by and often seduced by the wayward logic of form and structure'.

Jonathan Katz offers an innovative reading of British pop art, arguing that Richard Hamilton's 'self-consciously anti-oppositional modernism' can be productively understood through 'its surprisingly queer relation to gender and sexual norms'. For Katz, Hamilton's espousal of the 'cool' aesthetic of the late 1950s carries with it a ferocious need to destabilize the 'binary' distinctions that express power and hierarchy in established society. A straight male artist, Hamilton fascinates because he mobilizes the potential of gender as his lead exemplar of 'wobbly tension', in 'a contestatory structure in which neither term gets to carry the day'. Katz traces the unfolding dissident potential of this move through an analysis of Hamilton's queering of gender positions. In the process, Hamilton is confirmed as a major and radical artist in unexpected ways.

Taking her cue from Lawrence Alloway's 1971 essay, 'Anthropology and Art Criticism', Catherine Spencer explores the significance of anthropology as a reference point for the Independent Group. She traces their interest in what Mass

Observation called ‘an anthropology of ourselves’ and asks how this shaped their work and contributed to an understanding of the relations between individuals and the consumer environment. Anthropology suggested the idea of culture as ‘a whole way of life’ (in Raymond Williams’s phrase) rather than a sifting of the ‘best that has been thought and said in the world’ (in Matthew Arnold’s). It offered an alternative to the ‘high/low’ categories Alloway associated with an earlier generation (Roger Fry, Herbert Read, Clement Greenberg), and against which he advanced the concept of a ‘long front’ of culture – explicitly linking the anthropological model with the pop aesthetic. The affinity was especially close in the case of Nigel Henderson whose wife, Judith, was a social anthropologist engaged in fieldwork in Bethnal Green. A shared ‘anthropological’ perspective increased the Independent Group’s sensitivity to social networks and the communicative (rather than conventionally aesthetic) potential of everyday materials, and linked the otherwise distinct activities of Henderson, the Smithsons, Paolozzi, and Hamilton. There was a democratizing aspect to the ‘long front’ of culture but, as Spencer points out, the Independent Group was perhaps not immune from the accusation levelled at Mass Observation: that it risked constructing working-class culture on the colonial model as ‘exotic’ and ‘unknown’.

Chris Stephens claims that the challenge for historians has been to provide adequate accounts of an ‘original and pertinent’ art, alert to its specificities, neither under- nor overplaying debts incurred first to continental Europe and then to the ‘triumph’ of American painting. He argues that attitudes to post-war British art are still inflected by American values (elevating artists and works associated with the Independent Group and pop, for example), and by the continued identification of significant European art with figuration and American art with abstraction. In his view, the question at stake in the post-war years was whether the progressive ideals of the 1930s could be revived and whether art could or should ‘reflect, address or simply absorb recent events and the collapse of the pre-war movements’. Stephens then turns to St Ives and sets out to demonstrate how ‘the modernist project was continued and developed in Cornwall during the war’, and how Hepworth, Nicholson and others attempted to sustain it as the basis for a modernist vision in the 1940s and 1950s. Lanyon’s eventual rejection of Hepworth and Nicholson leads to a new kind of landscape, which in *St Just* can ‘lay claim to being the most original painting made in Britain in this period’. Lanyon’s letters reveal it as at once a memorial to the Levant mine disaster, a Crucifixion, a deeply personal act of psychic reparation and – through other associations – an allusion to broader histories of violence and trauma. He occupies common ground with Bacon, in other words, and Stephens argues that we fail to understand his attitude to landscape in a work like *St Just* if we miss a similar sense of existential crisis and fail to recognize that he uses place as Bacon uses the figure: ‘for expressions of states of being: of unease, of apprehension, of being in the world’.

Andrew Stephenson’s study of *Painting and Sculpture of a Decade ’54–’64*, the Tate Gallery’s landmark exhibition, 22 April–28 June 1964, explores the brief art boom before the economic slump of 1966–67. The study of the relationship between curatorial strategy, exhibition culture and the political economy of art in post-war Britain has attracted relatively little attention until recently, despite the growing importance of exhibitions at the time. The decade from the mid-1950s until the mid-1960s was a key transitional period in this political, economic and military realignment, when contemporary American art was perhaps most forcefully enlisted and exported to its European allies, thereby generating altered perspectives on the transatlantic cultural relationship, the newly empowered status of modern American



art and the growing pre-eminence of the New York art market. Stephenson reviews the changes in London institutions such as the ICA, the Gulbenkian Foundation, and the Tate Gallery, and the growing numbers of students of art and art history, which contributed to the climate of interest. This exhibition resonated as a symbol of the vibrant London art scene of the 1960s. Partly, this was because of the strong transatlantic dimension, but the growth of these alliances was notably resisted by John Berger who in 1959 saw overt promotion of American art, and abstract expressionism in particular, as demonstrating 'how rearmament and cold war thinking' had infiltrated localized artistic concerns in Europe marking out a pervasive Americanisation at work. The '54-'64 show therefore also marks a moment when the tensions across the Atlantic divide were becoming clarified.

Lisa Tickner's essay is concerned with the promotion of British art and design as an increasingly important component of national identity in the 1960s. The asymmetry between national economic crisis and local art-world prosperity helped create the conditions in which a thriving British culture could be promoted abroad. The British Council, operating with funds discretely diverted from the Board of Trade, was active in providing the 'cultural quid pro quo' demanded by the export drive, and a new generation of artists provided the stimulus for a shift from 'heritage' to 'modern' values in the projection of a new, 'Creative Britain'. The essay sets out to map the intersections of art, design, politics and trade at three events in 1967: 'British Week' in Brussels, 'British Fortnight' at Neiman Marcus in Dallas, and the British Pavilion at Expo '67 in Montreal. It explores the question of reception as something institutional, collective and instrumental, rather than essentially individual and passive, and – borrowing from Bourdieu – it offers an account of one particular instance in relations between the cultural field, the social field and the field of power.

Leon Wainwright's essay examines Frank Bowling who was 'warmly received in his day and arrived as contemporary', but whose status in this way has lapsed as a canon for British pop art has subsequently formed so that he has come to exemplify the 'belated outsider'. Wainwright suggests that the established principles of value that govern this canon-making and maintenance must be shaken up if a range of artists, particularly from outside the establishment, is to be recognized. Bowling moved in 1967 from London to New York and pursued the abstract painting that now largely defines him. In Britain he could only be both an outsider and belated; in the broader possibilities offered by New York he could hop to occupy the mainstream. Wainwright raises significant questions about the 'arbiters of value' involved in judging British pop and about the possibility of 'decolonizing' its procedures and histories.

Finally, Claire Zimmerman looks at the work of architects Alison and Peter Smithson, and James Stirling, in two buildings depicted in two sets of photographs: Nigel Henderson's image of the Smithsons, four-square in front of the rigorous geometry of Hunstanton Secondary School, and Richard Einzig's image of Stirling, half-hidden among the steel roof-trusses in the Cambridge History Faculty. She argues that photography, through the mass media, has become a constituent part of architectural activity rather than a secondary record of it, and alongside this she is interested in how the Smithsons and Stirling have come to be positioned on either side of the late modernism/postmodernism divide. She relates the 'demonstrative clarity' of Hunstanton School (the intelligibility of its plan and the transparency of its architecture) to what she terms 'architectural indexicality'. This concept is elaborated through an adaptation of semiotics to the architectural tradition running through nineteenth-century 'structural rationalism' (as it was understood in the Gothic Revival) to twentieth-century functionalism (in which the forms of a building

were determined by their use). Hunstanton's structural and functional lucidity is legible on the ground and in images on the page. This is very different from the photograph of Stirling among his roof trusses in Cambridge or in an earlier work, the Leicester Engineering Building, designed by Stirling and Gowan and completed in 1963. Hunstanton is described as an 'indexical' architecture of structural clarity, while the Leicester building is a 'rich and eclectic montage' of fragments. Both buildings reveal an acute awareness of the importance of photographs, but where Hunstanton 'engages architectural propositions deciphered from images', Leicester 'assembles images blown back up into three dimensional things'. The difference between the modern and the postmodern is less a matter of style than of attitude: for the Smithsons, architecture is a responsible activity with real agency over social experience; for Stirling, it has a fantasy component offering a fictional narrative of utopian desires.

The conference 'New Approaches to British Art, 1939–1969' took place in June 2010 at the Courtauld Institute of Art. It was generously supported by the Courtauld's Research Forum, the University of York, the University of East Anglia, the Henry Moore Foundation and the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art. The Paul Mellon Centre has, in addition, awarded a publication grant that has enabled us to expand the number of pages in this issue of *Art History*, for which we are extremely grateful. The essays published here were all first delivered as papers at this conference, except for that by Andrew Lee. Like Catherine Spencer, Lee graduated from Lisa Tickner's MA course at the Courtauld Institute of Art, 'Modernism in Britain, 1890–1970', funded initially by Sir Nicholas Goodison. A number of students have gone on to PhD research or to positions in museums and galleries and we are grateful for Sir Nicholas's initiative in supporting modern British art studies in this way. Regrettably, we were unable to include a fascinating paper by Anne Wagner due to her prior commitment, as the then Henry Moore Foundation Research Curator at Tate, to the first Rothenstein lecture in October 2010.<sup>9</sup> We are indebted to a number of individuals but in particular to our contributors, of course; to Professor Caroline Arscott, Head of Research, and Cynthia De Souza and Ingrid Guiot in the Research Forum at the Courtauld Institute of Art; and to Sam Bibby at *Art History* for his unflappable efficiency and calm.

#### Notes

- 1 Paul Nash, 'Going modern and being British', *Weekend Review*, 12 March 1932.
- 2 The most substantial is Charles Harrison, *English Art and Modernism, 1900–1939*, 2nd edn., New Haven and London, 1994. See also, David Peters Corbett, *The Modernity of English Art, 1914–1930*, Manchester, 1997; David Peters Corbett and Lara Perry, eds, *English Art 1860–1914: Modern Artists and Identity*, Manchester, 2000; and Lisa Tickner, *Modern Life and Modern Subjects: British Art in the Early Twentieth Century*, New Haven and London, 2000.
- 3 Robert Hewison, *Culture and Consensus: England, Art and Politics since 1940*, London, 1995, 82.
- 4 Harrison's adaptation of Harald Szeemann's Bern exhibition, *When Attitudes Become Form: Work – Processes – Situations*, opened at the ICA in London in August 1969.
- 5 Ludmilla Jordanova, in conversation; but see Jordanova, 'Periodisation', in *History in Practice*, London, 2000, 114–40. See also Fredric Jameson, 'Periodizing the sixties', in Sohnya Sayres et al., eds, *The 60s Without Apology*, Minneapolis, MN, 1984, 178–209.
- 6 James Meyer, *Minimalism: Art and Polemics in the Sixties*, New Haven

- and London, 2001, 9. Meyer continues: 'That is, one follows clues implicit in the work or historical problem rather than allowing a theory to predict in advance the interpretative result. The object however defined, suggests how to proceed rather than the other way round.' Jordanova, borrowing a term from sociology, refers to this as 'grounded theory': a 'pragmatic and flexible' approach that 'seeks to develop an apt framework out of the materials themselves'; *History in Practice*, 70.
- 7 This is to suggest the interpretative usefulness of Bourdieu's concepts, not to advance another 'master narrative'.
- 8 See, for a cogent version of these ideas, Robert Colls, *Identity of England*, Oxford, 2002.
- 9 Anne Wagner, 'Scale in sculpture: The sixties and Henry Moore', *Tate Papers*, 15, Spring 2011, <http://www.tate.org.uk/research/tateresearch/tatepapers/11spring/wagner.shtml>.